



YOUR MOST VALUABLE RESOURCE - WATER

April 1, 2016

California Department of Water Resources
Attn: Lauren Bisnett, Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, California 94236

OFFICE OF
FRESNO
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

TELEPHONE (559) 233-7161
FAX (559) 233-8227
2907 S. MAPLE AVENUE
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93725-2208

Subject: Draft GSP Emergency Regulations Public Comments

Dear Ms. Bisnett:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Emergency Regulations published on February 18, 2016. Acting as the lead agency on behalf of the North Kings / Fresno Area GSA MOU group within the Kings Subbasin 5-22.08, the Fresno Irrigation District would like to submit the following comments for your consideration. The comments included within this letter are supported by the following entities:

- Fresno Irrigation District
- County of Fresno
- City of Fresno
- City of Clovis
- City of Kerman
- Bakman Water Company
- Malaga County Water District
- Pinedale County Water District
- Biola Community Services District
- Garfield Water District
- International Water District
- Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
- California State University, Fresno

General Comments

- Words like “adequate” and “complete” are used throughout the draft regulations, but it’s seldom clear what such descriptors mean. A defined legal standard with which attorneys and planners are familiar would be more helpful.

- The word “all” appears an excessive number of times throughout the regulations and in many instances is problematic from a practical standpoint.
- The draft regulations should describe a conflict resolution mechanism if GSAs find themselves in disagreement with not just local agencies, but also with DWR on its review of Plans, coordination or progress towards sustainability.
- Clarification is needed with respect to instances of “formal” vs. “informal” consultation from the State Water Resources Control Board. Define clear thresholds. For example, OSHA can be consulted with or without inviting intervention.

Article 1. General Provisions

- 350.2.(a) The notion that a Plan must achieve the sustainability for “the entire basin” is inconsistent with the statute allowing multiple GSPs within a basin and the “good actors” provision at WC Sec 10735.2(e); a GSA cannot be responsible for areas beyond its jurisdiction. This approach is throughout the draft regulations and needs to be revised.
- 350.2.(g) The ability of DWR to evaluate a Plan “at any time” for compliance is inconsistent with SGMA and other provisions of the draft regulations (sections 355.2 and 355.6). There should be some certainty that a GSP is adequate as a GSA moves forward, investing significant time and money to implement an approved Plan.
- We suggest adding as a principle, consistent with the Legislative Intent of SGMA (WC 10720.1(d)) and the Governor’s signing statement, that groundwater management is best accomplished at the local level and local GSAs are principally in charge of developing and implementing SGMA.

Article 2. Definitions

- 351.(e). The definition of “baseline” should be modified to: (i) tie to WC 10727.2 of SGMA, “The plan, may, but is not required to, address undesirable results that occurred before, and have not been corrected by, January 1, 2015,” and (ii) in the context of surface water supplies, “baseline...shall include the historic average reliability and deliveries” (WC 10733.2(b)(2)).
- We suggest adding a definition for “groundwater recharge”, that it includes direct augmentation of groundwater and “in-lieu” recharge, consistent with the attempt to clarify SGMA through AB 617 in 2015.
- We suggest adding definitions for “basin” and “subbasin”, or include reference to Bulletin 118 definitions.

Article 3. Technical & Reporting Standards

- These standards are prescriptive and may not be realistic or consistent with existing local practices. For instance at 352.6.(a)(2), measuring groundwater elevations within 0.1 feet accuracy is not appropriate. It is also inappropriate to require GSAs to convert all spatial data to coordinate systems that are preferred by DWR.
- 352.6.(b)(3)(A) We suggest revising this sub-article so that it is not misinterpreted as a new requirement that wells monitored as part of SGMA must also be reported to the CASGEM program, which is not required by statute.
- 352.6.(b)(3)(D) and 352.6.(b)(4) Many wells are open bottom design and do not have perforations. Many more lack other well construction information. Deeming such wells inadequate as sources of data disqualifies a significant number of Central Valley wells that would need to be replaced with costly, new constructed monitoring wells. Furthermore, we believe it to be hypocritical that wells not meeting standards described in the draft regulations were apparently adequate enough for the State to determine which basins and subbasins will be regulated under the Act, but those same wells are now inadequate for use by GSAs.
- 352.6.(f) The exception that “proprietary data and reports need not be disclosed unless requested by the Department to resolve...disputes” conflicts with words like “all” and types of information outlined in other Plan and reporting Articles and Sub-articles.
- 352.8 SGMA does not require a “coordinated data management system” and this section implies the DMS will be Web connected to DWR. Such a requirement is too prescriptive and should not be included in the regulations.

Article 4. Procedures

- 353.4.(b) The sub-article states that all materials must be accompanied by a “penalty of law” statement and that the person signing must make inquiry of the “persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information”. This is not a requirement specified by SGMA, and “penalty of law” is undefined. We request that this requirement be removed.

Article 5. Plan Contents

- 354.8.(a)(5) It is not appropriate to include mapping of all wells, including showing de minimis extractors, as part of the Plan, before SGMA powers are implemented. This could require registration of wells and SGMA powers are not provided for until a GSA has submitted a Plan. It may be more appropriate to require that a Plan provide for developing such information.

- 354.14.(a)(3) The “definable bottom of the basin” is difficult and in some cases impractical to identify, for example, in confined aquifers that are many thousands of feet thick where the only available data may be from oil and gas industries.
- 354.18.(b)(2)(B) The regulations should specify what happens if a basin does not possess sufficient data to go back the required “minimum of 10 years, or as is sufficient to adequately...estimate and project future water budget information...”
- 354.18.(d)(1). The term “central valley land use” is undefined. If the regulation is referring to the Central Valley it should be removed as it is an inappropriate reference to a specific region of the state.
- 354.28.(b) The term “significant and unreasonable” is omitted several times and should be identified each time it applies qualitatively to “critical parameters.”
- 354.28.(e) The sub-article requires that thresholds for the various undesirable results be supported by “clear and convincing evidence”. This is inappropriate, particularly since additional information will be developed through the Plan process after SGMA powers can be invoked, it is not provided by SGMA, and it will invite challenges to local efforts of GSAs.

Article 6. GSP Evaluation & Assessment

- The SGMA provision of two discretionary extensions of up to 5 years each beyond the 20-year sustainability timeframe upon a showing of good cause (CWC 10727.2) is missing from the draft regulations and should be added.
- 355.4.(a)(3) An initial Plan should not be deemed inadequate if it does not cover the “entire basin”.
- 355.4.(a)(11) Insert the word “significantly” before “impair the right to...”
- 355.4. The sub-article refers to section 10720.7 as a deadline to file a proposed Plan. However, section 355.2 states that review will take up to two years. Perhaps the regulations should clarify that an agency should submit and begin to implement its plan by the deadline stated in section 10720.7, but that DWR shall have up to two years to review and approve a plan and propose changes.
- 355.6.(b) Provided an agency is meeting its milestones, as determined through monitoring programs described in the agency’s DWR-approved plan, it seems unnecessary to audit other aspects of an agency’s performance. Local control is a key goal of SGMA, and agency resources should be expended implementing plans, not continually justifying plans to DWR.
- 355.8. Regarding consultation with the SWRCB, the sub-article cites as authority Water Code sections 10735.2 and 10735.4, which in turn describe consultation by DWR as a precursor to placing a basin in probationary status. With the stakes so high, section 355.8 should further clarify the times and circumstances when such consultation will be warranted, and should include some provision for

notifying an agency and providing an opportunity to cure defects before consulting with the SWRCB.”

- 355.10.(d) As written, this would indicate a lack of commitment to providing assistance to resolve disputes and ignores “bad actor” provisions of the Act.

Article 7. Reports, Assessments, & Amendments

- 356.4. The requirements for the annual report are much more specific than the statute (WC sec 10728). In particular it requires summaries of groundwater extractions by water use sector and location of extractions (raw, discrete data instead of aggregated data as required by statute).
- 356.4.(b)(5)(A) Change in groundwater storage maps for each principal aquifer is problematic for confined aquifers, such as those underlying the Corcoran Clay, since groundwater elevations are influenced by spatially variable change in head pressures.
- 356.6.(b) This sub-article is confusing. DWR may “provide recommended corrective actions to address any deficiencies in [an] annual report,” and shall treat the agency’s plan as conditionally adequate until the deficiencies are addressed. Are the recommended corrective actions then actually “recommended” if the agency shall be sanctioned until deficiencies are addressed? What is intended by this language?
- 356.10. The amount of information that an agency must compile seems appropriate in the case of a plan amendment, but not for a five year review. If milestones are not being met, then more information is appropriate. Otherwise, it should be sufficient for an agency to prove that it is meeting its milestones.

Article 8. Coordination Agreements

- 357.4. For Intra-basin coordination, the term “Submitting Agency” is introduced (which is not defined) and will be a “single point of contact with the Department”. It is to “rectify data and interpretations regarding basin conditions”. The term “Submitting Agency” appears to be the same as “Coordinating Agency,” as used in sections 355.10(a) and 351(i). If these terms are to remain in the regulations, clarification is requested.

Thank again for your consideration of our comments. If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact Adam Claes at 559-233-7161 extension 7404 or aclaes@fresnoirrigation.com.

Sincerely,



William R. Stretch
Assistant General Manager