



MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Management Committees
Members and Alternates

FROM: John Brodie, Water Resources Program Manager

DATE: January 12, 2022

RE: Amended Contract and Task Order for Prop 68 SGMA Implementation Grant
Administration Services.

BACKGROUND

The San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) entered into a Master Services Agreement with Woodard & Curran on March 1, 2020 to provide Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation Support for the Northern and Central Regions of the Delta-Mendota Subbasin. On May 1, 2020, a Task Order (TO) was added to that contract for Grant Administration for Proposition 68 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Funding. The TO budget was set at \$57,406 including a contingency budget of \$9,815 that requires authorization from the Delta-Mendota Coordination Committee prior to expenditure.

ISSUES FOR DECISION

Woodard & Curran has requested staff seek authorization to 1) expend part of the Contingency Budget in Fiscal Year 2022, 2) expend the remainder of the Contingency Budget in Fiscal Year 2023, and 3) raise the total budget an additional \$27,278 to a total of \$84,684. Of the total, \$35,908 is needed to complete the project. The grant is scheduled to terminate April 30, 2022. Staff does not intend to seek an extension, and all active tasks are scheduled for completion by February 28, 2022.

Both the Coordination Committee and the Northern and Central Management Committees tabled this item during their December meetings pending further detail from Woodard & Curran.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the following steps for the Northern and Central Management Committees and Coordination Committee:

- January 12th – Northern and Central Management Committees consider approval to authorize the Management Committees representatives to the Coordination Committee to approve the following items:
 1. Authorize expenditure of a portion of the existing Contingency Budget to cover FY 2022 expenses of the Proposition 68 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Funding grant administration.
 2. Authorize expenditure of remaining Contingency Budget in FY 2023
 3. Authorize increase of \$27,273 to the total budget to complete grant administration tasks through final grant reporting and close-out activities in FY 2023.
- January 18th – Coordination Committee will consider approval of items 1, 2 and 3.

ANALYSIS

Approval of this grant administration expenses and budget increase will ensure successful completion and reporting of the Subbasin's Proposition 1/68 grant. A deeper examination of available funds in the grant indicates there is available grant money that can be transferred into the administration category. This will result in no net outlay of additional funds for the Subbasin.

The transfer of funds between grant categories requires an amendment to the agreement. However, Woodard & Curran previously anticipated the need for an agreement amendment, and the necessary time is already included in the TO.

BUDGET

Budget tables on the pages to follow show expenditures for the remainder of this fiscal year, the total project budget with the amended increase, and the remaining estimated grant funding by category.

Grant Submittal Expenses

DM Grant Deliverable Tracker_010522.pdf

Hi John,

Following up on our recent discussions, I took a look at the expenditures on each submittal and took a stab at allocating those costs to the GSP groups (*note that these expenses are specifically related to the submittals and not to the general, coordinated grant admin work*). The first crack (shown below) allocates cost based on the relative amount being requested by each group on the submittal. The problem with this method is that it ends up assigning too much of the cost to the groups with a larger grant amount (Coordinated work and SLDMWA in particular, but the N-C and SJREC groups as well). I think that the column on the far right is a little better at telling the story since it focuses on Prop 68 money where each GSP group received the same amount. As an individual agency, SLDMWA still has a bigger piece of that pie (split out from the N-C GSP specific expenses) but that isn't surprising since they are central to much of the grant work.

With that, I want to reiterate that I don't think there is a perfect way to break out these costs since we didn't track the time associated with reviewing/preparing the submittal sections for each group. Ultimately I think the following notes still best sum up the situation:

- Submittal 8 and 9 could have been combined as could have Submittals 10 and 11. Combining these would have saved a couple thousand dollars each.
 - We had emailed during the submittal prep that we could skip a submittal but did not receive direction to do so.
- I don't think it is entirely reflected here (though somewhat in the Prop 68 column), but Farmers, Aliso and Fresno (and Grasslands to a lesser extent) required extra time to coordinate.
 - I can't quantify this but for each of these groups there have been multiple rounds of emails back and forth to clean up invoices, though that has not been an issue with the last few submittals. More recently, there were multiple rounds of edits requested for their component completion reports because they did not follow my initial directions and/or address the comments that I provided.
- The contract amendment that we are requesting can be completely covered by grant funds. If we don't submit any grant admin expenses from WSID or SLDMWA then our full amendment amount fits into the remaining grant admin budget. If those agencies have some grant admin work (I have been projecting that they would have a few thousand dollars related to their coordination support) then we could request a grant amendment to move some funds around (along with opening up the Technical Assistance funding for use).

Estimated Grant Admin Expenses Associated with GSP Group/Stakeholders (based on the relative amount submitted each period and cost of submittal)														
Component Name/Number		Submittal 1	Submittal 2	Submittal 3	Submittal 4	Submittal 5	Submittal 6	Submittal 7	Submittal 8	Submittal 9	Submittal 10	Submittal 11	Total	Prop 68 Contract Only (Submittal 7+)
Summary	Coordinated Expenses	\$1,338	\$2,526	\$3,816	\$3,483	\$5,646	\$5,000	\$2,510	\$699	\$668	\$1,168	\$967	\$28,568	\$6,758
	WSID Expenses	\$28	\$36	\$23	\$26	\$45	\$14	\$0	\$414	\$7	\$0	\$0	\$592	\$421
	SLDMWA Expenses	\$0	\$206	\$1,958	\$1,307	\$2,218	\$581	\$164	\$1,166	\$146	\$1,764	\$3,382	\$12,892	\$6,620
	N-C GSP Expenses	\$7,687	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,435	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,122	\$1,435
	Grasslands WD Expenses	\$0	\$3,831	\$333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,433	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,598	\$2,433
	Farmers WD Expenses	\$0	\$3,482	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,827	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,309	\$1,827
	Aliso Expenses	\$1,856	\$0	\$0	\$1,492	\$0	\$1,068	\$0	\$0	\$3,150	\$0	\$0	\$7,567	\$3,150
	Fresno Co. Expenses	\$0	\$0	\$3,503	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,839	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,342	\$1,839
	SJREC Expenses	\$4,656	\$1,163	\$107	\$42	\$0	\$451	\$1,683	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,102	\$1,683
Total		\$15,566	\$11,244	\$9,741	\$6,350	\$7,909	\$7,115	\$9,458	\$4,711	\$3,971	\$2,932	\$4,349	\$84,091	\$26,167

Submittal Expenses Included by Component by GSP Group/Stakeholder														
Component Name/Number		Submittal 1	Submittal 2	Submittal 3	Submittal 4	Submittal 5	Submittal 6	Submittal 7	Submittal 8	Submittal 9	Submittal 10	Submittal 11	Total	Prop 68 Contract Only (Submittal 7+)
Summary	Coordinated Expenses	\$77,194	\$81,700	\$203,469	\$77,796	\$73,655	\$109,793	\$65,575	\$10,767	\$7,948	\$10,002	\$4,294	\$722,193	\$98,586
	WSID Expenses	\$1,615	\$1,153	\$1,227	\$571	\$581	\$313	\$0	\$6,379	\$85	\$0	\$0	\$11,925	\$6,464
	SLDMWA Expenses	\$0	\$6,674	\$104,407	\$29,188	\$28,940	\$12,768	\$4,283	\$17,964	\$1,732	\$15,105	\$15,016	\$236,076	\$54,099
	N-C GSP Expenses	\$443,362	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$480,862	\$37,500
	Grasslands WD Expenses	\$0	\$123,933	\$17,773	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$179,206	\$37,500
	Farmers WD Expenses	\$0	\$112,622	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,746	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$160,367	\$47,746
	Aliso Expenses	\$107,075	\$0	\$0	\$33,314	\$0	\$23,460	\$0	\$0	\$37,500	\$0	\$0	\$201,350	\$37,500
	Fresno Co. Expenses	\$0	\$0	\$186,755	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$48,040	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$234,795	\$48,040
	SJREC Expenses	\$268,518	\$37,617	\$5,711	\$937	\$0	\$9,898	\$43,977	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$366,658	\$43,977
Total		\$897,764	\$363,699	\$519,341	\$141,807	\$103,176	\$156,233	\$247,121	\$72,610	\$47,265	\$25,107	\$19,310	\$2,593,432	\$411,413

Budget Projections through Grant Completion

Description	Contract Fee	Projected Total Spent (Through Feb 2022)	Projected Contract Budget Remaining (at end of Feb 2022)	Projected Budget Remaining After Use of Contingency	Projected Budget Remaining After Task 1 Amendment	Budget Remaining after FY 23 Amendment
Task 1 – Prop 68 Quarterly Progress Reports and Reimbursement Requests	\$14,983	\$23,667	(\$8,684)	(\$1,942)	\$0	\$10,572
Task 2 – Prop 68/1 Final Component and Grant Close-out Reports	\$17,108	\$7,520	\$9,588	\$9,588	\$9,588	\$9,576 <i>*Slightly different than current projected remaining budget due to estimates/rounding</i>
Task 3 – Final Grant Agreement Amendment	\$1,816	\$828	\$989	\$989	\$989	\$996 <i>*Slightly different than current projected remaining budget due to estimates/rounding</i>
Task 4 – Grant-Related Communications	\$13,684	\$16,757	(\$3,073)	\$0	\$0	\$7,802
Task 5 – Contingency	\$9,815	\$0	\$9,815	\$0	\$0	\$6,962
PROJECT TOTAL	\$57,406	\$48,772	\$8,634	\$8,634	\$10,576	\$35,908
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Original Contract</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>Shift funds from Task 5 to Tasks 1 and 4</i>	<i>Amendment to cover Task 1 deficiency (\$1,942)</i>	<i>Estimate of \$35,908 included remaining budgets for Task 2 and 3. Adds \$25,331 to budget. Total added budget for both amendments = \$27,273.</i>

Component Name/Number	Prop Grant	Grant/Comp Admin Budget	Spent To Date (Dec 2021)	Estimated Budget Remaining
Component 1 – Administration	Prop 1 + Prop 68	\$76,599	\$52,337	\$24,262
Component 2 – Technical Assistance Services	Prop 1	\$85,000	\$74,119	\$10,881
Component 3 – Generic DMS	Prop 1	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$0
Component 9 – San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors GSP Development	Prop 1	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
Component 10 - Well Census and Inventory	Prop 68	\$4,300	\$0	\$4,300
Component 11 – Subsidence Characterization and Project Feasibility Determination	Prop 68	\$4,300	\$0	\$4,300
Total		\$188,699	\$144,956	\$43,743



MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Management Committees
Members and Alternates

FROM: John Brodie, Water Resources Program Manager

DATE: January 12, 2022

RE: Input on Reallocation of Proposition 1/68 Stakeholder Engagement Grant
Funding

BACKGROUND

The Proposition 1/68 SGMA Implementation Grant between DWR and the Delta-Mendota Subbasin is set to expire 4/30/2022. All work that will be grant funded must be completed prior to that date. Work is finishing up right now on two outstanding components: the Well Census and Inventory project and the Subsidence Characterization and Project Feasibility study. Nearly all funds awarded will be expended. As of this moment, there is approximately \$50,000 remaining in the Technical Assistance – Stakeholder Engagement component. This task can be used to cover any outreach and education related to GSP tasks.

SLDMWA could retroactively invoice for eligible stakeholder engagement expenses, or seek a grant agreement amendment and request to move funds to the general Technical Assistance category to cover expenses incurred during GSP development. It is required that this funding be used for GSP development rather than implementation. This remaining funding could perhaps be used to pay for work associated with filling data gaps, if DWR agrees.

ISSUES FOR DECISION

Direction is requested from the Management Committees and Coordination Committee on how the Subbasin should approach reallocating available funding in the Technical Assistance – Stakeholder Engagement category so that as much of the available grant funding is spent on appropriate tasks and activities to accomplish DWR's goals in funding this grant program.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff suggests seeking a grant agreement amendment with DWR to reallocate Technical Assistance – Stakeholder Engagement funds to the general Technical Assistance category so it can be retroactively used for GSP development work.

ANALYSIS

Reallocating the funding between categories will allow the Subbasin to maximize the use of grant funding for eligible activities and return the least amount of awarded funds back to DWR.

BUDGET

Woodard & Curran previously anticipated a grant agreement amendment would be needed at the end of this Proposition 1/68 grant. Costs for the grant agreement amendment can be incorporated into the same amendment that will move funds into grant administration category.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Management Committees
Members and Alternates

FROM: John Brodie, Water Resources Program Manager

DATE: January 12, 2022

RE: Identifying Northern and Central Regions' Projects for Inclusion in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin Sustainable Groundwater Management Round 1 Grant Application

BACKGROUND

Representatives from the Delta-Mendota Subbasin (Subbasin) are pursuing funding through the Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Round 1 funding. A Spending Plan totaling \$10M will be submitted to DWR for Subbasin projects by the February 18th deadline. DWR will then coordinate with Subbasin representatives to identify a final total of \$7.6M to support eligible Subbasin projects.

The Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Management Committees (Management Committees) and Subbasin Coordination Committee approved the following project and budget categories for the \$10M total submission during meetings held in December 2021:

- \$4M to projects listed in Prop 68 Implementation grant application
 - o Orestimba Creek Recharge and Recovery Project (DPWD and CCID)
 - o Los Banos Creek Recharge and Recovery Project (SLWD, CCID and Grassland)
 - o Flood Water Capture Project (Grassland)
 - o Cottonwood Creek Recharge Project (Aliso)
- \$2M development of monitoring sites
 - o Monitoring wells, subsidence monitoring sites and methods (based on recommendation from GSI project), and ISW sites, including stream gages
- \$4M recommendation to split remaining funding between GSP Groups for to-be-determined items consistent with the PSP

- Split equally between the six GSP Groups, a total of approximately \$665,000 will be available for each GSP Group

Input is requested from each GSP Group to identify eligible projects for the final to-be-determined category of the Spending Plan. The Management Committees are requested to identify a subcommittee of representatives who will determine eligible projects for the Northern and Central Regions. The Coordination Committee will meet on January 18th to rank recommended projects and finalize the Spending Plan categories for the application.

Northern and Central Regions projects previously discussed as part of this funding opportunity include:

- Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir Project
- Pacheco Canal Modernization Project
- Ortigalita Creek Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project
- Respond to DWR's comments on GSPs
- Additional eligible projects listed in the NCDM GSP

ISSUES FOR DECISION

The Management Committees must identify projects within the Northern and Central Regions that will be reviewed by the Coordination Committee and confirmed for submission within the Subbasin's final SGMA Round 1 application.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Management Committees identify a subcommittee of representatives from the Northern and Central Regions who will be available to review and provide input on eligible Northern and Central Regions projects in advance of the January 18th Coordination Committee meeting.

BUDGET

The Coordination Committee recommended an equal split of the \$4M total within the "to-be-determined" category of the SGMA Round 1 application. The Northern and Central Regions have approximately \$665,000 within this category to identify eligible projects.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Management Committees
Members and Alternates

FROM: John Brodie, Water Resources Program Manager

DATE: January 12, 2022

RE: Options for Northern and Central Delta-Mendota Region Representative(s) to
Meet with DWR to Discuss DWR's Subbasin GSP Determination Letter

BACKGROUND

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) issued an initial assessment letter to the Delta-Mendota Subbasin on December 9, 2021. DWR noted at that time that the six coordinated GSPs for the Subbasin will be deemed "incomplete" when a final determination letter and assessment is released later this month. When that letter from DWR is received by the Subbasin Point of Contact, GSP groups will have 180 days to take recommended corrective actions to address identified deficiencies or risk mandatory oversight by the State Water Resources Control Board.

ISSUES FOR DECISION

Subbasin representatives will have the opportunity to meet with DWR SGMA Program Staff to discuss the perceived deficiencies and suggested corrective actions. The Subbasin's designated Point of Contact for the SGMA Program suggests the first meeting between Subbasin representatives and DWR SGMA Program Staff be as detailed and direct as possible. The issue is to determine how best to achieve the comfort level necessary to promote pointed or possibly blunt discussion by both Subbasin representatives and Program Staff.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff suggests that if more than one Northern and Central Management Committee representative wishes to participate in this meeting, that only one of those Management Committee representatives also be a Coordination Committee member.

ANALYSIS

Achieving the level of confidentiality needed for a direct and detailed discussion of the assessed Subbasin Plan weaknesses will demand an equivalent measure of sequestration not possible with unregulated attendance required under specific assembly conditions.

BUDGET

There is no budget or cost incurred.