



**GREATER KAWEAH
GROUNDWATER
SUSTAINABILITY
AGENCY**

www.GreaterKaweahGSA.org

Greater Kaweah GSA Board Meeting

Monday, January 6, 2020

1

PUBLIC COMMENT

ANNOUNCEMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2

ITEM 5: Subbasin and Committees Reports

Kaweah Subbasin:

- January 15, 2020 Management Team Committee meeting

RCC and SC:

- RCC applications received and reappointments
- SC applications received and appointment/reappointments
- RCC appointment of Board Director and Alternate

TAC:

- Temporary waiver of by-laws requirement of quarterly meetings

3

OTHER GOVERNING BOARD APPOINTMENTS BOARD OFFICERS APPOINTMENTS

4

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Schedule Update

- GKGSA Board approved Public Review Draft GSP schedule on September 9th and released the Draft to the Public September 16th
- 90-day notice issued for public hearing on December 16th
- Combined RCC/SC meeting December 17. Management Team Committee, 2-3 Combined RCC/SC and 2-3 Board meetings in January
- Adoption and submission to DWR week of January 20th
- DWR is required to establish its own GSP public comment period of no less than 60 days for an adopted plan
- A GSP that is determined to be incomplete after the deadline may be revised and resubmitted to DWR within 180 days from the date DWR issues the assessment

5

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • City of Visalia | • The Nature Conservancy |
| • Exeter ID and LSID | • Ag Innovations |
| • Kings River Water Association | • City of Woodlake |
| • Westchester Group | • Tulare County Farm Bureau |
| • Wonderful Citrus | • Mr. Del Strange |
| • Self-Help Enterprises | • Ms. Karen Yohannes |
| • Leadership Council | • Ms. Carole Combs (public hearing) |
| • CDFW | |

6

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments

- 14 comment letters
- 6 comments received during public hearing, most restating written comments received
- All comments parsed out in Excel spreadsheet into 336 individual comments
- Comments categorized into batches
 - Batch A: 198 comments
 - Batch B: 113 comments
 - Batch C: 24 comments
- Duplicate comments consolidated – Multiple Comment Response (MCR) coded
- Batch A comments handled administratively, most Batch B and C presented to committees and Board for direction
- Public Comment Summary report prepared by Stantec

7

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- Exeter ID and Lindsay Strathmore ID comment regarding unresolved issue between EKGSA/GKGSAs MTs and MOs in various hydro zones

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSAs will evaluate these differences again as monitoring data become available and consider revisions in the future. GKGSAs expect similar action by EKGSA and will continue to coordinate with EKGSA to resolve significant issues.

8

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- LCJA comments regarding concern that the GKGSA GSP is incomplete, does not adequately analyze drinking water impacts, lacks basic elements required under SGMA, does not include projects and management actions that benefit protected groups, does not adequately analyze nor incorporate input from DACs and domestic well users

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSA believes its GSP is complete, and did conduct drinking water well impact analysis using best known data at the time and given available schedule and resources. The agency will continue to evaluate impacts and craft solutions to drinking water communities as it data gaps are filled and the monitoring network is improved.

9

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- LCJA comments regarding concern that the GKGSA did not adequately consider input from vulnerable groundwater communities and domestic well owners

- ✓ Recommended Response:

The GKGSA GSP documents collaborating with LCJA as well as other organizations to conduct stakeholder surveys, workshops and meetings to obtain and to consider input from drinking water communities. Drinking water well impact evaluations, modifications to the monitoring network and a mitigation MA were largely in response to input received from these outreach activities. The agency will continue to seek and respond accordingly to input received as the GSP is implemented.

10

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- Comments regarding the Sustainability Goal being too focused on “existing enterprises” of the region and insufficiently acknowledges protection of significant and unreasonable impacts to other users, most notably drinking water users

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSAs have worked with MKGSAs and EKGSA to address this concern by modifying the coordinated Sustainability Goal to reflect more co-equal protection of all beneficial users and uses of groundwater.

- ✓ Sustainability Goal:

“The broadly stated sustainability goal for the Kaweah Subbasin is for each GSA to manage groundwater resources to preserve the viability of existing agricultural enterprises of the region and the smaller communities that provide much of their job base in the Sub-basin, including the school districts serving these communities. The goal will also strive to fulfill the water needs of existing and amended county and city general plans that commit to continued economic and population growth within Tulare County.”

11

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- Comments regarding concern that the GSP does not clearly show how the Sustainability Goal will be achieved through combined actions of the three GSAs, and a recommendation that GKGSAs set a unique Sustainability Goal and unique UR definitions for the GKGSAs area

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSAs have worked with MKGSAs and EKGSA to develop a shared Sustainability Goal and definitions of URs for the Kaweah Subbasin as required by SGMA and will seek to monitor and modify those descriptions as appropriate over the course of the sustainability period.

12

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- Comments from LCJA and SHE questioning the technical validity of the well impact analysis conducted by GEI/GSI and expressing concern that this analysis grossly underestimates the number of wells that will be dewatered during the implementation period

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSa will improve discussion within the GSP to clarify how this analysis was conducted, and will seek to collaborate with other agencies and organizations to improve/update its understanding of impacts during the early stages of GSP implementation.

13

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch C)

- Comments from LCJA and SHE regarding improper consideration of water quality impacts, monitoring and mitigation

- ✓ Recommended Response:

GKGSa will coordinate with other organizations and efforts to monitor water quality trends from existing water quality sampling programs and will report annually on the water quality MOs and MTs.

14

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch B)

- Comments from CDFW, TNC and others concerning inadequate definition of ISWs and GDEs, inadequate consideration of the environment and GDEs as beneficial users and uses of groundwater, criticism over the validity of the technical analysis conducted to identify these users and the potential impacts to them, and finally, the lack of Projects and MAs in the GSP that would mitigate and/or restore ecosystems

- ✓ Recommended Response:

The GKGSA GSP adheres to the definition of “Interconnected Surface Waters” contained in SGMA Regulations. SGMA Regulations also do not require restoration of groundwater conditions before the benchmark date of January 1, 2015 and thus the GKGSA is not responsible for restoring ecosystems to their condition prior to that date. The GSA will continue to monitor potential impacts to environmental users and uses as data gaps are filled and will report annually the groundwater elevation contour maps and depths to groundwater.

15

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch B)

- Various comments from CDFW, NGOs and individuals regarding improper consideration of/understanding of property and water rights

- ✓ Recommended Response:

Comments will be given due consideration and corrections will be made as deemed appropriate.

16

ITEM 8: GSP Public Review Draft Review of Public Comments (Batch B)

- Various comments from KRWA, City of Visalia and others regarding Projects and Management Actions which improperly assume leveraging excess water and/or facilities without authorization

- ✓ Recommended Response:

Projects and Management Actions in the GSP are intended to propose concepts that may be possible but that acknowledge the need for additional feasibility work. GKGSA will work with concerned parties to modify Project and MA descriptions to better reflect that intention.

17

NEXT MEETING DATE



FINANCIAL REPORT

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE SALARY REVIEW

CLOSED SESSION

REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

18