



# **Regional Water Management Group**

**LOCATION: Online (ZOOM)**

## **MINUTES**

**Monday, July 25, 2022, 1:30 pm**

### **1. The meeting was called to order at 1:33 pm, by Carl Janzen, vice-chair.**

Those present included:

Brandon Tomlinson – Chowchilla WD  
Carl Janzen – Madera ID  
Carol Potter – Indian Lakes  
Dina Nolan – Madera ID  
Don Roberts – Gravelly Ford WD  
Eddie Mendez – Madera County  
Emily Garcia – Madera County  
Erin Capuchino – Yosemite/Sequoia RCDC  
Gretchen Heisdorf – Root Creek WD  
Jack Rice – MAWA  
Jacklynn Kouzougian – SEMCU

Jacob Roberson – RWMG Coordinator  
Jason Rogers – City of Chowchilla  
Jeannie Habben – Madera County  
Jenny Nunez-Rodriguez – Madera County  
Keith Helmuth – City of Madera  
Kristi Robinson – CMZ/Triangle T WD  
Melanie Aldridge – Madera WD  
Robert Macaulay – Madera County  
Sam Cunningham – Madera County  
Stephanie Anagnoson – Madera County  
Sue Ruiz – SHE

### **2. Review & Approval - Agenda & Minutes**

- A motion to approve the July agenda was made by Kristi R; Gretchen H second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.
- A motion to approve the June minutes was made by Jason R; Gretchen H second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Approval – Resolution No. 2022-07**

- A motion to approve meeting resolution no. 2022-07 was made by Kristi R; Gretchen H second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

### **4. Public Comment**

- Items of interest were mentioned by Jacob R (for more information, reach out to Jacob):
  - The Sierra Vista Scenic Byway is hosting a free tour of the Nelder Grove this Saturday, July 30<sup>th</sup>. In August or September, they plan on hosting another tour with a Native American culture theme.
  - New tools and information have been released to help deal with dry wells in California. DWR and the State Water Resources Control Board have developed the Dry Well Susceptibility tool. There is another tool available online for private well owners to report dry wells. There is also a list of resources available to private well owners and those in small communities who are concerned about losing access to water. This list of resources was compiled by the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley.

- The Madera/Chowchilla RCD has started their irrigation evaluation program in Madera County where they are completing distribution uniformity testing and soil health assessments as part of this program. If you would like to schedule one of these tests, please reach out and I can pass along the contact information for Chris Yohannan.
- DWR has contracted with the California Rural Water Association to provide no-cost leak detection surveys to community water systems that serve 3,000 or less connections. Tribal water systems also qualify for this service. If leaks are detected as a result of taking advantage of this resource, DWR has funding opportunities for projects through the Small Community Drought Relief Program. Other available grants can be found on the California grants portal website.
- The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery is now accepting applications for their Farm & Ranch Solid Waste Cleanup and Abatement Grant Program. This program has an ongoing application deadline and is expected to make award announcements on October 18, 2022. Grantees have approximately two years to complete the project(s).

This program provides funding as a reimbursement method to help cleanup and prevent illegal dumping on farm and/or ranch property. Funding includes reimbursement for administrative, recycling or disposal, equipment, material, and personnel costs. Abatement and prevention measures shall be addressed if needed, such as site security and public education or outreach efforts.

Eligible applicants include public agencies, cities, counties, resource conservation districts, Tribal governments, and federally recognized Native American Tribes. Sites that have been previously remediated, homeless encampments, and illegal cannabis grows may be eligible. Multiple projects and sites may be included in one application.

Maximum amount of funding per applicant each fiscal year is \$200,000. Maximum amount per cleanup site is \$50,000.

- **UPCOMING FUNDING OPPORTUNITY IN EARLY 2023:** The Strategic Growth Council (SGC) has launched their Development of Community Resilience Centers (CRC) Program in response to the 2021-2022 State Climate Budget package, which provides over \$15 billion to tackle wildfire and drought challenges, build more resilient communities, promote sustainable agriculture, and advance a nation-leading climate agenda. The budget includes \$100 million for the Strategic Growth Council's Community Resilience Centers program over two years.

This program will fund new construction and upgrades of neighborhood-level resilience centers to provide shelter and resources during climate and other emergencies, such as extreme heat events and poor air quality days. The program will also fund year-round services and ongoing

community amenities and programming, such as food distribution and workforce development training, that build overall community resilience. SGC will prioritize community-serving locations across the state, such as schools, libraries, community centers, health clinics, and places of worship.

Strategic Growth Council's Community Resilience Centers program will fund both planning and implementation activities. \$25 million will be available in Round 1 of the program, and \$75 million will be available in Round 2. Staff anticipate releasing the Round 1 Notice of Funding Availability and application in early 2023. Strategic Growth Council plans to release draft program guidelines in September 2022 for a 30-day public comment period. Once released, Strategic Growth Council will host a series of public workshops to provide opportunities to review and comment on the proposed program structure.

- The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection is accepting applications for its [California Forest Improvement Program \(CFIP\)](#). The purpose of this program is to encourage private and public investment in, and improved management of, California forest lands and resources. The focus is to ensure adequate high quality timber supplies, related to employment and other economic benefits, and the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of a productive and stable forest resource system for the benefit of present and future generations.

The program's scope includes the improvement of all forest resources including fish and wildlife habitat, and soil and water quality. Cost-share assistance is provided to private and public ownerships containing 20 – 5,000 acres of forest land.

Eligible applicants include:

- Businesses
- Individuals
- Nonprofits
- Public agencies

Landowners must own at least 20 acres of forestland but not more than 5,000 acres of forestland in California. The 20-acre minimum does not apply to forestland zoned as timber production. Forestland means land at least 10% occupied by trees of any size that are native to California. Developed areas such as structures, landscaping, and gardens shall not be excluded from the 20-acre minimum property size and shall be included.

Landowners less than 500 acres can receive 90% funding. Landowners greater than 500 acres receive 75% funding, unless the property has been substantially damaged due to fire, flood, and/or insects, in which case they will receive 90% funding.

The application deadline is ongoing.

- [Videos and documents from the July 11<sup>th</sup> Update 2023 Climate Change Workshop are now available online.](#) The workshop covered details on the science, tools, and processes that DWR has been developing and applying for climate resilience. There was also information on how DWR's work can support local and regional water resource-related climate adaptation efforts. Various segments of the workshop are available as individual videos.
- The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) has been looking into how to manage fallowed farmland in the San Joaquin Valley amid efforts to bring groundwater basins into balance. [The research will be discussed during an online event tomorrow, July 26<sup>th</sup>, from 11 am – 12:15 pm.](#) It will include information on other management practices that could mitigate dust and air quality concerns in the valley.

Registration is required to attend.

## **5. Discussion & Action - Financial Report/Warrant Approvals**

- July 2022 Financial Report
  - Carl J reported that we started off the month with \$35,584.01 and received \$625 from SEMCU and \$3,914.94 for Prop 1 grant funds during the month. For spending during the month, we spent \$2,250 for administrative duties, \$2,788.71 to CMZ and \$190.83 to the Farm Bureau for Prop 1 grant work, and \$1,000 for Prop 1 grant administration. At the end of the month, we have \$33,894.40 in the account which will get us through to the end of the year with no problem.
  - A motion to approve the financial report was made by Kristi R; Jason R second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Discussion – Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Funding**

- San Joaquin Valley
  - Self-Help Enterprises – Projects 12 and 13
    - Jacob R mentioned that SHE is focusing on the drought that California is experiencing. A lot of the work for projects 12 and 13 has been done by CMZ since the beginning of the summer.
  - Chowchilla Nitrate Control Program / Chowchilla Management Zone – Projects 12 and 13
    - Kristi R reported that they have tested 25 wells to date in Madera County. They are testing for 12 constituents and providing bottled water only for those that are in the CMZ boundaries and over the safe threshold for nitrates in their drinking water. Out of the 25 wells tested, 9 have come back over the 10 mg/L safe threshold for nitrates and they are providing bottled water to a total of 14 homes.
      - Sue R with SHE asked Kristi which kind of contaminants CMZ is finding that are common or are problematic relating to groundwater. Kristi mentioned that it is all over the place. They have had a couple of hits on E. coli or bacterial

organisms. Lead seems to be slightly elevated in some areas, and lead seems to be the most common found issue for contaminants other than nitrates. Sue also asked about other contaminants, and Kristi mentioned they have had 0 findings for those. Kristi said there was 1 test that came back positive for arsenic. Sue added that they have found some tests done in Fresno for surface water to be more aggressive for lead.

## **7. Discussion – Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Funding**

- Mountain Counties and San Joaquin Valley Counties
  - Indian Lakes
    - Eddie M reported that they had the kickoff meeting with the vendor that is managing the integration and installation for Indian Lakes' meters. The maintenance crew is still updating about 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the connections for the new meters. The old connections are still there past a certain point and are delicate due to their age. They are also at a high risk of leaking once they begin to be worked on. Eddie is working with DWR to see what is allowed to be done to the older connections in terms of ordering parts. Eddie asked DWR if he can order large quantities of materials needed for the older connections which DWR is OK with. If there are any restocking fees incurred due to materials being ordered but not needed, then the grant will not cover those restocking fees for returned items.
  - Parkwood
    - Eddie M reported that the vendor has the meters and the associated radio components as of now. What Eddie has been working on is acquiring all the miscellaneous components like boxes, fittings, etc. The challenge that they are currently encountering is that a lot of the smaller parts aren't available in the quantities needed. At the start of this project when the application was turned in, Parkwood was not having any leaking issues with the current connections, but they are starting to have issues now. They are going to need to order some additional materials so no one in the Parkwood community is left without water. OEM does have some material on hand to deal with the old connections, but not enough for 1,000 connections. The main challenge here is when Eddie talks to the manufacturers for the miscellaneous materials, they all give him the answer of an 18-week lead time for any kind of special orders. This would put them out to a start time in November at the earliest. They do have the routing for the agreement extension in progress, which Eddie should see within a month from DWR. There should be no issues with running out of time on the agreement due to the extension. Eddie had a call with DWR about 2-weeks ago regarding why an extension has been requested.
  - City of Madera
    - Keith H reported that nothing has really changed since last month's report. They are still working with the engineer on the reviews.

- Parksdale
  - This project has been completed.
- City of Chowchilla
  - Jason R reported that they received their funding agreement from DWR last week. They met with them today for a kickoff meeting for reporting requirements and Jason will be meeting with their engineers moving forward so they can start completing the design. They are hoping to be able to go out and bid the work this summer.

## 8. Discussion – Prop 68 Funding

- Domestic Well Project – Madera County GSA
  - Stephanie A reported that for Prop 68 planning funds, they have funds that conducted a domestic well inventory and they are in the process of installing monitoring wells. In the Chowchilla Subbasin, there are 3 monitoring wells, and, in the Madera Subbasin, there are 2. Luhdorff & Scalmanini is the consultant for this project, and they are working with drillers to get the monitoring wells drilled sometime this Fall. The grant ends before the end of the year.
    - Carl J asked for the approximate area that these wells will be drilled, and Stephanie answered that she would need to look at a map to name the exact locations. What they're trying to do is fill in gaps in the monitoring well network.
- Prop 68 Round 2
  - No new updates for the Prop 68 Round 2. It is expected to open sometime in September of this year.

## 9. Discussion – Creek Fire / Forest Management / Watershed

- Carl J reported that Mariposa is currently burning. A lot of smoke is being produced from this fire and is visible. We are currently in the peak of the fire season. Everyone needs to be careful, and do not drag your tow chain when towing, especially in the foothills since they are very dry right now due to the ongoing drought. Tow chains being dragged on the road when towing is one way a fire can be started.

## 10. Discussion – Drought Working Group

- Jenny N reported that the last drought meeting for Madera County was held on July 15<sup>th</sup> and the next meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 19<sup>th</sup>. The meetings are held every 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of each month. During the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, they had a Professor from UC Merced as their guest speaker. The Professor provided a presentation about the economic impacts of the drought in the agricultural industry. The Professor also shared about some studies that UC Merced is doing about the effects of the drought on the economy. Jenny also shared some tools during the July drought meeting. One of the tools was for the [California Water Library](#) from Maven's Notebook. Another tool shared is from Maven's Notebook as well, and this tool has information about SGMA called the [Groundwater Exchange](#).
  - Carl J asked how many people attend the monthly drought meetings, and Jenny mentioned that there were about 13 people who attended the meeting on July 15<sup>th</sup>. 13 is about the average for each month, but some

months have had 22 people attend the meeting on Zoom. State representatives, County representatives, SHE staff, other nonprofit staff, and some farmers attend.

## 11. Discussion – 2022 IRWM Implementation Grant Prop 1

- Round 2 Funding
  - Jacob R mentioned that there are 2 deadlines for the Round 2 funding. The 1<sup>st</sup> deadline is on August 19<sup>th</sup>, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline is on February 1, 2023. A few months ago, Tom W mentioned he would like to get an application in for the Madera region by the August 19<sup>th</sup> deadline. Project(s) submitted for the Madera region need to be for the Mountain Counties Funding Area (MCFA) and the total funding we have is \$594,782.67. Jacob reached out to a few organizations that have projects on our IRWM project list to see if the projects still need to be implemented or if they were interested in having the project(s) voted on by the group for possible Round 2 funding. There are a total of 5 projects to be considered today for the group's approval to move forward on the application process for:
    - Indian Lakes has 3 projects that Jacob sent out to the group to review prior to voting during today's meeting. The 1<sup>st</sup> project for Indian Lakes is project # 78 on the IRWM list, and the project is for studies necessary to fabricate and install a new water tank. The 2<sup>nd</sup> project is project # 80, and the project is for studies necessary to drill a new well. The 3<sup>rd</sup> project is project #83, and the project is for a replacement well and connection to the water delivery system. The Water Committee for Indian Lakes would like to have projects # 78 and 80 combined and turned in as 1 project for the Round 2 application since the tasks are similar and can be done by the same contractor on the same timeline. Indian Lakes is not considered to be a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) on DWR's mapping tool, but they are considered an Economically Distressed Area (EDA). With being an EDA, there are no matching funds required for any of the projects for Indian Lakes.
      - Carl J mentioned that there are no dollar amounts listed or checked on the proposal form for projects # 78 and 80 so Carl is not sure what amount of money is needed for these 2 projects. Jacob mentioned that these project proposals were turned in for Indian Lakes years ago. Jacob is not sure if any pricing was known when the projects were originally proposed to the group, but Jacob is sure that those pricing estimates have changed.
        - Carol P with Indian Lakes mentioned she is not aware of any pricing being known for these projects.
      - Gretchen H asked if Indian Lakes wants just 1 project, or if they want to get multiple projects funded. Carl answered that the number of projects that we can turn in an application for is not limited, but we just need to meet or stay under the amount allocated to us for this round. Jacob said we can turn in multiple projects on the same application.

- Carol added that the study and the replacement well would cover a lot of the \$595,000 available for the Round 2 funding. Jacob does not think that the available funds would cover the full cost for the studies and the actual drilling of a new well along with the connections to the new system. Jeannie mentioned that when the new well project was reviewed in the past, the study for the new well hadn't been done yet. Property would need to be purchased for the new well, the location of the new well would need to be determined, along with a lot of other things before the well can be drilled. The cost for the study and for a new well along with the pipes for connecting to the new system would be over \$1 million. Carol mentioned that property would not need to be purchased since they already have the property up on the hill where the new well would be located. This project was last reviewed and presented to DWR a few years ago. This project would need to be submitted by the Public Works Department, not by Indian Lakes since Indian Lakes is a water district under the County Maintenance Department. Jacob also added that there are certain eligible applicants for the Round 2 funding.
  - Jacob also added that the Drought Funding provided by DWR can be combined with projects funded using Round 2 dollars if additional funding is required for projects.
- The 4<sup>th</sup> project is from the Madera County Department of Water and Natural Resources. The project is #120 on the IRWM project list, and the project is for the Oakhurst River Parkway cleanup and rehabilitation. An application for Prop 68 was turned in by the department for the Oakhurst River Parkway which they are still waiting to hear back about. Jeannie H mentioned that the Prop 68 application is not for this same project being considered for the IRWM Prop 1 Round 2 funding, but it is within the same area. The Round 2 funding would partner up well with the Prop 68 funding possibility. Oakhurst is considered a DAC, so there are no matching funds required for this project.
- The 5<sup>th</sup> project is for the North Fork Rancheria (NFR) of Mono Indians and is on the IRWM project list as project # 90. This project is for the Muddy Falls area on the rancheria. This project is not on Madera RWMG's Storm Water Resources Plan (SWRP) project list, and it will need to be added to the project list for stormwater to be eligible for the Round 2 funding since this project deals with stormwater/flood control. North Fork is considered a DAC and there are no matching funds required for this project. NFR did note that the ponding basin included in this project proposal has been cleared as part of their Low-Income Housing Tax Credit project. The project plans also call for an earth baffle (berm) in the center to separate the sediment and will raise the overflow to the County. The storm drainage system daylights further up the hill behind the



community center and surface flows down to the pond. It could still use some improvement and stabilization if funds are available. The flow line could be cleared and lined with rip rap to prevent further erosion.

- Carl J mentioned that for this project, the box for under \$100,000 on the proposal form has been checked which is far from the amount of total funding available for the MCFA in Madera.
- Jeannie added that this project was voted for to be on the SWRP project list a while ago. If a project added to the IRWM project list deals with stormwater, then it would automatically be added to the SWRP project list. Gretchen said that we made this vote as a group early on during the COVID pandemic. Jacob will double check on this and get it added to the SWRP project list.
- Carl J suggested doing the project for NFR with the funds available for Round 2, and then using the remaining funds for projects #78 and 80 for Indian Lakes. We are not sure how far the remaining funds will get the 2 projects for Indian Lakes, but it will not provide enough funding to drill a new well (project # 83).
  - Gretchen would like to know how much each of these projects will cost. If it does go above the \$595,000 that we have available, can the remainder of the project cost(s) be covered by the individual grantee. Carl mentioned that if the individual grantee can cover the additional costs, these projects will not be rejected by DWR based off past experiences. Gretchen clarified that for the \$1 million cost for the Indian Lakes new well, does the County or Indian Lakes have the additional funds to pay for the new well. Carl said that the Indian Lakes' water district would probably not have the money available to pay for the additional costs not covered by the available Round 2 funds. Gretchen just wants to be sure that the overages can be covered if the bids come in too high once the projects are approved for funding through grants. Gretchen mentioned some projects have had to drop out of funding after being approved for the funding since they are unable to cover the additional costs because the bids are coming in above the funding amount. Carl thinks that the studies (projects 78 and 80) can be done for under \$500,000.
- Robert M added that the Public Works Department was wanting a storage tank replacement project added to the IRWM project list for the Sierra Highlands (rejected by the Madera RWMG during the June meeting due to being unsustainable and not including metering for the community connections). Robert added that this project is viable and there is available funding in the district to cover additional costs if there are any. They did look at the new well for Indian Lakes and there is not enough available funding to cover the additional costs not covered by grant funding.

- Eddie M mentioned that Sierra Highlands is already metered. Carl said that last month no one was sure, so the project was not accepted by the group. Robert asked that since the community is metered and that was one of the reasons why the group did not accept the project, would it be eligible for this Round 2 funding opportunity. Jacob said that the project would need to be on our IRWM project list to be eligible for the Round 2 funding, and the project is not on the project list since it was rejected by the group during the June meeting due to the project being unsustainable. Metering was not mentioned on the proposal form nor on the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) attached to the proposal form, so the group was not aware that the community is already metered. Robert was wondering if that decision can be amended by the group since this project is a preferred project from the Public Works Department and is highly needed for the Sierra Highlands community. Carl added that the \$595,000 available through Round 2 would not come close to getting the community sustainable. We need to find a bigger grant or a better funding source for this project. Jacob added that the Drought Funding available from the state would be a good source for this project (Small Community Drought Relief Funding mentioned under “Items of Interest”).
- Jeannie added that there is an issue with the group originally rejecting this project due to it being deemed unsustainable. The project was submitted to the group to be put on the IRWM project list, not for grant funds specifically. Jeannie does not see why this project cannot be on the list. The list has a lot of different projects on it that may or may never be sustainable. A lot of the projects are just ideas and were submitted to just get them on the list. Jeannie does not understand why the project was never added to the list in the 1<sup>st</sup> place. One project for Root Creek WD is for \$60 million, but it’s still on the list. Carl said that Jeannie is probably right, but this project was discussed last month with the \$595,000 available for the Round 2 funding in mind and that complicated the whole issue. Jeannie thinks adding the Sierra Highlands project to the list is fine. Keith H also thinks adding this project to the list is fine, but we need to find a method to pare the list down since it does include projects with a high cost. Jeannie mentioned that any project has been added to the list to make it eligible for funding that may possibly be available in the future. When the project list is reviewed once a year to see if projects on the list have already been completed, then they would be taken off the list. Keith would like to find those projects that are most sustainable and have the best benefit to go ahead and provide recharge for the basin in general. Some projects are

not necessarily for the benefit of the basin. They are more specifically beneficial to individual users or maintenance districts. We need to narrow down our goal for what we want as a group and match the list towards that goal. Jeannie added that this is a regional water group and is for everyone in Madera County. It's for the foothills and the valley, and it is for individual groups. If they get their project completed, then they get their project completed. That's when we vote for who's going to get funded. To be on the list, it can be any project. Keith added that when a project is presented, the group should understand what the project's benefits are for what the group wants. The identifiers within Round 2's guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) shows benefits/priorities that maybe the group doesn't want (sediment management for example). Jeannie added that maintenance projects are generally not funded. Keith mentioned that some of the projects on the list are asking for dollars for maintenance. Jeannie mentioned that those maintenance projects may not be funded, but they are on the list because some state funding requires the project to be on an IRWM project list to be eligible. We have had times that when funding became available for this group (for drought, etc.), no one has applied for it which is not the fault of this group or of the list. It's the fault of the individuals not wanting to do the application work. If the individuals do not want to do the work, then who's going to do the work. If it ends up being maintenance (Public Works Department) because no one else wants to do the work, then that's who gets funded. Keith added that he does not care for lists that go one for miles and miles, and that is where our project list is headed. Keith would like for projects to be on the list or indicated somehow that help the basin going forward. Carl added that he feels the same way as Keith regarding lists containing a lot of projects. Our list currently has 140+ projects on it. The problem is that the groups putting out the grant applications always put restrictions on them that end up saying that the funds are only for this little niche of what you might want to do. With our wide range of projects, it does give us the ability to try to apply for some grants that fit the niche. It's the same problem that they are having for the valley with this Round 2 funding (Madera does not have any money allocated for the valley with the Round 2 funds). It's what the state gave us so it's what we have to live with.

- Carl asked Jacob that with the help of the County, would it be possible to put together a grant application by the August 19<sup>th</sup> deadline that could cover the Indian Lakes' studies (#78 and 80) and cover the NFR Muddy Falls project (# 90). Jacob said that we just need to get the exact dollar amount for each project to see if the \$595,000 available to us would cover all 3 projects. A portion of

the NFR project already has been completed, so the costs should be lower than what was originally expected when the project proposal was first submitted to the group. Jacob does think meeting the August 19<sup>th</sup> deadline would be possible. Jacob has some time set aside to assist with the grant application where needed. The application does need to be turned in on [DWR's GRanTS portal](#). An eligible applicant for the Round 2 funding would need to submit the application on the portal.

- Gretchen asked if getting the total pricing would be able to be gathered before the actual voting is done by the group, and Carl said no since we are voting on it today and not meeting before the August 19<sup>th</sup> deadline. A special meeting could be held. We can vote today on the projects to be submitted if the total pricing comes in at or under the \$595,000 available.
- A motion to approve projects # 78, 80, and 90 if the total costs are at or under the allocated amount for the MCFA was made by Gretchen H; Kristi R second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.
  - Carl added that if the costs are not known in time and an application is not turned in by the August 19<sup>th</sup> deadline, an application would need to be turned in for the February 1, 2023, deadline.
  - Jacob said that if the application does get turned in by August 19<sup>th</sup>, DWR is looking to make the funding announcement by early Fall. For applications turned in by February 1, 2023, Jacob would anticipate funding announcements being made in mid-Spring 2023.

## **12. Report – Sustainable Groundwater Management – SGMA**

- Stephanie A reported that the Madera County GSA has been working on revisions for the Delta-Mendota San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Groundwater Authority GSP which the County is in. The GSP went to the Board last week and was promptly turned back in to DWR. The Chowchilla Subbasin GSP goes to the Board tomorrow and then will be turned in to DWR on the 27<sup>th</sup>. None of the Madera Subbasin GSPs have received a letter yet from DWR but should by October.
  - Carl J mentioned that he saw something about the County GSA going to the Board tomorrow about something with a domestic well program for Chowchilla. Stephanie mentioned this is regarding the DWR letter to the Chowchilla Subbasin's GSP which strongly suggested that the plan would not be approved without a domestic well mitigation program. There's a MOU that agrees to fund the program in the Chowchilla Subbasin. Carl asked how that is going to be funded since they voted down the 218. Stephanie said there a couple sources of potential funds including penalties. There are growers also working on a local funding mechanism where they self-access and then pay the County rather than paying the County on their property tax bill.
- Carl J reported that the Madera ID GSA has nothing new to report since last month's report.

### **13. New/ Suggested Members for the Madera RWMG**

- No new members suggested.

### **14. Future Agenda Items**

- Gretchen H requested that the IRWM/SWRP project list update and reformatting be added to the agenda for next month. Anyone with missing information on their project proposal should be contacted to provide the missing information. A lot of the headers on the project lists are off the old IRWM priorities and a lot of the checkboxes on the proposal form are not included on the project list. The spreadsheet that DWR uses for Prop 1 applications has a lot more information on it. It would be very helpful for us as a group to have that information already pulled.
  - Costs, statewide priorities, funding area (valley vs mountain/foothills), DAC/EDA benefits, etc. should be gathered for all the projects currently on both project lists.
- Proposal review and vote for the Sierra Highlands project to be put on the IRWM project list.
- Change the Creek Fire agenda item to California Wildfires.

### **15. Next Meeting**

- Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022, at 1:30 pm on Zoom for now until COVID restrictions are lifted and allow us to meet in person.

### **16. The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.**