



December 1, 2017

**TO:** Northern Delta-Mendota Region Management Committee,  
Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Steering Committee,  
Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Management Committee, and  
Interested Parties

**FROM:** Jason Peltier, Secretary (by Cheri Worthy)

**RE: JOINT MEETING OF THE NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION GSA  
STEERING COMMITTEE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE,  
THURSDAY, December 7, 2017, 1:30 P.M.**

Attached for your review in preparation of the December 7, 2017 Joint Meeting of the Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region, Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA, and Management Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA are:

- 1) Notice & Agenda
- 2) Draft June 12, 2017, September 21, 2017, and October 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- 3) Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region GSP Development Scope of Services
- 4) SGMA Activities Budget

Thank you, and please give us a call if you have any questions or concerns regarding this information.



December 1, 2017

**TO:** Northern Delta-Mendota Region Management Committee,  
Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Steering Committee,  
Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Management Committee and  
Interested Parties

**FROM:** Jason Peltier, Secretary (by Cheri Worthy)

**RE: JOINT MEETING OF THE NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION GSA  
STEERING COMMITTEE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE,  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7th, 2017, 1:30 P.M.**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that a Joint Meeting of the Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region, Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA, and Management Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA has been called for **Thursday, December 07, 2017, 1:30 P.M., at the Santa Nella County Water District, 12931 South Hwy 33, Santa Nella, California**, on items listed on the attached agenda, which is incorporated by reference and made a part hereof.

This Joint Meeting is being noticed pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54950 et seq.) as an informational workshop at which quorums of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region Management Committee, Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Management Committee, and Central Delta-Mendota Region GSA Steering Committee may be present and may discuss the items listed on the attached agenda.



**Notice of  
Joint Meeting of the  
Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region Activity Agreement and  
Meeting of the  
Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota Multi-Agency GSA, and Management  
Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota Region Activity Agreement**

**Thursday December 7th, 2017, 1:30 PM  
Santa Nella County Water District, 12931 South Hwy 33, Santa Nella, CA**

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Opportunity for Public Comment

**Action Items**

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - a. June 12, 2017(North & Central)
  - b. September 21, 2017 (Special Meeting, North & Central)
  - c. October 26, 2017 (North & Central)
4. Approve SLDMWA contract with Woodard & Curran for GSP Development and Program Management - Garcia
  - a. Agreement
  - b. Scope of Services and Fee Estimate

**Report Items**

5. Preliminary Activity Agreement Budget – Garcia
  - a. Fiscal Year 19 Budget Estimate

- b. Contract Agreement Estimate
  - c. Coordinated Plan Expenses Estimate
- 6. Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(2)
- 7. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with a disability may request disability-related modification or accommodation by contacting Cheri Worthy at the Water Authority, 842 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Banos, CA 93635, and telephone: (209) 826-9696 at least 3 for regular or 1 for special day(s) before the meeting date.

**JOINT WORKSHOP OF MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE NORTHERN-DELTA  
MENDOTA REGION, STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL DELTA-  
MENDOTA GSA, AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL DELTA-  
MENDOTA GSA**

**MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 12, 2017**

The Joint Workshop of the Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region, Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA, and Management Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA convened at approximately 10:30 a.m. at 842 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Banos, California.

**Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region**

**Members and Alternate Members in Attendance**

Lacey Kiriakou – Merced County  
Walt Ward – Stanislaus County  
Fernando Ulloa – City of Patterson

**Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota GSA Members and**

**Alternate Members in Attendance**

Vince Luchessi – San Luis Water District  
Steven Sopp – Fresno County  
Randy Miles – Eagle Field Water District  
Aaron Barcellos – Pacheco Water District

**Authority Representatives Present**

Andrew Garcia, Associate Civil Engineer  
Frances Mizuno, Assistant Executive Director  
Jason Peltier, Executive Director

**Others in Attendance**

Kirsten Pringle, Workshop Facilitator, Stantec  
Lisa Beutler, Stantec  
Amanda Peish-Derby California Department of Water Resources  
Chris Olvera, California Department of Water Resources  
Ben Gallegos, City of Firebaugh  
Roy Catania – Aliso Water District  
Jennifer Parks – Fresno County  
Chris Linneman – Panoche Water District  
Jarret Martin – CCID  
Mario Gouveia – Firebaugh Consultant  
Koosun Kim – City of Newman  
John Beam – Grassland WD  
Valerie Kincaid – Oro Loma Water District  
Julia Berry – Madera County  
Joe Hopkins – Aliso Water District (Provost & Pritchard)

**1. Call to Order**

The Workshop was called to order by Kirsten Pringle at approximately 10:30 AM.

**2. Opportunity for Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**3. Review of GSA Survey Results, Garcia**

Andrew Garcia reviewed the results of the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) survey conducted by the Authority. There was brief discussion about the development of a single or multiple GSP(s) for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin.

**4. Review of Delta-Mendota Subbasin Stakeholder Assessment, Beutler**

Lisa Beutler from Stantec reviewed the results of the Delta-Mendota Subbasin Stakeholder Assessment. Mr. Beutler noted that the results of the Stakeholder Assessment would be further developed into a communications plan for the entire subbasin.

**5. Review of Process for Subbasin Coordination, Peish-Derby and Olvera**

Amanda Peish-Derby and Chris Olvera from the California Department of Water Resources reviewed the process for subbasin coordination, including the options and requirements for developing a GSP in a subbasin with multiple GSAs. Peish-Derby and Olvera also discussed the requirements for a Coordination Agreement in a basin with multiple GSPs. There was lengthy discussion about the development of a single or multiple GSP(s) for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin, coordination efforts and management areas. It was agreed that the consultants from Stantec, under the direction of the Authority, would develop a fact sheet outlining the potential advantages and disadvantages of each GSP option.

**6. Prop 1 Grant Application – Process for Submitting Application, Pringle**

Kirsten Pringle from Stantec led a discussion on the Proposition 1 (Prop 1) grant application for Groundwater Sustainability Plans and Projects. It was agreed that Authority would be the applicant for the Prop 1 grant and hire a consultant to develop the grant proposal. There was a discussion about cost allocation for the grant development costs. It was proposed that the cost of developing the grant proposal would be divided equally among the 23 GSAs in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin.

Authority staff stated that they would develop request a proposal on the costs of the grant application preparation and send the proposal amount to each GSA in the subbasin. It was requested that each GSA bring the grant proposal cost share to their boards no later than July 1, 2017. There was further discussion about the project list for the Prop 1 grant. It was agreed that each GSA in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin would inform Andrew Garcia from the Authority their decision to participate in the grant application and to send a proposed project list for the Prop 1 grant no later than July 1, 2017.

**7. Adjournment**

The next Joint Workshop date was announced to be Wednesday, July 12 at 10:30 am. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 PM.

Approved by:

---

Chairman

Attest:

---

Secretary

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE NORTHERN  
DELTA-MENDOTA REGION ACTIVITY AGREEMENT

MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 21, 2017

The Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region Activity Agreement convened at approximately 10:30 a.m. at 7995 Bruns Rd, Byron, California.

**Steering Committee Members and Alternate Members in Attendance**

Vince Lucchesi – Member  
Walt Ward – Member  
Lacey Kiriakou - Member  
Adam Scheuber - Alternate

**Authority Representatives Present**

Andrew Garcia

**Others in Attendance**

Joe McGahan – Central Delta-Mendota Region Multi-Agency GSA

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The Meeting was called to order by Andrew Garcia at approximately 10:30 AM.

**2. Opportunity for Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Action Items**

**3. Interview Consultants for Program Management and Preparation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan**

Mr. Garcia informed the group that three consultant teams would be interviewed by the Committee and Andrew Garcia and Joe McGahan for the GSP development and Program Management work. The teams were from prime consultants of Kennedy Jenks & Associates, Woodard & Curran, and Hydrofocus Inc. The interview panel allocated 75 minutes to each team and heard a presentation of approximately 20 minutes followed by 55 minutes of question and answer. General questions were asked as well as specific questions any member of the panel may have had based on the presentation and methodology and approach described for the work scope.

After the interviews were complete, the interview panel of the North Committee with Andrew Garcia and Joe McGahan discussed the proposed Program Management strategy for coordinating multiple GSPs as well as the development of a Northern/Central Region GSP in the Delta Mendota Subbasin.

The Committee and interview panel agreed to recommend to the Northern DM Region Management Committee, Central DM Region Management Committee and Central DM Region Multi-Agency GSA Steering Committee to negotiate a scope of work with the



Woodard & Curran team for this effort.

4. **Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(2)**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Approved by:

---

Chairman

Attest:

---

Secretary

MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION ACTIVITY AGREEMENT AND MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA MULTI-AGENCY GSA, AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION ACTIVITY AGREEMENT

MEETING MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 26, 2017

The Management Committee of the Northern Delta-Mendota Region Activity Agreement, the Steering Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota Multi-Agency GSA, and the Management Committee of the Central Delta-Mendota Region Activity Agreement convened at approximately 10:40 a.m. at 842 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Banos, California.

**Steering Committee Members and Alternate Members in Attendance**

Danny Wade – Alternate  
Vince Luchessi – Member  
Anthea Hansen – Member – via phone  
Damian Aragona – Member  
Amy Montgomery – Member  
Aaron Barcellos – Member  
Joe McGahan – Member  
Juan Cadena – Alternate  
Christina Guzman – Alternate  
Ben Fenters – Alternate  
Glenn Allen – Alternate  
Lacy Kiriakou – Member  
John Bennett – Member

**Authority Representatives Present**

Andrew Garcia  
Frances Mizuno – via phone

**Others in Attendance**

Lauren Layne – Legal Counsel for TID/FSWD  
Leslie Dumas – Woodard and Curran

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The Meeting was called to order by Aaron Barcellos at approximately 10:40 AM.

**2. Opportunity for Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Action Items**

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- a. September 28, 2017 (North and Central)

Motion to approve the Minutes of the September 28, 2017 meeting by Joe McGahan.  
Second by Danny Wade. All agree.

**4. Appointment of Regional Committee Representatives for Inter-Basin Coordination**

Andrew Garcia opened with a discussion of the initial Inter-basin meeting and the need to appoint representatives from the North and Central agencies. The meeting should focus on data sharing and modeling, especially for overlapping areas. There was a discussion of the group interaction and how to coordinate meetings. He noted that Fresno and Modesto (overlapping areas) are not severely over-drafted. There was a discussion of who is the best representative, for example, landowners or agencies, and whether representatives should be technical or policy makers. The group consensus was that technical should be considered first and then as the GSP develops there could be more management/policy maker input. There was further discussion of coordination agreements (for Inter-basin participants), ongoing monitoring, assumptions, and impacts to each basin. Vincent Luchessi and Ben Fenter volunteered as representatives for the Northern and Central, respectively, and will report back to the group in a standing agenda item.

**5. Update on Draft Delta-Mendota Sub-Basin Coordination Agreement**

Diane Rathman is currently working on a draft coordination agreement. The Coordination Committee will review a draft the first week of December.

**6. Introduction of Woodard & Curran team for GSP Development and Program Management**

Leslie Dumas was introduced and gave a PowerPoint presentation that included an organizational chart, those working on the project, and a schedule. There was a lengthy discussion of the amount of work to be done in a short period of time. She also advised that a draft GSP would need to be ready by next Summer/Fall, that GSPs will need to be updated every five years under SGMA, and other SGMA deadlines. She presented a work breakdown schedule and went through nine tasks line by line. There was a discussion concerning Proposition 218, Proposition 26 guidance and the number of GSPs in the DM Sub-basin. There was further discussion of cost sharing, the Grant Application and the nine attachments that must be part of the Application.

**7. Status of Prop 1 Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant Application**

**a. Draft Application Package**

Leslie Dumas presented the nine attachments required for the Application. She discussed that Del Puerto would be the applicant for the funding and she further explained each attachment and its purpose. She shared a goal schedule for submittal of the Grant Application and shared her opinion on DWRs review period, signing of the agreement and actual funding. There was a discussion of the amount of money available for funding and the categories that will receive funding. There was a discussion about how the funding would be split among the participants and four options were covered. There was a question concerning funding of the GSP and percentages as to each participant has been determined in the Activity Agreement. It was decided that Del Puerto will ask the Authority to manage the costs.

**b. Scope of Services**

The Scope of Work was presented. It was agreed that the group would review the Scope of Work and respond with comments by November 3, 2017. The Scope of Work will be part of the Grant Application.

**8. Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(2)**

No report was presented.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon. The next meeting will be held on December 7, 2017 at 1:30 pm.

Approved by:

---

Chairman

Attest:

---

Secretary

# NORTHERN AND CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION GSP DEVELOPMENT

## Scope of Services

### Task 1: Funding Administration

Activities under Task 1 will begin starting with receipt of Notice to Proceed (anticipated to occur at the end of November 2017) in order to meet the SGMA deadline of January 31, 2020 for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin.

Project funding and administration activities carried out under Task 1 are exclusive to GSP development activities and are therefore not duplicative of activities carried out under the following projects, which partially overlay the Subbasin and are funded under the SGWP Proposition 1 *Counties with Stressed Basins* grant program:

- Fresno County's Kings/Westside Subbasin Boundary Monitoring Project
- Madera County's Madera Subbasin and Chowchilla Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Formation
- Merced County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Program
- San Joaquin County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project
- Stanislaus County's Programmatic EIR (PEIR) for Implementation of Stanislaus County Groundwater Ordinance

Activities to be conducted under this task are related to grant administration, including invoicing and reporting. Specifically, this task will include processing eight (8) quarterly reports throughout the extent of the funding agreement as well as a project completion report upon submittal of the Final GSP to DWR.

#### **Task 1 Deliverables:**

- *DWR Quarterly Progress Reports*
- *DWR Project Completion Report*

### Task 2: Data Management

While groundwater and surface water data have been collected in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin for decades, data exists as local data sets primarily collected and maintained by local agencies to meet agency-specific objectives. The existing data are stored in multiple formats and need to be centralized to display and disseminate the information to interested parties, as well as to simplify annual reporting requirements. To date, the Delta-Mendota Subbasin has been managed without a complete understanding of subsurface inflows and outflows with adjoining subbasins, as well as groundwater-surface water interactions in the subbasin. The intent of Task 2 is to compile data and develop a Data Management System (DMS), as required under GSP Regulations § 352.6, which states that each Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) develop and maintain a DMS that is capable of storing and reporting information relevant to the development or implementation of the GSP and monitoring of the subbasin.

The GSP will focus on improving hydrogeologic and hydrologic understanding and developing monitoring networks capable of collecting more focused data for future use. The GSP will also build on existing data being compiled by Stanislaus County under the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) with SGWP Proposition 1 *Counties with Distressed Basins* grant funding, including a well database, datasets for development of a groundwater model, and a library of planning documents and technical publications. The Delta-Mendota Subbasin includes portions of Stanislaus and Merced Counties

(in addition to other counties) and therefore data collection efforts are not duplicative of model development for the Discretionary Well Permitting and Management Program funded by the SGWP Proposition 1 *Counties with Distressed Basins* program. These materials are going to be incorporated into the GSP where applicable.

### ***Subtask 2.1: Data Compilation***

Additional effort is required to compile and check datasets and organize them into a central clearinghouse that will support hydrogeologic analyses, numerical model revisions, and a credible analysis of sustainability indicators in the subbasin, as well as display and disseminate the information to interested parties and simplify annual reporting requirements. Compilation of data and information to support the GSP will adhere to applicable standards for data, reporting, monitoring, and GIS, when applicable (Reg. § 352).

GSP regulations (Reg. § 352.6) require development and maintenance of a data management system (DMS) that is capable of storing and reporting information relevant to the development or implementation of the Plan and monitoring of the basin. At a minimum, GSP data will be organized into standardized data sets using typical formats for groundwater data including a Project Access database coupled with a Geographical Information System (GIS) geodatabase. All data compiled into the DMS will undergo quality control checks, reconciled to standardized benchmarks, and in a consistent format.

### ***Subtask 2.2: DMS Identification***

While groundwater and surface water data have been collected in the Subbasin for decades, data exists as local data sets primarily collected and maintained by local agencies to meet agency-specific objectives. The existing data are stored in multiple formats and needs to be centralized to display and disseminate the information to interested parties, as well as simplify annual reporting requirements. In Subtask 2.2, the wireframe DMS developed as part of the Sustainable Groundwater Planning grant program funding will be evaluated relative to the needs of the Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Regions for use in these portions of the groundwater basin, and modifications/changes to the system identified as required to both comply with SGMA and meet the needs of the Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Regions.

### ***Subtask 2.3: DMS Setup***

Upon identification of the DMS in Subtask 2.2, data collected and reviewed in Subtask 2.1 will be compiled within the selected DMS, and appropriate reporting formats and data management protocols developed.

### ***Subtask 2.4: Coordinated Data Management System***

A Coordinated Data Management System will be developed in a format similar to the DMS developed for this GSP. This Coordinated DMS will compile individual data from other coordinating GSPs in the Subbasin. The Coordinated DMS will be utilized by all various GSAs and GSPs in the Subbasin for the purposes of reporting coordinated data specific to the Subbasin monitoring network and tracking of Subbasin undesirable results and sustainability indicators.

#### ***Task 2 Deliverables:***

- *Compiled Data Management System (Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region)*
- *Data Management Protocols*
- *Coordinated Data Management System (Delta-Mendota Subbasin-wide)*

## Task 3: Flow Modeling

The intent of Task 3 is to refine and enhance an existing local groundwater flow model within the Subbasin and develop a robust, defensible, and reliable integrated hydrologic conceptual model (HCM) to support GSP Regulation § 354.14, which requires the development of a HCM. The HCM will be used for assessment of the historical and baseline hydrologic conditions for the groundwater system, as well as the land surface processes, stream system, and interactions among these physical systems. The HCM will be used to refine the groundwater numerical model to assess management options and scenarios that achieve a long-term, sustainable groundwater system. Groundwater analyses are designed to comply with Reg. § 354.16 and to provide for an improved understanding of current groundwater conditions to support sustainable management. BMPs for developing the HCM will be incorporated under Task 3 where feasible.

To date, the Subbasin has been managed without a complete understanding of subsurface inflows and outflows with adjoining subbasins, as well as groundwater-surface water interactions in the subbasin. The GSP will focus on improving hydrogeologic and hydrologic understanding and developing monitoring networks capable of collecting more focused data for future use.

Three counties that overlay the Subbasin have projects funded under the Proposition 1 *Counties with Stressed Basins* grant program that require work related to Task 3. Work being done in each project will not be duplicated, but rather built upon, in Task 3. Merced County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project includes a summary of available models and their suitability to perform water budget analyses. This information about local models will be compiled and incorporated into Task 3. The Merced project will also make revisions to the bottom of the Merced Water Resources Model (MercedWRM). However, the MercedWRM model only covers 44% of the Delta-Mendota Subbasin geographic area and therefore would need to be expanded to include the entire Subbasin should MercedWRM be selected as the local model to support GSP development. San Joaquin County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project includes an update to the County's model, development of a comprehensive basin-scale water budget. However, the San Joaquin County only covers 1% of the Subbasin's geographic area and therefore modeling efforts proposed under Task 3 would not be duplicative to efforts done in San Joaquin County. The PEIR for Implementation of the Stanislaus County Groundwater Ordinance is working to develop the Stanislaus County Hydrologic Model (SCHM) and will serve as a key tool for characterizing groundwater conditions in Stanislaus County. Stanislaus County cover 19% of the Subbasin and, therefore, the SCHM can be used to refine the model being developed under Task 3.

### ***Subtask 3.1: Basin Characterization***

A comprehensive texture analysis of the available data will be conducted, and will take into consideration the subbasin characterizations of the adjacent groundwater basins to facilitate the most effective coordination and compatibility for inter-basin flows. A comparison of subbasin characterization of the HCM with what is contained in C2VSim will also be conducted to identify datasets and information that may be contained in C2VSim that should be extracted and utilized in the refined CVHM model.

### ***Subtask 3.2: HCM Development***

This task will develop a robust, defensible, and reliable integrated hydrologic conceptual model (HCM) to be used for assessment of the historical and baseline hydrologic conditions for the groundwater system, as well as the land surface processes, stream system, and interactions among these physical systems. The HCM will be used to refine the groundwater numerical model to assess management options and scenarios that achieve a long-term, sustainable groundwater system. This task will rely on the refinement

and enhancement of existing models in the region (CVHM) using field well-log data and other data provided by stakeholders.

### ***Subtask 3.3: Water Budget***

Following completion of the HCM, a model selection, refinement, and enhancement effort will take place in an open and transparent stakeholder-driven process to support GSP development, if necessary. Additional screening of the modeling tools will be conducted to select a robust and defensible tool for GSP development that is consistent with local information. Existing models, CVHM, developed by USGS, and C2VSim, developed by DWR, will be refined using local-scale data, field well-log data, and other data provided by stakeholders. The task will include a comprehensive texture analysis of the available data and will consider subbasin characterizations of the adjacent groundwater basins to facilitate the most effective coordination and compatibility for inter-basin flows. Model refinement for local conditions will be conducted following model selection and the development of a detailed approach to implement necessary model refinements. The updated and refined model will be calibrated for several target calibration criteria, including water budget, groundwater levels, and streamflows, and be used to measure the performance of the model for GSP development needs. The calibrated model will result in an evaluation of historical hydrologic conditions of the groundwater basin and development of water budgets representing historical basin conditions. To evaluate the basin in terms of current and future management and operational conditions, two baseline scenarios should be developed, representing the current and future land/water use conditions, respectively. Annual groundwater budgets will be used to assess the short-term and long-term groundwater storage, which will result in estimation of overdraft condition, along with stream budgets and groundwater levels at key locations, which will be used to estimate sustainable yield of the groundwater basin. Final model files will be packaged and submitted to DWR.

The calibrated model will also be used to evaluate impacts of management options on the groundwater basin and undesirable results due to future projects and management actions that are formulated to achieve sustainability in 20 years. A streamlined protocol will be developed for modifying the model input files to capture the projects definitions in the model and for processing the model output to meaningful and easy-to-understand comparative graphics for managers and decision makers.

#### **Task 3 Deliverables:**

- *Administrative Draft and Draft Technical Appendix to the GSP with model documentation*
- *Final model files packaged for release to DWR*

### **Task 4: Monitoring**

The intent of Task 4 is to establish a monitoring network and monitoring protocols with the collection of data of sufficient quality, distribution, and frequency to characterize groundwater and related surface water and subsidence conditions, and to track changes, including short-term, seasonal, and long-term trends, per GSP Regulations Subarticle 4 (§ 354.32 – 354.40) and § 352.2 – 352.4.

Four counties that overlay the Delta-Mendota Subbasin have projects funded under the Proposition 1 *Counties with Stressed Basins* grant program that require work related to Task 4. Monitoring-related work being done in each of the four projects will be built upon in Task 4 and are not duplicative of the efforts being proposed in the proposal. Fresno County's Kings/Westside Subbasin Boundary Monitoring Project includes expansion and integration of a groundwater monitoring network to provide better data for sustainable groundwater management. It will also include the construction of monitoring wells where there are gaps. Fresno County overlays about 29% of the Subbasin geographic area. Work being done to implement a monitoring network in the Subbasin regional will expand upon what is already being done in Fresno County, but will also include areas outside of the Fresno County jurisdiction. The Programmatic



EIR for Implementation of the Stanislaus County Groundwater Ordinance includes a GSA Support task which would include an evaluation of the adequacy of currently monitoring networks within Stanislaus County. As mentioned in Task 3, Stanislaus County only covers 19% of the Subbasin and therefore work done as part of the PEIR will only partially satisfy the monitoring needs of the Subbasin. Merced County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project is conducting a county-wide monitoring assessment and developing a county-wide monitoring plan. As Merced County counts for about 44% of the Delta-Mendota Subbasin, the work being done as part of Merced County's project will significantly support Task 4 efforts. San Joaquin County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project is expanding and modernizing San Joaquin County's existing monitoring well program. This effort will only partially help Task 4 as San Joaquin County only overlays 1% of the Subbasin. Additionally, the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors are establishing a database of monitoring stations in their service area, which can be combined with SLDMWA level survey information along the Delta-Mendota Canal and monitoring data from USGS extensometers for subsidence monitoring.

#### ***Subtask 4.1: Monitoring Network Assessment***

A broad range of monitoring information currently exists within the context of each GSA and/or agency operations in the Subbasin. For the purposes of establishing a basin-wide comprehensive monitoring program, these existing networks, and their associated data sets, will be evaluated for applicability to SGMA-related monitoring, starting with the Subbasin's existing CASGEM monitoring program.

The CASGEM Monitoring Plan was established in July 2015. San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) member agency CASGEM data was compiled into a single geodatabase, which will help facilitate efforts to assess the Subbasin's current monitoring network.

#### ***Subtask 4.2: Data Gap Analysis***

Data gaps will be identified, and an action plan developed to chart a pathway forward to completion of one or more monitoring networks that meet SGMA reporting requirements, provide necessary feedback relative to the success of management actions and programs, and allow for regular assessment relative to the achievement of sustainability goals. Ultimately, the intent of the monitoring network will be the collection of data of sufficient quality, distribution, and frequency to characterize groundwater and related surface water conditions and to track changes, including short-term, seasonal, and long-term trends.

#### ***Subtask 4.3: Monitoring Plan Development***

The monitoring network will be designed to support achievement of the Subbasin's identified sustainability goals and objectives, with identification of the data and analytical methods to evaluate sustainability indicators, define performance criteria, and allow for development of a plan for obtaining data. Implementation of the monitoring network will be described in terms of objectives, specifically how the network will demonstrate progress toward achieving the measurable objectives, monitor impacts to beneficial uses or users of groundwater, monitor changes in groundwater conditions, and quantify annual changes in water budget components

The monitoring plan will be described in terms of its coverage of the relevant sustainability indicators, including the following:

- Density of monitoring sites and frequency of measurements to demonstrate short-term, seasonal, and long-term trends
- Scientific rationale for site selection
- Consistency with data and reporting standards

- Corresponding sustainability indicator, minimum threshold, measurable objective, and interim milestone
- Location and type of each site on a map.

If management areas are used, this description of the monitoring network will provide detail appropriate for each management area. The monitoring network also will be developed to support consistency of data across basin boundaries both spatially and temporally.

Protocols for collecting data under the basin-wide monitoring program to ensure reliable and comparable data and methodologies, and for incorporating those data into the DMS developed under Task 2 will be established to facilitate data analysis for demonstration of compliance with SGMA regulations.

**Task 4 Milestones:**

- *Draft Monitoring Plan*
- *Draft Data Gap Analysis TM*

**Task 4 Deliverables:**

- *Monitoring Plan*
- *Data Gap Analysis TM*

## **Task 5: Intra-basin Coordination and Program Management**

The intent of this task will be to provide technical support for a comprehensive Outreach and Stakeholder Involvement Plan as described in Task 9, Outreach and Education. The focus of this task will be on coordinating technical analyses across the Delta-Mendota Subbasin per GSP Regulation Article 8, § 357.

### ***Subtask 5.1: Intra- Basin Coordination***

Twelve (12) technical workshops/meetings will be conducted amongst the Northern and Central Delta-Mendota GSAs and are envisioned to be presented on a quarterly basis throughout the project to keep the Northern and Central Delta-Mendota GSAs informed of the ongoing technical analysis as appropriate for the given audience. Each technical workshop/meeting will be focused on a particular portion of the GSP. Meeting minutes and action items will be made available following each meeting.

In addition, 21 technical GSP meetings and 21 policy GSP meetings will be held among all the GSAs in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin responsible developing the anticipated six (6) GSPs. These meetings will address specific topics such as data and information sharing, coordination of shared technical and policy tasks (e.g. coordinated basin-wide monitoring), and overall GSP coordination to provide coordinated coverage for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin as a whole. Meeting minutes and action items will be made available following each meeting.

### ***Subtask 5.2: Program Management***

Program Management is intended to provide oversight of basin-wide SGMA activities and coordination of GSPs throughout the Delta-Mendota Subbasin. The goal of this task is to ensure, during development, that each of the individual GSPs utilize the same methodologies and assumptions, definitions, and monitoring network. The consultant will work and the other GSP development teams to ensure that all Plans are coordinated and do not adversely affect one another. This task will ensure the Basin is covered by adequate plans, and there are no adverse impacts or conflicting results

This task provides for a Project Management Plan that establishes the structure, roles, and responsibilities of the member agencies staff, managers, and consultants and provides the framework for measuring progress and success—typically referred to as Key Performance Indicators—to provide the basis for ensuring effective and efficient project delivery. The Project Management Plan will cover an approximate 2.5-year period and will require active management among Project team members and Agency personnel. In addition, a 100-day plan will be developed that will define critical activities in order to establish project direction.

Also included in this task is the coordination of the activities of all GSP program team members. The project team will conduct bi-weekly to monthly progress report conference calls to ensure coordination among tasks and sharing of information and data. Work progress will be effectively tracked and obstacles will be identified at the earliest possible time. Team members will meet on occasion to coordinate work tasks with close collaboration and coordinated work sessions, as needed.

As described in Task 1, SGMA Activity Agreements were developed to support intra-basin coordination efforts. Additionally, the SGMA Program Guide, developed in early 2017, directs coordination efforts among the GSAs.

**Task 5 Deliverables:**

- *Presentation materials for Technical Workshops*
- *Meeting Minutes and Action Items for meetings with GSAs and Subbasin personnel*
- *Agreed-upon technical approach for aspects of coordination*

**Task 6: Inter-basin Coordination**

The intent of Task 6 will be to provide technical support for a comprehensive Outreach and Stakeholder Involvement Plan, as described in Task 9, Outreach and Education. The focus of this task will be on coordinating technical analyses with adjacent subbasins per GSP Regulation Article 8, § 357.

Following development of a Regional Coordination Committee by Stantec, funded by DWR's facilitation support services program, approximately seven (7) technical workshops with adjacent groundwater basins, are anticipated. The purpose of these meetings will be to coordinate with the schedules of the adjacent basins that are also critically-overdrafted. Topics of these meetings will focus on key aspects of the technical work that require coordination, including (but not limited to) modeling assumptions and data sharing. Following the grant application submittal deadline, GSP development schedules will be compared and an early coordination meeting will be held that will focus on developing an agreed-upon technical approach for aspects of coordination between adjacent basins. Meeting minutes and action items will be made available to participants and stakeholders following each meeting.

This task will cover each of the individual GSP Project teams in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin, and will facilitate inter-basin coordinated for the subbasin as a whole.

**Task 6 Deliverables:**

- *Presentation materials for Technical Workshops*
- *Meeting Minutes and Action Items for Technical Workshops with Adjacent Subbasins personnel*
- *Agreed-upon technical approach for aspects of coordination*

## Task 7: GSP Preparation

SGMA requires (per GSP Regulations § 355.2) the preparation and submittal of a GSP to DWR for review; as such, a formal GSP document will be compiled, incorporating the work conducted under all other tasks outlined in this Scope, along with other work items as described below. This work can be generally divided into four subtasks, each of which is described further in the following sections.

Preparation of the GSP document carried out under Task 7 is exclusive to GSP development activities and is therefore not duplicative of activities carried out under the Stanislaus County Groundwater Ordinance and Merced County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Readiness Project, which is funded under the SGWP Proposition 1 *Counties with Stressed Basins* grant program. GSA/GSP Support activities carried out by Merced County with *Counties with Stressed Basins* funding are focused on GSA development and technical support rather than direct development of the GSP document.

### *Subtask 7.1: Develop Sustainability Goals and Indicators*

SGMA defines sustainable groundwater management as “the management and use of groundwater in a manner that can be maintained during the planning and implementation horizon without causing undesirable results” (Section 10721 (v), Water Code). Therefore, as part of this subtask, the GSAs will work with the technical team and stakeholders to develop parameters defining how groundwater may be managed over the 20-year planning and implementation horizon to achieve a variety of goals for the subbasin. This effort will occur in several steps as follows:

- Define undesirable results
- Define sustainability and associated sustainability goals
- Define minimum thresholds and measurable objectives that will prevent and/or mitigate undesirable results and achieve the sustainability goal
- Identify five-year interim milestones

#### Define Undesirable Results

This subtask will evaluate the five sustainability indicators (all except seawater intrusion) for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin and for the Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region to define conditions determined to be significant and unreasonable for each indicator. These will be defined as undesirable results for the Subbasin. For the sustainability indicators, current beneficial uses of groundwater and surface water in the Subbasin will be considered. Potential effects on land use and property interests will be considered and discussed with stakeholders. The analysis will follow requirements in Reg. § 354.26.

For this analysis, the revised groundwater flow model will be applied to simulate conditions in the basin under current land use, groundwater use, and water resources management operations. These conditions will be projected 50 years into the future to evaluate changes in the groundwater basin assuming current conditions. This will be used to determine if current management of the Subbasin meets sustainability criteria.

The undesirable results will be described in the GSP. The text will also explain what groundwater conditions lead to the undesirable results. This understanding will be based on the HCM, analysis of current groundwater conditions, and the results of the water budget modeling from previous tasks. This understanding is also needed to determine minimum thresholds in the following task.

The definition of undesirable results will consider various applicable local, state, and federal standards, especially as applied to beneficial uses. Water quality objectives in the water quality control plan (Basin Plan) for the Subbasin will be considered along with state and federal drinking water standards.

Agricultural water standards and problematic constituents for various crops will also be incorporated into the analysis. Definitions for undesirable results will include specificity on when, where, and why certain conditions occur. The analysis will consider whether the definitions of undesirable results for each indicator applies to all Management Areas. If not, one or more undesirable results will be defined on a Management-Area basis. The analysis will be linked to the determination of minimum thresholds in the following task. Those numeric thresholds will be used to define undesirable results in specific areas.

#### Determine Minimum Thresholds

Minimum thresholds are numeric values that are quantified for each sustainability indicator and used to define undesirable results. Using water levels as an example, a certain groundwater elevation may be determined to indicate that there is a significant and unreasonable lowering of water levels in a certain area and if water levels fall below that groundwater elevation, then the basin would experience an undesirable result. In this example, the groundwater elevation would be determined to be the minimum threshold for that sustainability indicator. Assuming that water levels will be used at least as a minimum threshold for at least one (or more) sustainability indicator(s), the minimum threshold will likely need to differ across the Subbasin. Accordingly, minimum thresholds will require definition at each monitoring network well or representative monitoring site (Reg. § 354.28), allowing undesirable results to be monitored for the entire Subbasin.

The GSP will explain how each minimum threshold was determined and how they can be used to prevent undesirable results. In accordance with Reg. § 354.20 (b) (2), minimum thresholds will be established for each sustainability indicator applicable to each Management Area. The GSP will describe the rationale for selection of each minimum threshold. The text will also describe relationships between different minimum thresholds over the Subbasin and how they relate to the minimum thresholds for the other sustainability indicators.

It is likely that water levels would be used as a proxy for other sustainability indicators including chronic lowering of water levels, depletion of groundwater storage and subsidence. Under certain conditions, water levels may also serve as a proxy for groundwater quality if there are areas of the Subbasin where water levels need to be maintained to avoid upcoming of poor quality groundwater at depth and/or as a proxy for depletion of surface water or groundwater dependent ecosystems. If used for more than one indicator, water levels may be set at one level to avoid undesirable results for one sustainability indicator and at another level in the same location to avoid undesirable results for a different sustainability indicator. Ultimately, the most stringent threshold will apply for each area. Notwithstanding the potential usefulness of defining water levels as minimum thresholds, numerous additional types of thresholds will be considered in the analysis including drinking water standards, agricultural water standards, surface water flows or quality, and other criteria.

#### Establish Measurable Objectives

Measurable objectives are quantifiable goals for the maintenance or improvement of specified groundwater conditions related to each sustainability indicator to achieve the Subbasin sustainability goal. This subtask will establish measurable objectives for the Subbasin using the same metrics as used for minimum thresholds and following additional requirements in Reg. § 354.30. When considered with each minimum threshold, the measurable objective will provide an effective operating range for applicable sustainability indicators. In addition, the measurable objective will be established such that minimum thresholds can be avoided.

A measurable objective will be established for each sustainability indicator in each Management Area (Reg. § 354.20 (b) (2)). The rationale for selecting the measurable objectives will be described for each

Management Area. The GSP will also include an analysis of how different measurable objectives for different Management Areas will not adversely impact other Management Areas or adjacent subbasins.

Recognizing that the groundwater analysis will be associated with some level of uncertainty, a reasonable “margin of safety” measurable objective will be defined. The uncertainty may be associated with determining the amount of time needed to recognize that objectives are not being met and to implement a management action such that undesirable results are avoided. This may involve setting an objective higher than would be established if sufficient information were available.

Similar to the process of determining minimum thresholds, the establishment of measurable objectives may include water levels as a proxy for more than one sustainability indicator. In addition, measurable objectives may be established at discrete monitoring sites or representative monitoring sites across the Subbasin.

#### Develop Five-Year Interim Milestones

In order to track the progress of achieving the sustainability goal for the basin and as required by SGMA, five-year milestones will be developed for each measurable objective in each Management Area. The milestones will provide a means for evaluating the performance of the GSP and whether measurable objectives are being reached, maintained, or need to be adjusted. As required in Reg. § 354.30 (e), milestones will be developed in increments of five years over the planning horizon. For the 20-year planning horizon for meeting the sustainability criteria, milestones will be developed for 5, 10, 15, and 20 years from GSP development.

#### *Subtask 7.2: Develop Action Plan*

Once groundwater sustainability has been defined, basin sustainability objectives identified (including minimum thresholds and measurable objectives), and the Subbasin’s water budget established, sufficient information should exist to determine how far groundwater basin conditions are relative to its sustainability goal. It is at this point (consistent with Reg. § 354.44) that steps are taken to develop an implementation program to meet the sustainability goal.

Several steps are required for developing a sustainability program; these include the following:

1. Identifying possible management actions, programs and projects (called components herein) that can be implemented to help achieve sustainability.
2. Screening the identified components for technical, environmental, economic, social and regulatory feasibility and removing those most likely not to succeed.
3. Combining the remaining components into various combinations to form implementation portfolios.
4. Screening the preliminary portfolios for technical, environmental, economic, social and regulatory feasibility and removing those most likely not to succeed.
5. Simulating the top portfolios via numerical groundwater modeling and possible other methodologies (e.g. economic analyses) to provide a basis for comparison.
6. Selecting the preferred alternative for inclusion in the GSP for implementation.

The following subtasks describe this process in more detail.

#### Identify Management Actions, Programs and Projects

Potential components (specific management actions, programs or projects) for achieving groundwater sustainability will be identified based on existing planning documents (including County General Plans,

Integrated Regional Water Management Plans and other similar planning documents), along with other sources of input to the planning process. A selection of water supply and demand management components will be identified, including those required for sustaining groundwater dependent ecosystems and aiding disadvantaged communities.

Planned, funded or previously evaluated projects by individual cities, water districts, groundwater sustainability agencies will be evaluated initially and recommended for prioritization to leverage other efforts and reduce costs.

Once the list of potential management actions, programs and projects has been developed, the individual components will be evaluated and screened to eliminate those least likely to meet the overall sustainability goals and objectives. Specifically, a screening methodology will first be developed that includes criteria to establish which components best meet the program objectives. This screening methodology will begin with the application of 'exclusionary' criteria, representing a "fatal flaw" analysis. If a component does not meet the exclusionary criteria, then it is eliminated. The exclusionary criteria will most likely include technical, operational, economic and legal feasibility.

After components are evaluated against exclusionary criteria, the remaining selections will be tested against an array of 'evaluating' criteria utilizing a weighted approach to incorporate decision-making preferences. This step will also yield a sensitivity analysis of how amending the weighting assigned to the various criteria affects the ranking of the water supply components array. It should be noted that multi-benefit projects are preferred over single-benefit projects due to the higher likelihood of receiving outside funding for implementation. Nonetheless, single-benefit projects may be required to ensure that sustainability goals are met.

After potential management actions, programs and projects (components) have been identified and screened, the best-fit components will be used to develop management scenarios for simulation using the numerical groundwater model. The best-fit components will be grouped in 'portfolios' developed to meet the Subbasin's sustainability goals and planning objectives of GSP while minimizing cost and risk. It is anticipated that each groundwater management portfolio will likely contain an array of both supplemental supply and demand management components. There will be no limits on the number of components per portfolio nor the number of times any one component can be included in a portfolio.

After the portfolios are assembled using the best-fit components, a two-step screening process will be implemented to evaluate the established portfolios and identify a preferred groundwater management portfolio. The details of this screening process will be developed in conjunction with the GSAs, however, both levels of portfolio screening will consider wet, normal and dry years, with a multi-year drought represented by the drought sequences included in the proposed simulation period and/or by other methods. It is anticipated that the preliminary portfolio screening will occur in a manner similar to that used for the components evaluation, described above. This weighted analytical screening process will eliminate the weaker portfolios based on pre-determined criteria. The remaining portfolios will then go through a detailed screening analysis that will include the use the evaluation criteria – operational, engineering, reliability, public health, environmental, institutional, risk assessment and policy in conjunction with the numerical groundwater model and/or other identified models (such as a Decision Support System model similar to WEAP) to identify a subset of preferred portfolios. Additional evaluation criteria for meeting scheduling/phasing requirements, permitting, grant application, and/or regional and state planning documents (e.g., California Water Plan), performance under extreme conditions, and climate change may also be considered during this detailed screening process.

Following the detailed screening process, the preferred portfolios will be presented to the GSAs for consideration, with up to five portfolios selected for detailed simulation. At this time, it is anticipated that two of these portfolios will 'bookend' alternatives (one portfolio consisting of only demand-management

actions and a second portfolio consisting of only supplemental supply components). The remaining three portfolios to be simulated will contain a mix of demand-management and supplemental supply alternatives and will provide an internal range of results between the ‘bookends’. The selected portfolios will be presented to the public and basin stakeholders for comment, along with the alternatives development and evaluation process.

The results of management portfolios modeled will be compared against both current and future baseline conditions. The model results to be used for comparison of parameters such as comprehensive water budgets, groundwater levels at key locations, groundwater level contours, and streamflows at key gaging stations. Model results will be evaluated in the context of development of sustainable groundwater conditions; for example, groundwater levels will be evaluated in the context of thresholds and objectives at key wells.

### ***Subtask 7.3: Develop Implementation Plan***

Once the recommended approach for obtaining and maintaining subbasin sustainability has been identified, the implementation chapter of the GSP will be prepared. This effort will identify the steps, schedule, and a fiscal strategy for implementing the GSP (see Task 8). The GSP schedule will incorporate the planning for annual reporting and periodic evaluations.

As provided in Reg. § 354.6 and described in Task 8, the cost for GSP implementation will be estimated, and will include costs for the projects and management actions described in the Action Plan section of the GSP. Depending on the project, costs may be amortized over time. In addition to projects, costs will be developed for monitoring network improvements that may be recommended during GSP development.

The GSP will include a schedule for Plan implementation. The schedule for project development will depend on available funding and the benefits of the project to achieve certain milestones and measurable objectives. Schedules for improvements to the monitoring network may also depend on cooperation with local agencies or permission to access private property.

As required by SGMA, the Subbasin GSAs will conduct annual reporting of groundwater conditions and water resources in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin. Using groundwater level data from the monitoring network, groundwater elevation contour maps will be developed for each principal aquifer and management area in the Subbasin illustrating seasonal highs and lows. Representative hydrographs will also be included based on the groundwater elevation data. The time period for which to present hydrographs is yet to be determined, but will include historical data up to and including January 1, 2015 and will likely include the proposed 27-year study period for the water budget analysis.

The Implementation Plan section of the GSP will also describe the process of required periodic evaluations, including a re-examination of the GSP at five-year increments. These evaluations allow assessment of progress in meeting milestones and measurable objectives. Evaluations will be used to report the performance of the GSP and determine if revisions are required.

### ***Subtask 7.4: Prepare GSP***

SGMA requires the preparation of a document (GSP) that will be submitted to DWR for review. As such, various sections of the GSP will be prepared as the project progresses and as work is completed in tasks described in this Work Plan. GSA and technical reviewer comments will be incorporated into each GSP section as the draft plan is prepared. Therefore, this task involves assembling the document into a coordinated and unified report that clearly describes the data, methods, and analyses.

Draft GSP sections will be compiled and assimilated into a comprehensive GSP. The Draft GSP will be presented at one of the last technical workshops, involving both GSAs and stakeholders. Comments will



be received at the workshop, as well as written comments submitted following the workshop, and will be incorporated into the Final GSP. The Final GSP will then be submitted to the GSAs for final review and presented at a public hearing. Additional presentations will be made to the various GSA Boards of Directors and/or City Councils as required to facilitate plan adoption.

Following completion and adoption of the Final GSP, the document will be submitted to DWR for review. At this time, the format for filing the supporting information for the GSP is not known; however, it is anticipated that the DMS, supporting documents, and appendices along with the GSP will be prepared for upload to DWR as needed.

**Task 7 Deliverables:**

- *Monitoring Network and Protocols GSP Chapter*
- *Action Plan GSP Chapter*
- *Implementation Plan GSP Chapter Electronic version (.pdf format) of Draft and Final GSP*
- *15 Printed copies of Final GSP*
- *Appendices and DMS for DWR submittal*

## **Task 8: Financing**

As provided in Reg. § 354.6, the estimated costs for implementation of the GSP will be calculated and presented in the implementation section of the GSP along with an implementation plan for financing. Costs to be considered in this analysis include costs for the projects and management actions for the GSP components, in addition to administrative costs associated with other GSP-related activities, including monitoring, data analyses and sharing, annual reporting and regular plan updates as required by SGMA. Depending on the project or management actions, costs may be amortized over time. In addition to projects and management actions, costs will be developed for monitoring network improvements and to address data gaps that may be recommended during GSP development.

### ***Subtask 8.1: Financing Plan***

Once the estimated cost of GSP implementation has been determined, a financing plan will be prepared that will evaluate potential alternatives for obtaining necessary implementation funding. These actions may include the assessment of regulatory fees per the Prop 218 process, and/or the assessment of penalties relative to specific management actions.

### ***Subtask 8.2: Funding Support***

Also included as part of this task will be the identification of potential outside funding, including state and federal grants and low interest loans. Securing additional funding sources that may be used to assist the GSAs in developing a meaningful financing plan that addresses the economic realities of the region while providing the basis for implementing the proposed programs and projects included in the final GSP.

**Task 8 Deliverables:**

- *Financing Plan*

## **Task 9: Outreach and Education**

Outreach and Education involves: 1) communication, outreach, and engagement with and between interested parties and beneficial users of groundwater within the Delta-Mendota Subbasin; 2) Coordination between the 23 Subbasin GSAs; and 3) coordination with adjacent subbasin GSAs for plan development. These tasks shall be supported by a consultant Program Management team and lead

facilitator working with SLDMWA staff retained to support overall outreach and stakeholder involvement, and by the Subbasin GSAs members' staff. Outreach and education activities will fulfill GSP Regulation § 354.10.

Outreach and education activities carried out under Task 9 are exclusive to Delta-Mendota Subbasin GSP development activities and are therefore not duplicative of activities carried out under projects funded under the SGWP Proposition 1 *Counties with Stressed Basins* grant program (listed in Task 1).

### ***Subtask 9.1: Website Development***

This subtask will include the development of a new webpage which will provide links to other GSA member websites and the DWR's SGMA website. The new webpage will provide greater opportunity for open dialogue and communication. This task will also include webpage maintenance and updates as new information becomes available.

### ***Subtask 9.2: Public Outreach Workshops***

The GSP public outreach and education efforts will focus on the coordinated outreach activities shared by the Subbasin GSAs. Facilitators will assist them in identifying shared and individual messages. Activities will focus on accomplishing the following outreach goals: educate stakeholders about SGMA, its requirements, and outcomes; communicate deadlines and important dates; encourage stakeholder engagement in GSP development and implementation; and receive early feedback from stakeholders on Subbasin GSAs' activities.

Stakeholders and the general public will be provided regular updates and information in a manner they can understand and that speaks to their individual interests as they relate to GSP development and the general SGMA process. All Subbasin GSA meetings and workshops are open to the public. In addition, Subbasin GSAs will develop regular updates and materials to educate and inform stakeholders on the GSA activities; explain how GSP components are developed; explain how the GSP and its implementation will impact stakeholder groundwater access and use; and help stakeholders identify the best opportunities for them to engage in GSA activities, GSP development, and implementation. Facilitators will work with Subbasin GSAs to develop materials and coordinate messaging. General outreach materials, updates, and notices as well as a Delta-Mendota Subbasin Meeting Calendar will be made publicly available. Public outreach efforts will be incorporated into the Delta-Mendota Outreach and Stakeholder Involvement Work Plan and is discussed in its existing Communication Plan.

The Subbasin GSAs shall conduct up to five (5) bi-annual Public Workshops. These workshops will be an engagement opportunity for all Delta-Mendota Subbasin Stakeholders. The workshops will be held throughout the Subbasin to maximize opportunities for stakeholder participation. The general goals of these workshops will include: sharing information and updates on GSP development activities, ensuring stakeholders understand GSP components and impacts, and soliciting stakeholder input on GSA activities. Specific workshop goals and themes will depend on the components under development at the time of the workshops, consistent with the project schedule. In general, and for all public workshops, the following steps/services will be employed: preparation, outreach, facilitation, workshop summaries, and follow-up.

The primary method for coordination and involvement of the Subbasin GSAs in Plan Development will be to hold joint technical workshops and internal workgroup coordination meetings. Joint technical workshops will be conducted on a quarterly basis for the duration of GSP development for a total of seven (7) workshops. Workshops will focus on: updates on GSP development activities, identifying joint tasks and activities to develop GSP components, discussing recommendations on GSP components, resolving disagreements and reaching consensus on GSP component recommendations for approval by each

Subbasin GSA. Specific GSP components discussions shall be determined by the project schedule. Activities related to these workshops include but are not limited to: preparation, outreach, facilitation, and workshop summaries. Specific workgroups or teams consisting of staff GSA Members as well as consultants may require regular check-in meetings to coordinate outcomes and ensure consistency among various workgroup activities. Workgroups and/or workgroup leads shall meet at least monthly or as needed through the duration of their project activities to coordinate activities with the project consultant and/or facilitator. These calls shall ensure that all individual projects and workgroups are coordinated, action items are completed, issues of concern are highlighted and resolutions steps are defined, and any updates required to the work plan and project schedule are incorporated immediately in between technical workshops.

**Task 9 Deliverables:**

- *GSP webpage*
- *General outreach materials, updates, and notices developed in coordination with the Subbasin GSAs*
- *Delta-Mendota Subbasin Meeting Calendar*
- *Delta-Mendota Outreach and Stakeholder Involvement Work Plan*
- *Public Workshop agendas, facilitation plans, and materials*
- *Public Workshop outreach materials*
- *Final Public workshop summaries*
- *Internal GSP Workgroup Coordination Call highlights and action items summary*
- *Internal GSP Workgroup updates to project work plan and project schedule as needed*
- *Joint Technical Workshop agendas, facilitation plans, and materials*
- *Joint technical Workshop outreach materials (as applicable)*
- *Final Joint Technical Workshop summaries*
- *Inter-basin Coordination Committee Meetings materials*
- *Inter-basin Coordination Committee Meeting highlights and action items summary*

## Coordinated Plan Expenses and Program Management

As defined in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin Coordination Agreement (Agreement), Coordinated Plan Expenses means any expenses incurred by a third-party Coordinator, Plan Manager, and any consultants hired by any Groundwater Sustainability Agency on behalf of the GSAs and all other items within an approved budget for the Coordination Agreement. These Coordinated Plan Expenses are described in detail in the Agreement and are estimated through completion and submittal of final Groundwater Sustainability Plans, or January 2020.

Task 1, Task 2, Task 5, Task 6, and Task 9 of the attached Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region GSP Development Scope of Services outline consultant services for funding administration, the development of a coordinated data management, and GSP coordination / facilitation. The costs, shown in the attached fee table, are to be shared equally between each GSP Group. The Delta-Mendota subbasin GSAs contain six (6) GSP Groups, each developing an individual GSP.

The Agreement also describes the process for selecting a ‘Coordinator’, ‘Treasurer’ and ‘Plan Manager’, with roles defined in the Agreement. Currently, it is the intent of the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies and their representatives to have the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority serve in these roles. From August of 2017 through the execution of the Coordination Agreement, assumed to be December 2017, Water Authority staff has coordinated and facilitated meetings between subbasin GSAs and GSP groups. This cost, described in the Agreement as the Initial Budget, includes meeting scheduling, preparation of individual meeting materials, agendas, minutes, as well as coordination with the state contracted facilitator. For this period, Authority time was calculated based on actual meeting dates and projected meeting dates through December 2017.

Between January 2018 through January 2020, the Water Authority assumes one (1) Coordination Committee meeting per month (Intrabasin coordination), in which a staff member will act as the Agreement Coordinator. The assumed tasks include meeting scheduling, material preparation, and more as assigned by the Committee. In addition, the estimate assumes one (1) Interbasin coordination meeting per month for the period between January 2018 and January 2020. The assumed tasks include meeting coordination, material preparation, and Delta-Mendota stakeholder communication materials.

Coordinated Plan Expenses for the Coordinator and Treasurer role are shown in the attached SLDMWA Cost Estimate table. The Plan Manager cost, assumed to be approximately \$10,000 per year, is not included in these estimates. The Plan Manager costs should be expected following submittal and approval of the Groundwater Sustainability Plans to DWR in early 2020.



**San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority**  
**GSP Development (22Oct17)**

Tasks	Labor												Total Hours	Total Labor Costs (1)		
	Lyndel Melton	Leslie Dumas	Ian Jaffe	John Ayres	Brian van Lienden	Jim Blanke	Andy Neal	Lindsey Wilcox	Reza Namvar	Staff Support	Graphics	Admin.				
	PIC	Project Manger	PM Support	Sustainability Analyses/Monitoring	GSP Preparation	Interbasin Coordination	Project Controls	Funding	Modeling	Misc.	Graphics and Support					
<b>Task 1: Funding Administration</b>																
Funding Coordination and Administration																
Subtotal Task 1:	0	28		0	0	0	0	60	0	28	0	15	131	\$26,599		
<b>Task 2: Data Management</b>																
2.1 Data Compilation		4		4									8	\$2,060		
2.2 DMS Identification		4		24									28	\$7,040		
2.3 DMS Setup		8		40						20			68	\$15,128		
2.4 Coordinated Data Management System		8		40						20			68	\$15,128		
Subtotal Task 2:	0	24		108	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	172	\$39,356		
<b>Task 3: Flow Modeling</b>																
3.1 Basin Characterization	4	8		40						16	40	8	8	124	\$23,584	
3.2 HCM Development	8	8		48						40	120	8	8	240	\$42,624	
3.3 Water Budget																
Model Updates and Calibration	8	40		120						80	600	16	24	888	\$150,688	
Water Budgets	8	40		100						40	100			288	\$59,300	
Subtotal Task 3:	28	96		308	0	0	0	0	176	860	32	40	1540	\$276,196		
<b>Task 4: Monitoring</b>																
4.1 Monitoring Network Assessment																
Evaluate Existing Systems		4		12										16	\$4,052	
Identify and Evaluate Alternative Systems		2		8										10	\$2,524	
Implement Recommended System/Improvements		4		8										12	\$3,056	
4.2 Data Gap Analysis		2		8										10	\$2,524	
4.3 Monitoring Plan Development		4		8										12	\$3,056	
Subtotal Task 4:	0	16		44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	\$15,212		
<b>Task 5: Intrabasin Coordination and Program Management</b>																
5.1 Intrabasin Coordination																
Coordination	16	60												76	\$20,920	
N-C Technical Meetings (12)		64	32											96	\$24,224	
Technical & Policy GSP Coordination Meetings (21 technical meetings; 21 policy meetings)		200	64	16							32			312	\$76,448	
5.2 Program Management																
Project Delivery/100 Day Plan	4	20		4	4	4	4							40	\$10,796	
Project Schedule and Budget Controls														56	\$16,520	
Monthly Reporting		56											56	112	\$20,776	
QA/QC	40													40	\$12,400	
Subtotal Task 5:	60	400	96	20	4	4	60	0	0	32	0	56	732	\$182,084		
<b>Task 6: Interbasin Coordination</b>																
6.1 Interbasin Coordination																
Coordination	16	20					100							136	\$36,880	
Technical Workshops (7)		36	24											60	\$14,976	
Subtotal Task 6:	16	56	24	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	\$51,856		
<b>Task 7: GSP Preparation</b>																
7.1 Develop Sustainability Goals and Indicators																
Confirm Success & Sustainability Criteria	4	16		8										28	\$7,488	
Evaluate Sustainability	10	10		10						20	40			80	\$14,270	
7.2 Develop Action Plan																
Develop Management and Supply Options	8	24			32									64	\$16,832	
Evaluate Management and Supply Options		12			32					40	200			284	\$47,640	
7.3 Develop Implementation Plan		4			32						40			76	\$15,112	
7.4 Prepare GSP																
Prepare Draft GSP Chapters		16			40									56	\$14,216	
Incorporate GSA Input		16			20									36	\$9,236	
Prepare Final GSP		16			20									36	\$9,236	
Support Plan Adoption	24	24												48	\$13,824	
Subtotal Task 7:	36	138		18	176	0	0	0	60	280	0	0	708	\$147,854		
<b>Task 8: Financing</b>																
8.1 Financing Plan																
Financial Alternatives and Evaluations (Prop 218)		4												4	\$1,064	
8.2 Funding Support																
Opportunity Identification		8							20				8	36	\$7,408	
Grant Applications (assume 2)		32							60	120			16	236	\$42,656	
Subtotal Task 8:	0	44		0	0	0	0	80	120	0	8	24	276	\$51,128		
<b>Task 9: Outreach and Education</b>																
9.1 Website Development																
Website Development	4	20										60		84	\$13,340	
On-going Maintenance/Updates		16										40		56	\$8,776	
9.2 Public Outreach Workshops																
Outreach Plan	16	24										4		44	\$11,796	
Outreach & Coordination (monthly calls)	80	50										16		146	\$39,908	
Bi-Annual Public Workshops (5)		40												40	\$10,640	
Subtotal Task 9:	100	150		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	370	\$84,460		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>952</b>		<b>498</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>1240</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>4185</b>	<b>\$874,745</b>		



# Fee Estimate

## San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority GSP Development (22Oct17)

Tasks	Outside Services										ODCs			Total
	Joe Hopkins	Kevin Johansen	Bob Stoddaard	Dan Flory	Gavin O'Leary	Tribby Barton	Admin	Richard Howitt	David Mitchell	Subtotal	Sub Consultant Total Cost (2)	ODCs	Total ODCs (3)	Total Fee
	Water Management	Interbasin Coordination	Exchanges & Transfers	Supplies & Conservation	Data Management	Stakeholder Support	P&P	Ag Economics	Urban Economics					
<b>Task 1: Funding Administration</b>	\$155	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$130	\$85	\$75	\$225	\$250					
Funding Coordination and Administration										\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,599
Subtotal Task 1:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,599
<b>Task 2: Data Management</b>														
2.1 Data Compilation					80					\$10,400	\$11,440		\$0	\$13,500
2.2 DMS Identification	8									\$1,240	\$1,364	\$250	\$275	\$8,679
2.3 DMS Setup	20				320					\$44,700	\$49,170		\$0	\$64,298
2.4 Coordinated Data Management System	12				80					\$12,260	\$13,486		\$0	\$28,614
Subtotal Task 2:	40	0	0	0	480	0	0	0	0	\$68,600	\$75,460	\$250	\$275	\$115,091
<b>Task 3: Flow Modeling</b>														
3.1 Basin Characterization	40			30						\$12,200	\$13,420		\$0	\$37,004
3.2 HCM Development	30			90						\$22,650	\$24,915	\$250	\$275	\$67,814
3.3 Water Budget														
Model Update and Calibration	50			150						\$37,750	\$41,525		\$0	\$192,213
Water Budgets	50			50						\$17,750	\$19,525	\$250	\$275	\$79,100
Subtotal Task 3:	170	0	0	320	0	0	0	0	0	\$90,350	\$99,385	\$500	\$550	\$376,131
<b>Task 4: Monitoring</b>														
4.1 Monitoring Network Assessment														
Evaluate Existing Systems					16					\$2,080	\$2,288		\$0	\$6,340
Identify and Evaluate Alternative Systems	4				8					\$1,660	\$1,826		\$0	\$4,350
Implement Recommended System/Improvements	20				24					\$6,220	\$6,842		\$0	\$9,898
4.2 Data Gap Analysis	20				24					\$6,220	\$6,842		\$0	\$9,366
4.3 Monitoring Plan Development	10				40					\$6,750	\$7,425		\$0	\$10,481
Subtotal Task 4:	54	0	0	0	112	0	0	0	0	\$22,930	\$25,223	\$0	\$0	\$40,435
<b>Task 5: Intra-basin Coordination and Program Management</b>														
5.1 Intra-basin Coordination														
Coordination	180									\$27,900	\$30,690		\$0	\$51,610
N-C Technical Meetings (12)										\$0	\$0	\$500	\$550	\$24,774
Technical & Policy GSP Coordination Meetings (21 technical meetings; 21 policy meetings)	24									\$3,720	\$4,092	\$1,000	\$1,100	\$81,640
5.2 Program Management														
Project Delivery/100 Day Plan	8									\$1,240	\$1,364		\$0	\$12,160
Project Schedule and Budget Controls										\$0	\$0		\$0	\$16,520
Monthly Reporting	56									\$8,680	\$9,548		\$0	\$30,324
QA/QC			20							\$4,000	\$4,400		\$0	\$16,800
Subtotal Task 5:	268	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$45,540	\$50,094	\$1,500	\$1,650	\$233,828
<b>Task 6: Interbasin Coordination</b>														
Coordination		80								\$16,000	\$17,600		\$0	\$54,480
Technical Workshops (7)										\$0	\$0	\$500	\$550	\$15,526
Subtotal Task 6:	0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$16,000	\$17,600	\$500	\$550	\$70,006
<b>Task 7: GSP Preparation</b>														
7.1 Develop Sustainability Goals and Indicators														
Confirm Success & Sustainability Criteria	16									\$2,480	\$2,728		\$0	\$10,216
Evaluate Sustainability	10									\$1,550	\$1,705		\$0	\$15,975
7.2 Develop Action Plan														
Develop Management and Supply Options	40		60	40						\$26,200	\$28,820		\$0	\$45,652
Evaluate Management and Supply Options	200		40	200						\$79,000	\$86,900		\$0	\$134,540
7.3 Develop Implementation Plan	10		9	9						\$5,150	\$5,665		\$0	\$20,777
7.4 Prepare GSP														
Prepare Draft GSP Chapters	120						40			\$21,600	\$23,760	\$250	\$275	\$38,251
Incorporate GSA Input	24									\$3,720	\$4,092		\$0	\$13,328
Prepare Final GSP	20									\$3,100	\$3,410	\$500	\$550	\$13,196
Support Plan Adoption	20									\$3,100	\$3,410	\$250	\$275	\$17,509
Subtotal Task 7:	460	0	109	249	0	0	40	0	0	\$145,900	\$160,490	\$1,000	\$1,100	\$309,444
<b>Task 8: Financing</b>														
8.1 Financing Plan														
Financial Alternatives and Evaluations (Prop 218)	40	40			40					\$19,400	\$21,340		\$0	\$22,404
8.2 Funding Support														
Opportunity Identification										\$0	\$0		\$0	\$7,408
Grant Applications (assume 2)	40	40								\$14,200	\$15,620		\$0	\$58,276
Subtotal Task 8:	80	80	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	\$33,600	\$36,960	\$0	\$0	\$88,088
<b>Task 9: Outreach and Education</b>														
9.1 Website Development														
Website Development										\$0	\$0	\$250	\$275	\$13,615
On-going Maintenance/Updates										\$0	\$0		\$0	\$8,776
9.2 Public Outreach Workshops														
Outreach Plan						24				\$2,040	\$2,244		\$0	\$14,040
Outreach & Coordination (monthly calls)						100				\$8,500	\$9,350	\$1,000	\$1,100	\$50,358
Bi-Annual Public Workshops (5)										\$0	\$0		\$0	\$10,640
Subtotal Task 9:	0	0	0	0	0	124	0	0	0	\$10,540	\$11,594	\$1,250	\$1,375	\$97,429
<b>TOTAL</b>	1072	160	129	569	632	124	40	0	0	\$433,460	\$476,806	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$1,357,051

## SGMA Activities Budget

**Fiscal Year 2019**

**Legal:**

Linneman et al	\$	-
General Counsel	\$	3,500

**Other Professional Services:**

Contracts	\$	769,121
- Funding Administration		
- Data Management		
- Flow Modeling		
- Intrabasin Coordination and Program Management		
- Intrabasin Coordination		
- GSP Preparation		
- Financing		
- Outreach and Education		

**Other:**

Sacramento Administrative Office	\$	50
In-House Salary & Benefits		
Assistant Executive Director	\$	24,758
Planning & Engineering Manager	\$	3,362
Associate Engineer	\$	101,613
Associate Engineer	\$	138,544
Project Coordinator	\$	2,154
Other Professional Services	\$	-
License & Continuing Education	\$	250
Conferences & Training	\$	2,500
Travel/Mileage	\$	2,500
Group Meetings	\$	500
Telephone	\$	250
 Total Direct Expenditures	 \$	 1,049,101
 Administrative Expenditures	 \$	 4,700

<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,053,801</b>
---------------------------	-----------	------------------

By: Andrew Garcia  
 Date: 11/20/2017

Woodard Curran - GSP Development & Program Management Fee Table

**North and Central Region Estimate - Assume 1/6 responsible for Coordinated Costs**

	FY18	FY19	FY20		FY18	FY19	FY20
<b>Task 1: Funding Administration</b>							
Funding Coordination and Administration	\$ -	\$13,300	\$13,300		\$ -	\$ 2,217	\$ 2,217
	\$ -	\$ 13,300	\$ 13,300		\$ -	\$ 2,217	\$ 2,217
<b>Task 2: Data Management</b>							
	\$13,500	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 13,500	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$8,679	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 8,679	\$ -
	\$ -	\$64,298	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 64,298	\$ -
2.4 Coordinated Data Management System	\$ -	\$28,614	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 4,769	\$ -
	\$ 13,500	\$ 101,591	\$ -		\$ 13,500	\$ 77,746	\$ -
<b>Task 3: Flow Modeling</b>							
	\$37,004	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 37,004	\$ -	\$ -
	\$67,814	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 67,814	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$192,213	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 192,213	\$ -
	\$ -	\$79,100	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 79,100	\$ -
	\$104,818	\$271,313	\$ -		\$ 104,818	\$ 271,313	\$ -
<b>Task 4: Monitoring</b>							
	\$ -	\$6,340	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 6,340	\$ -
	\$ -	\$4,350	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 4,350	\$ -
	\$ -	\$9,898	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 9,898	\$ -
	\$ -	\$9,366	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 9,366	\$ -
	\$ -	\$10,481	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 10,481	\$ -
	\$ -	\$40,435	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 40,435	\$ -
<b>Task 5: Intrabasin Coordination and Program Management</b>							
	\$ 3,686	\$ 23,962	\$ 23,962		\$ 3,686	\$ 23,962	\$ 23,962
	\$ 4,129	\$ 10,323	\$ 10,323		\$ 4,129	\$ 10,323	\$ 10,323
Technical & Policy GSP Coordination Meetings (21 technical meetings; 21 policy meetings)	\$ 11,663	\$ 46,651	\$ 23,326		\$ 1,944	\$ 7,775	\$ 3,888
	\$ 12,160	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 12,160	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 16,520	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 16,520	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 2,166	\$ 14,079	\$ 14,079		\$ 2,166	\$ 14,079	\$ 14,079
	\$ 1,200	\$ 7,800	\$ 7,800		\$ 1,200	\$ 7,800	\$ 7,800
	\$ 51,524	\$ 102,815	\$ 79,489		\$ 41,805	\$ 63,939	\$ 60,051
<b>Task 6: Interbasin Coordination</b>							
Coordination	\$ 7,783	\$ 23,349	\$ 23,349		\$ 1,297	\$ 3,891	\$ 3,891
Technical Workshops (7)	\$ 2,218	\$ 6,654	\$ 6,654		\$ 370	\$ 1,109	\$ 1,109
	\$ 10,001	\$ 30,003	\$ 30,003		\$ 1,667	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000

Note: Yellow highlighted cells depict Coordinated Plan Expenses



Task 7: GSP Preparation							
	\$ -	\$ 10,216	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,216	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 15,975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,975	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 45,652	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,652	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 134,540	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 134,540	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 20,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,777	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,251	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,251	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,328	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,328	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,196	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,196	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,509	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,509	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 227,160	\$ 82,284	\$ -	\$ 227,160	\$ 82,284	\$ -
Task 8: Financing							
	\$ -	\$ 22,404	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,404	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 3,704	\$ 3,704	\$ -	\$ 3,704	\$ 3,704	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 29,138	\$ 29,138	\$ -	\$ 29,138	\$ 29,138	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 55,246	\$ 32,842	\$ -	\$ 55,246	\$ 32,842	\$ -
Task 9: Outreach and Education							
	\$ 13,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 8,776	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,776	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 14,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 25,179	\$ 25,179	\$ -	\$ 25,179	\$ 25,179	\$ -
Bi-Annual Public Workshops (5)	\$ -	\$ 5,320	\$ 5,320	\$ -	\$ 887	\$ 887	\$ -
	\$ 36,431	\$ 30,499	\$ 30,499	\$ 36,431	\$ 26,066	\$ 26,066	\$ -
				subtotal	\$ 198,221	\$ 769,121	\$ 208,460
				Prop 1 Grant	\$ 13,160		
				Subtotal Coordinated Costs	\$ 3,611	\$ 20,648	\$ 11,991
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$216,274</b>	<b>\$872,361</b>	<b>\$268,416</b>				
					<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19</b>	<b>FY20</b>
					\$211,381	\$769,121	\$208,460
				<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,188,962</b>		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,357,051</b>					

# Coordinated Plan Expenses FY18      FY19      FY20

Note: Yellow highlighted cells depict Coordinated Plan Expenses

<b>Task 1: Funding Administration</b>			
Funding Coordination and Administration	\$ -	\$13,300	\$13,300
<b>Task 2: Data Management</b>			
2.4 Coordinated Data Management System	\$ -	\$28,614	\$ -
<b>Task 5: Intrabasin Coordination and Program Management</b>			
Technical & Policy GSP Coordination Meetings (21 technical meetings; 21 policy meetings)	\$ 11,663	\$ 46,651	\$ 23,326
<b>Task 6: Interbasin Coordination</b>			
Coordination	\$ 7,783	\$ 23,349	\$ 23,349
Technical Workshops (7)	\$ 2,218	\$ 6,654	\$ 6,654
<b>Task 9: Outreach and Education</b>			
Bi-Annual Public Workshops (5)	\$ -	\$5,320	\$5,320

	FY18	FY19	FY20
<b>Consultant Contract Coordinated Plan Expenses</b>			
Task 1	\$ -	\$ 13,300	\$ 13,300
Task 2	\$ -	\$ 28,614	\$ -
Task 5	\$ 11,663	\$ 46,651	\$ 23,326
Task 6	\$ 10,001	\$ 30,003	\$ 30,003
Task 9	\$ -	\$ 5,320	\$ 5,320
	\$ 21,663.71	\$ 123,887.50	\$ 71,947.79
<b>Total Coordinated Contract Cost</b>			<b>\$ 217,499</b>

<b>SLDMWA Coordinated Expenses</b>	\$ 21,031.92	\$ 44,317.26	\$ 44,317.26
<b>Total SLDMWA Coordination Cost</b>			<b>\$ 109,666</b>

<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 42,695.63	\$ 168,204.76	\$ 116,265.05
<b>Coordinated Plan Expenses Total</b>			<b>\$ 327,165</b>

3 Year Cost Per GSP Group      \$ 54,527.57