



Regional Water Management Group

LOCATION: Online (ZOOM)

MINUTES

Monday, August 22, 2022, 1:30 pm

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:32 pm, by Carl Janzen, vice-chair.

Those present included:

Al Solis - SEMCU	Jenny Nunez-Rodriguez – Madera County
Brandon Tomlinson – Chowchilla WD	Jim Brohm – Indian Lakes
Carl Janzen – Madera ID	Jon Cottingham – Coarsegold RCD
Clyde Wheeler – Indian Lakes	Keith Helmuth – City of Madera
Dina Nolan – Madera ID	Kim Witten – Madera County
Eddie Mendez – Madera County	Kristi Robinson – CMZ/Triangle T WD
Emily Garcia – Madera County	Mary Stalter – North Fork Rancheria
Erin Capuchino – Yosemite/Sequoia RCDC	Melanie Aldridge – Madera WD
Gretchen Heisdorf – Root Creek WD	Mira Dick – USDA NRCS
Jacob Roberson – RWMG Coordinator	Sam Cunningham – Madera County
Jason Rogers – City of Chowchilla	Stephanie Anagnoson – Madera County
Jeannie Habben – Madera County	Sue Ruiz – SHE

2. Review & Approval - Agenda & Minutes

- A motion to approve the August agenda after changing item #12 to “Review & Approval – IRWMP Project Proposals” and adding Sierra Highlands Well Rehab Project Proposal and Indian Lakes Water System Improvements Project Proposal under item #12 was made by Kristi R; Gretchen H second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.
- A motion to approve the July minutes was made by Gretchen H; Kristi R second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval – Resolution No. 2022-08

- A motion to approve meeting resolution no. 2022-08 was made by Kristi R; Gretchen H second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comment

- Carl J comment that both Madera and Chowchilla have finished their short surface water run for the year. They were able to provide more surface water than they originally thought. Madera had 6-weeks for surface water availability and Chowchilla’s availability was a little shorter. People need to understand that because of the shortness of surface water availability in Northern California via the Delta, we basically lost half of our Friant water supply to the Exchange Contractors. We lost out on about 4-weeks of surface water availability due to this.
- Items of interest were mentioned by Jacob R (for more information, reach out to Jacob):
 - The USDA Emergency Watershed Protection Program is a federal emergency recovery program, and helps local communities recover after a natural disaster strikes. The program offers technical and financial

assistance to help local communities relieve imminent threats to life and property caused by floods, fires, windstorms, and other natural disasters that impair a watershed. All funded projects must:

- Provide protection from flooding or soil erosion;
- Reduce threats to life and property;
- Restore the hydraulic capacity to the natural environment to the maximum extent practical; and
- Are economically and environmentally defensible and technically sound

This program has a rolling application deadline. For those interested in applying, [please click here for more information](#).

- DWR's facilitation support service is available to help local agencies work through challenging water management situations. This service provides the help of professional facilitators to foster discussions among diverse water management interests and local agencies when developing and implementing GSPs.

For details, visit the Facilitators Support tab on the [Assistance and Engagement webpage](#).

- On July 13th, EPA hosted a webinar to discuss how the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) funding can help communities improve their water and wastewater infrastructure. The webinar recording is now available on [EPA's Water Finance Webinars and Forums](#) website.
- On July 25th, the USDA announced their strategic plan to handle roughly 4 million acres of backlogged reforestation initiatives. With funds provided in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Framework, hundreds of millions of dollars in new funds for these efforts will help speed up their plan to plant one billion trees over the next 10-years. The detailed reforestation plan intends to make forests more resilient, particularly given the increased risks associated with ongoing droughts, wildfires, disease, pest infestation, and other challenges.

[Read the Reforestation Strategic Plan here](#)

- The State Water Resources Control Board has identified a need for regional programs that address drought related and contamination issues for state small water systems and domestic wells serving DACs and low-income households. Funding for this is available from various sources within the SAFER program to fund drinking water projects that address drought related and contamination issues. One key goal of this program is to award funding to counties or their partners to enable them to setup programs proactively, based on anticipated needs, and therefore be ready to respond promptly when urgent needs arise.

Eligible applicants include nonprofits, Tribal governments, and public agencies. This program is statewide, requires no matching funds, and has an ongoing application deadline. Please [click here](#) to learn more about this opportunity.

- [The Environmental Finance Center \(EFC\) at CSU Sacramento](#) is part of the USEPA EFC Network. They provide resources, training, and technical assistance to support and improve the capacity of Region 9 (California is in Region 9) in solving environmental challenges. Their expertise includes financing and planning for environmental and public health programs in areas such as drinking water, wastewater, stormwater, groundwater, and energy. Services they offer include asset management, stormwater funding and financing, direct technical assistance, grant application assistance, GIS analysis, tool and resource development, and training.

For small communities and DACs, this is a great resource to reach out to when limited capacity is inevitable and help is needed when it comes to applying for grants and managing those grants. [Please visit their website](#) for more information.

- DWR has published some best practices and tips for success when it comes to applying to their grants. Please [click here](#) to visit this website with some great information for those unfamiliar with DWR grants and the process for applying.
- The Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) has announced \$23 million for their forest and fire restoration grant program. This is the second cycle for this program. Eligible applicants include public agencies, nonprofits, or Tribal entities. Projects must be within, or provide services to, the [Sierra Nevada Region](#). Please [click here](#) to read the full announcement.
- DWR has announced the development of a [new web-based interactive mapping tool \(California Groundwater Projects Tool\)](#) that will allow the public to explore thousands of groundwater projects initiated in California over the last decade. There are various filters to quickly identify projects in a basin, subbasin, legislative district, county, and many others. The tool focuses on project benefits and effectiveness in relationship to SGMA sustainability indicators. Please read the [Press Release](#) for more information on the tool and other resources provided by DWR.
- Registration is now open for the October 27th Water Summit in Sacramento. This will be a one-day conference, in-person, highlighting the latest information and perspectives on water resources in California and the West. The event includes an evening reception along California's largest and longest river, the Sacramento River, for an opportunity to network with speakers and other attendees from a variety of backgrounds. Please [click here](#) to learn more about this event and to register.

- FEMA has announced its annual Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) programs for a combined \$3 billion in nationally competitive funding.

[BRIC Notice of Funding Opportunity](#) - \$2.3 billion

[FMA Notice of Funding Opportunity](#) - \$800 million

To apply, you must submit a Notice of Interest (NOI) to Cal OES by September 16th through the [Cal OES Engage Portal](#). If eligible, you will then be invited to submit a subapplication by December 2nd.

Please visit the Cal OES [BRIC](#) and [FMA](#) websites for more information on the application process. Cal OES can provide technical assistance to support the development of subapplications. If interested in receiving technical assistance, please set up a project scoping call with the Cal OES team to discuss the project idea by emailing HMA@caloes.ca.gov

The Cal OES Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) Team will be presenting a webinar titled, “2022 Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Webinar”.

During the webinar, the HMA Team will cover:

- FMA timeline
- FMA funding overview
- FMA NOFO overview
- C&CB, localized flood risk reduction, and individual flood mitigation projects
- Key changes in the NOFO
- How to get ready for FMA 2022
- Next steps
- Questions and Answers

The webinar will be held on Friday this week, August 26th, from 10 am – 11 am. The webinar will be held virtually via Microsoft Teams.

- The Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) will be cohosting the September 27th– 28th meeting of [California’s Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force](#) in the Sierra Nevada region.

The meeting will be held in Grass Valley, CA, this year for the in-person option which includes the September 27th meeting and the September 28th field tours. The September 27th meeting has an option to attend virtually, however the September 28th field tours will only be available to attend in-person. Please [click here](#) for more information and to register.

- DWR has released the draft 2022 Guidelines/Proposal Solicitation Package for the [Urban Community Drought Relief Program](#) for public review. The release of the draft materials commences a 15-day public comment period which closes on August 31st at 5 pm.

This solicitation will make approximately \$285 million in grant funding available for drought response projects. The drought relief goal is to address immediate impacts on human health and safety and on fish and wildlife resources, and to provide water to persons or communities that lose or are threatened with the loss or contamination of water supplies.

Please note that the Legislature is still working on trailer bill language that could affect this solicitation. The final GL/PSP will incorporate any legislative changes.

Electronic submissions for public comment are strongly encouraged.

5. Discussion & Action - Financial Report/Warrant Approvals

- August 2022 Financial Report
 - Carl J reported that we started the month off with \$33,894.40 and spent \$2,250 for the administrator and \$35 to the Madera County Farm Bureau for a total spent of \$2,285. After the month, we have \$31,609.40 which will get us through the end of the year with no problem.
 - A motion to approve the financial report was made by Gretchen H; Kristi 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
 - Nothing new to report.
 - Chowchilla Nitrate Control Program / Chowchilla Management Zone – Projects 12 and 13
 - Kristi R reported that they are continuing to do a lot of outreach. To date, they have reached residents 66,310 times via social media, USPS mailers, emails, outreach meetings, door-to-door canvassing, and on their website. There have been 76 inquiries for domestic well testing so far, 32 applications, and 30 wells have been tested. 10 of the wells tested have come back over the 10 mg/L for nitrates, and bottled water is being supplied to 14 homes. They are looking to get more wells tested in Madera County. If you or someone you know in Madera County would like to have their domestic well tested, please reach out to Kristi.
 - Carl J asked if any wells in the Madera Subbasin have been tested, and Kristi answered that there have. Only 1 or 2 of those wells have come back high in nitrates, and those residents have been notified as soon as the results come back high. They also provide the residents with the documentation showing the test results and resources that may be able to provide them bottled water or assist them to find a temporary or permanent solution since CMZ only provides bottled water to those in the Chowchilla Subbasin.
 - Sue R added that getting out to communities primarily relying on private domestic wells and getting the members to

trust them is challenging. This type of outreach (domestic well testing) is being done by organizations throughout the entire valley and it is challenging to all of them. If anyone has ideas on how to be more successful with this outreach, please share with Sue. If you would like her contact information, please reach out to Jacob R and he can get that for you.

- Sue also mentioned that for the smaller communities, maybe there is a local doctor or nurse that could help encourage the domestic well testing to the community and market it as a health concern for community members to have their well water tested. Kristi added that they have reached out to Camarena Health in Chowchilla, and they have been encouraging residents to have their wells tested but that hasn't been working very well regarding increasing the number of wells tested. They have also been working with Friends of Fairmead, local school districts, community leaders, and medical providers, and those channels are providing communication directly to residents for CMZ.
- Carl asked if they could provide incentives to residents to have their wells tested, and Kristi answered that the only incentive right is providing them bottled water if they test high in nitrates in the Chowchilla Subbasin. There have been discussions about other incentives that can be provided rather than just bottled water.
- Clyde W suggested that it may be good to investigate what the source for the lack of trust is within the different communities – what are they afraid of and what are their concerns with having their wells tested. Sue mentioned that she thinks it's a total of 3 things. First is that residents are told it's not going to cost anything, but they think it's going to end up costing money. Second, domestic well owners don't want any test results being on record or anyone else to know what their water tested at for private reasons. Another reason is that some people just don't want to know what their water quality is like.
- Dina N asked if there is any confidentially tied in with the testing and results because she can see how some owners wouldn't want the information to be publicly known, especially if the water tests high in some constituent and they are trying to sell their property. Kristi mentioned that they are required to report the test results through the Nitrate Control Program if they come back high in nitrates. Those results are reported to the state and are not pinpointed to the exact location, but the report does indicate the general area where the test was performed. The results are not associated with a specific address or homeowner. The report sent to the state is no different than the reporting required for the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) in which

growers test domestic wells for nitrates as well. All results are then sent to the state to be uploaded to their database. Sue added that they worked with a lab in the past that is now being subpoenaed for some testing that was done about 15-years ago.

- Dina also asked if residents could bring a water sample to a site or laboratory to be tested so the location of the well is not necessarily associated with a specific location, and Sue mentioned that SHE has allowed that in the past but sometimes the water is not collected correctly which may result in bad test results. Kristi added that having residents do their own water sampling is not currently an option for their program. Their program is currently geographically defined with boundaries for qualification to receive free testing and bottled water if high in nitrates. Samples from growers have been accepted from growers if they have done ILRP testing in the past and are over the 10 mg/L in nitrates.

7. Discussion – Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Funding

- Mountain Counties and San Joaquin Valley Counties
 - Indian Lakes and Parkwood
 - Eddie M reported that they are currently waiting on some miscellaneous items to be received to begin on the projects (connectors, fittings, etc.). The previous lead time was at 18-weeks for the items, but it has now been extended to 18 – 30 weeks. Eddie has reached out to other manufacturers and vendors for the items, but there is no alternative available to speed up the lead time.
 - City of Madera
 - Keith H reported that the engineer they are consulting with for this project has been slowing down in responses to the City of Madera about their meter project, and the city is working on accelerating the communication with the engineer. They are still in the design phase and are waiting on a report back from the engineer.
 - Parksdale
 - This project has been completed. Eddie M is working on getting the reimbursements from DWR for this project. The well is currently operating at 350 GPM and it's capable to produce a maximum of 450 GPM. The pump is also running off a variable frequency drive (VFD) to help maintain the GPM, so it is not always running at the maximum production amount of 450 GPM.
 - City of Chowchilla
 - Jason R reported that the funding agreement has been executed with DWR. Jason had a meeting with the engineers last week and they are going to start moving forward with the design for the project so they can begin construction as soon as possible.

8. Discussion – Prop 68 Funding

- Domestic Well Project – Madera County GSA

- Stephanie A reported that the domestic well inventory is done. The additional monitoring wells are going to be drilled between now and the end of the year. They are on the waiting list with Bradley & Sons to have the wells drilled and have extended the grant agreement to allow for that to happen. Last month, Sue R asked for a map indicating the locations of the monitoring wells which Jacob R had sent out.
- 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 – California Wildfires / Forest Management / Watershed

- Carl J mentioned that there are currently no large wildfires going on in the state. Wildfires are still happening, but they seem to be able to get them under control quickly right now.
- Stephanie A report that the Madera County Department of Water and Natural Resources has almost been fully reimbursed for the mudslide mapping that they did for the 2020 Creek Fire.

10. Discussion – Drought Working Group

- Jenny N reported that they had their monthly meeting last week on Friday. They had a guest speaker present on Madera County's response to SB 552 which requires counties to work on addressing the drought that California is experiencing. The presentation was an overview on what the County's plan is to address the drought. About 20 people attended the meeting, and the next meeting will be continued discussion on SB 552 and the drought plan.

11. Discussion – 2022 IRWM Implementation Grant Prop 1

- Round 2 Funding
 - Jacob R reported that an application was not able to be submitted by the August 19th deadline, but an application will be turned in by the 2nd deadline which is February 1, 2023. There was some confusion regarding the Indian Lakes projects regarding who will be writing and turning in the grant application. Indian Lakes is a district of the Public Works Department for the County, so they would be the ones turning in the application and implementing the work. Jacob had a call with Eddie M and Public Works does have a few projects in the Mountain Counties Funding Area which are higher up on their priority list. The higher priority projects will be voted on today to be added to the IRWMP project list to make it eligible for the Prop 1 funding.
 - Jacob also reported that the Nork Fork Rancheria (NFR) does not have the internal capacity to apply or implement the work. They asked if Public Works would be the local project sponsor for NFR's project, and Jacob let NFR know that Public Works would need to make that decision. The 3 projects that were voted on and approved by the MRWVG to apply for will need to be reconsidered since the organizations do not have capacity to apply or are not eligible to apply based on the eligibility requirements for Prop 1 Round 2. The group will need to vote on which projects they want an application to be turned in for, and Jacob will work with Public Works to

see which projects they are willing to turn in an application for and implement the work once the agreements are executed with DWR.

- Jacob reached out to DWR about the application process since they are doing Round 2 a little differently than they did Round 1 back at the end of 2019. Instead of having 1 organization submit an application packet for the entire funding area, they are having 1 applicant per region. Madera County is considered a region. Public Works would be the applicant and the local project sponsor for their project(s). Out of the total funding we have available to apply for in Round 2 (roughly \$595,000), no more than 10% can be for grant administration.
 - Sue R asked how the group handles projects for areas that do not have the capacity to apply on their own, and Jacob mentioned that areas looking to apply need to have a grant writer or find a way to get a grant writer or organization to write a grant for them.

12. Review & Approval – IRWMP Project Proposals

- Indian Lakes Water System Improvements Project Proposal
 - Jacob R mentioned that this project was turned in by Public Works, which could include the source capacity water storage and consolidation alternatives.
 - Clyde W added that they are looking into getting the engineering and studies done ahead of time so when funding is available, this project would be shovel-ready.
 - Gretchen H asked if this is more of a planning grant proposal rather than an implementation project, and Eddie M said it's more of a planning grant proposal. This proposal is modeled after how they do their grant applications for Public Works through the State Water Board. After Eddie read through what is eligible for reimbursement through the Prop 1 Round 2 funding solicitation, it mentioned design costs are eligible. If this project were to receive funding, they would be able to work on the design at the same time as the implementation construction to help streamline the process as a more general approach. This allows a broader approach to identifying various improvements to the water system.
- Sierra Highlands Water System Improvements Project Proposal
 - Jacob mentioned that this project would be for the design and construction for a new water system, and to connect the existing system to the new one. They currently have 26 connections. When the water was tested, it failed to comply with the secondary drinking water standard because it came back high in iron and manganese.
 - Gretchen H had 3 questions about this proposal:
 - The project costs on the proposal form show \$550,000+, but the costs on the Correction Action Plan (CAP) show \$400,000. Which one is the correct cost estimate? The CAP also doesn't include the design and construction costs.
 - Eddie answered that \$400,000 is modeled after the way the State Water Board Division of Financial Assistance (DFA), our most common grant provider, now sets up their planning/design grants. His most recent planning grants for

small water systems were capped at \$400,000 for items such as preliminary engineering, environmental, land acquisition, etc. Once the preliminary engineering report (PER) is completed the grants are amended as necessary by the DFA. Estimated construction and design costs are confirmed once the DFA agrees with the selected alternative. The \$550,000 just considers additional costs that may be identified during the PER.

- Is this proposal only for engineering and design? Or would this project include construction?
 - Eddie answered that the intent is to include construction if possible. The extent will be determined by the results of the PER. He would need to discuss this with the DWR to make sure that they understand the process the County typically completes planning/design.
- If this project is for construction, would the County be able to cover the difference between a grant award and potential cost overruns?
 - Eddie answered that they would amend the project as needed to avoid overruns. Future costs would be covered by other State funding sources.
- Sierra Highlands Well Rehab Project Proposal
 - Jacob mentioned that this project would be like the Parksdale project that was currently completed and reported on earlier during this meeting under item #7.
- Carl J added that for those in smaller districts, the costs are going up and some money from the local users will need to start coming in. The State will not have enough money available to catch up on all these projects and get them implemented.
- A motion to approve and add all 3 projects to the IRWMP Project List was made by Gretchen H; Kristi R second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

13. Review & Approval – Madera RWMG Project Proposal Form

- Jacob R updated the project proposal form to match the statewide priorities for the Prop 1 Round 2 solicitation. The updates to the project proposal form include:
 - Madera RWMG logo added to proposal form
 - Project Sponsor changed to “Project Sponsor/Applicant”
 - Project cost estimates broken down to smaller quantities
 - Community benefit areas added with hyperlinks to DWR mapping tool for DACs and EDAs
 - Funding areas added with a hyperlink to the funding area map
 - Statewide priorities updated to match Prop 1 Round 2 Guidelines. Hyperlink included
 - Program preferences updated to match Prop 1 Round 2 Guidelines. Hyperlink included
 - Added hyperlink to CA water management plan – water resource management strategies (RMSs)
- Gretchen H recommended adding additional boxes to indicate if the project is for a planning grant, implementation grant, or both. Stephanie A agreed with adding

in boxes to the proposal form to indicate if the proposal is for a planning grant, implementation grant, or both.

- A motion to approve the updated project proposal form after adding in the planning grant or implementation grant indicators was made by Gretchen H; Kristi R second; all voted; Motion passed unanimously.

14. Review – IRWM and SWRP Project List

- Jacob R reported that he has been going through the IRWM Project List to try and identify projects that are sustainable and would benefit Madera County's watershed. Jacob was originally asked to go through the list to identify projects that are sustainable and promote groundwater recharge. For projects promoting recharge, it was easy to identify those based on the project proposal (if one was filled out) but the sustainable projects were more difficult. Jacob set the dollar amount for the project cost at \$2 million or below to label projects as sustainable. Groundwater pumping reduction and floodwater management were added to the identifying criteria by Jacob after starting to go through the list since that would also help with groundwater levels and recharge water availability.
 - Stephanie A asked if the result will be a list that has the criteria that Jacob is identifying for projects currently on the IRWM Project list, and then another list of projects that do not have the criteria. Jacob said that is correct, but some projects do not have a cost listed or any criteria identified as well on the project list. No changes will be made to the IRWM Project List, but Jacob is creating more of an internal list to have on file once funding is available to help narrow down projects for the group to identify and select to go forward with funding.
- Jacob also mentioned that the sustainability criteria has been a little hard to identify for some projects due to costs not being included on the project list and/or proposal form, or the costs are high (\$16 million or more for example). Jacob asked if \$2 million is a good number to use to determine if projects are sustainable or not, and Carl J mentioned he thinks it's a good starting point since a lot of grants will not have more than \$2 million available for each project.
 - Stephanie is a little confused on sustainability being related to how much it's going to cost for projects to be implemented. Jacob mentioned that the cost of the project was a concern for a project when it was originally proposed to the group; some group members were worried that the cost of the project in the long run would not be sustainable for the community which is considered a DAC. Stephanie said costs of projects is not something that IRWM groups use as criteria when it comes to including projects on their project list or not. Kristi R commented that if the project is going to cost more than the original amount funded to keep it going, then it is up to that organization/community to keep the project going with additional funds. That is not something that we should be worried about. Stephanie added that sustainability for the group is sounding like it may relate to the institutional capacity to find and apply for other funding sources, not the overall cost of the project. This is not something that was identified on the proposal forms, so it will be difficult to identify which projects would be considered sustainable.
 - Jeannie H added that there are a lot of projects on our list that are over the \$2 million mark, and those projects may require some matching funds

or something to get them implemented if a funding source is identified. Jeannie agreed with Kristi that it is not our responsibility to ensure that a project can continue to move forward based off a dollar amount, our responsibility is to get the project on the list so that project can be applied for through various funding opportunities. The projects may never even have an application turned in for IRWM funding, but they may be applying for other funding that is more than \$2 million. Some funding criteria that are not for IRWM funding ask if the project is on the list for an IRWM group. If we pull a project off our list due to the cost, then we would make that project ineligible for other funding since it is not on an IRWM Project List.

- Melanie A added this would've been an issue for Madera WD since they just got \$6 million+ in funding for a project that is on our project list, but they could not have applied for the funding if the project wasn't on our list.
- Carl J added that we are not taking anyone off the list, but we are trying to identify projects that are sustainable for IRWM funding. Jeannie recommended creating a column to identify projects that are sustainable to the group, but the term sustainability is confusing and can mean a lot of different things for this group.
- Kristi mentioned that asking organizational capacity questions for the projects may help identify if the project is sustainable or not. For example, is the organization able to provide matching funds for the project if needed or is the organization able to wait for money to be reimbursed after the project has been started. Also, identifying the projects as being part of SGMA or being in a GSP may help with identifying projects as sustainable or not.
- Carl mentioned that it may be best to just drop the sustainability criteria all together when selecting projects to include on the internal list. Just focus on projects that benefit the watershed for Madera County.
- Sue R mentioned that they had turned in an application in the past for the community of Easton in Fresno County which is a domestic well community. The project was to get Easton on a water system, and with the help of SHE they were able to get the application form completed and turned in to the IRWM group in Fresno to be included on the list. In the end, the project was not approved to be included on the list because SHE did not have the internal capacity to manage the funding if received. It was a lot of work that SHE did for the application, and in the end, they were not successful.
- Jacob will continue to work on the internal list and identify projects that promote recharge, reduce groundwater pumping, and manage floodwater. He'll have it completed within the next 2-weeks and send it to the group members to review and provide comments on prior to September's meeting.

15. Review – Madera RWMG Voting Members

- Jacob R reported that after last month's meeting, there were some questions on which groups/organizations can vote on matters for the group. For example, which projects to move forward with for IRWM funding or projects to include on our IRWM Project List. Jacob just wanted to go over the voting members and

their voting rights for our group. Paying members each have a vote, and the organizations representing or supporting DACs and/or Tribal governments have 1 vote together.

- Paying members that have 1 vote each include Chowchilla WD, City of Chowchilla, City of Madera, Gravelly Ford WD, Madera Ag Water Association, Madera County, Madera ID, Madera WD, Root Creek WD, SEMCU, and Triangle T WD.
- Organizations representing or supporting DACs and/or Tribal governments that have 1 vote together include Indian Lakes, Fairmead Community and Friends, Madera Valley Water Company, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians, and SHE.
 - Kristi R asked how the DAC/Tribal members vote together. Jacob mentioned that it has not been an issue yet where they disagreed on something being voted on, and they rarely first or second a vote during the monthly meetings. Carl J mentioned that there has never been an issue on passing items during the meetings in the past prior to COVID when the meetings were done in person. Voting is not done formally with this group, and it has always been a unanimous decision to approve or a unanimous decision to not approve whatever is being voted on. That is how this group has been voting for the past 16 years+ since this group was formed. If the groups equaling 1 vote did not agree with each other, they would need to conference and decide how their vote is going to be casted.
 - Clyde W added that Indian Lakes has stayed out of voting on most matters. So far, deciding on how the DAC/Tribal members vote together has not been an issue for the group.

16. Report – Sustainable Groundwater Management – SGMA

- Carl J reported that the Madera Subbasin and the Delta-Mendota Subbasins have voted to have fees, and the Chowchilla Subbasin voted to not have fees. Madera ID continues to work on their projects. The revised GSPs have been turned in by the Subbasins which were required to do so by DWR, and they are currently waiting to hear back from DWR to see if the revised GSPs are OK or not.

17. New/ Suggested Members for the Madera RWMG

- No new members suggested.

18. Future Agenda Items

- IRWM Round 2 Project vote to select which project to turn in an application for by the 2nd deadline of February 1st.

19. Next Meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 26th, 2022, at 1:30 pm on Zoom for now until COVID restrictions are lifted and allow us to meet in person.

20. The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.