

## Day 2 - April 1, 2020; Reflecting & Looking Ahead

### Table of Contents

1. [Panel Discussion: 2020 Plan Review Lessons Learned](#)
2. [Deep Dive: Lessons Learned from GSP Review](#)
3. [State Agency Panel: Commitment, Coordination, & Policy Direction](#)
4. [Convening Summary & Next Steps](#)
5. [Resource Fair](#)

---

9:00 - 9:30 AM

#### Welcome & Introductions

Jennifer Clary & Danielle Dolan

[Mad Libs](#) - Winner: **Amanda Monaco!**

---

9:30 - 10:20 AM

#### Panel Discussion: 2020 Plan Review Lessons Learned

Samantha Arthur, National Audubon Society

Sandi Matsumoto, TNC

Debi Ores, CWC

#### Notes:

*Samantha Aruthur, Audubon*

- Groundwater Leadership Forum coordinated plan review of 31 GSPs
- Lack of IDing beneficial users in plans
- Impacts
  - Lack of analysis, how disadvantaged communities would be impacted by plan, how dependent groundwater ecosystems are impacts; not adequately addressing climate change projections
- Outcomes
  - Not coming up with timelines and schedules; no detail in projects and management actions
- Final Groundwater Sustainability Plan
  - Stakeholder engagement plans, identifying disadvantaged communities
  - 180 day fixes to remedy deficiencies with DWR actually requiring that
- We will pick and choose the best examples of what we are seeing in our review of 30 plans, but it's also worth noting that we selected our GSPs to review because we suspected there might be deficiencies. So we may be missing the best examples out there.

*Sandi Matsumoto, TNC*

- Nature Conservancy worked on their own review, followed requirement under SGMA, fed

it into the Groundwater Leadership Forum review

- TNC reviewed roughly 30 plans, prior to reviewing plans they put out guidance on how to incorporate GDE's, and published a map for identifying groundwater dependent ecosystems. It is free and GSA's have access to.
- Letter available on Water Hub resource site and posted to SGMA portal, helpful resource to see other letters that came in
- *Key Take-aways:*
  - Good amount of groundwater ecosystems excluded, took the map and cut the ecosystems out; GDE's cut out because viewed as surface water dependent
  - Looking at groundwater levels and monitoring wells that were far away from GDEs (broad brush, looking at the wrong data)
  - Some plans are individual plans and some are nested together, different combinations and tracking that is a job in itself, resource-intensive
  - More collaboration with comment letters
  - Thinking ahead: provide more transparency with the comments and working on a tool that TNC would love to get feedback on
  - Policy rec 1: it would be great if DWR brought in sister agencies to comment from the inside instead of relying on public comments
  - Policy rec 2: GDW could have requested shape file data for mapping GDEs; TNC doing that individually now
- Sandi (via chat box): Hi All - just a clarification. I mentioned that GDEs often depend on perched aquifers. These are localized areas of shallow groundwater, where shallow groundwater is held near the surface by clay or other geological features.

#### *Debi Ores, CWC*

- Focused on 6 plans
- Focus on impacts to drinking water and stakeholder engagement
- *Common deficiencies:*
  - Failure to consider water quality (despite it being an undesirable result)
    - "Nitrates is in the realm of Irrigated Lands program" BUT management actions can decrease these contaminants
  - Failure to consider impacts to shallow domestic wells
  - Failure to engage stakeholders - meetings in the middle of the day; no childcare; no translation
  - Minimum Thresholds (MTs)/Measurable Objectives (MOs) were wholly inadequate
    - Minimum threshold (the worst the basin could get) - some set their MT's to "if SGMA didn't exist"; some set their's to 10-20% better than if SGMA didn't exist
    - 40-80% shallow domestic wells will go dry at MT/MO
  - Lack of political will to require adequate pumping restrictions
  - Many GSPs not considering needs of small community drinking water systems
  - Small communities won't be able to compete for Gwr market credits
  - Undesirable results were defined as impacts 50% of the wells +1 for all undesirable results
    - Shallow domestic wells serving DACs are left out of this
    - Ignoring domestic wells and DACs (listed as beneficial users in SGMA)
  - No drinking water mitigation plans - how to prevent negative impacts to small drinking water systems (includes how to get emergency water to these

- communities & facilitate consolidation)
- Good examples? Kings River East:
  - Drinking water user on GSA Board; did some outreach; but still had meetings in the middle of the day
- Plan review:
  - Resource intensive; had a grant from DWR to work on SGMA; funded their review of central valley plans; hired consultants to do so - the consultant help was critical; writing letters took a lot of staff time
  - Groundwater Leadership Forum did a more in depth review of Salinas Plan
  - For 2022 plans, would be difficult to comment without a consultant
  - Lack of time and resources - weren't able to look at coordination agreements - lots of interconnections between different GSPs in one basin
- Need to:
  - Consider impacts to drinking water users (gwr levels and gwr quality)
    - Data on gwr quality is lacking compared to quantity data BUT there are tools coming out:
      - GAMA water quality
      - CWC drinking water tool
      - Water Foundation: EKI white paper; impacts of 2 wells in SJV at MT/MOs; CWC helped guide this report; where impacts are; how many people will be impacts; costs associated w/ impacts
      - DWR is working on a drought tool
      - CWC working on legislation for drought contingency planning
- Hoping DWR sends plans back for 180 period - hoping GSAs can then use these tools to improve plans, MT/MO
  - If SWB indicates plans are inadequate, DWR needs to indicate as such

#### Q&A:

- Felice: Should the administration and legislature be informed that many GSPs are failing to address the same key issues?
- Candice: Ventura County actually contracted with NOAA to do Climate Change modeling for the IRWM Plan update. The modeling had very wide outcomes, is there any input/recommendation on how to manage for these wide possibilities in climate change projections?
  - *My GSA boards response is that - if you don't know for sure that its a GDE, why would you put the financial burden on the pumpers. I foresee getting out-voted on taking a overly cautious approach for GDEs.*
- Cindy: Are there any plans that are not so bad or could be considered models for others to follow?
  - Sammy: Good question, Cindy. I forgot to mention that we are going through a process of trying to pull together a model plan. We will pick and choose the best examples of what we are seeing in our review of 30, but it's also worth noting that we selected our GSPs to review because we suspected there might be deficiencies. So we may be missing the best examples out there.
  - *DWR and CNRA wants to be able to point to examples of success*
  - *Not one GSP that did it well comprehensively - but some better at certain elements than others*
  - *30 GSPs that were evaluated have "review forms" completed - you can look*

*through these and ID who is doing it better than others*

- Felice - Would like to know if DWR has been involved and panelists assessment of the quality of DWR participation. Did they attend meetings, pay attention to E Justice groups, formally comment in drafts and/or submitted GSPs?
  - I.e., Are there any examples of outstanding outreach that goes beyond just having a contact list and informing those on it that docs are on the website, meeting times, etc. WHAT IS EXCELLENT OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT?
    - *Debi: Not really...*
- Felice - "Resource intensive": I fear that round 2 will not have the interest, engagement of larger organizations and technical resources. Will big groups lose interest outside the Central Valley?
- *How to engage stakeholders under COVID conditions:*
  - Debi: CWC has been putting a lot of thought into this; GSAs still holding in-person meetings; remote options not being made available
    - But even if remote options are available, how do you provide notice?  
Issues of translation
    - NEED: translation; can be separate call in option for translation OR all on one call - meetings need to be held bi-lingually - this is critical
    - Need to rely on NGOs/CBOs that exist within their boundaries who already have contacts locally
  - Sandi: important to have stakeholders not just coming to meetings in public forum; need to be PART of overall governance in GSA - need reps in Board or Advisory committee
    - Ventura County GSA Board: Requires an enviro rep; if they're going to have a meeting, at a minimum, they HAVE to include all board members - institutionalized into engagement
    - Need to make asks of GSAs to change it up; COVID
- Roberta - I'd like to know more about the '180 day plan' referred to. Is the 180 day marker something official and if so what is it?
  - Sammy: Roberta, yes this is official in the emergency regulations, section 355.2. DWR can find a plan incomplete and require fixes within 180 days..
- Raven S: Does anyone know of any GSA's that have water bottling inside the basin and if so, is their 'take' being reported? Will it have to be?
- Aimee R: Regarding engaging disadvantaged communities - Is there any funding available - either from DWR or from NGOs - to financially support disadvantaged community members to be actively involved in GSAs and/or GSP review processes? Would offering financial support help lower the threshold for them to be able to participate (for example, be able to take time off work to attend meetings because they know they'll be paid/reimbursed)?
- Candice M: Wondering how GSAs are handling housing developments that will have groundwater? When there is a housing need, but a very real groundwater impact.
- Felice: It is depressing to realize that on these round two plans that are located far from the seats of power and where big e groups are based will not have access to the resources that the big groups have. Any ideas on how to address these under resourced review efforts?
- Sprek: All for working cooperatively w/ water agencies, but at some point someone's going to need to get sued. Have you thought about how a lawsuit in one place will bring

everyone else

- Lisa: Looking at GSPs in Northern SJV; focusing on increasing recharge and SW use; some planning for additional conservation - are there any example GSPs that include land-use planning that would be good examples?
  - Sammy: Pixley and Lower Tule - setting specific acreage targets for bringing land out of production; working on a watershed plan with NRCS to plan for land-use changes (both TNC and Audobon working in this basin)
    - Evaluating final plans: GSPs ID'd recharge but not the reduction in use that's required - trying to assess what PMAs in the first 5 years, and what do they do to address overdraft in their basin?
      - And THEN looking at which projects and actually funded, what questions, and timelines?
  - *Sammy (in text): Perhaps land use planning shouldn't be the term I should use, but some GSAs are setting acreage targets for taking ag land out of production to lower consumptive use and balance the basin water budget. The example I gave of Pixley doing land use planning is actually happening in a watershed plan outside of the GSP, but complimentary to the GSP, to bring the acreage targets to reality.*
- Angie Islas: North Fork Kings GSA; coordinated an ad hoc committee to foster a bigger discussion on first 5 years of GSP implementation; are there other GSPs that are looking into adding an ad hoc committee (or a GSP that did) for there to be opportunities for community residents to engage?
  - *Debi: Salinas had talked about it; not sure of others*
- Roberta: Samantha, can you share an actual example of how land use planning is being incorporated in a GSP? We keep hearing that this is not within the jurisdiction of a GSA and is up to the counties. Which leads to another important intersection for implementation: counties and GSAs
- Jane: Regarding land fallowing, is anyone giving any thought to how to deal with the impact of that on agricultural workers?
- Felice: Sounds like those of us in more remote areas will have a challenging time leveraging the resources needed for technical analysis. Are there sources of funding for that we can seek funds from?
  - Great question, Felice... We should ask our DWR & SWB reps today, and maybe do a call on funding availability

### **Closing Comments:**

- Sandi: encourages folks to comment; raising questions is just as important as commenting; need to show that there are constituencies that care about drinking water - what steps have you taken to show that you've taken stakeholders into account? NEED voices from the ground to affirm that there are stakeholders out there who care about these things from the local level
  - Not just NGO's - there are LOTS of things you can do to amplify these issues as a community member
- Sammy: GSP review started in the weeds of every technical detail; but it really comes down to 3 big questions:
  - Did they engage beneficial users (have they been identified); are they analyzing the impacts to these beneficial users; AND does the GSP have projects and management actions to support those beneficial users
  - Pulling back to see the forest through the trees - need to ask broad questions

- Debi: comment, comment, comment! Even if you can't understand several hundred page GSPs; need to be pushing for better MT/MO's

#### **Action Items:**

- Capture questions that were asked & didn't get answered; figure out a way to get them answered & share via follow-up
  - Maybe panelists can write comments, and we can send out w/ follow-up info?
- Comments:
  - Kristin: As I go through all the plans I am noting things that each GSP did particularly well (if any).
  - Roberta: I think Sandi's point about stakeholders involved in governance is really important and maybe can be part of the implementation phase. Our basin (Cuyama) looks good on paper in terms of stakeholder engagement, but really had no power. We did have translation and childcare and evening meetings—but still no power!
  - Candice: for consideration - if you take legal actions, your implementation projects may not be eligible for government grant funding, which may further delay your objectives.

---

10:30 - 11:30 AM

#### **Deep Dive: Lessons Learned - Looking Forward**

##### Group 1 (Equity & EJ) - Amanda Monaco, LCJA (Suzannah reported)

- State funding to help NGOs participate AND community members actively participate in GSAs or advisory groups
  - See community members as experts
- Policy interventions at the state level (increased requirements by DWR) - this may require legislation; institute a requirement that drinking water / DAC rep on governing GSA board OR required role on GSP advisory boards (if the advisory boards play a significant role that builds their feedback into the GSP and implementation); there's a clear need for requirements
  - OR when DWR/SWB are reviewing plans, they can institute additional requirements
- Push for agencies to follow the Brown Act during the current crisis
  - [Executive Order "loosening" Brown Act requirements](#)
    - Nat: But meetings still must be publicly noticed and the agency must provide a publicly accessible location to watch the meeting
- Bilingual services act - ensure that materials are translated if a certain percentage of the population in the basin identifies as speaking that language
- How can we better collaborate to do so?
  - Advocating for funding directly to NGOs
  - Sharing best practices for low-tech solutions in the time of COVID (e.g. phone calls); Amanda and Conner mentioned guidance documents that they can share w/ the group
  - Low-tech; phone-call trees

- RESOURCES:
  - Amanda: [LCJA COVID-19 Recommendations for Public Participation Letter](#)
  - Connor Everts:
    - Article on [LA City Council](#)
    - UCLA Luskin Center - [Human Right to Water Research & Report](#)
      - [The Human Right to Water applied to Water Supply](#)

### Group 2 (Climate Predictions) - Pablo Ortiz, UCS (Jennifer reported)

- Improve 2020/2022 Plans
  - Difficult for climate to be analyzed at the local level
  - Lots of DWR bashing - the guidance does a lot of averaging which isn't generally recommended; and the guidance doesn't help local GSAs to use information (e.g. which extreme they should be planning from)
  - Need to better integrate agencies
    - E.g. IRWM plans were required to do regional modeling (which was helpful in Ventura) - IRWM's could help GSAs
- Ways to collaborative:
  - Link guidance to management actions
  - Integrate agencies that have climate responsibilities/modeling
  - Advocate for integration of climate modeling and climate impacts
    - E.g. what a drought can do to drinking water supplies
  - DWR local climate discussions
  - General factsheets on climate to help others better understand the nexus between climate and other issues
  - Amend SGMA leg: requiring integrating climate into management actions

### Group 3 (Environmental Flows & Recharge) - Pablo Garza

- Improve 2020/2022 Plans
  - Recognize there's a lot of interest in recharge to comply w/ SGMA; BUT different perspectives on HOW to approach recharge
    - We don't have enviro flows standards on streams or rivers; perspective that we shouldn't divert for recharge until those standards are in place
    - On the other end of the spectrum, GSPs are already including recharge in projects, need to figure out how to work the best way it can
  - Could there be an interim standard (90% of average state of flow)? BUT there's a concern that interim standards become permanent standards; setting minimum flows is no easy task; interim standards could last a decade or more
  - GSPs don't have a lot of detail on recharge
  - SWB - when actors change water rights to do recharge; need to judge projects on case by case basis to ensure local needs (DFW, others) are met
  - Recharge has impacts on water quality

#### Group 4 (Water Markets & Fallowing) - Christina Babbitt (Kelly reported)

- Improve 2020/2022 Plans
  - A number of GSPs mention water trading and markets - communities and environments need to be protected
    - Not just engagement, but also representation
    - Need adequate rules for each basin
  - Need hard data so the engagement process can tell us what users need and will need in the future:
    - Defined management areas & set boundaries - large agribusiness can bring in water/trade water; need to ensure socially disadvantaged farmers or minority farmers are able to participate
  - Need to look at what other water markets have done in other states
- Jacqueline: R.e: to Market and Fallowing group: According to the USDA, small farmers are those which grow and sell between \$1,000 and \$250,000 in agricultural products per year. <https://lpeic.org/usda-small-farm-definitions/>
- Candice: This '[The Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership](#)' report helps to move beyond tokenization with certain stakeholder groups.

#### **Common themes:**

- More engagement w/ GSA and DWR
- Stronger representation on GSA Boards
- Filling the gaps with NGO expertise
- Providing specific guidance to communities on each of these 4 topical areas

#### **Thoughts? Reflections?**

- Christina:
  - Community Water Markets Guide - CWC
- Pablo Ortiz
  - Integrate ag into these conversations; they use more of the water and have a lot of influence; trying to bridge the gap between ag, environment, and EJ - the more we talk among US, the more common ground we can get
- Paul B
  - Incorporating ag is important, even when we have seat at the table at the GSA board, we're still a minority opinion; NEED to have conversations where they're part of it and we are too
- Stacey Sullivan:
  - Ag is not a monolith; there are a range of people there; small but growing number of farmers who aren't grudgingly accepting SGMA but thinking about how they're going to live and thrive in this situation
  - Could lift up some of these stories
- Sandi:



- It seems like stakeholder engagement is the first key step towards everything else we want to accomplish. So maybe the first step is to focus on advancing better inclusion, governance and funding for NGOs/stakeholders
- Jane:
  - Younger people involved in regenerative agriculture in SJV
- Amanda: starting having convos w/ small farmers/minority DAC farmers; could elevate them in these conversations; share a lot of interests
  - Some skepticism about engaging big ag in these conversations; from her experience in GSAs
  - We ready ourselves to be in spaces where they're dominating, have been dominating; not been listening to others' interests for a long time
  - Need to have just OUR coalition for certain convos; this is a useful space to build our own strength before talking to them
- Stacey agrees - right and wrong places for different conversations
- Every once in a while there ARE ag folks that are open to these discussions
  - How best to engage and when to engage farmers in these conversations
- Felice: Proposal: phase out irrigation for wine grapes. It was illegal to irrigate wine grapes in France until recently. We'll have better wine too!
  - Dave R: Dry farming grapes works along the coast but won't work in the San Joaquin Valley where the cheap grapes and wine are produced
  - Raven: Dave, they may have to replant to prepare for the future...works great in Italy
  - Jennifer: Grapes are more environmentally friendly than other crops - from my perspective, they're preferable because they require less nitrogen, so there's less opportunity to pollute groundwater
  - Robbie J: Well, dry farming grapes works in Cuyama....so I think it's a matter of scale both in terms of size and profitability!

---

12:00 - 1:00 PM

**State Agency Panel: Commitment, Coordination, & Policy Direction**

Craig Altare, DWR

Natalie Stork, SWB

Catherine Freeman, Leg Assem. Comm. WPW

**Notes:**

*Craig Altare, DWR*

- Plan Review
  - January 31, 2020: deadline for critically overdrafted basins
  - "Acceptance review" checking that PDFs submitted the checklist (excel)
  - Spot check on some sections
  - Ensure plan area was accurate

- Issues with references, links - following up directly with GSAs
  - Let DWR know if you find any issues!
- Monitoring sites; data for annual report use correct reference points, etc.
- Posted all by 20 day deadline (except 1 basin; Madera?)
  - Initiated minimum 60 day public comment period
  - Extended to 75; now w/ COVID-19 added another 30 days
  - Comment period ends mid-may, early June
- Now Technical review phase
  - Teams of scientists, geologists, engineers; reviewing each GSP
    - Kern Count 13,000 pages
- 3 Options for Review Decision
  - Substantially comply, can be approved
    - 5year updates
  - Incomplete
    - 6 month max period to fix deficiencies
  - Inadequate (if significant deficiencies)
    - Only after consultation with state board
- As your reading GSP's, if you have comments please submit to the department in the SGMA portal
- Next Steps:
  - Annual reports for WATER YEAR 2019 due APRIL 1
    - Will accept late reports; ½ of GSPs have submitted annual reports on time; or have shared that they will submit soon
  - GSP PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS END MAY 15 & JUNE 3  
<https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/all>

*Natalie Stork, State Water Board*

- Made it to January 2020! All put 1 plan submitted
- SWB focus is on coordinating w/ DWR - when DWR considers failing a plan, they must have a formal consultation w/ SWB
- Division of Water Rights; Division of Drinking Water; Division of Water Quality - lots of expertise; need to communicate what they're seeing in plans to DWR
- When plans are inadequate, State Water Board intervenes - probationary determination
  - If DWR deems plan inadequate or there's no plan in place, there's a period of time, then SWB can determine probationary status - this is discretionary
  - State Water board decides how much of basin should be taken into probation; if the board should exclude pumpers from probationary reporting requirements
  - 90 days after probationary determination - probationary actors need to report extraction data to SWB (in prep for SWB writing their own plan)
  - Prior to probationary determination, SWB will communicate w/ GSAs and local parties to avoid probation
  - Once probationary status is determined: 6 months to 1 year when Board can work w/ plans
    - During this time SWB will gather info in case they need to write their own plan; during this time; SWB can require meters to ensure they're getting good data
- Data gathering: SWB has investigation authority; if they need more info, they can order this information

- Probationary - go through issues and resolve them but ALSO get the data that they need
- Goal: successful local gwr mgmt - want to fix issues and get them back to local control
- Timeline:
  - 90-day notice to cities, counties, GSAs: if SWB if going toward probation, SWB must give notice
  - 60-day notice to all pumpers
    - During this time, lots of public meetings, get relevant info out to people before they even get 60 day notice
  - Probation hearing:
    - SWB makes determination on whether basin is on probation
    - Staff presentation, public comment, vote - they can decide which sections of the basin and which pumpers must report
  - Monthly pumping data requirement
  - Water year reporting cycle - subsequent Dec 15th - first reports are due
    - Fees come soon after
    - Online reporting system - click where well is located; place of use for water; how much water their well can and does pump; simple system
    - Everyone who submits report has to pay fee - base fee, automatic pumping fee
  - Information orders can happen at any time as necessary to get data they need
- If can't fix issues, start working on interim plan - want to get basin back on track to manage locally
  - Corrective actions: pumping cut backs
- Coordinating w/ DWR throughout this process
- SWB Factsheets: Stakeholder Inclusion; Water Quality FAQ (audience is GSAs)
  - Still important for 2020 plans
  - Joint DWR / SWB fact sheet on submittal and evaluation of GSPs

#### *Catherine, CA State Assembly*

- SGMA is important to the leg; need it to move forward
- If there's still a problem after plans have been submitted, then can change SGMA regs
  - BUT took a long time to put this package together - there won't be changes to SGMA regs unless it's an absolute emergency
- Legislature is not meeting in-person
  - Every day get a new memo about what they're doing
- "Workload budget" - create a budget that doesn't change much except for things that are related to current crisis
  - Tax revenues are pushed back to June 15th - no way to know what revenue is
  - Putting together a "no change" budget
    - Then will do "budget bill junior" where they'll make real changes to the budget
- By Aug 31 - will know revenue; then will look at cuts based on actual revenue
- *What happens to funding for SGMA, climate bond, etc. (that would result in General Fund expenditures if it's passed by voters)?*
  - She's worried about funding for groundwater management; 10 years ago there was no funding; there's a risk that we lose some funding for areas that really need it

- Legislature return date is tentatively set to April 13; this will likely be pushed back
  - Leg is the check and balance to the governor; in times like this, we give Governor a lot of leeway BUT need to make sure there are no activities that would go against legislative directives
- Most boards have shifted deadlines to accommodate folks because of COVID
  - Flood Board has authority to move deadlines; will need to give agencies time to move through this; state agency remote access is limited
- Bills to track:
  - Gwr recharge as a beneficial use under water rights laws - REALLY controversial; what does it mean to have water right; how long can you keep that right for; is gwr in the basin a beneficial use?
    - Helping members look at how they can support local communities in SGMA implementation; SWB has been HUGE part of this
  - Talking about infrastructure in new ways / “chunk lines”
    - Being able to move water to certain water districts
    - Leg has a lot of thinking to do about how we move water

#### Q&A:

- *Craig: What does review look like over these first 2 years?*
  - Statute gives 2 years to review plans; with Alternative Plans, this took a little over 2 years; built the DWR program a lot since then
    - Trying to expedite review for some GSPs; some reviews out in the first year, need to wait until we see what comes in through public comment, which has been extended
  - 46 plans in review; IDing those that can be expedited
    - Expedited reviews will be single GSA/GSP
    - Takes more time to review basins with multi agencies/plans
  - Want to get info out to GSAs now about what an improved GSP can look like
  - 6 months:
    - DWR will ID deficiencies and provide them back to GSAs
    - If there are minor deficiencies (if the initial effort seems good) - can provide corrective actions
- *Natalie: Probationary Process - how ag withdrawals are measured vs beverage companies; fees & will small farmers be disproportionately impacted?*
  - Base fee: \$300 per well; Volumetric fee: \$35 per AF (roughly)
    - SEB can change fees at any time via emergency reg process; fees need to align to fund program
    - Fees can change in probationary hearing (by SWB)
  - Small farmer impacts: looking at this; want costs to be appropriate
  - Statute doesn't give SWB ability to waive fees for anyone; going through emergency reg process so if parties report water use on time and aren't having a significant impact on the basin, they're hoping that the Board can waive fees on a case-by-case basis
  - If there are going to be situations w/ disproportionate impacts, SWB wants to know about them
- Beverage companies vs ag

- Need to enter info on purpose of pumping - how much water per month, per well, and that's what fees are based on
- *Catherine: SJV Blueprint Economic Analysis; members of the leg are reading this; how should we approach the leg to represent our concerns or counter what big ag is going?*
  - Acknowledge that they made a shot at it; not the best economic analysis she's seen; strategic - removing heavy emphasis on a new dam, acknowledging that they need to change their direction
  - No assurance that we are going to lose and fallow X amount of fields - there are good decisions that can be made about the way we farm and how we use land; not just going to assume that we're going to shut down industries - can shift from tree crops to row crops; but from her convo w/ farmers, they want to "farm how they want"
  - Concerns w/ Blueprint: lots of different ways we can move water around
  - Blueprint is correct in that we need more infrastructure to move water around; can help poorest communities, moving clean water from one area of the Valley to another; this is one of the most critical things they can work on
- *Roberta: Our GSA has paid minimal attention to water quality deferring this to other agencies. How will SWB work with DWR on water quality issues? What is the overlap with what SWB already has in place?*
  - Natalie: SWB Div of Water Quality and Regional Boards (primary water quality regulators in the state)
    - GSAs need to consider all SWB programs; SGMA doesn't supercede SWB requirements; GSPs still need to be compliant w/ other SWB programs
    - May be water quality issues best handled by State or Regional Board programs; see if there are red flags w/ other SWB programs
  - Craig: there are many other programs within state and regional boards; GSAs need to translate how existing SWB programs translate into GSPs
- *Sonia: How will Human Right to Water be considered in GSP reviews?*
  - Craig: need to consider this in regulations; he's learning more about it; some SGMA regs already incorporate HRW (e.g. GSAs need to incorporate all beneficial user needs) - but there's no formal requirement
    - DWR will document if a plan is consistent w/ HRW
    - Would be surprised if a plan got through all of SGMA requirements and was not compliant with HRW
  - SWB has guidance on HRW and DWR doesn't
    - SWB is focused on implementing SAFER (Safe and Affordable DW Act); will be having convos with SAFER team and Div of DW to see how GSPs fit within these programs
    - When looking at plans through SGMA lense; looking at issues where it's making situation worse for communities; water quality impacted by management actions and highlighting these issues
- *Will SWB plan review be public?*
  - Everything the Board does is public; everything can get "PRA'd" get a Public Records Request

- *Sandi: are you seeing any challenges to SGMA's timeline or authorities?*
    - *Catherine: Worried about people trying to mess w/ SGMA; there will be people trying to undermine it*
    - Leg, DWR, SWB need to hold firm; let the next 60 days roll out; let the DWR review process proceed and get info in; we need to be vigilant and helpful in making sure the review is done in a robust and adequate way
    - Lots of people are saying "why don't you just change XYZ thing" - need to submit formal comments to DWR
  - *Angie:*
    - DWR regs don't have boundaries on # of meetings or HOW meeting should be run; GSAs need to describe HOW they did their outreach; how they intend to pursue outreach moving forward
    - Public comments do help - describe limitations from a stakeholder perspective on limits to comms outreach and engagement plans
    - GSAs were up against tight deadlines; some comments on draft plans weren't sufficient
- 

#### **Final Remarks**

- Craig: DWR is continuing on review, even in remote working environment
- Natalie: Grateful to be able to join; ready to use State intervention as needed but goal is successful local management; committed to working w/ DWR to get there
  - If you have questions that we didn't get to, email Natalie directly
  - SGMA Factsheets
- Catherine: this is a great time to send info about concerns on GSP; send comments that you send to DWR to the Committee
  - Leg will continue working; want to support bill and implementation of it

#### **Action Items:**

- How to follow up with DWR - submit all public comments to [SGMA portal](#) - DWR will review ALL comments
  - Jennifer & Emily will discuss organizing remaining Q's and follow up w/ the panelists to respond w/ written comments/bullet point thoughts
- 

1:10 PM

#### **Summary & Next Steps**

Danielle Dolan

Notes:

#### **Management Actions (Union of Concerned Scientists Presentation)**

- Difficulty in placing economic cost on priceless values, but need to try - otherwise they won't be valued at all; need to make the economic counter-argument for immediate rather than deferred action
  - Felice: It is good to ID costs and benefits even if we can't put a dollar value on them. We should ask the GSAs to ID these costs and benefits in their plans and we should comment on them if they are not adequate.
- Monitoring networks - need to advocate that GSAs monitor for all relevant SIs, and that data gaps are filled
- Jennifer: could synthesize a list of questions that advocates can ask GSAs
- Emily: know that GTAN network is out there for support

### **EJ / Enviro Shared Priorities (Breakout Groups)**

- Need to bridge the gap so we can better align, and *then* integrate our efforts
- Increased communication across our sectors
  - Marina D: Along with communication I would also include collaboration across all sectors!
  - Events like this; having these discussions; it's one thing to communicate, but when we collaborate we can build trust / relationships
- Leverage our Shared history of land use and water mgmt practices that impact both EJ and enviro communities
- Biggest current challenge is representation; neither of us are "in the room" -need to co-advocate for "both/and" (both EJ and enviros) representation
- Alliance between our efforts will shift the power dynamic
- Angie Islas: Glad to hear the conversations on both sides and recognize the shared interests and concerns; representation on the board is a common issue; both need to play a shared role in implementation

### **Plan Review (Panel + Breakout Groups)**

- *Equity & EJ*
  - Funding to help NGOs AND community members actively participate in GSAs or advisory groups
  - Policy interventions at the state level - mandatory requirements to include EJ reps in decision-making bodies
  - Sharing best practices for low-tech solutions in the time of COVID
- *Climate*
  - Need better inter-agency alignment, and regional climate modeling (like IRWM)
  - Link guidance to management actions; consider leg to revise SGMA, require climate analysis for management actions
  - Fact sheets & guidance on climate nexus w/ other issue areas
- *Flows & Recharge*
  - Recognize there's a lot of interest in recharge to comply w/ SGMA; BUT different perspectives on HOW to approach recharge
    - env flow standards
    - water quality standards
  - Not enough info in GSPs about recharge

- SWB - when actors change water rights to do recharge; need to judge projects on case by case basis to ensure local needs
- Paul: There are natural habitats that ran out of water in the drought; need to target recharge facilities for areas with sensitive ecosystems; “upgradient” of DACs and vulnerable ecosystems
- Stacey: the importance of recognizing that there can be multiple benefits of recharge projects; not just increasing water supply; flood plans & enviro benefits there - alternatives to “hard” flood control
- Felice: one of the best points made was that this rule that SWB (“90% of avg flows”) could be 90% of very impaired flows; 90% of long-term avg could be a lot more than 90% of short term average
- Lisa: some places can use floodplain restoration for multi benefits; no water rights issues; leaving water in riparian habitat
- *Water Markets & Following*
  - Partner on filling data gaps; commissioning academic or technical studies
  - Collectively advocate for stronger community / stakeholder representation, so we actually have influence on the rules
  - prioritize management areas to protect

### **State Agency Coordination**

- DWR & SWB working hard; reviewing plans & coordinating
- Leg is upholding intent of SGMA; no changes unless absolute emergency (which we’re now in)
- DWR & SWB working hard; reviewing plans & coordinating
- DWR Expediting “good” or “simple” plans
- DWR corrective actions even for “approved” plans; SWB “probationary” status is discretionary
- Leg is upholding intent of SGMA; no changes unless absolute emergency
- Concerned about funding for SGMA implementation; some concern of efforts to delay or undermine.
- Jennifer: could have had twice as long in that panel and would have learned just as much
- Amanda: encouraged to see Craig and Natalie talk more fluidly about the HRW; still skeptical, but GLF/LCJA are having an impact, esp. w/ Craig able to talk with more confidence about HRW
- Angie: She acknowledges that it’s good to hear from Natalie and Craig that they’re highlighting HRW and seeing this as a criteria for GSP review; skeptical of review itself; feels like she didn’t receive a very compelling response about how the GSPs would be reviewed and what criteria they would be looking for in terms of outreach; it doesn’t reflect exactly how they would like GSAs to understand the importance of outreach and engagement; all stakeholders are DEFINED under GSP and being considered; not just communicating by email; this should not be “acceptable” - would rather know how their review going to be now, but we will likely need to wait
- Felice: One lesson: we need to be talking to our legislators and the committee folks because Big Ag is surely bringing them their concerns.
  - Candice: Agreed, Felice. Catherine was just at a Ag driven water summit in Ventura County, and our local Ag and cities are pushing inter-ties down here.



These have a huge cost, which makes the human right to water affordable.

---

1:45 PM

## Resource Fair

### Coreen Weintraub, Union of Concerned Scientists

- Stakeholder voices are critical; offering scientists to support (put on workshops, create curriculum; help stakeholders understand various elements of GSP; etc.)
- Reach out to Coreen

### Ruthie Redmond, The Nature Conservancy

- Groundwater snapshots for nature - reports how GSPs are meeting the needs of enviro users
- Create profiles for each GSP
- Available fall 2020 - Gwr Resource hub

### Amanda Monaco, Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability

- Looking at how GSPs will impact domestic wells; map where you can see domestic wells through OCSAR database; then additional artificial intelligence component to ID where wells could be
- Pre-set for minimum thresholds - clearly map where wells go dry with minimum thresholds

### Debi Ores, Community Water Center

- Can search by address and ID
  - Who manages water
  - How many wells within area are impacted by drought
  - Water quality data
  - Cost to remediate impacts to domestic wells

### Becky Rittenburg, The Freshwater Trust

- ID what best management actions to meet multiple benefits
- Assess available benefits and costs for projects and management actions

### Christina Babbitt, Environmental Defense Fund

- Develop an open source tool to help water mangers account for supply and demand; three main components of the platform - water accounting (integrates water use and water supply); will let folks know if they go over their allocation
  - Trading component if you want to integrate buying and selling gwr credits
  - Modeling to run scenarios to evaluate management actions - look at cumulative impacts

### Daniel Mountjoy, Sustainable Conservation

- Visualization tools - public view site
  - Site suitability for replenishing aquifers - avoiding negative water quality impacts

### Tara Moran, Stanford Water in the West

- One research project to better understand how GWAs make decisions to coordinate
- Analyzing how each of the plans submitted address climate change