

**04/19/2011**

**ADDITIONAL  
DOCUMENTS  
ADDENDUM**

**ITEM #8**

**Support of AB 1152**

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 14, 2011

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2011–12 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 1152**

---

**Introduced by Assembly Members Chesbro and Cook**

February 18, 2011

---

An act to amend Sections ~~10933 and 10933.7~~ 10932 of the Water Code, relating to groundwater.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1152, as amended, Chesbro. Groundwater.

*Existing law authorizes specified entities to assume responsibility for monitoring and reporting groundwater elevations in all or a part of a groundwater basin or subbasin. Existing law requires an entity seeking to assume those functions to notify the Department of Water Resources, and requires the department to determine which entities will perform monitoring functions. Existing law requires monitoring entities to commence monitoring and reporting groundwater elevations on or before January 1, 2012.*

*This bill would authorize a monitoring entity to report groundwater elevations using specified alternate monitoring techniques for certain groundwater basins and subbasins meeting prescribed conditions. The bill would condition this authorization upon submission of a report to the department and a determination by the department that the monitoring entity may use the alternate monitoring techniques. The bill would require a monitoring entity, every 3 years, to submit to the department information establishing its continued eligibility to use the alternate monitoring techniques.*

~~(1) Existing law requires the Department of Water Resources to identify the extent of monitoring of groundwater elevations that is being~~

~~undertaken within each basin or subbasin. If the department determines that all or a part of a basin or subbasin is not being monitored, the department is required to attempt to contact all well owners within the area not being monitored and determine if there is an interest in establishing a specified groundwater management plan, integrated regional water management plan, or voluntary groundwater monitoring association.~~

~~This bill would instead require the department to contact, for those purposes, all well owners within the unmonitored part of the groundwater basin or subbasin, and the county or counties and other specified entities overlying the unmonitored part of the groundwater basin or subbasin.~~

~~(2) Existing law provides that, if the department is required to perform groundwater monitoring functions for portions of a basin or subbasin after contacting all well owners within the area not being monitored, then the county and other specified entities that are authorized to assume responsibility for groundwater monitoring are not eligible for a water grant or loan awarded or administered by the state, with a specified exception.~~

~~This bill would, instead, make the county and other specified entities that are contacted by the department ineligible for a water grant or loan awarded or administered by the state, if that county or other entity declines to assume responsibility for monitoring and reporting groundwater elevations in all or a portion of the unmonitored part of the basin or subbasin.~~

~~Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.~~

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1     SECTION 1. Section 10932 of the Water Code is amended to
- 2     read:
- 3     10932. (a) Monitoring entities shall commence monitoring
- 4     and reporting groundwater elevations pursuant to this part on or
- 5     before January 1, 2012.
- 6     (b) For purposes of reporting groundwater elevations pursuant
- 7     to this part, and subject to subdivision (c), a monitoring entity may
- 8     use alternate monitoring techniques for a basin or subbasin,
- 9     instead of monitoring groundwater elevations directly through

1 monitoring wells, if the basin or subbasin meets any of the  
2 following conditions:

3 (1) Groundwater elevations are unaffected by land use activities  
4 or planned land use activities, or naturally occurring total  
5 dissolved solids within the groundwater preclude the use of that  
6 water.

7 (2) It is underlying land that is wholly owned or controlled,  
8 individually or collectively, by state, tribal, or federal authorities,  
9 and groundwater monitoring information is not available.

10 (3) It is underlying an area where geographic or geologic  
11 features make monitoring impracticable, including, but not limited  
12 to, a basin or subbasin that is inaccessible to well-drilling  
13 equipment.

14 (c) Before using an alternate monitoring technique pursuant to  
15 subdivision (b), a monitoring entity shall submit to the department  
16 a report, signed by a professional geologist registered pursuant  
17 to Section 7850 of the Business and Professions Code, setting forth  
18 the factual basis and supporting documentation demonstrating  
19 that the basin or subbasin meets any of the conditions set forth in  
20 subdivision (b). Upon receiving the report, the department shall  
21 determine, in its discretion, whether the monitoring entity may use  
22 an alternate monitoring technique, and the alternate monitoring  
23 techniques that may be used, for the basin or subbasin. For a basin  
24 or subbasin that the department has determined is eligible to use  
25 an alternate monitoring technique, the department shall determine  
26 whether information provided by the monitoring entity using the  
27 alternate monitoring technique is sufficient to comply with the  
28 monitoring and reporting requirements of subdivision (a).

29 (d) (1) Within 60 days of finding that a basin or subbasin no  
30 longer meets any of the conditions set forth in subdivision (b), the  
31 monitoring entity shall report that finding to the department. Not  
32 later than 12 months after providing that report, the monitoring  
33 entity shall commence monitoring and reporting groundwater  
34 elevations using monitoring wells.

35 (2) A failure to comply with the report requirements of  
36 paragraph (1) shall constitute noncompliance with the monitoring  
37 and reporting requirements of subdivision (a).

38 (e) Every three years following an initial determination by the  
39 department pursuant to subdivision (c), a monitoring entity shall  
40 submit sufficient information, as may be determined by the

1 department, establishing its continued eligibility to use alternate  
2 monitoring techniques in accordance with this section.

3 (f) A determination by the department pursuant to this section  
4 shall be final and conclusive.

5 (g) For purposes of this section, an "alternate monitoring  
6 technique" may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the  
7 following, as the department may determine to be appropriate:

8 (1) Hydrologic records for the basin or subbasin.

9 (2) Well permits or similar reports from within the area  
10 overlying the basin or subbasin.

11 (3) Aerial photographs.

12 (4) Remote sensing data.

13 SECTION 1. Section 10933 of the Water Code is amended to  
14 read:

15 10933. (a) On or before January 1, 2012, the department shall  
16 commence to identify the extent of monitoring of groundwater  
17 elevations that is being undertaken within each basin and subbasin.

18 ~~(b) The department shall prioritize groundwater basins and~~  
19 ~~subbasins for the purpose of implementing this section. In~~  
20 ~~prioritizing the basins and subbasins, the department shall, to the~~  
21 ~~extent data are available, consider all of the following:~~

22 ~~(1) The population overlying the basin or subbasin.~~

23 ~~(2) The rate of current and projected growth of the population~~  
24 ~~overlying the basin or subbasin.~~

25 ~~(3) The number of public supply wells that draw from the basin~~  
26 ~~or subbasin.~~

27 ~~(4) The total number of wells that draw from the basin or~~  
28 ~~subbasin.~~

29 ~~(5) The irrigated acreage overlying the basin or subbasin.~~

30 ~~(6) The degree to which persons overlying the basin or subbasin~~  
31 ~~rely on groundwater as their primary source of water.~~

32 ~~(7) Any documented impacts on the groundwater within the~~  
33 ~~basin or subbasin, including overdraft, subsidence, saline intrusion,~~  
34 ~~and other water quality degradation.~~

35 ~~(8) Any other information determined to be relevant by the~~  
36 ~~department.~~

37 ~~(c) If the department determines that all or part of a basin or~~  
38 ~~subbasin is not being monitored pursuant to this part, the~~  
39 ~~department shall do all of the following:~~

40 ~~(1) Attempt to contact all of the following:~~

1 ~~(A) All well owners within the unmonitored part of the basin~~  
2 ~~or subbasin.~~

3 ~~(B) The county or counties overlying the unmonitored part of~~  
4 ~~the basin or subbasin.~~

5 ~~(C) All entities described in subdivisions (a) to (d), inclusive,~~  
6 ~~of Section 10927, that are overlying the unmonitored part of the~~  
7 ~~basin or subbasin.~~

8 ~~(2) Determine if there is an interest in establishing any of the~~  
9 ~~following:~~

10 ~~(A) A groundwater management plan pursuant to Part 2.75~~  
11 ~~(commencing with Section 10750).~~

12 ~~(B) An integrated regional water management plan pursuant to~~  
13 ~~Part 2.2 (commencing with Section 10530) that includes a~~  
14 ~~groundwater management component that complies with the~~  
15 ~~requirements of Section 10753.7.~~

16 ~~(C) A voluntary groundwater monitoring association pursuant~~  
17 ~~to Section 10935.~~

18 ~~(d) If the department determines that there is sufficient interest~~  
19 ~~in establishing a plan or association described in paragraph (2) of~~  
20 ~~subdivision (c), or if the county agrees to perform the groundwater~~  
21 ~~monitoring functions in accordance with this part, the department~~  
22 ~~shall work cooperatively with the interested parties to comply with~~  
23 ~~the requirements of this part within two years.~~

24 ~~(e) If the department determines, with regard to a basin or~~  
25 ~~subbasin, that there is insufficient interest in establishing a plan~~  
26 ~~or association described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c), and~~  
27 ~~if the county decides not to perform the groundwater monitoring~~  
28 ~~and reporting functions of this part, the department shall do all of~~  
29 ~~the following:~~

30 ~~(1) Identify any existing monitoring wells that overlie the basin~~  
31 ~~or subbasin that are owned or operated by the department or any~~  
32 ~~other state or federal agency.~~

33 ~~(2) Determine whether the monitoring wells identified pursuant~~  
34 ~~to paragraph (1) provide sufficient information to demonstrate~~  
35 ~~seasonal and long-term trends in groundwater elevations.~~

36 ~~(3) If the department determines that the monitoring wells~~  
37 ~~identified pursuant to paragraph (1) provide sufficient information~~  
38 ~~to demonstrate seasonal and long-term trends in groundwater~~  
39 ~~elevations, the department shall not perform groundwater~~  
40 ~~monitoring functions pursuant to Section 10933.5.~~

1 ~~(4) If the department determines that the monitoring wells~~  
2 ~~identified pursuant to paragraph (1) provide insufficient~~  
3 ~~information to demonstrate seasonal and long-term trends in~~  
4 ~~groundwater elevations, and the State Mining and Geology Board~~  
5 ~~concurs with that determination, the department shall perform~~  
6 ~~groundwater monitoring functions pursuant to Section 10933.5.~~

7 SEC. 2. Section 10933.7 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8 ~~10933.7. (a) If the department is required to perform~~  
9 ~~groundwater monitoring functions pursuant to Section 10933.5;~~  
10 ~~the county, and any other entity contacted by the department~~  
11 ~~pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 10933, that~~  
12 ~~declines to assume responsibility for monitoring and reporting~~  
13 ~~groundwater elevations in all or a portion of the unmonitored part~~  
14 ~~of a basin or subbasin shall not be eligible for a water grant or loan~~  
15 ~~awarded or administered by the state.~~

16 ~~(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the department shall~~  
17 ~~determine that an entity described in subdivision (a) is eligible for~~  
18 ~~a water grant or loan under the circumstances described in~~  
19 ~~subdivision (a) if the entity has submitted to the department for~~  
20 ~~approval documentation demonstrating that its entire service area~~  
21 ~~qualifies as a disadvantaged community.~~

**04/19/2011**

**ADDITIONAL**

**DOCUMENTS**

**ITEM #9C**

**Public Hearing**

**Regarding Solid**

**Waste Gate Fees**

# Proposed Budget – Transfer Stations Open 2 Days Per Week

## BX Closed on County Holidays and Sundays

### Revenues

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Tipping Fee (\$68.50)        | \$1,351,175      |
| Parcel Fee                   | \$772,454        |
| Increased Min. Tip Fee       | \$45,000         |
| Parcel Fee Interest          | \$40,000         |
| Franchise and Capacity Grant | \$65,000         |
|                              | \$20,000         |
| Miscellaneous                | \$70,000         |
| Sludge                       | \$139,982        |
| Board Contribution           | <u>\$288,490</u> |
| Total Revenues               | \$2,791,971      |

### Expenses

|                             |                 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Salaries and Wages          | \$858,133       |
| Other Departmental Expenses | \$67,400        |
| Fees and Special Waste      | \$219,891       |
| Debt Service                | \$574,900       |
| Grant Expenditures          | \$20,000        |
| Maintenance                 | \$168,650       |
| Professional Services       | \$133,000       |
| A87 Cost Allocation         | \$207,490       |
| Transfer Station Contract   | \$319,261       |
| Land and Improvements       | \$75,000        |
| Transfer Out to Closure     | <u>\$67,795</u> |
| Total Expenses              | \$2,734,520     |

NET (Contingency)

**\$80,451**

**04/19/2011**

**ADDITIONAL**

**DOCUMENTS**

**ITEM #11A**

**Request for**

**Support of Conway**

**Ranch Fish Hatchery**

Every American community takes pride in maintaining and preserving their roots. June Lake is no different, our roots has always been fishing. We can see that in the photographs displayed at Silver lake resort's café and the lobby in the Heidelberg Inn's.

So often we hear from our guests say that when they think of the Eastern Sierras, three things come to mind: Schat's Bakery, Mammoth Mountain and Alpers trophy trout.

Our late Board of Supervisor from North County George Cecil, who was passionate about fishing, put it so very well. The greatest form of promotion to our area is to have that child or grandchildren catch their first fish in our waters. The family is hooked and they will come back again and again.

The fish is the product that drives our summer visitor to us. Over the last few years our supply of fish has deteriorated. Each opening season we have a new crises'; Last year the Willow Fly Catcher, before that the economic hardships of the department of fish and game, before that the mussel and before that the mud snail.

Fishing touches almost every person that lives in Mono County in one way or another. Though the ownership of businesses; Tackle shops, marina, restaurants, campground and Lodging. From these business jobs are created. The revenue generated from fishing then becomes Income tax, Sales tax, Bed tax, and also property tax. Because of the love of fishing, our visitors want to buy a piece of heaven in June Lake and fish, so they buy that always wanted cabin.

Hatchery fish and especial the Alpers trophy trout is a major driving force for our economy. We have all experiencing the downward trend of our summer and winter business in the last few years, should we lose our source of quality fish, our livelihood will become even worse. We, the members of the June Lake Loop Chamber of Commerce, are asking you to support a working fish hatchery in our area to supply us with quality fish for the June Lake Loop.



**JUNE LAKE ADVOCATES** PO Box 610, June Lake, California 93529

April 18, 2011

Mono County Board of Supervisors  
P. O. Box 715  
Bridgeport, CA 93517  
Via email: [roberts@mono.ca.gov](mailto:roberts@mono.ca.gov)

Subject: Conway Ranch Alpers Trout hatchery

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

It goes without question that a decrease or loss of Alpers Trout stocking in the June Lake Loop area will have negative ramifications on the economy and tourism.

We believe the County should take reasonable steps to support continued Alpers planting to both attract visitors and stimulate local business.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Al Heinrich, President  
June Lake Advocates

**04/19/2011**

**ADDITIONAL  
DOCUMENTS**

**ITEM #14A**

**Inyo-Mono**

**Integrated Regional  
Water Mgmt.**

**FINAL AGENDA**  
**Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting**

**Wednesday, April 27, 2011**  
**9:30 am - 12:30 pm**  
**LADWP Bishop Office**  
**300 Mandich St.**  
**Bishop, CA**

Call-in option:  
866-862-2138  
passcode: 1678718

**Please RSVP to Holly Alpert ([holly.alpert@gmail.com](mailto:holly.alpert@gmail.com)) by Monday, April 25, 2011, at 9:00 am and let me know whether you will be *attending in person or via phone*. It is important that you RSVP so that we can set up the meeting space to accommodate the correct number of people and ensure that we have a quorum of MOU signatories attending.**

If you will be calling in to the meeting and you are an MOU signatory, please send your call-in address to Holly Alpert ([holly.alpert@gmail.com](mailto:holly.alpert@gmail.com)) by 9:00 am Sunday, April 24, 2011. You will also need to post the meeting notice and agenda at your location by that time.

Call-in locations:

1. Inyo County Water Department  
135 South Jackson St.  
Independence, CA 93514
2. Inyo National Forest/BLM/Sierra Nevada Conservancy Office  
351 Pacu Ln  
Bishop, CA 93514
3. Leroy Corlett Residence  
1217 N. Inyo  
Ridgecrest, CA

If you require special accommodations to participate in this meeting in person or by phone, please contact Holly Alpert ([holly.alpert@gmail.com](mailto:holly.alpert@gmail.com); 760-924-7564) 72 hours prior to the meeting.

The public will be offered the opportunity to comment on each agenda item prior to any action on the item by the membership. The public will also be offered the opportunity to address the membership on any matter pertaining to IRWMP business. Agenda items indicated as "Action" require that members undertake activities subsequent to the meeting. Agenda items indicated as "Decision" are items where the membership will make a decision on the item at the meeting. This agenda can also be viewed in the Calendar section of [www.inyomonowater.org](http://www.inyomonowater.org).

All decisions of the RWMG are made by consensus as defined in Article I of the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group Planning and Implementation Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). After a motion is made by a Member, there is opportunity for discussion, and then RWMG Members are asked to vote. Members may approve a decision (thumbs up),

vote that they can live with a decision while not completely approving of it (thumbs sideways), or disapprove of a decision which withholds consensus (thumbs down). A Member may also abstain from voting, which will be interpreted as no opposition to the action. If there are no Members voting thumbs down, the decision is passed by consensus. The decision is then recorded in the meeting notes.

## Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
  - \* Introduction of new Program Assistant
2. Public comment period
3. Planning/implementation MOU Revised Version #1
  - \* DECISION ITEM: Approve Revised Version #1 of Planning/Implementation MOU (attached).
  - \* DECISION ITEM: MOU Revised Version #1 will take effect May 1, 2011. Current MOU signatories may sign the revised MOU any time before June 30 without losing Member status.
4. Round 1 Implementation Project presentations:
  1. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD (2 projects)
  2. Dan Moore, Round Valley Schools
  3. Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
  4. Nate Reade, Inyo-Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office
  - \* **Presentations will be no more than 10 minutes, including questions**
  - \* **Please review application materials for each project on the Inyo-Mono website: <http://www.inyomonowater.org/index.php?page=Documents>**
5. Round 1 Implementation funding working committee update
  - \* Review process and discussions since last RWMG meeting
  - \* DECISION ITEM: Approve document containing goals, methods, and questionnaire for Round 1 Implementation funding allocation (attached).
  - \* For discussion: Implementation grant administration language to be added to funding allocation document.
6. Planning Grant
  - \* Organizational structure
  - \* Update from staff on status of grant award
  - \* DECISION ITEM: Provide Program Office authority to implement the Planning Grant, including establishing contracts for tasks identified and approved by the Group within the Planning Grant application.
7. Updates
  - \* Implementation Grant
  - \* Prop 1E Grants
  - \* DAC funding
  - \* 2013 California Water Plan Update
  - \* IRWM Roundtable of Regions survey
  - \* Feedback to DWR

\* FY 2010-11 Finance Report

8. Announcements

9. Process check

10. Approval of previous RWMG meeting notes

\* February 23, 2011 (attached)

\* March 23, 2011 (attached)

\* Discuss comments, edits, corrections

\* DECISION ITEM: Approve February 23 and March 23, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

11. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

12. Next meeting dates:

\* Wednesday, May 18, 2011

\* Wednesday, June 15, 2011

\* Wednesday, July 27, 2011



## **IRWMP Approach for Allocation of Grant Funds April 2011**

**Goal:** To address as many regional needs as possible while adhering to the ranking outcome for Phase 1 projects, the following will be the guiding principles for the distribution of Round 1 Implementation Funds, while acknowledging that DWR grant directions may affect the specifics of grant distribution.

**Methods:**

**A. Voluntary Reduction of Proponent's Grant Request**

Aided by a questionnaire, all Project Proponents will be asked to review their proposals for potential savings by re-evaluating costs, considering reducing scale or phasing of their project(s) or using non-DWR funding sources. Such savings, if found, will aid the Group to fund a greater number of projects. Any savings will be distributed according to the protocol described in "B" and "C" below.

**B. Highest Ranked Projects on the approved 2010 Rankings List will be awarded full funding up to the amount of the DWR Grant**

Following the voluntary aspects of "A", beginning with the highest ranking project, proponents will be fully funded until the grant request amount for the next project on the List exceeds the amount available to fund it.

**C. Remainder Distribution**

Following "B", any remaining funds will be allocated to the next lower ranked project that can make suitable use of the funds according to DWR requirements.

**Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group  
Draft Questionnaire for Round 1 Implementation  
Funding Project Proponents**

All Project Proponents are asked to review their proposals for potential savings by re-evaluating costs; considering reducing the scale of, or phasing of their project(s); or identifying non-DWR-IRWMP funding sources that will reduce requested Phase I Implementation funding amounts. Such savings, if any are found, will enable the Group to stretch the Department of Water Resources' grant to fund a greater number of projects.

- 1) Can you identify any cost-savings that would reduce your funding request from your original project proposal submitted to the Department of Water Resources during January 2011? If so, what is your reduced grant request?
- 2) Have you applied for and/or received funding for your project from sources other than through the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group (I-M RWMG) that could reduce your grant request? If so, how would your request to the I-M RWMG be changed and what is the schedule for decision on your other funding source?
- 3) Could your project be scaled down or phased so that it could more readily be completed during the first round of the implementation funding? Note that currently, the Phase I Implementation schedules include projects having a duration of 24 months or less.
- 4) If the full amount of grant funding that you requested in your proposal is not available during this round of funding, could you make use of partial funding for your project? If so, describe how the project could be phased and scheduled and what minimal level of funding is necessary to complete each phase.