BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PRESIDENT
MARIA GUTZEIT
VICE PRESIDENT
RUSS BRYDEN
B. J. ATKINS
WILLIAM COOPER
JASON GIBBS
GARY MARTIN
GINA NATOLI
ALTERNATE BOARD
E.G. "JERRY" GLADBACH
R.J. KELLY
LYNNE PLAMBECK
LAURENE WESTE
GENERAL COUNSEL
THOMAS BUNN III
SECRETARY
EUNIE KANG

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING OF SANTA CLARITA VALLEY GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY BOARD

Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency – Board Room
Rio Vista Treatment Plant Facility
27234 Bouquet Canyon Road
Santa Clarita, CA 91350

IN-PERSON MEETING

Thursday, June 30, 2022 at 2:30 PM

Attendees should be aware that while the Agency is following all applicable requirements and guidelines regarding COVID-19, the Agency cannot ensure the health of anyone attending the Board meeting. Attendees should therefore use their own judgement to protect themselves from exposure to COVID-19.

We request that the public submit any comments in writing if practicable, which can be sent to ekang@scvwa.org or mailed to Eunie Kang, Board Secretary, Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency, 27234 Bouquet Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350. All written comments received before 12:00 PM the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Board members and posted on the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency website prior to the start of the meeting. Anything received after 12:00 PM the day of the meeting will be posted on the SCV-GSA website the following day.

1. REGULAR PROCEDURES

1.1 Call to Order

1.2 Pledge of Allegiance

1.3 Public Comments – Members of the public may comment as to items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Agency that are not on the Agenda at this time. Members of the public wishing to comment on items covered in this Agenda may do so now or at the time each item is considered. (Comments may, at the discretion of the Board's presiding officer, be limited to three minutes for each speaker.)

1.4 Approval of Agenda

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and non-controversial and will be acted upon by the Board by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items prior to the time the Board votes unless any Board member, staff or the public, requests specific items be discussed and/or removed from the Consent Calendar for separate action.

ITEMS			PAGE
2.1	*	Approve Minutes of the March 30, 2022, Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Special Board of Directors Meeting	1

3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION AGENDA ITEMS

ITEMS			PAGE
3.1	*	Quarterly Status Update of Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation	3
3.2	*	Discussion of Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Application (SGMSP)	7
3.3	*	Addendum to the Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) 2021 Annual Report	11
3.4	*	Consideration to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget	17
3.5		Bouquet Creek Status Update	
3.6	*	Approval of Resolution No. GSA 2022-02 Rescheduling the Regular Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Meetings	31

4. DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

5. ADJOURMENT

*** Indicates attachment**
♦ To be distribute

NOTICES:

Any person may make a request for a disability-related modification or accommodation needed for that person to be able to participate in the public meeting by telephoning Eunie Kang, Secretary to the Board of Directors, at (661) 297-1600 or writing to Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency at 27234 Bouquet Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350. Requests must specify the nature of the disability and the type of accommodation requested. A telephone number or other contact information should be included so that Agency staff may discuss appropriate arrangements. Persons requesting a disability-related accommodation should make the request with adequate time before the meeting for the Agency to provide the requested accommodation.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.5, non-exempt public records that relate to open session agenda items and are distributed to a majority of the Board less than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection at the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency, located at 27234 Bouquet Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, California 91350, during

regular business hours. When practical, these public records will also be made available on the Agency's Internet Website, accessible at http://www.scvgsa.org.

Posted on June 23, 2022

[This page intentionally left blank.]

DRAFT

ITEM NO. 2.1

Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency – March 30, 2022

A special board meeting of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency (SCV-GSA) was held in person at 10:00 AM on Wednesday, March 30, 2022. A copy of the Agenda is inserted in the Minute Book of the SCV-GSA preceding these minutes.

DIRECTORS PRESENT: B.J. Atkins, Russ Bryden, William C. Cooper, Jason Gibbs, Maria Gutzeit, Gary Martin, Gina Natoli,

DIRECTORS ABSENT: None

Also present in person: SCV-GSA General Counsel Tom Bunn, SCV-GSA Board Secretary Eunie Kang, SCV Water; Assistant General Manager Steve Cole, Director of Water Resources Dirk Marks, Principal Water Resource Planner Rick Viergutz, Communications Manager Kathie Martin, Jeff Barry GSI Water Solutions, Inc.; and various members of the public.

President Gutzeit called the meeting to order at 10:01 AM. A quorum was present.

Item 1.3: There was no public comment.

Item 1.4: Upon motion of Director Cooper, seconded by Director Natoli and carried, the Agenda was approved by the following roll call votes:

Director Atkins	Yes	President Gutzeit	Yes
Vice President Bryden	Yes	Director Martin	Yes
Director Cooper	Yes	Director Natoli	Yes
Director Gibbs	Yes		

Item 2.1: Upon motion of Director Martin, seconded by Director Gibbs and carried, the Board approved the Consent Calendar by the following roll call votes:

Director Atkins	Yes	President Gutzeit	Yes
Vice President Bryden	Yes	Director Martin	Yes
Director Cooper	Yes	Director Natoli	Yes
Director Gibbs	Yes		

Item 3.1: Upon motion of Director Atkins, seconded by Director Gibbs and carried, the Board approved the 2021 GSP Annual Report by the following roll call votes:

Director Atkins	Yes	President Gutzeit	Yes
Vice President Bryden	Yes	Director Martin	Yes
Director Cooper	Yes	Director Natoli	Yes
Director Gibbs	Yes		

There was public comment on item 3.1.

Item 3.2: Rick Viergutz presented a quarterly status report of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (SGMA) Implementation Activities.
Topic covered:

- DWR is in receipt of SCV-GSA GSP – Public comment period closes April 23, 2022
- Implementation has begun

Item 3.3: Steve Cole provided a status update on the Bouquet Canyon Creek restoration.

Item 3.4: Upon motion of Director Natoli seconded by Director Atkins and carried, the Board approved to call a special board meeting on June 30, 2022 and the cancellation of the regular board meeting on July 4, 2022 by the following roll call votes:

Director Atkins	Yes	President Gutzeit	Yes
Vice President Bryden	Yes	Director Martin	Yes
Director Cooper	Yes	Director Natoli	Yes
Director Gibbs	Yes		

Item 4: Director Atkins requested a continuous update on the status of the Bouquet Canyon Creek.

Item 5: The meeting was adjourned at 11:14 AM.

_____
Eunie Kang, Board Secretary

ATTEST:

_____
President of the Board

ITEM NO. 3.1

Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Quarterly Status Update of Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

---

OVERVIEW:

Implementation of the adopted Groundwater Sustainability Plan is underway. Consistent with the Administrative Services Agreement, SCV Water Staff continues to coordinate and manage administrative and technical aspects of GSP implementation. This board memo also provides a six-month look ahead.

Current Status Groundwater Sustainability Plan Approval Process

Following adoption of the GSP in January, the team prepared the final GSP and uploaded it to the Department of Water Resources' SGMA Portal as required. The GSP was posted on its website shortly after, commencing DWRs 75-day public comment period (closing April 23, 2022). Public comments provided to DWR were posted on its SGMA Portal. Staff will review and consider comments and prepare responses if needed.

Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

Consistent with SGMA and GSA Board direction, staff has initiated activities to implement the GSP. Key efforts are summarized below.

- Annual Report
  The first Annual Report was adopted by your Board at its March meeting. With the evaluation of current data, we did not find undesirable results taking place. The report did note a data gap regarding water quality. We have notified DWR that with the recent completion of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan update, this data gap has been filled and no undesirable results were identified

- Address Data Gaps
  Piezometers and temperature probes were installed upstream of Interstate 5 in March. The locations were recently surveyed using SCV Water's team. Data continues to be collected.

  Downstream of Interstate 5, Five Point installed piezometers and continues to collect data.

Staff initiated work to evaluate potential subsidence through survey of benchmark elevations. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, informed staff that benchmarks are subject to removal when new construction occurs, and benchmarks are not always replaced. As a result, field verification is required and installation of new benchmarks may be necessary.

- Monitoring, Reporting, and Outreach
  SCV Water is coordinating with Five Point on groundwater elevation measurements. Groundwater elevation data is also being tracked against the GSP Minimum Thresholds. The representative monitoring sites for minimum thresholds show groundwater elevations are above minimum thresholds.

- Promoting Best Water Use Practices
  SCV Water continues to conduct outreach and education for drought awareness and water conservation. The GSA will perform outreach to private well operators during implementation to provide support in best water use practices as needed.

- Fiscal and Grants
  Staff prepared quarterly reports and invoices pursuant to Round 2 and Round 3 grant agreements that ultimately may provide reimbursement up to $416,000 and $891,159 reimbursement, respectively. To date, DWR has authorized reimbursement of $1,069,646.

- Consultant Proposals for GSP Implementation
  We developed scope and obtained consultant proposals from GSI Water Solutions, ESA, and CV Strategies. The proposals provide support for implementation steps including groundwater dependent ecosystem analysis, hydrogeologic support, filling data gaps, and outreach support. These are described in more detail in the budget item considered at the June 30, 2022 Board meeting.

Six Month Look Ahead

Initiation of consultant contracts for GSP Implementation will follow budget adoption. The work plan approach described in the budget item will be implemented, including consultant coordination to evaluate areas where data gaps exist which informs where outreach is needed. Outreach will include communication with domestic well owners to determine if existing wells are available to fill data gaps (water levels and water quality), communication with non de minimis pumpers (those that pump more than 2-acre feet of water per year) to evaluate the best approaches for groundwater extraction reporting. With respect to outreach, we will inform the Board early regarding items that may be sensitive to well owners such as with extraction reporting.

Outreach will also include support for best management practices for private well operators; we feel this will primarily be limited to agricultural water use. The team's approach is to talk with agricultural users and others with experience in this area to evaluate how the GSA can support them with best management practices. If we determine through outreach that small domestic well operators need support on best management practices, we will support that.

Filling data gaps will continue as described in the GSP and includes but is not limited to outreach to domestic well operators, extraction reporting, water quality testing, land surface monitoring, and GDE evaluations if needed. We will regularly track groundwater elevations and other metrics relative to the Sustainable Management Criteria and provide regular reports to the Board.

Member agencies are also considering submitting a grant application under DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management program. As described in the budget item, this solicitation is expected to open in October 2022 and we will continue to advise the Board on options for grants.

CHALLENGES/OPPORTUNITIES:

The downstream property owner installed several piezometers and temperature probes consistent with the proposed GSP monitoring approach and is working with the SCV-GSA to evaluate data under a proposed data-sharing agreement. There are clear cost and time benefits with this approach as well as potentially gaining insights through cooperative data evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS:

Undesirable results did not occur in calendar year 2021. Groundwater elevations are above minimum thresholds through the first half of this year and basin conditions are being monitored regularly in order to avoid the potential for undesirable results. Significant progress has taken place implementing the GSP this last quarter. Monitoring of newly installed monitoring equipment along the Santa Clara River has begun, coordination with LA County on benchmark elevation surveys continues, and consultant proposals are in order to support GSP implementation.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

ITEM NO. 3.2

Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Discussion of Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Application (SGMSP)

BACKGROUND:

The SCV-GSA has successfully obtained $1.3 M of grant funds to help offset GSP development costs and expects to receive nearly all of the awarded funds by the close of FY 21/22.

The California Department of Water Resources is expected to open solicitations for Round 2 of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Program (SGMGP) in October 2022. The first round of solicitations has concluded and applied only to basins subject to critical conditions of overdraft.

This Board memo describes details of this forthcoming solicitation, examples of eligible project types, and an approach to evaluate possible projects. Staff would return to the Board for authorization to proceed with a grant application.

OVERVIEW:

Round 2 of the SGMGP will make available approximately $200M for competitive grant applications for medium and high priority groundwater basins. This funding includes approximately $17M from the 2021 Budget Act, $71M from Proposition 68, and $114M in future General Funds. Local cost share (a.k.a. matching funds) is not required under this program, but additional application points are provided for those who provide a local cost share at a minimum of 5% of the total project cost.

Priority will be given to applicants who have not previously received SGMA Implementation funding. Eligible grant applicants are GSAs, member agencies of GSAs and others, including non-profit organizations, public utilities, certain Tribes, and mutual water companies.

The minimum Round 2 grant amount per basin is $1M, and the maximum is $20M. Only one application will be accepted per basin. Applicants who apply on behalf of a GSA are required to obtain and submit a letter of support from the GSA.

Examples of Eligible Project Types

- Filling data gaps in a GSP(s) or Alternative to a GSP

- Project development activities (e.g., feasibility studies, design, permits, environmental documents)
- Planning, design, and environmental documentation only as a task of a Project or Component of an overall project (not a standalone task)
- Technical and planning assistance for Underrepresented Communities and/or Engagement and outreach to Underrepresented Communities
- Interested party outreach and engagement
- Vulnerability or risk assessments
- Annual reporting for GSPs and Alternative to a GSP
- Identifying of recharge location(s)
- Groundwater recharge projects with surface water, stormwater, recycled water, and other conjunctive use projects
- Construction, rehabilitation, or expansion of conveyance facilities for groundwater recharge projects
- Stormwater and runoff capture projects that support groundwater recharge
- Installation of monitoring well(s) and/or instrumentation for monitoring wells
- Groundwater contaminant remediation or prevention projects for groundwater that serves as a source of drinking water

Program preferences will be given for both the 2021 Budget Act and Proposition 68 Funding to projects that leverage funding for the greatest public benefits that address the most critical statewide needs and projects that benefit Severely Disadvantaged Communities.

Further, Proposition 68 implementation preference will be given to projects that include the following components: efficient use and conservation of water supplies, use of recycled water, capture of stormwater to reduce runoff, pollution, or recharge supplies (or a combination thereof) stormwater capture for infiltration or reuse.

Local Project Ideas Under Evaluation Include

- Bouquet Canyon Restoration- The County of Los Angeles has applied for a Wildlife Conservation Board grant (via CDFW) for studying and planning for restoration. Given the broad nature of this effort, it may be possible for the GSA or one of its member agencies to carve out a small component of Bouquet Canyon Restoration and support it via a grant.
- Groundwater Recharge- there are several groundwater recharge project ideas in the basin currently. Some ideas are far along and include cost estimates and schedules to complete CEQA, while other ideas remain conceptual.
- Groundwater remediation- SCV Water has been very active in pursuing state and federal funding for projects that install treatment systems to remove PFAS from the groundwater. SCV Water continues to evaluate all options and is reviewing this grant accordingly.
- Additional monitoring points such as monitoring wells
- Invasive species removal

SCHEDULE CONSIDERATIONS:

The solicitation is anticipated to open in October 2022 (https://water.ca.gov/sgmgrants). DWR has not published the duration of the solicitation at this time, but we are currently estimating 60 days based on past practices. Final awards are currently expected in summer 2023.

If CEQA is required for the work, then it must be completed and provided to DWR for review and determination prior to DWR authorizing funding. All work, including final invoicing and reporting must be completed on or before June 30, 2025, unless revised based on future appropriations or legislation approvals.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

GSA member agency representatives continue to evaluate options for a grant application. If member agencies feel a strong candidate project or projects exist, we will bring an item to the Board at its next regularly scheduled board meeting for discussion and decision making about moving forward with a grant application.

The Board would also include budget considerations and potential budget modifications if needed to advance a grant application.

The proposed 22/23 budget includes $20,000 for a grant application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the SCV-GSA Board provide feedback on the Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Application (SGMSP).

[This page intentionally left blank.]

ITEM NO. 3.3

Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Addendum to the Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) 2021 Annual Report

---

DISCUSSION:

On March 30, 2022, the Board adopted the first Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) 2021 Annual Report (Board memo attached).

At that time, analysis for the degraded groundwater quality sustainability indicator for salts and nutrients was underway but could not be completed before the first annual report was due because the 2022 update to the Salt Nutrient and Management Plan (SNMP) had not been published. The 2022 update, now complete, includes analyses of inorganic water quality data relative to the water quality objectives (WQOs) and assimilative capacities established in the SNMP. This also informs water quality concentrations relative to the GSPs minimum thresholds for this sustainability indicator.

The minimum thresholds established in the GSP for this sustainability indicator are the water quality objectives set by the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board for Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), chloride, nitrate, and sulfate, or ambient water quality if it exceeds the water quality objective in separate management zones within the Basin. A potential undesirable result is degradation of groundwater quality not meeting the water quality objectives and assimilative capacities established in the 2016 Salt and Nutrient Management Plan in 20% of representative wells.

Our updated analysis finds this water quality threshold has not been exceeded. Though some ambient concentrations of salts and nutrients have increased slightly in some management zones, average ambient concentrations are consistent with what was reported in the GSP and constituents exceeding the Basin WQOs occur in the same management zones as identified in the previous 2016 SNMP and GSP. We believe that the most probable reason for the observed increase in average concentrations of some salts and nutrients is because drought conditions have persisted. Increasing salt concentrations have been observed in groundwater during previous low rainfall periods when surface water evaporation and evapotranspiration rates and salt accumulations in groundwater are greatest.

We have advised the Department of Water Resources that this additional data has been reviewed and the data gap in our first annual report filled.

CONCLUSION:

With the addition of this finding, we do not see that there are undesirable results, as defined in the GSP, rather we see the basin is being managed sustainability with respect to water quality. Water quality and water level monitoring will continue to be conducted to ensure that we know when conditions change.

During the coming year, data gaps associated with water quality in domestic and private wells will be addressed. SCV Water is moving forward with a program to select and sample private wells. In addition, piezometers have been installed to monitor groundwater levels within the GDE area and land surface elevation control points are being established to monitor for subsidence in coordination with LA County Department of Public Works.

RECOMMENDATION:

This is provided for informational only.

Attachment

Santa Clarita Valley
Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Board Memorandum

DATE: March 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Consideration to Adopt the Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) 2021 Annual Report

---

DISCUSSION:

The State's requirements for Groundwater Sustainability Plans include GSA submittal of annual reports by April 1, 2022. As such the first annual report which can be viewed on the SCV-GSA website: https://scvgsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SCVGSA_2021-Annual-Report_Final_March2022.pdf has been prepared and is provided for your Board's consideration and adoption at the March 30, 2022 special meeting.

Because this is the first GSP Annual Report for the Basin, this report documents and updates data from October 1, 2019 through September 31, 2021 (i.e., for water years 2020 and 2021), and reviews changes in groundwater basin storage since 2015. Reports convey monitoring and water use data to the DWR and to Basin stakeholders to provide data on performance of the Basin relative to the sustainable management criteria set forth in the GSP.

The following sections provide a high-level summary of report contents.

Summary of Basin Conditions and Data Gaps

Groundwater Elevation Sustainability Indicator

Representative Monitoring Sites (RMSs) are monitoring locations used to determine if Minimum Thresholds are reached. None of the RMSs showed groundwater elevations at or below their Minimum Threshold value during water years 2020 and 2021, which indicates that the Basin remains in a sustainable condition with respect to the groundwater elevation sustainability indicator.

Groundwater Storage Sustainability Indicator

The observed changes in storage and groundwater elevation hydrographs show that conditions during water years 2015 through 2021 were similar to those observed historically, with declining groundwater elevations and storage in certain parts of the Basin during low-rainfall periods (dry cycles in the Basin's local hydrology), but stable or even rising groundwater elevations and storage in parts of the Basin under these same dry conditions because of careful management of groundwater pumping.

Moreover, the reduction in groundwater levels and storage are not indicative unstainable operation of the basin as has occurred in the past, groundwater levels and storage are anticipated to increase during the next cycle of normal or above-normal rainfall. These observations indicate that the Basin was being operated in a sustainable manner with respect to the groundwater level and groundwater storage sustainability indicators.

Land Subsidence Sustainability Indicator

Available DWR InSAR land subsidence data through June 2021 indicate a displacement of less than the single-year minimum threshold value of 0.1 foot across the Basin from the end of water year 2019 through the end of water year 2021. Additionally, the InSAR mapping for October 2016 through June 2021 indicates that during the most recent 5-year period for which the InSAR data are available, no land subsidence has occurred exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.5 foot over 5 years. This indicates that the basin is being operated sustainably with respect to the land subsidence sustainability indicator

Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water Sustainability Indicator

Groundwater elevations in the three existing GDE monitoring wells (NLF-E, NLF-G3, and NLF-W5) did not reach or fall below the Minimum Thresholds for this sustainability indicator during water years 2020 and 2021. This indicates that the basin is being operated sustainably with respect to the Interconnected Surface Water Sustainability Indicator. Further, groundwater levels did not approach or fall below the GDE Trigger levels, meaning no GDE evaluations were warranted.

Degraded Groundwater Quality Sustainability Indicator

Analysis for the degraded groundwater quality sustainability indicator for salts and nutrients is underway at this time by SCV Water consultants preparing the 2022 update to the Salt Nutrient and Management Plan. This 2022 update includes analyses of inorganic water quality data relative to the water quality objectives (WQOs) and assimilative capacities established in the plan. These metrics also inform water quality concentrations relative to the GSPs minimum thresholds for this sustainability indicator. GSA staff will review this information when available (expected April 2022) and advise your Board of the findings relative to the sustainability indicator at your next meeting.

Data Gaps

The GSP identified a number of data gaps, including those related to water level and water quality from private wells, semi-annual land surface elevation data from LA County Public Works bench marks, need for new GDE wells and data collection, and new or updated wellhead elevation surveys. Efforts are under way to reduce data gaps over time consistent with the GSP implementation plan.

CONCLUSION:

The annual report finds that the basin conditions are above the minimum thresholds identified in the GSP and the basin is being operated sustainably. The results for the Groundwater Sustainability Indicator for Degraded Water Quality are pending and we will advise your Board of those results at its next meeting.

During the next year, data gaps are expected to be reduced further, such as relating to the need for water level and water quality data for domestic wells, water level data from GDE wells, and development of final land surface elevation control points in coordination with LA County Department of Public Works.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the SCV-GSA Board of Directors adopt the Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) 2021 Annual Report.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

ITEM NO. 3.4

Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Consideration to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget

---

SUMMARY:

The SCV-GSA Joint Powers Agreement provides for the SCV-GSA adopting a fiscal year (FY) budget, or alternatively automatically renewing the previous year's budget. Staff recommends adoption of the FY 22/23 budget described in this memorandum and summarized in Tables 1 through 3.

The $675,000 budget reflects your Board's January 2022 adoption of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP), deferral of previously approved budget expenditures from FY 21/22 and a refined work plan to implement the GSP during FY 22/23. Consistent with past practice, staff has included in the attached budget tables any updates to previous fiscal year estimates and an estimate for the next fiscal year.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Expenditure Categories

The proposed FY 21/22 Budget along with estimates for FY 22/23 budgets are shown on the following Tables:

- Table 1. Estimated SCV Water Costs + Ad Buys
- Table 2. Estimated Consultant Costs
- Table 3. Budget Summary

Table 1. Estimated SCV Water Costs + Ad Buys

This expenditure category includes administrative, consultant management and technical services, public outreach support, and ad buys. Administrative expenditures include preparation of Board packets and minutes, financial statements, annual audits, and grant administration. The consultant management services category includes all phases of consultant contract administration, management and technical review of GSP work products.

The Public outreach category includes coordination with the GSP consultant as necessary for stakeholder engagement and advertisement purchases.

Now shifting to GSP implementation means FY 22/23 staff hours will be lower than 21/22 hours. The 22/23 budget year estimate is $65,000, a reduction of $38,000 from the previous year's estimate.

Table 2. Estimated Consultant Costs

Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development

With wrap up of GSP development taking place, we have updated the 21/22 GSP development costs and show this to be under budget by $133,926. Key reasons it's under budget relate to certain field work (piezometers) being installed by the downstream landowner, lower costs in plan development related to formal development of projects, and certain deferred work for infiltration testing and pilot studies (site access delays and pandemic related).

Work under this category in FY 22/23 is limited to follow on work for completion of the infiltration testing and pilot studies work and modest costs for consultant services with grants.

As a result, the FY 22/23 budget recommendation for GSP Development is $64,000, an increase of $14,000 over last year's budget projection. This increase is primarily related to deferred work from 21/22 and grant management.

Consultant Cost Estimate for Contingency Funded Items
The Board previously authorized use of most of the contingency funds for the technical consultant and all of the funds for the stakeholder engagement consultant. $34,497 of contingency funds were not utilized and have since been eliminated from the 21/22 budget update. As a result, no contingency funds are sought in 22/23.

Consultant Cost Estimate for Administration
This budget category includes funds for grant applications, insurance, legal, and annual audit costs.

The earlier budgeted FY 21/22 expenses for budget category Rate Study for Post GSP Adoption Fee Collection ($75,000) were not utilized in FY 21/22 and are not proposed to be included in FY 22/23. As a result, these funds are removed from the budget. The purpose of such a work effort would include consideration of extraction fees to help fund operation of the GSA. At this stage it does not appear such a step is needed as member agency contributions and voluntary contributions from SCV Water are expected to be sufficient; however, if in the future the Board determined an additional source of revenue is required to meet implementation or other objectives, a rate study could be performed.

No FY 22/23 changes are proposed for insurance, legal, and annual audit costs. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Planning grant program will accept grant applications from GSA's beginning in October 2022. In the event a grant application is submitted by this GSA, we should fund the consultant costs for an application. The FY 22/23 costs are slightly increased over last year's estimate to reflect $20,000 for a grant application. This potential grant application is being evaluated currently and discussed during a separate board item today; however, from a budget perspective, if a grant application is advanced, we may need to later adjust the SCV-GSA budget before you today, and of course would seek Board's approval to do that, as well as adopt a resolution in support of the grant application.

As a result, the FY 22/23 budget recommendation for Administration is $47,500 an increase of $20,000 over last year's budget projection.

Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Implementation
Specific GSP Implementation steps are now known with completion of the GSP and as a result last year's budget line items have been reorganized. Additionally, the earlier budgeted FY 21/22 budget was underspent for several reasons including that certain work was able to be included in existing consultant contracts, such as for the Annual Report and further development of the GDE Evaluation Process, in other cases work was not necessary (field GDE evaluations), and in other cases it was performed by SCV Water (such as surveying). Scope in the previous year's budget line items is largely included in the new line items, but now associated with consultant contracts like the past approach we utilized with GSP Development budget line items.

The first budget category relates to Technical Consultant Implementation Support for $200,000. This consultant scope includes efforts to catalog and perform QA/QC on incoming data streams to the Data Management System, to continue to address data gaps (including domestic water quality and land surface elevations for subsidence monitoring), to compile data and regularly report on basin conditions relative to the sustainable management criteria, to use updated wellhead reference point survey data, and land surface data, to generate new hydrographs for predicted future water levels at representative well locations. It will also include a review of minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, and GDE triggers. Work also includes coordinating with other consultants on outreach, and GDEs. Work will also include preparation of the Annual Report. Consistent with past practices with your Board, for contracts that exceed $100,000, we are also seeking Board's approval to execute a contract with GSI Water solutions for a not to exceed value of $200,000.

The second budget category relates to outreach for GSP implementation for $43,500. This outreach is related to engaging private well owners and seeking volunteers to assist in groundwater level and groundwater quality monitoring. The outreach would be done in partnership with the technical consultant efforts identifying locations of data gaps where private wells may be able to help fill data gaps. The outreach work also includes talking with your board, after some desk top exercises with the technical consultant, to consider implementing a groundwater extraction reporting program that would apply to "non-de minimis" groundwater users (wells that extract more than 2-acre feet per year) to fill data gaps described in Chapter 9 of the GSP. A final component of this outreach not related to extraction reporting, is communication with private well operators on best management practices for groundwater use. We anticipate this effort will mainly be geared toward non de minimis well operators but may also include domestic well operators if there is interest or need.

The third budget category is for the environmental/biological consultant team to provide support for upland GDE monitoring for $30,000. This work includes the GSP implementation step of a habitat survey in upland areas of Placerita Canyon and Sand Canyon to better understand local GDE conditions. The evaluation will consider the extent these areas are supported by groundwater elevations that are influenced by pumping and provide recommendations to continue monitoring these areas. The work will also include work not called out in the GSP, but referenced in public comment, specifically regarding a stakeholder concern about the Savanah Oak habitat near I-5. The work will include budget for one or two other areas as needed.

The fourth budget category is for the environmental/biological consultant team to provide support for evaluations of the conditions of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems, for example if GDE triggers are approached or reached for $40,000. This scope includes field work in up to 9 locations where the biological consultant would evaluate conditions by looking at changes in vegetation caused by stress along the edges of a given riparian canopy. The boundaries would be delineated and compared year to year to see if the there is growth or shrinkage of the survey area. The width of the channel and depth of water in the channel will also be recorded. A summary memorandum will be prepared. In consultation with the technical consultant, a GDE evaluation report will be prepared as warranted. The technical consultant's role will be to help describe the future groundwater elevation trends.

The fifth budget category is for management of the required data management system for $35,000. This contract would include receiving and inputting primarily water level and water quality data into the data management system, but other data would be entered too such as imported water data, land surface elevation data, and spatial data (e.g. locations of land surface elevation locations and GDE monitoring areas). Data would be subject to a quality assurance (systematic activities to provide confidence in data collection) and quality control (inspection of data). The database consultant would also be called on to prepare routine reports displaying data relative to sustainable management criteria, and to coordinate with

the technical consultant in providing data for the GSA's annual report. Data management in general, and administration of the Data Management System continues becomes more important each year. SCV Water continues to evaluate options to bring more of this work in house but isn't fully staffed to handle all the efforts. Next year at this time we may seek an increase in staffing services for the 23/24 budget to administer the Data Management System.

The sixth category is for conducting a feasibility study and/or an environmental document for $150,000. No specific effort is identified yet under this category, but examples would be in alignment with the GSP, for example it may be used to support a feasibility study to support Bouquet Canyon Restoration, or for a feasibility study for an infiltration basin to help with groundwater recharge. We would communicate with your board before advancing work under this budget category.

As a result, the FY 22/23 budget recommendation for GSP implementation is $498,500, an increase of $204,500 over last year's budget projection.

Summary for all Task 2 Items above
As a result, the FY 22/23 budget recommendation is $610,000, which is $238,500 higher than last year's budget estimate. This increase is made up of additional implementation scope including the technical consultant having a larger role in organization of over 10 incoming data streams to the data management system, additional efforts to incorporate into the model updated reference point and land surface elevations and those effects, if any, on minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, and GDE triggers. An increase from $50,000 to $150,000 for feasibility studies is also included.

BUDGET SUMMARY AND ANTICPATED REVENUE

Expenditures under this category recognize the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) provides several opportunities to raise revenue and grants broad authority to GSAs to carry out the objectives of SGMA.

Chapter 8 of SGMA is applicable to GSP development and operation of the GSA after the GSP is completed. Chapter 8 provides that a GSA may, impose fees, including but not limited to permit fees and fees on groundwater extraction to fund the costs of a groundwater sustainability program, including but not limited to preparation, adoption, and amendment of a GSP and investigations, inspections, compliance assistance, enforcement and program administration including a prudent reserve. Imposition of fees is not proposed at this time.

We anticipate invoicing for 100% of available grant reimbursement within FY 21/22. Therefore grant revenue is not shown in FY 22/23 meaning the main sources of revenue are member agency contributions under the Joint Powers Agreement, and voluntary contributions from SCV Water. Annual member contributions of $20,000 are provided by the County of Los Angeles, City of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 36, Val Verde, and Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency consistent with the Joint Powers Agreement. The balance of revenue is anticipated to be provided by SCV Water under the terms of the Administrative Services Agreement and is shown on Table 3, Budget Summary, as Additional Revenue Required. The source for the additional contributions is the general fund/operating budget and SCV Water Capital Planning and Studies budget. If additional grant funds are identified and awarded, such funds would be included as a revenue source and be used to offset SCV Water costs as has been done with the current grant revenue.

The recommended FY 22/23 budget and estimated FY 23/24 budget reflect changes in Budget Categories 1 and 2, completing the draw on R2 and R3 grant revenue in FY 21/22, and transition of staff time and

consultant contracts to GSP implementation. Additional revenue required in FY 22/23 is estimated at $595,000.

CONCLUSION:

Narratives above provide an overview of the work in each budget category, highlighting proposed revisions since your Board adopted a budget in July 2021.

Today's report recommends budget reductions to last year's FY 22/23 budget estimates for Table 1 (Estimated SCV Water Staff Costs + Ad Buys) but recommends increases in Table 2 (Estimated Consultant Costs). Table 3 Additional Revenue Required is higher in FY 22/23 than the previous estimate largely due to not having grant revenue.

Much of the work for implementation of the GSP is accomplished through the Administrative Services Agreement with SCV Water. Accordingly Exhibit A of that agreement will need to be updated to reflect the FY 22/23 Budget and the newly added budget estimates for FY 23/24.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the SCV-GSA Board:

1) Adopt the proposed FY 22/23 budget detailed in the attached Tables 1, 2, and 3.
2) Replace the Administrative Service's Agreement's Exhibit A with Tables 1, 2, and 3.
3) Authorize SCV Water to execute a contract with GSI Water Solutions to support GSP Implementation and not exceed the amount of $200,000.

Attachments:

Table 1. SCV Water Staff Costs Estimate
Table 2. Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development (multiple tables)
Table 3. Proposed 22/23 Budget Summary Including Anticipated Revenue
SCV-GSA Budget FY 2021-2022, Adopted July 12, 2021

[This page intentionally left blank.]

TABLE 1 SCV Water Staff Cost Estimate							
	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24 estimate	New Totals including FY 23/24
SCV Water Administrative Support	$ 6,000	$ 12,000	$ 15,000	$ 6,000	$ 10,000	$ 10,000	$ 59,000
SCV Water Consultant Management and Technical Services	$ 78,000	$ 75,000	$ 80,000	$ 71,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 404,000
SCV Water Support with Public Outreach	$ 2,000	$ 5,000	$ 9,000	$ 7,000	$ 3,000	$ 3,000	$ 29,000
Ad Buys for Outreach	$ 3,000	$ 4,000	$ 10,000	$ 6,000	$ 2,000	$ 2,000	$ 27,000
Proposed FY 22/23 Total SCV Water Staff Cost	**$ 89,000**	**$ 96,000**	**$ 114,000**	**$ 90,000**	**$ 65,000**	**$ 65,000**	**$ 519,000**
Adopted FY 21/22 Total SCV Water Staff Cost	**$ 89,000**	**$ 96,000**	**$ 114,000**	**$ 114,000**	**$ 103,000**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (24,000)**	**$ (38,000)**	NA	NA

TABLE 2 Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development							
	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24 estimate	New Totals including FY 23/24
Groundwater Model Readiness- Additional Calibration of Modflow USG	$ 35,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 35,000
RFP Development- Status of Groundwater Model Memo	$ 5,800	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 5,800
RFP Development - Consultant Assistance in Drafting RFPs and Reviewing Proposals	$ 20,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 20,000
GSP Technical Consultant	$ 37,883	$ 516,121	$ 570,000	$ 355,424	$ -	$ -	$ 1,479,428
R3 Grant Application Tech Support for Meetings	$ -	$ -	Inc. In GSP Tech	Inc. In GSP Tech	$ -	$ -	$ -
R3 Grant Application GSP Tech Consultant Install of Data Loggers	$ -	$ -	Inc. In GSP Tech	Inc. In GSP Tech	$ -	$ -	$ -
GSP Stakeholder Engagement Consultant	$ 5,976	$ 66,365	$ 70,000	$ 30,159	$ -	$ -	$ 172,500
GSP Grant Administration Consultant	$ 2,625	$ 2,500	$ 10,000	$ 13,682	$ 5,000	$ -	$ 33,807
Peer Review Group to evaluate Modflow USG for suitability.	$ -	$ -	$ 80,000	$ 20,000	$ -	$ -	$ 100,000
R3 Grant Application Incremental Cost for GW Flowmodel Peer Review	$ -	$ -	Inc. In GSP Tech	Inc. In GSP Tech	$ -	$ -	$ -
R3 Grant Application Infiltration Testing and Pilot Studies	$ -	$ 57,696	$ 50,000	$ 115,000	$ 59,000	$ -	$ 281,696
Proposed FY 22/23 Total SCV Water Staff Cost	**$ 107,284**	**$ 642,682**	**$ 780,000**	**$ 534,265**	**$ 64,000**	**$ -**	**$ 2,128,231**
Adopted FY 21/22 Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development	**$ 107,284**	**$ 642,682**	**$ 780,000**	**$ 668,191**	**$ 50,000**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (133,926)**	**$ 14,000**	NA	NA

TABLE 2 Consultant Cost Estimate Contingency							
	FY 18/19	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**FY 23/24 estimate**	**New Totals including FY 23/24**
15% Contingency for Stakeholder Engagement Consultant	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	NA	$ -
15% Contingency for GSP Technical Consultant	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	NA	$ -
Proposed FY 22/23 Contingency Fund	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	NA	NA
Adopted FY 21/22 Contingency Fund	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 34,497**	**$ -**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (34,497)**	**$ -**	NA	NA

TABLE 2 Total Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development							
	FY 18/19	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**FY 23/24 estimate**	**New Totals including FY 23/24**
Proposed FY 22/23 Consultant Cost Estimate For GSP Development	**$ 107,284**	**$ 642,682**	**$ 780,000**	**$ 534,265**	**$ 64,000**	**$ -**	**$ 2,128,231**
Adopted FY 21/22 Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development	**$ 107,284**	**$ 642,682**	**$ 780,000**	**$ 702,688**	**$ 50,000**	NA	
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (168,423)**	**$ 14,000**	NA	

TABLE 2 Consultant Cost Estimate for Administration							
	FY 18/19	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**FY 23/24 estimate**	**New Totals including FY 23/24**
Grant Application Cost	$ -	$ 33,504	$ -	$ -	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 73,504
Pre GSP Adoption Rate Study for Fee Collection	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Rate Study for Post GSP Adoption Fee Collection	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -
Agency Insurance through JPIA	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 15,000
Legal	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000	$ 90,000
Annual Audit Costs	$ 3,288	$ 3,353	$ 3,420	$ 3,700	$ 10,000	$ 10,000	$ 33,761
Proposed FY 22/23 Consultant Cost Estimate for Adminstration	**$ 20,788**	**$ 54,357**	**$ 20,920**	**$ 21,200**	**$ 47,500**	**$ 47,500**	**$ 212,265**
Adopted FY 21/22 Consultant Cost Estimate for Administration	**$ 20,788**	**$ 54,357**	**$ 20,920**	**$ 96,200**	**$ 27,500**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (75,000)**	**$ 20,000**	NA	NA

TABLE 2 Consultant Cost Estimates for GSP Implementation							
	FY 18/19	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**FY 23/24 estimate**	**New Totals including FY 23/24**
Technical Consultant Support For GSP Implementation. (NEW) GSI Water Solutions GSP Implementation Support. Includes efforts to fill data gaps, to collect data, to monitor and track basin metrics (sustainable management criteria), preparation of annual report, coordination with ESA on GDEs, and CV Strategies on outreach, preparation of Annual Report					$ 200,000	$ 125,000	$ 325,000
Outreach Consultant for GSP Implementattion (NEW) CV Strategies Implementation Support. Includes outreach for helping fill data gaps and best management practices for non municipal wells.					$ 43,500	$ 35,000	$ 78,500
(NEW) ESA Woodlands Condition Monitoring					$ 30,000	$ 10,000	$ 40,000
(NEW) ESA GDE Evaluation Support					$ 40,000	$ 35,000	$ 75,000
(NEW) Data Management System Includes inputting data into the DMS, preparation of reports and charts to display basin metrics, provision of charts and data for Annual Report.					$ 35,000	$ 35,000	$ 70,000
(NEW) SCV Water Capital Planning and Studies "Feasibility Study and Environmental Docs (GSP)					$ 150,000	$ 150,000	$ 300,000
(Last Year's) Addressing Data Gaps: Elevation survey's (wells and thalweg), domestic well sampling, subsidence benchmark elevations, GDE evaluations. data management				$ -	$ -		$ -
(Last Year's) Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: monitoring, Drafting Report, Surveying Bench marks, outreach plan, data management.				$ -			$ -
(Last Year's) Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: Promoting Best Management Practices for private well operators. data management.				$ -			$ -
(Last Year's) Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: Basin-wide monitoring evaluation and annual report. GDE Evalautions. data management				$ -			$ -
(Last Year's) Response to DWR Comments on submitted GSP				$ -			$ -
(Last Year's) Project Development (Feasibility Studies, CEQA, design, construction, O&M)				$ -			$ -
Proposed FY 22/23 Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Implementation	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 498,500**	**$ 390,000**	**$ 888,500**
Adopted FY 21/22 Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Implementation	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 282,000**	**$ 294,000**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (282,000)**	**$ 204,500**	NA	NA

TABLE 2 Proposed FY 22/23 Consultant Costs All Categories							
	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24 estimate	New Totals including FY 23/24
Proposed FY 22/23 Consultant Cost All Categories	**$ 128,072**	**$ 697,039**	**$ 800,920**	**$ 555,465**	**$ 610,000**	**$ 437,500**	**$ 3,228,996**
Adopted FY 21/22 Consultant Cost All Categories	**$ 128,072**	**$ 697,039**	**$ 800,920**	**$ 1,080,888**	**$ 371,500**	NA	NA
Difference 22/23 minus 21/22	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (525,423)**	**$ 238,500**	NA	NA

TABLE 3 Proposed 22/23 Budget Summary Including Anticipated Revenue							
	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24 estimate	New Totals including FY 23/24
Table 1. Total Estimated SCV Water Staff	$ 89,000	$ 96,000	$ 114,000	$ 90,000	$ 65,000	$ 65,000	$ 519,000
Table 2. Total Estimated Consultant Services*	$ 128,072	$ 697,039	$ 800,920	$ 555,465	$ 610,000	$ 437,500	$ 3,228,996
Estimated Staff and Consultant Cost	$ 217,072	$ 793,039	$ 914,920	$ 645,465	$ 675,000	$ 502,500	$ 3,747,996
Anticipated Revenue							
Estimated R2 Grant Reimbursement	$ -	$ 134,423	$ 172,783	$ 108,900	$ -		$ 416,106
Estimated R3 Grant Reimbursement	$ -	$ -	$ 447,152	$ 444,007	$ -		$ 891,159
Member Agency Contributions	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 480,000
Subtotal	$ 80,000	$ 214,423	$ 699,935	$ 632,907	$ 80,000	$ 80,000	$ 1,787,265
Additional Revenue Required*	$ 137,072	$ 578,616	$ 214,985	$ 12,558	$ 595,000	$ 422,500	$ 1,960,731
Total Revenue for GSP Development and Implementation	$ 217,072	$ 793,039	$ 914,920	$ 645,465	$ 675,000	$ 502,500	$ 3,747,996
Balance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

*SCV Water may, in its discretion, advance these funds, or provide a voluntary nonreimbursable Member contribution.

SCV-GSA Budget FY 2021-22 Adopted July 12, 2021

Table 1. Estimated SCV Water Staff Costs + Ad Buy

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	Total
SCV Water Administrative Support	$6,000	$12,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$63,000
SCV Water Consultant Management and Technical Services	$78,000	$75,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$393,000
SCV Water Support with Public Outreach	$2,000	$5,000	$9,000	$9,000	$5,000	$30,000
Ad Buys for Outreach	$3,000	$4,000	$10,000	$10,000	$3,000	$30,000
Total SCV Water Staff Cost	**$89,000**	**$96,000**	**$114,000**	**$114,000**	**$103,000**	**$516,000**

Table 2. Estimated Consultant Costs

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	Total
Consultant Cost Estimate for GSP Development						
Groundwater Model Readiness-Additional Calibration of Modflow USG	$35,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$35,000
RFP Development- Status of Groundwater Model Memo	$5,800	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$5,800
RFP Development - Consultant Assistance in Drafting RFPs and Reviewing Proposals	$20,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$20,000
GSP Technical Consultant	$37,883	$516,121	$570,000	$448,942	$ -	$1,572,946
R3 Grant Application Tech Support for Meetings	$ -	$ -	GSP Tech	GSP Tech	$ -	$ -
R3 Grant Application GSP Tech Consultant Install of Pressure Transducers, Data Loggers, Temperature Data Loggers	$ -		GSP Tech	GSP Tech	$ -	$ -
GSP Stakeholder Engagement Consultant	$5,976	$66,365	$70,000	$30,159	$ -	$172,500
GSP Grant Administration Consultant	$2,625	$2,500	$10,000	$13,682	$ -	$28,807
Peer Review Group to evaluate Modflow USG for suitability.	$ -	$ -	$80,000	$20,000	$ -	$100,000
R3 Grant Application Incremental Cost for GW Flowmodel Peer Review	$ -	$ -	GSP Tech	GSP Tech	$ -	$ -
R3 Grant Application Infiltration Testing and Pilot Studies	$ -	$57,696	$50,000	$155,408	$50,000	$313,104
Subtotal	**$107,284**	**$642,682**	**$780,000**	**$668,191**	**$50,000**	**$2,248,157**
Consultant Cost Estimate for Contingency Fund	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

15% Contingency for Stakeholder Engagement Consultant	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
15% Contingency for GSP Technical Consultant	$ -	$ -	$ -	$34,497	$ -	$34,497
Subtotal	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$34,497**	**$ -**	**$34,497**
Total Consultant Cost Estimate for Technical Development	**$107,284**	**$642,682**	**$780,000**	**$702,688**	**$50,000**	**$2,282,654**

Table 2A. Update to Consultant Cost Estimates for GSP Development

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	Total
SCV-GSA Adopted 20/21 budget table (May 2020)	$113,863	$658,275	$1,015,902	$447,040	$ -	$2,235,080
Proposed 21/22 budget (July 2021)	$107,284	$642,682	$780,000	$702,688	$50,000	$2,282,654
Change (new minus old budget)	**$ (6,579)**	**$ (15,593)**	**$ (235,902)**	**$255,648**	**$50,000**	**$47,574**

Table 2. Estimated Consultant Costs (continued)

Consultant Cost Estimate for Administration	**FY 18/19**	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**Total**
Grant Application Cost	$ -	$33,504	$ -	$ -	$ -	$33,504
Pre GSP Adoption Rate Study for Fee Collection	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Rate Study for Post GSP Adoption Fee Collection	$ -	$ -	$ -	$75,000	$ -	$75,000
Agency Insurance through JPIA	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500	$12,500
Legal	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$75,000
Annual Audit Costs	$3,288	$3,353	$3,420	$3,700	$10,000	$23,761
Subtotal	**$20,788**	**$54,357**	**$20,920**	**$96,200**	**$27,500**	**$219,765**

Table 2B. Update to Consultant Cost Estimates for Administration

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	Total
SCV-GSA Adopted 20/21 budget table (May 2020)	$20,788	$54,357	$145,920	$21,200		$242,265
Proposed 21/22 budget (July 2021)	$20,788	$54,357	$20,920	$96,200	$27,500	$219,765
Change (new minus old budget)	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ (125,000)**	**$75,000**	**$27,500**	**$ (22,500)**

Table 2. Estimated Consultant Costs (continued)						
Consultant Cost Estimate for Post GSP Adoption Activities	**FY 18/19**	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**Total**
Addressing Data Gaps: Elevation survey's (wells and thalweg), domestic well sampling, subsidence benchmark elevation monitoring, GDE evaluations. Database maintenance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$64,000	$ -	$64,000
Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: Monitoring, Drafting Report, Surveying bench marks, outreach plan, Database Maintenance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$62,000	$93,000	$155,000
Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: Promoting Best Management Practices for private well operators. Database maintenance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$11,000	$11,000	$22,000
Monitoring, Reporting, Outreach: Basin-wide Monitoring Evaluation and Annual Report. GDE Evaluation. Database maintenance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$70,000	$90,000	$160,000
Response to DWR Comments on submitted GSP	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$50,000	$50,000
Project Development (Feasibility Studies, CEQA, design, construction, O&M)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$75,000	$50,000	$125,000
Subtotal	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$282,000**	**$294,000**	**$576,000**
Total Consultant Cost Estimate All Categories	**$128,072**	**$697,039**	**$800,920**	**$1,080,888**	**$371,500**	**$3,078,419**

Table 2C. Update of Consultant Cost Estimates for Post GSP Adoption (GSP Implementation)						
	FY 18/19	**FY 19/20**	**FY 20/21**	**FY 21/22**	**FY 22/23**	**Total**
SCV-GSA Adopted 20/21 budget table (May 2020)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$25,000		
Proposed 21/22 budget (July 2021)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$282,000	$294,000	$576,000
Change (new minus old budget)	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$257,000**	**$294,000**	**$576,000**

Table 3. Budget Summary

Budget Summary	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	Total
Table 1. Total Estimated SCV Water Staff	**$89,000**	**$96,000**	**$114,000**	**$114,000**	**$103,000**	**$516,000**
Table 2. Total Estimated Consultant Services*	**$128,072**	**$697,039**	**$800,920**	**$1,080,888**	**$371,500**	**$3,078,419**
Total Estimated Staff and Consultant	**$217,072**	**$793,039**	**$914,920**	**$1,194,888**	**$474,500**	**$3,594,419**
Anticipated Revenue						
Estimated R2 Grant Reimbursement	$ -	$134,423	$172,783	$108,900	$ -	$416,106
Estimated R3 Grant Reimbursement	$ -	$ -	$447,152	$444,007	$ -	$891,159
Member Agency Contributions	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$400,000
Subtotal	$80,000	$214,423	$699,935	$632,907	$80,000	$1,707,265
Additional Revenue Required*	$137,072	$578,616	$214,985	$561,981	$394,500	$1,887,154
Total Revenue for GSP Development and Implementation	**$217,072**	**$793,039**	**$914,920**	**$1,194,888**	**$474,500**	**$3,594,419**
Balance	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**

*SCV Water may, in its discretion, advance these funds, or provide a voluntary non-reimbursable Member contribution

ITEM NO. 3.6

Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Memorandum

DATE: June 30, 2022

TO: SCV-GSA Board of Directors

FROM: SCV-GSA Staff

SUBJECT: Approval of Resolution No. GSA 2022-02 Rescheduling the Regular Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Meetings

---

SUMMARY/DISCUSSION:

The SCV-GSA regular Board meetings are scheduled to meet quarterly, the first Monday of every third (3) month at 2:30 p.m.

The Board and staff would benefit from moving the April meeting to March to support the Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP) annual report submittal to the California Department of Water Resources required by April 1 and the July meeting to June to support the adoption of the annual SCV-GSA budget.

The rescheduled Board meetings would be the first Monday of January, March, June, and October. The meeting location and time will remain the same.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

None at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors adopt Resolution No. 2022-02 Rescheduling the Regular Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Meetings.

Attachment

[This page intentionally left blank.]

RESOLUTION NO. GSA 2022-02

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY RESCHEDULING THE REGULAR SANTA CLARITA VALLEY GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY BOARD MEETINGS

WHEREAS, the Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency's regular Board meetings are scheduled to meet quarterly, the first Monday of every third (3) month at 2:30 pm at the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency Rio Vista Water Treatment Plant in the Boardroom; and

WHEREAS, the SCV-GSA Board of Directors and staff would benefit from moving the April meeting to March to support the Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP) annual report submittal to the California Department of Water Resources required by April 1 and the July meeting to June to support the adoption of the annual SCV-GSA budget.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of SCV-GSA reschedules the regular Board meetings to the first Monday of January, March, June and October at 2:30 pm at the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency located at 27234 Bouquet Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, CA 91350 in the Agency's Boardroom.

_____
President

I, the undersigned, hereby certify: That I am the Secretary of the Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency, and that at a special meeting of the Board of Directors of said Agency held on June 30, 2022, the foregoing Resolution No. GSA 2022-02 was duly and regularly adopted by said Board, and that said resolution has not been rescinded or amended since the date of its adoption, and that it is now in full force and effect.

DATED: June 30, 2022

_____