



January 5, 2018

TO: San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority Water Resources Committee,
San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority Board of Directors, Alternates,
and Interested Parties

FROM: Jason Peltier, Secretary (by Cheri Worthy)

RE: **Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee Meeting and Joint
Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee Meeting - Special
Board Workshop, January 8, 2018, 10:00 a.m.**

Attached for your review, in preparation of the **January 8, 2018 10:00 a.m., Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee (WRC) Meeting and Joint Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee Meeting - Special Board of Directors Workshop**, are the following documents:

- 1) Notice/Agenda
- 2) Draft December 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- 3) Material Related to Strategic Planning Effort
- 4) Material Related to Water Bond Initiative
- 5) Material Related to the Update Reinitiation Consultation
- 6) Material Related to Proposed Activity Budget Cost Allocation Adjustments
- 7) Material Related to Review of Draft FY19 Activity Budget
- 8) Material Related to Water Operations Update

Thank you, and please give us a call if you have any questions or concerns regarding this information.



**Notice of Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee Meeting
and
Joint Adjourned Regular Water Resources Committee Meeting-Special Board
Workshop**

Monday, January 8, 2018 10:00 a.m.

SLDMWA Boardroom
842 6th Street, Los Banos

[telephonic participation locations identified below]

Agenda

NOTE: Any member of the public may address the Water Resource Committee/Board concerning any item on the agenda before or during its consideration of that matter. Public comment is limited to no more than three minutes per person per item. For good cause, the Chair may waive this limitation.

NOTE FURTHER: Because the notice provides for an adjourned regular meeting of the Water Resources Committee and a joint adjourned regular Water Resources Committee/special Board workshop, Board Directors/Alternates may discuss items listed on the agenda; however, only Water Resource Committee Members/Alternates may correct or add to the agenda or vote on action items.

1. Call to Order
2. Water Resources Committee to Consider Corrections or Additions to the Agenda of Items, as authorized by Government Code Section 54950 *et seq.*
3. Opportunity for Public Comment – Any member of the public may address the Water Resource Committee concerning any matter not on the agenda, but within the Committee's jurisdiction. Public comment is limited to no more than three minutes per person. For good cause, the Chair may waive this limitation.

Action Items

4. **Water Resources Committee to Consider Approval of the December 4, 2017, Meeting Minutes**

REPORT ITEMS

5. Update on Strategic Planning Effort, Mizuno/Rubin
6. Update on Water Bond Initiatives, Including the Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018, Rubin
7. Update on California WaterFix Project, Rubin
8. Update on Reinitiation of Consultation on Biological Opinions Issued by National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service for Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, Including National Environmental Policy Act Compliance, Rubin
9. Update on Delta Stewardship Council, Delta Plan Update and Related Activities, Rubin
10. Proposed Activity Budget Cost Allocation Adjustments, Mizuno
11. Review of Draft FY19 Activity Budget, Mizuno

12. Update on Water Operations, Boardman

13. Closed Session

Conference with Legal Counsel -- Anticipated Litigation: Initiation of Litigation Pursuant to paragraph (4) of Subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9 – 4 potential cases

Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation: Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Paragraph (2) or (3) of Subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9 – 10 potential cases

Conference with Legal Counsel: Existing Litigation Pursuant to paragraph (1) of Subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9

- A. Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Salazar et al., U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Cir., Appeal Case No. 09- 17661; Natural Resources Defense Council et al. v Jewell et al., U.S. District Court, E.D. Cal., Case No. 1:05-cv-01207, LJO-BAM (Old FWS – OCAP BO/Contracts)
- B. Central Delta Water Agency v. State Water Resources Control Board et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2010-80000520 (Petition to Prohibit CDO proceedings)
- C. Modesto Irrigation District, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board & Woods Irrigation Company, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2011-80000803 (Complaint for Declaratory Relief re Woods Irrigation Company)
- D. San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2013-800001486 (Dunkel Order)
- E. SWRCB Water Rights Complaints: Modesto Irrigation District, State Water Contractors, San Luis & Delta- Mendota Water Authority, Interested Persons in SWRCB CDO Enforcement Proceedings and/or Petitions for Reconsideration: Woods Irrigation Company; Pak & Young; Mussi et al; George Speckman Testamentary Trust (Water Rights Complaints)
- F. Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Friends of the River, San Francisco Crab Boat Owners Association, Inc., The Institute for Fisheries Resources, and Felix Smith v. Donald R. Glaser and San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority, U.S. District Court, E.D. Cal., Case No. 2:11-CV-02980-KJM-CKD ("PCFFA v Glaser" or "GBP Citizens Suit")
- G. San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority and Westlands Water District v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2013-80001500 (Delta Plan Litigation). Appeals in Delta Plan Litigation:

City of Stockton v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758)(Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082994); State Water Contractors, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082944); California Water Impact Network, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082994); Central Delta Water Agency, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082994); North Coast Rivers Alliance, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No.C082994); San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Agency, et al. v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082994); Save the California Delta Alliance v. Delta Stewardship Council, et al. (Sacramento County Superior Court JCCP No. 4758) (Third District Court of Appeal Case No. C082994)

- H. AquAlliance, et. al., v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, et. al., U.S. District Court, E.D. Cal., Case No. 1:15- CV-00754 LJO BAM (Challenge to Long-Term Transfer EIR/EIS)
- I. California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, et al. vs. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al., Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG15780498 (State WQCP/TUCP)
- J. In re State Water Resources Control Board Petition Requesting Changes in Water Rights of the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for the California Waterfix Project (Waterfix Change Petition)
- K. San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2016-80002075 (TUCP Extension)
- L. Oakdale Groundwater Alliance et al. v. Oakdale Irrigation District et al., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2019380 (OID On Farm Conservation-Transfer)
- M. Yuba County Water Agency v. Cordua Irrigation District, et al., Yuba County Superior Court, Case No. YCSCCVPT 16-0000324 (Cordua Transfer)
- N. Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. McCarthy, et al., U.S. District Court, N.D. Cal., Case No. 16-CV-02184-JST ("USEPA CWA Compliance Suit")
- O. San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority, et al. v. Sally Jewell, et al., U.S. District Court, E.D. Cal., Case No. 1:16-CV-983 ("EIS on OCAP BiOps Suit")
- P. City of Fresno, et al. v. United States, U.S. Court of Federal Claims, Case No. 16-1276L ("Friant Takings Suit")

14. Return to Open Session

15. Report from Closed Session, if any, Required by Government Code Section 54957.1

16. Reports Pursuant to Government Code Sec 54954.2

17. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with a disability may request disability-related modification or accommodation by contacting Cheri Worthy or Felicia Luna at the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority Office, 842 6th Street, P.O. Box 2157, Los Banos, California, telephone: 209/826-9696 at least 3 days before a regular meeting or 1 day before a special meeting/workshop.

Telephonic Participation Location:

San Benito County Water District
30 Mansfield Road
Hollister, CA 95023

Santa Clara Valley Water District
5750 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95118

¹ Attention telephonic participants: This Notice and Agenda must be posted at the telephonic participation location, which must be accessible to the public.

DRAFT

**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY
MINUTES
REGULAR WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
AND
JOINT REGULAR WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING AND
SPECIAL BOARD WORKSHOP
DECEMBER 4, 2017**

The Water Resources Committee and Joint Water Resources Committee Meeting and Special Board Workshop of the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority convened at approximately 10:05 a.m. at 842 6th Street in Los Banos, California with Acting Chair and Ex-Officio Cannon Michael presiding.

Water Resources Committee Members Present

Ex-Officio

Cannon Michael

Division 1

Earl Perez, Member - Anthea Hansen, Alternate

Division 2

Bill Diedrich, Member

Division 3

Chris White, Alternate

Division 4

Jeff Cattaneo, Alternate for Cindy Kao

Division 5

Steve Stadler, Alternate for Tom Birmingham

Board of Directors Present

Division 1

Anthea Hansen, Director - Earl Perez, Alternate

Division 2

Bill Diedrich, Director - Lon Martin, Alternate

Division 3

Chris White, Alternate for Director James O'Banion

Cannon Michael, Director

Mike Gardner, Alternate for Ric Ortega

Division 4

Jeff Cattaneo, Alternate for John Tobias

Sara Singleton, Alternate for Director Joseph Tonascia

Division 5

Steve Stadler, Director

Authority Representatives Present

Jason Peltier, Executive Director

Tom Boardman, Water Resources Engineer

Frances Mizuno, Assistant Executive Director

Jon Rubin, General Counsel

Others Present

Russ Freeman, Westlands Water District

Ben Fenters, San Luis Water District

Dana Jacobson, San Benito County Water District

Ara Azhderian, Panoche Water District

Call to Order

Ex-Officio Cannon Michael called the meeting to order and a roll call was held.

1. **The Water Resources Committee Will Consider Corrections or Additions to the Agenda of Items, as authorized by Government Code Section 54950 et seq.**

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.

2. **Opportunity for Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

3. **Committee to Consider Approval of the September 11, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

The September 11, 2017 meeting minutes of the Water Resources Committee were previously distributed for review. There were suggested corrections to the meeting minutes. Member Earl Perez made a motion to approve the September 11, 2017 meeting minutes with corrections. The motion was seconded by Alternate Stadler and passed unanimously. The Committee action is reported as follows:

AYES: Michael, Perez, Diedrich, White, Cattaneo, Stadler

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

4. **Update on California WaterFix Project**

Executive Director Jason Peltier reported that the Governor may make an announcement by the end of the year about the course of California WaterFix. Peltier reported that there were several meetings at fall

ACWA conference to explore a viable option to allow CVP involvement but no options were identified. Peltier indicated that, as a result, he expected the WaterFix to proceed as a staged approach, with the initial stage begin State-only and a future phase for the benefit of the CVP.

5. Update on State Water Resources Control Board's Effort to Update the Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay-Delta

General Counsel Jon Rubin reported that the State Water Resources Control Board is currently working to complete Phase I within the next month or so and Phase II within the first six months.

6. Update on Reinitiation of Consultation on Biological Opinions Issued by National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service for Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project

Executive Director Jason Peltier reported that the United States Bureau of Reclamation continues to hold meetings focusing on the range of issues of the Reinitiation of Consultation process. Peltier also reported that Reclamation is working on a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement. Peltier indicated that a draft of the notice of intent reflected a desire to use the process to: 1) improve water supplies, 2) address regulatory drivers for ongoing shortages, 3) address other stressors, and 4) increase power production. General Counsel Jon Rubin next provided an overview of Reclamation's pre-NEPA brainstorm process.

7. Update on Delta Stewardship Council, Delta Plan Update and Related Activities

General Counsel Jon Rubin reported that the Delta Stewardship Council is looking at updating the portion of the Delta Plan that deals with conveyance, storage, and operations. Rubin reported that the Authority is working on comments, which are generally consistent with issues raised in the litigation concerning the Delta Plan.

8. Update on Sacramento Valley Fish Food Project

Executive Director Jason Peltier reported that, in the prior water year, the Authority invested in the Sacramento Valley Fish Food Project. Peltier reminded the Committee that the Project involved the flooding of fields in the Sacramento Valley in order to produce fish food. Peltier reported that the Authority has been asked to support this project once again, and that more information will be provided at the upcoming Board of Directors meeting.

9. **Review of Approaches to FY19 Activity Budget Development (including possible items that may be included therein)**

Executive Director Jason Peltier provided an overview of the process being followed for the development of the FY19 Activity Budget. Peltier reported that a budget workshop will be scheduled in January. The Committee members recommended that the workshop be held in December instead with a second workshop in January if necessary to allow sufficient time to work through the budget. Acting Chair and Ex-Officio Cannon Michael emphasized the importance of the strategic planning process previously discussed by the Board of Directors.

10. **Update on Water Operations**

Water Resources Engineer Tom Boardman reported that C.W. “Bill Jones and Harvey O. Banks pumping has been at capacity since late November thanks to increase delta inflow and the fall X2 requirement ending November 30. Pumping is expected to remain at capacity for the near future, but may be reduced if a significant storm causes a spike in delta turbidity levels.

Boardman reviewed two San Luis storage projection charts under 90% and 50% exceedance conditions. The charts showed that CVP San Luis is projected to fill by early 2018, but the SWP share may not fill. If the SWP does not fill, the CVP will have the opportunity to store water in unused SWP storage space.

Boardman concluded his report with a discussion about the 150 TAF rescheduling cap and the tradeoffs between increasing the cap vs bolstering 2018 allocations if the CVP stores water in the SWP share. This issue will be discussed with the Regional Director in the near future.

11. **Closed Session**

Acting Chair and Ex-Officio Cannon Michael adjourned the open session to address the items listed on the Closed Session Agenda at approximately 11:55 a.m. Upon return to open session at approximately 12:15 p.m., General Counsel Jon Rubin reported that there were no reportable actions taken in closed session.

12. **Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2**

No report given.

13. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m.

SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO ASSIST IN PREPARATION OF A STRATEGIC PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (Authority) is seeking proposals from qualified consultants to assist in creating a 10-year strategic plan for the period of 2018 through 2028. The Authority currently envisions a 3-step strategic planning process: 1) assess satisfaction with the Authority's current scope and scale of services to affirm or adjust future Activities¹, 2) assess, and potentially modify, the Authority's capacity to implement the desired scope and scale of services, and 3) identify and select specific actions to implement and achieve the strategic goals and objectives. This Request for Proposals is aimed at Steps 1 and 2. The Authority is interested in receiving proposals that articulate the respondents approach toward developing a custom strategic plan, which may follow or deviated from the envisioned 3 step process described above, as our interest is in selecting the best suited process to develop and implement a relevant, effective long-term plan to guide future Activities.

The Authority is looking for a consultant, consulting team, or consulting firm that can offer the most advantageous balance of quality, performance, and price. The successful candidate will 1) prepare a communication and outreach plan to conduct a survey of the Authority's Board Members (19), select Authority staff (up to 5), and representative Member Agencies (up to 5) to assess satisfaction with the scope and scale of the Authority's Activities services, 2) synthesize the survey results to indicate areas and levels of services satisfaction, 3) analyze Authority staffing and consultant support to assess alignment with services satisfaction, and 4) prepare a services and support assessment report.

ABOUT THE SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY

I. Mission Statement²

"We are committed to providing our employees with a working atmosphere of mutual respect and appreciation. We promote a superior work force, encourage career opportunities and individual professional growth, and are dedicated to providing water in an efficient manner at a reasonable cost, ensure long term reliability of the systems, and to work with other governmental and public agencies to promote the common welfare of the landowners and water users of the Authority."

II. General Description

The Authority is comprised of 28 Member Agencies³. Our Members provide Central Valley Project⁴ water to five of the nation's top ten agricultural producing counties, the largest contiguous wetlands

¹ Generally, the Authority provides 2 types of services. One is operation and maintenance of certain federally owned Central Valley Project water conveyance facilities. The second is representation services, referred to as Activities, that focus on the Authority's Members' common interests as they may be affected in state or federal administrative, judicial, legislative, and/or public forums. It is for this second area the Authority seeks strategic planning advice.

² <http://www.sldmwa.org/learn-more/mission-statement/>

³ <http://www.sldmwa.org/learn-more/member-agencies/>

⁴ <https://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvp/about-cvp.html>

on the Westcoast, and to millions of Californians residing in a range of communities from small, rural, and often disadvantaged to the affluent center of global technological innovation, the “Silicon Valley”. Over the past 25+ years, ever increasing regulation has diminished access to water supply, reduced supply reliability, and increased costs throughout the Authority’s service area. Further, our Members are coping with regulations that impact water quality (source and treatment), groundwater pumping, drainage, recycling, and discharge, water conservation and use efficiency, stormwater and flood management, climate change, endangered species, water rights, planning, finance and ratesetting, infrastructure maintenance and modernization, and public agency administration, generally. A few of our Members are able to engage on these matters directly but for most it is more efficient to have the Authority represent their common interests.

III. Problem Statement

Increased regulation, diminishing water supplies, and other factors are adversely impacting Members’ traditional abilities to provide services. The array of issues affecting, or potentially affecting, Members is generally understood; however, the Authority’s prioritization and level of effort to engage in common interest issues on Members’ behalf is largely assessed on only an annual basis with no formally stated multi-year vision to guide activities toward stated objectives over the long-term. Undefined goals and lack of long-term planning can result in less effective engagement, stranded investments, and inferior outcomes for our Members.

IV. Goals of Strategic Planning Effort

- Improve the value of Members’ investments in Authority Activities;
- Ensure appropriate prioritization and focus of Authority Activities;
- Improve impact of Authority Activities;
- Ensure Authority capacity to meet Members’ stated, common interests;
- Improve consistency of effort over time;
- Ensure Members’ satisfaction with Authority services.

DUTIES, TASKS, MILESTONES, AND DELIVERABLES

The successful candidate will work closely with the Authority to help develop, guide, and evaluate the strategic planning work effort and final services and support assessment report. The successful consultant will perform the following duties and tasks and complete the following milestones and deliverables during the project term:

1. Kick-Off Meeting (Month 1)

The consultant will meet with the Authority to discuss the parties’ roles and responsibilities in the strategic planning effort and the Authority’s envisioned internal process to determine the best means for developing and executing the project deliverables. The Authority will provide the consultant with information about its current program Activities, relevant reports and financial data, etc.

2. Develop and Present an Action Plan (Months 1-2)

In consultation with the Authority, the consultant will develop an action plan with specific measurable benchmarks and tasks to complete the final services and support assessment report on time and budget. The consultant may be asked to prepare and present to a body of the Authority (Los Banos, CA) the draft strategic planning proposal, solicit input, and finalize the action plan.

3. Conduct Interviews (Months 2-3)

The consultant will survey the Authority's Board Members (19), and select Authority staff (up to 5) and Member Agencies (up to 5) to gain knowledge and evaluate satisfaction with the Authority's current scope and scale of services.

4. Synthesize Interview Findings and Prepare Assessment Report (Month 3)

The consultant will synthesize the survey results to indicate areas and levels of services satisfaction and present findings. The synthesis will identify areas of broad strong support, limited strong support, broad weak support, and limited weak support for specific Activities. Consultant will then assess the Authority's staffing and consultant support to gauge alignment with the services satisfaction findings. Consultant will then provide recommendations to address survey findings and inform "next steps" in the strategic planning process. Consultant will meet twice with the Authority during this stage to review and solicit input on initial draft (Month 3) and final reports (Month 4).

5. Status Updates (ongoing)

The consultant will meet with the Authority in Los Banos, CA as necessary and determined by the Authority. The consultant will present written status updates on a monthly basis to the Authority.

6. Draft Report (Month 4)

The consultant will prepare and provide to the Authority a draft report that:

- a) Synthesizes survey results;
- b) Assesses Authority's staffing and consultant support;
- c) Recommends action to address survey findings and inform "next steps".

7. Final Report (Month 5)

The consultant will prepare and provide to the Authority a final report that:

- d) Synthesizes survey results;
- e) Assesses Authority's staffing and consultant support;
- f) Recommends action to address survey findings and inform "next steps".

CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

The successful candidate will have demonstrated experience facilitating meetings, creating and conducting interviews, writing reports and other steps necessary for strategic planning for nonprofit organizations. The candidate should be adept at tailoring interview questions to a variety of audiences,

while simultaneously creating a cohesive plan to ensure that all questions elicit useful information. Knowledge of Authority's functions, structures and activities is not a requirement, but is desirable.

RFP SCHEDULE DATE**EVENT**

January 15, 2018

RFP Issued

February 16, 2018

Deadline for Responses

TBD

Consultant Selected

TBD

Draft Action Plan Complete

TBD

Board Presentation/Discussion of Action Plan

TBD

Review of Initial Survey Findings

TBD

Review/Discuss Draft Survey Report

TBD

Distribute Draft Survey Report

TBD

Board Presentation/Discussion of Draft Survey Report

TBD

Finalize Survey Report

[INCLUDE BOILER PLATE LANGUAGE AND PROPOSAL AND COST ESTIMATE; ETC.]

California Water Bond of 2018

From: <https://waterbond.org/>

This initiative measure will appear on the November 2018 statewide California ballot. It will invest \$8.877 billion dollars in California water infrastructure, benefitting people, the environment and agriculture. It is a balanced measure, resulting in improved water supplies for every part of the state. This measure is sponsored by conservation, agricultural, water and civic organizations.

You can learn about this measure by clicking on the following links:

Text of water bond

Distribution of water bond

SHORT SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROGRAMS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Endorsement List

How the water bond meets the goals of Governor's Water Action Plan

How the bond benefits disadvantaged communities

Chart of funding for disadvantaged communities

Benefits to Rivers, Streams and fisheries

Benefits to Agriculture

Regional Benefits

Specialized Benefits

Benefits to migratory birds and wildlife

Friant Kern Canal Capacity Restoration

SB 5 and the Water Supply and Water Quality Act Initiative

Short Summary of major programs in Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act of 2018

Safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities. \$750 million.

Provides safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities, especially in the Central Valley.

Wastewater recycling. \$400 million.

Recycles wastewater mainly for landscaping and industrial uses

Groundwater desalination. \$400 million.

Converts salty groundwater to usable water supply.

Urban water conservation. \$300 million.

Leak detection, toilet replacement, landscape conversion.

Agricultural water conservation. \$50 million.

Improves inefficient irrigation systems, increasing river flows

Central valley flood management, including flood plain restoration. \$100 million.

Makes farms and communities more flood safe, and makes flood plains for habitat friendly. Additional \$50 million for retrofit of a reservoir (probably Bullard's Bar) for better flood management.

San Francisco Bay Wetlands and flood improvements. \$200 million.

Improves wetlands in San Francisco Bay to provide flood protection and mitigate sea level rise.

Data management. \$60 million.

Better data collection and management: streamflow, etc.

Stormwater management \$600 million for a variety of state agencies.

Capture and treatment of stormwater flows improved river and ocean water quality and increasing water supplies

Watershed Improvement \$2355 million to a wide variety of state agencies.

Pays for better management of watersheds throughout the state to improve water quality and water supply. Includes \$150 million for the Los Angeles River, as well as \$100 million for the Delta Conservancy, which helps fund the governor's Eco-Restore program. Includes \$80 million for the removal of Matilija Dam, a silted-in dam in Ventura County. \$200 million for ecological restoration and dust control at the Salton Sea. Watershed restoration after fires in the Sierra Nevada and elsewhere receives \$100 million. Funds state conservancies and state parks to better manage watersheds.

Land Management for Water Yield. \$100 million.

Removal of invasive weeds which use excessive amounts of surface and groundwater such as tamarisk, yellow starthistle, and Arundo. Estimates of water savings are in excess of one million acre feet per year.

Fisheries restoration. \$400 million.

Restoring fish habitat. Supplements necessary streamflows.

Groundwater. \$675 million.

Implements the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act., stabilizing groundwater levels in overdraft groundwater basins.

Water and specific habitat improvements for fisheries. \$500 million.

Purchase of water for fish and waterfowl.

Completion of fish screens in Central Valley. \$100 million. Will prevent baby fish from being diverted into irrigation systems.

San Joaquin River fisheries Restoration. \$100 million. Restoration of Spring Run Chinook Salmon downstream of Friant dam.

Waterfowl habitat. \$280 million. Helps meet waterfowl obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and other waterfowl habitat improvement programs.

Bay Area Regional Reliability. \$250 million. Improves interconnections between Bay Area water agencies, making it easier to survive droughts.

Improvement to Friant Kern Canal and other Friant water interconnections. \$750 million. Restores lost capacity to Friant Kern Canal, pays for groundwater recharge programs, water conservation and possibly new water conveyance in the Friant area.

Oroville Dam Spillway Repair. \$200 million. Makes Oroville Dam more flood safe.

The initiative also allows state and federal water contractors to recover the funds they pay in climate change charges due to implementation of AB 32, and use those funds in their own systems for water and energy conservation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Questions and Answers about the Water Supply and Water Quality bond act for the November, 2018 ballot.

Updated November 17, 2017

What is the need for more State investment in water resources? What is the role of local water agencies and the federal government in paying for this infrastructure?

The State of California has invested many billions of dollars in water infrastructure. This is because California has three distinct water problems. First, most precipitation falls north of Sacramento, but most water demand for cities and agriculture is south of Sacramento. Second, most precipitation falls in the winter, but most demand is in the summer. Third, most of the population lives near the coast, but most rivers and groundwater are inland.

Although some large cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the East Bay have built large pipelines to move water from east to west, it has taken huge state and federal investments to move store winter and spring runoff, and move water hundreds of miles from north to south and east to west for the benefit of most Californians. The federal government has invested billions of dollars over the past 100 years, but there have not been any major new federal infrastructure investments in California water for nearly 40 years. During this time, the demand for water for vitally important environmental concerns, as well as population growth, have added to the pressures on the existing system.

The state has helped fill the gap by passing a series of water bonds, beginning in 1960, and continuing through 2014. The state has presented the voters with 21 water bonds during that time, and 20 have been approved, totaling many billions of dollars.

Despite this large investment by the state, local water districts have invested even more money in storage, distribution, wastewater recycling, desalting, and many other forms of water management. The state usually acts as a partner to local water agencies, using state bond funds to incentivize local water projects which might have otherwise been built later to be built earlier.

Dozens of publications demonstrate the need for additional investment in water infrastructure. Here are just a few:

Public Policy Institute of California report on water infrastructure funding need:

<http://www.ppic.org/main/pressrelease.asp?i=1464>,

Bay Area Council funding needs study <http://documents.bayareacouncil.org/bacwppfinal.pdf>

Bay Area Council link to video about SF Bay flooding <http://www.bayareacouncil.org>

Governor Brown's list of infrastructure needs, including \$50 billion for flood control:

<https://www.cnn.com/2017/02/24/california-plans-to-bolster-states-flood-control-efforts.html>

Can California afford this bond?

Yes. The state can afford a new water bond. Taking on new debt is always a serious consideration, however the state's bond rating is steadily improving, and the interest rate we pay is equivalent to a bond with an AAA rating. There is a huge demand for California bonds by the bond market.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-08-08/california-once-compared-to-greece-now-trading-better-than-aaa>

As described in the 2016 Voter Handbook published by the Secretary of State and the Treasurer, California devotes less than five percent of its general fund budget to servicing general obligation bonds. This is well within the prudent limit for bond expenditures.

<http://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2016/general/en/pdf/complete-vig.pdf> (see page 114 for an analysis of state debt)

Bonds are almost the only way the state invests in repairing its water infrastructure.

What is the history of water bonds in California?

Since 1972 California voters have approved 20 of 21 general obligation bond measures which provided funding for water development. Those in green passed. The bond in pink failed.

Year	
1960	burns porter act. Bond. Established state water project.
1970	recreation at state water project; fish and wildlife enhancement
	clean water bond act
1974	clean water bond act
1976	safe drinking water bond act
	clean water and water conservation
1978	bond
1980	amend safe drinking water bond act of 1976
1984	safe drinking water bond act
	clean water bond act
1986	water conservation and water quality bond
	safe drinking water bond act
1988	water conservation bond act
	clean water and water reclamation bond act
	safe drinking water bond act

1990	water resources bond act
1996	safe reliable water supply bond act
2000	parks, water, air coast bond act
	water bond act
2002	parks, water, air, coast bond act
	water quality supply safe drinking water initiative
2006	water bond act initiative
	Disaster preparedness and flood prevention
2014	water Quality, Supply, Treatment, Storage

Does this measure meet the needs outlined in the Governor's water action plan?

Yes. Governor Brown adopted a water action plan in 2013. It is comprehensive, including all elements of water management, including water for people, agriculture and the environment. This measure funds all elements of the water action plan. An analysis of how this measure conforms to the Water Action Plan is on this website. See the Water Action Plan at

http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf

Are all parts of the state included fairly?

Every part of the state will benefit from implementation of this measure. No area is excluded.

How are the water bond funds allocated?

Proceeds from the bonds will be applied to the places of highest need. A table of all the funding categories is found on this website.

What are the principal purposes of the water bond?

The water bond initiative invests in these important programs:

- **Safe Drinking Water and safe disposal of wastewater for disadvantaged and other poor communities.** Many of these communities have no drinking water at all, or unsafe water supplies. This is unacceptable in an advanced 21st Century society like California. Funds for this purpose from previous bond acts will be exhausted by 2018.
- **Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.** The Legislature passed this landmark act several years ago. This bond act will provide funds to help bring California's groundwater

basins into balance. Water from the ground provides nearly 40% of California's water supply, and has been subject to severe overdraft in some regions. This must be corrected.

- **Restoration of the delivery capacity of the Friant-Kern Canal.** This canal, which stretches from Fresno to Bakersfield delivers water to 15,000 farms, and has lost much of its capacity due to subsidence caused by groundwater overdraft. The canal water irrigates more than one million acres of California's most productive farmland, annually producing more than \$4 billion in gross agricultural production. Much of our long term food supply will be at risk if this problem is not corrected.

- **Wastewater recycling, groundwater desalting, and water conservation.** These proven techniques to increase and extend water supplies are ecologically sound methods of meeting California's water needs.

- **Stormwater management.** Stormwater can pollute rivers and the ocean, by carrying waste into these water bodies. By capturing and treating stormwater in urban areas, water supplies can be increased and pollution reduced.

- **Increased water supplies and improved habitat for fish, waterfowl and wildlife.** By providing more water and improving habitat conditions, these native California species will thrive, and endangered species will recover.

- **Watershed improvement and fire recovery.** Most of our water comes from the watersheds that supply our rivers, streams and groundwater. Better watershed management can improve the quality and quantity of these water supplies, and restore watersheds damaged by fire, improving public safety.

- **Flood management.** By broadening flood plains, flood damage to farms and cities can be reduced. Modifying existing inadequate flood control facilities will also reduce flood risk.

- **Salton Sea.** Without state investment, California's largest lake will dry up, causing huge air quality problems in Southern California due to blowing dust. The Sea's diverse wildlife also needs protection.

- **River parkways and urban streams.** Many cities and towns in California are located on or near rivers and streams. Enhancing these important recreational and habitat features will improve the quality of life in these cities, as well as water quality.

- **Bay Area Regional Reliability program.** This important program will integrate the water supplies of various water agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.

- **Oroville Dam Repair.** State and federal general funds were used to pay for the flood control and recreational features of Oroville Dam. Restoring the flood control features of the dam is a reasonable purpose of this bond act.

How much water will this bond produce for people?

A great deal. A reasonable estimate of new water supplies provided by this measure is more than 1.5 million acre feet. This is enough water to supply water for three million families. A full analysis of these new water supplies is found on this website. (This link will be active shortly.) Most of this new water will be available in critical drought years, greatly increasing its value.

How are the needs of fish and wildlife met?

The bond will focus urgently needed resources to the environment. Fish and wildlife need two things to thrive: a good water supply, and protected habitat. The water bond includes funding for a wide variety of projects which provide for both these needs. Funding is provided to acquire water for fish and wildlife, and also to protect and expand wetlands and other water related habitat. A full analysis of the benefits of the bond for fish and wildlife is found on this website.

How does the bond help with flood control and management?

Although much of California is arid, floods are a constant problem throughout the state. There are two responses to this problem. The first is to keep development out of flood plains, to allow floods to pass by developed areas safely. The second is to use levees to channel floodwaters, and to detain flood flows in reservoirs, and then meter them out slowly to provide a water supply benefits.

This measure uses both these methods to avoid and reduce flood damage. It includes repairs to existing flood control reservoirs including Oroville and those in Southern California. It also provides funds to improve and set back levees, so that the floodwater carrying capacity of flood plains is increased.

Are there still funds left over from the 2014 water bond?

For water storage projects, but not for the kinds of infrastructure needs this bond will address. The 2014 water bond included two major categories of funding. The first was water storage projects. Due to provisions in the bond, these funds could not be expended until at least 2018. The California Water Commission is charged with expending these funds. The Commission has received 12 proposals for these funds, but will not award grants until at least 2018. Since these funds are still unexpended, and to avoid interfering with the Water Commission process, this measure does not have an expenditure category for new water storage.

The remainder of the 2014 water bond went to a wide variety of categories of expenditure. The various state agencies charged with awarding these funds have followed the mandate of the voters to award these funds as quickly as possible. The California Natural Resources Agency keeps track of these expenditures, and states that more than 75% of the funds have been obligated, spent or encumbered. Most of the remainder will be spent by the time this measure goes into effect. You can examine the expenditures of the 2014 water bond at:

<http://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/PDF/Prop1/P1AllocBalRpt.pdf?v=1>

Why didn't this go through the legislature?

Proponents of the water bond asked the Legislature to include at least \$3 billion of items in this measure in Senate Bill 5 (DeLeon), the legislative water and park bond. But the legislature decided not to accept this increase in the bond package. For this reason, the supporters of this measure decided to proceed with the initiative.

Senate Bill 5 will appear on the June, 2018 ballot. Although it includes some water elements, it is not a comprehensive water bond. The water bond initiative includes a wide variety of programs which are

not covered by Senate Bill 5. There is little overlap between the two measures. The water bond initiative will appear on the November, 2018 ballot.

Who supports the water bond?

The bond will be endorsed by a wide variety of conservation, agricultural, water, environmental justice and civic organizations.

Why should so much money be devoted to meeting the water needs of the Central Valley watershed?

Most of the water California uses originates in the mountain watersheds surrounding the Central Valley, and in the aquifers underneath the valley. While the bond act responds to the flood control, water supply and environmental needs of the coastal and other inland regions of California, it is impossible to deal with the major water problems of California without concentrating on water supply issues in the Central Valley.

Why is money for Oroville Dam repair included? When Oroville Dam was built, the federal government paid for the flood control aspects of the dam. Since the public agencies that receive water from the dam do not receive any flood control benefits, they were not required to pay for the flood control purposes of the dam. Indeed, by dedicating a large amount of space in the dam to flood control, the water, recreation and power supply purposes of the dam were diminished. The federal government is providing some funds to repair the damage to the dam caused by the 2017 storms, but will not provide enough money to repair the flood control aspects of the dam. It is reasonable for the state to pay for at least part of the flood control repairs.

This is not the only case where general fund money has been used to pay for aspects of the State Water Project that are not the responsibility of the State Water Project contractors. The Davis-Dolwig Act provides state general funds for recreation facilities at the State Water Project. Proposition 84 provided \$54 million for this purpose in 2006.

Does this measure fund the Delta tunnels (California Water Fix)? No. The water bond contains language which prohibits any of the bond funds from being used to pay for the tunnels, and requires that the tunnels be paid for by the water users.

Does this measure benefit Disadvantaged Communities and Economically Distressed areas?

Yes. Nearly half of the funds are either entirely dedicated to these communities, or include provisions which waive matching fund requirements for disadvantaged communities, or grant them high priority in funding. An analysis of the bond act from the perspective of these communities and a table of benefits to disadvantaged communities are both found on this website.

Does the bond act provide seismic safety benefits so that an earthquake will not disrupt water supplies? Yes. The \$200,000,000 provided to upgrade flood control facilities at Oroville Dam will also improve the seismic resistance qualities of the dam. An additional \$100,000,000 is provided to improve flood control reservoirs, mainly in Southern California, to make them more earthquake safe.

Why is so much money provided to the Friant Water Authority? Shouldn't local farmers and irrigators take care of these needs? What about the federal government fixing this federal facility? During the drought, overpumping of groundwater along the Friant-Kern Canal caused the canal to subside, reducing water supplies to up to 15,000 farms covering more than one million acres of some of the most productive farmland in the world. Almost all of these farms are family farms of 1,000 acres or less. . Some of the overpumping was done by farmers who are not supplied by the Friant-Kern Canal. Capacity in the Madera Canal has also been reduced. Many of the communities along the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals are disadvantaged (see this [map](#) of disadvantaged communities: look at the area between Madera and Bakersfield). Many farmworker would be unemployed if water deliveries from the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals were permanently curtailed. Much of California's fresh fruit, vegetables and milk are grown with water from the Friant Kern Canal.

Given the huge demands on the federal government for recovery from Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, plus the Trump Administration's budget cuts for the Department of Interior, it is very unlikely that they would provide the funds to repair the Friant-Kern Canal.

Any funds that remain from the Friant allocation could go to water conservation and groundwater management in the Friant-Kern service area, to help prevent the subsidence problem from recurring, and to improve the ability to move water within and to the canals.

For decades California has invested in urban water supply improvement projects such as wastewater recycling, flood control, water conservation and desalting. Given our dependence on California agriculture for our food supply, it is reasonable to make investments in our agricultural water supply as well.

What is the impact on other sources of funds for water development?

Funds from other sources such as Proposition 1 (2014 water bond) are diminishing, and the federal government is investing less in water purposes. Providing the funds from this bond act, will reduce pressure on these other sources.

Do bonds create incentives for good behavior by grantees?

Yes. By providing matching funds for such projects as wastewater recycling, water conservation, and groundwater and other types of inland desalination, the bond act will steer local agencies in the direction of investment of these types of projects. The bond will make these projects more affordable for local agencies.

Official Endorsement List for the Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018

Conservation Groups

- ∞ American Woodland Conservancy
- ∞ Anza-Borrego Desert Natural History Association
- ∞ Bear-Yuba Land Trust
- ∞ California Native Plant Society
- ∞ California Urban Streams Partnership
- ∞ California Waterfowl Association
- ∞ California Watershed Network
- ∞ California Wildlife Foundation/California Oaks Fund
- ∞ Carrizo Plain Conservancy
- ∞ Delta Waterfowl
- ∞ Dry Creek Conservancy
- ∞ Ducks Unlimited
- ∞ Foothill Watershed Collaborative
- ∞ Friends of Corte Madera Creek
- ∞ Friends of Orinda Creeks
- ∞ Friends of San Leandro Creek
- ∞ Friends of the Napa River
- ∞ Friends of Wild Cherry Canyon
- ∞ Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee
- ∞ Mattole Salmon Group
- ∞ National Wild Turkey Foundation
- ∞ Natural Heritage Institute
- ∞ Nor-Cal Guides & Sportsmens Association
- ∞ Noyo Headlands Urban Design Group, Fort Bragg
- ∞ Pheasants Forever
- ∞ Placer Land Trust
- ∞ Putah Creek Council
- ∞ Quail Forever
- ∞ Sacramento River Watershed Program
- ∞ Sacramento Urban Creeks Council
- ∞ Salmonid Restoration Foundation
- ∞ Santa Barbara Urban Creeks Council
- ∞ Sierra Nevada Alliance

- ∞ Sonoma Ecology Center
- ∞ Truckee Donner Land Trust
- ∞ Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy
- ∞ Wildcat San Pablo Creeks Watershed Council
- ∞ Worth a Dam

Agricultural organizations

- ∞ California Dairies
- ∞ California Fresh Fruit
- ∞ American Pistachio Growers
- ∞ California Rice Commission
- ∞ California Rice Industry Association

Environmental Justice Organizations

- ∞ Community Water Center
- ∞ Grassroots Ecology
- ∞ The Watershed Project
- ∞ Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods

Water agencies

- ∞ Arvin Edison Water Storage District
- ∞ Association of California Water Agencies
- ∞ Bear Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency
- ∞ Big Bear Municipal Water District
- ∞ Borrego Water District
- ∞ City of Big Bear Lake, Department of Power and Water
- ∞ Friant Water Authority
- ∞ Kern-Tulare Water District
- ∞ Lindmore Irrigation District
- ∞ Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District
- ∞ Madera Irrigation District
- ∞ Northern California Water Association
- ∞ Porterville Irrigation District

- ∞ Saucelito Irrigation District
- ∞ Solano County Water Agency
- ∞ Tulare Irrigation District

Individuals

- ∞ Brigadier General Gerald Galloway, United States Army (Retired)
- ∞ Ron Gastelum, Former CEO and GM of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- ∞ Brian Jordan, Vice President, Tetra Tech
- ∞ Peter B Moyle, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, University of California, Davis
- ∞ Ann L. Riley, Ph.D.

Business

- ∞ California Building Industry Association
- ∞ Sierra Business Council
- ∞ Northern California Water Association Water Bond Support (November 2017), and members:
 - Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District
 - B&B Ranch
 - Brophy Water District
 - Browns Valley Irrigation District
 - City of Colusa
 - City of Redding
 - Crain Orchards, Inc.
 - Danna & Danna Inc.
 - Edwards Ranch
 - Feather Water District
 - Fedora Farms
 - G&K Farms, LLC.
 - Garden Highway Mutual Water Co.
 - Garner, Garner & Stoy
 - Glenn Colusa Irrigation District
 - Hallwood Irrigation District

Henle Family Limited Partnership
Hershey Land Row Crop, LLC.
J.A. Driver
Joint Water Districts Board
 Biggs-West Gridley Water District
 Butte Water District
 Richvale Irrigation District
 Sutter Extension Water District
Knaggs Ranch
Larry Pires Farms
Lindauer River Ranch, Inc.
Llano Seco Rancho
M&T Ranch
Maxwell Irrigation District
Meridian Farms Water Co.
Natomas Mutual Water Co.
North Yuba County Water District
Oji Brothers Farms, Inc.
Pacific Farms & Orchards
Pacific Gold Agriculture
Paul Bertagna
Pelger Mutual Water Company
Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual Water Co.
Plumas Mutual Water Co.
Princeton-Codora-Glenn Irrigation Dist.
Provident Irrigation District
R. Gorrill Ranch Enterprises
Ramirez Water District
Reclamation District 1004
Reclamation District 108
Reclamation District 2035
Richter Brothers, Inc.
Rising Eagle Ranch
River Garden Farms
Riverview Land & Equipment, Inc.
South Sutter Water District
South Yuba Water District
Sutter Bypass-Butte Slough WUA

Sutter Mutual Water Company
Sycamore Trust
Taylor Brothers Farms
Tehama Angus Ranch, Inc.
Thermalito Irrigation District
Tudor Mutual Water Co.
Tuttle Ranches
Western Canal Water District
William P. Locket
Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Yuba County Water Agency

Cunningham Wash to the Graham Well, intersecting Butler Valley Road, then north and west on the county-maintained road to the "Bouse Y" intersection, 2 miles north of Bouse, Arizona. The course proceeds north, paralleling the Bouse-Swansea Road to the Midway (Pit) intersection, then west along the North Boundary (power line) Road of the East Cactus Plain Wilderness Area to Parker-Swansea Road. The course turns west into Osborne Wash crossing the CAP Canal, along the north boundary of the Cactus Plain Wilderness Study Area; it continues west staying in Osborne Wash and crossing Shea Road along the southern boundary of Gibraltar Wilderness, rejoining Osborne Wash at the CRIT Reservation boundary.

Closure Restrictions: The following acts are prohibited during the temporary land closures in order to provide for public and race participant safety:

1. Being present on or driving on the designated race course or the adjacent lands described above. All spectators must stay within the designated spectator areas. The spectator areas have protective fencing and barriers. This does not apply to race participants, race officials, or emergency vehicles authorized or operated by local, State, or Federal government agencies. Emergency medical response shall only be conducted by personnel and vehicles operating under the guidance of the La Paz County Emergency Medical Services and Fire, the Arizona Department of Public Safety, or the BLM.
2. Vehicle parking or stopping in areas affected by the closures, except where such is specifically allowed (designated spectator areas).
3. Camping in the closed area described above, except in the designated spectator areas.
4. Discharge of firearms.
5. Possession or use of any fireworks.
6. Cutting or collecting firewood of any kind, including dead and down wood or other vegetative material.
7. Operating any off-road vehicle (as defined by 43 CFR 8340.0-7(a)).
8. Operating any vehicle in the area of the temporary closure or on roads within the event area at a speed of more than 35 miles per hour. This does not apply to registered race vehicles during the race, while on the designated race course.
9. Failing to obey any official sign posted by the BLM, La Paz County, or the race promoter.
10. Parking any vehicle in violation of posted restrictions, or in such a manner as to obstruct or impede normal or emergency traffic movement or the parking of other vehicles, create a safety

hazard, or endanger any person, property, or feature. Vehicles parked in violation are subject to citation, removal, and/or impoundment at the owner's expense.

11. Failing to obey any person authorized to direct traffic or control access to event area including law enforcement officers, BLM officials, and designated race officials.

12. Failing to observe spectator area quiet hours of 10 p.m. to 6 a.m.

13. Failing to keep campsite or race viewing site free of trash and litter.

14. Allowing any pet or other animal to be unrestrained. All pets must be restrained by a leash of not more than 6 feet in length.

15. Reserving sites within the spectator area. Spectators are prohibited from denying other visitors or parties the use of unoccupied portions of the spectator area.

Exceptions to Closure: The restrictions do not apply to emergency or law enforcement vehicles owned by the United States, the State of Arizona, or La Paz County, and designated race officials, participants, pit crews, or persons operating on their behalf. All BITD registered media personnel are permitted access to existing routes 50 feet from the race course per BITD standards. Outside of the race corridor, other lands in the Field Office will remain open and available for off-highway vehicle access and all other recreation activities.

Penalties: Any person who violates these temporary closures may be tried before a United States Magistrate and fined in accordance with 18 U.S.C. 3571, imprisoned no more than 12 months under 43 U.S.C. 1733(a) and 43 CFR 8360.0-7, or both. In accordance with 43 CFR 8365.1-7, State or local officials may also impose penalties for violations of Arizona law.

Effect of Closure: The entire area encompassed by the designated course and all areas outside the course as described above and in the time period as described above are closed to all vehicles. The authorized applicant or their representatives are required to post warning signs, control access to, and clearly mark the event route and areas, common access roads, and road crossings during the closure period. Support vehicles under permit for operation by event participants must follow the race permit stipulations.

Authority: 43 CFR 8364.1.

Jason West,
Field Manager.

[FR Doc. 2017-28217 Filed 12-28-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[RR02800000, 18XR0680A1,
RX.17868949.0000000]

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Revisions to the Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, and Related Facilities

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) intends to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS) for analyzing potential modifications to the continued long-term operation of the federal Central Valley Project (CVP), for its authorized purposes, in a coordinated manner with the State Water Project (SWP), for its authorized purposes. Reclamation proposes to evaluate alternatives that maximize water deliveries and optimize marketable power generation consistent with applicable laws, contractual obligations, and agreements; and to augment operational flexibility by addressing the status of listed species. Reclamation is seeking suggestions and information on the alternatives and topics to be addressed and any other important issues related to the proposed action.

DATES: Submit written comments on the scope of the EIS by February 1, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Katrina Harrison, Project Manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Bay-Delta Office, 801 I Street, Suite 140, Sacramento, CA 95814-2536; fax to (916) 414-2425; or email at kharrison@usbr.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katrina Harrison at (916) 414-2425; or email at kharrison@usbr.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Agencies Involved

Reclamation will request the following agencies participate as cooperating agencies for preparation of the EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Western Area Power Administration, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Reclamation has also identified Indian tribes and other Federal, State,

and local agencies (*e.g.*, public water agencies, power marketing agencies, power customers, etc.) as potential cooperating agencies, and Reclamation will invite them to participate as cooperating agencies.

II. Why We Are Taking This Action

The CVP is a major water source for agricultural, municipal and industrial (M&I), and fish and wildlife demands in California. State and Federal regulatory actions, federal trust responsibilities, and other agreements, have significantly reduced the water available for delivery south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, in order, among other things, to protect water quality within the delta and prevent jeopardy and adverse modification of critical habitat of threatened and endangered species. This project will evaluate alternatives to restore, at least in part, water supply, in consideration of all of the authorized purposes of the CVP.

In this programmatic EIS, Reclamation will analyze potential modifications to the continued long-term operation of the CVP (proposed action), in a coordinated manner with the SWP, to achieve the following:

- Maximize water supply delivery, consistent with applicable law, contracts and agreements, considering new and/or modified storage and export facilities.
- Review and consider modifications to regulatory requirements, including existing Reasonable and Prudent Alternative actions identified in the Biological Opinions issued by the USFWS and NMFS in 2008 and 2009, respectively.
- Evaluate stressors on fish other than CVP and SWP operations, beneficial non-flow measures to decrease stressors, and habitat restoration and other beneficial measures for improving targeted fish populations.
- Evaluate potential changes in laws, regulations and infrastructure that may benefit power marketability.

Reclamation has decided to prepare an EIS. As an example for why NEPA is required related to CVP operation, in 2014, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals determined that the current, coordinated operation of the CVP and SWP under biological opinions issued by the USFWS and NMFS in 2008 and 2009, respectively, was a major Federal action that affected the quality of the human environment that required the preparation of an EIS. *San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 581 (9th Cir. 2014); *SLDMWA v. Locke*, 776 F.3d 971 (9th Cir. 2014). This EIS is expected to be primarily programmatic in nature. It is

anticipated that this current programmatic effort will be followed by tiered project-level NEPA analyses to implement various site specific projects or detailed programs that were generally described in the programmatic EIS.

III. Purpose and Need for Action

The need for the action is to increase operational flexibility, as further described in Section II above. The purpose of the action considered in this EIS is to continue the operation of the CVP in a coordinated manner with the SWP, for its authorized purposes, in a manner that enables Reclamation and California Department of Water Resources to maximize water deliveries and optimize marketable power generation consistent with applicable laws, contractual obligations, and agreements; and to augment operational flexibility by addressing the status of listed species.

IV. Project Area (Area of Analysis)

The project area includes the existing CVP and SWP Service Areas, proposed CVP Service Areas, and storage and export facilities (including potential modifications), within the Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds (including external watersheds connected through facilities). The project area also includes potential improvements and developments of other water supply or power generation programs.

The CVP is Reclamation's largest federal reclamation project. Reclamation operates the CVP in coordination with the SWP, under the Coordinated Operation Agreement between the federal government and the State of California (authorized by Pub. L. 99–546). The CVP and SWP operate pursuant to water rights permits and licenses issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. The CVP and SWP water rights allow appropriation of water by directly using and/or diverting water to storage for later withdrawal and use, or use and re-diversion to storage further downstream for later consumptive use. Among the conditions of their water rights, are requirements of the projects to either bypass or withdraw water from storage and to help satisfy specific water quality, quantity and operations criteria in source rivers and within the Delta. The CVP and SWP are currently operated in accordance with the 2008 USFWS Biological Opinion and the 2009 NMFS Biological Opinion, both of which concluded that the coordinated long-term operation of the CVP and SWP, as proposed in Reclamation's 2008 Biological Assessment, was likely to jeopardize the continued existence of

listed species and destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. Both Biological Opinions included Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives designed to allow the CVP and SWP to continue operating without causing jeopardy to listed species or destruction or adverse modification to designated critical habitat. Reclamation accepted and then began Project operations consistent with the USFWS and NMFS Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives.

V. Alternatives To Be Considered

As required by NEPA, the EIS will include and consider a proposed action and a reasonable range of alternatives, including a No Action Alternative. Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action may include a combination of:

- Operations in coordination with new or proposed facilities to increase water supply deliveries and marketable power generation:
 - Actions that increase storage capacity upstream of the Delta for the CVP
 - Actions that increase storage capacity south of the Delta
 - Actions that increase export capabilities through the Delta
 - Actions to generate additional water or that improve and optimize the utilization of water such as desalinization, water conservation, or water reuse
- Modified operations of the CVP and SWP with and without new or proposed facilities including possible requests to modify environmental and regulatory requirements, and sharing of water and responsibilities in the Delta
- Habitat restoration and ecosystem improvement projects intended to increase fish populations which would be factored into the regulatory process
- Modification to existing state and federal facilities to reduce impacts to listed species

The Final EIS will identify an agency-preferred alternative.

Alternatives could affect all or various facilities and/or operations of the CVP, and may also include actions that affect SWP and local project operations. Reclamation will engage with California Department of Water Resources and local stakeholders in developing the proposed action and reasonable alternatives. Reclamation will also consider reasonable alternatives identified through the scoping process.

The proposed EIS will address operations of the CVP and SWP, operations in coordination with new or proposed projects, and habitat restoration in the Project area, designed to increase operational flexibility, increase water supply for CVP

authorized purposes, and/or increase power marketability.

VI. Indian Trust Assets and Environmental Justice

There are Indian Trust Asset issues and there may be environmental justice issues related to the Trinity River, as well as potential impacts within other areas.

VII. Statutory Authority

NEPA [42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*] requires that Federal agencies conduct an environmental analysis of their proposed actions to determine if the actions may significantly affect the human environment. As required by NEPA, Reclamation will develop an EIS which will analyze the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects that may result from the implementation of the proposed action and alternatives.

The Rivers and Harbors Act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 844, as amended and supplemented) provides for operation of the CVP.

VIII. Request for Comments

The purposes of this notice are:

- To advise other agencies, CVP and SWP water users and power customers, affected tribes, and the public of our intention to gather information to support the preparation of an EIS;
- To obtain suggestions and information from other agencies, interested parties, and the public on the scope of alternatives and issues to be addressed in the EIS; and
- To identify important issues raised by the public related to the development and implementation of the proposed action.

Reclamation invites written comments from interested parties to ensure that the full range of alternatives and issues related to the development of the proposed action are identified. Comments during this stage of the scoping process will only be accepted in written form. Written comments may be submitted by mail, electronic mail, facsimile transmission or in person to the contact listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice. Comments and participation in the scoping process are encouraged.

IX. Public Disclosure

Before including your address, phone number, email address or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment

to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

X. How To Request Reasonable Accommodation

If special assistance is required, please contact Katrina Harrison at the address provided above or TDD 916–978–5608. Information regarding this proposed action is available in alternative formats upon request.

Dated: December 20, 2017.

David Murillo,

Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 2017–28215 Filed 12–28–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4332–90–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Certain Subsea Telecommunications Systems and Components Thereof, DN 3283*; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>, and will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised

that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to § 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Neptune Subsea LP Ltd.; Neptune Subsea Acquisitions Ltd.; and Xtera, Inc. on December 22, 2017. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain subsea telecommunications systems and components thereof. The complaint names as respondents Nokia Corporation, Finland; Nokia Solutions and Networks B.V., the Netherlands; Nokia Solutions and Networks Oy, Finland; Alcatel-Lucent Submarine Networks SAS, France; Nokia Solutions and Networks US LLC, Phoenix, AZ; NEC Corporation, Japan; NEC Networks & System Integration Corporation, Japan; and NEC Corporation of America, Irving, TX. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order, cease and desist orders, and impose a bond upon respondents' alleged infringing articles during the 60-day Presidential review period pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(j).

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or § 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

- (i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;
- (ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;
- (iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the

Non Activity Agreement Fund Cost Reallocation Analysis (FY18 Budget)
Consolidate Leg Ops 1, Leg Ops 2 and DIPS

5-Jan-18

	B	C	D	E	F B+C+D+E	G	H	I	J	G-F	H-F	I-F	J-f
	Leg Ops 1	Leg Ops 2	DIPS	General Membership	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference
						Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Consolidate Leg Ops 1, Leg Ops 2, DIPS and Gen Membership	Revised Leg 1 (75%) and General Membership	Revised Leg 1 (50%) and General Membership	Revised Leg 1 (41.5%) and General Membership *	Revised Leg 1 and General Membership and current	Revised Leg 1 (75%) and General Membership and current	Revised Leg 1 (50%) and General Membership and current	Revised Leg 1 (41.5%) and General Membership and current
Division 3 (EC etal)	\$ 449,439	\$ -	\$ 67,127	\$ 98,967	\$ 615,533	\$ 1,121,116	\$ 930,020	\$ 703,609	\$ 616,807	\$ 505,583	\$ 314,487	\$ 88,076	\$ 1,274
WWD	\$ 587,594	\$ 712,718	\$ 351,103	\$ 129,389	\$ 1,780,804	\$ 1,465,740	\$ 1,577,955	\$ 1,710,633	\$ 1,761,460	\$ (315,064)	\$ (202,849)	\$ (70,171)	\$ (19,344)
SCVWD	\$ 77,495	\$ 93,933	\$ 46,300	\$ 17,064	\$ 234,792	\$ 193,308	\$ 208,160	\$ 225,652	\$ 232,253	\$ (41,484)	\$ (26,632)	\$ (9,140)	\$ (2,539)
DPWD	\$ 70,529	\$ 85,469	\$ 42,133	\$ 15,530	\$ 213,661	\$ 175,932	\$ 189,464	\$ 205,306	\$ 211,577	\$ (37,729)	\$ (24,197)	\$ (8,355)	\$ (2,084)
All Others	\$ 266,151	\$ 299,918	\$ 150,538	\$ 59,608	\$ 776,215	\$ 664,909	\$ 715,406	\$ 775,805	\$ 798,908				
Total All Assessment	\$ 1,451,208	\$ 1,192,038	\$ 657,201	\$ 320,558	\$ 3,621,005	\$ 3,621,005	\$ 3,621,005	\$ 3,621,005	\$ 3,621,005				
Allocation Methodology	All Members Based on 100 % contract supply	Contract Supply- Ag and M&I only	All Members based on Contract Supply- Ag and M&I- 100%, EC and GWD- 25%	All Members- Contract Supply		All Members Based on 100% contract supply	Ag and M&I based on 100% Contract Supply, EC and Refuge at 75%	Ag and M&I based on 100% Contract Supply, EC and Refuge at 50%	Ag and M&I based on 100% Contract Supply, EC and Refuge at 41.5%				

* 41.5 % maintains the EC and Refuge Assessment at approximately the same current level based on FY18 budget

Staff Recommendation: For FY19 Budget: 1. prepare budget and allocate cost using Leg Ops 1, Leg Ops2 and DIPS to determine assessment for the EC and Refuges.
2. Consolidate Legs Ops 1, Leg Ops 2 and DIPS, calculate the percentage of EC/Refuge assessment to total consolidated assessment that provides for an equivalent assessment based current allocation methodology. 3. Establish that percentage for the EC/Refuge allocation beginning FY19. 4. Re-evaluate that percentage every 5 years.

SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY
March 1, 2018 - February 28, 2019
DRAFT BUDGET EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

Direct Expenses	Total 1/8/18	Allocation
Legal:		
1 Linneman et al	\$ 24,000	50% DMC O&M; 12.5% Leg Ops 1; 12.5% DIPS; 25% Leg Ops 2
2 Kronick Moskovits et al	\$ 877,625	
3 Kronick Moskovits et al (Annual Costs)	\$ 10,000	
4 General Counsel	\$ -	
5 Pioneer Law Group	\$ 24,000	25% Leg Ops 1; 75% Leg Ops 2
6 Pioneer Law Group (Annual Costs)	\$ 2,000	
7 Technical Support	\$ 279,000	See Separate Sheet
8 Legal Contingency	\$ 300,000	
Sub Total	\$ 1,516,625	
Technical:		
1 Direct Funding Projects	\$ 550,000	See Separate Sheet
2 Coordinated Science/Project Efforts with SWC	\$ 500,000	
3 Collaborateive Adaptive Management Team (CAMT)	\$ 105,000	
Sub Total	\$ 1,155,000	
Legislative Advocacy/Public Information Representation:		
1 Federal Representation	\$ 255,000	15.83% Leg Ops #1; 31.67% Leg Ops #2; 47.5% DIPS; 2.5% GBD; 2.5% SJVDA
2 State Representation	\$ -	
3 Contingency	\$ -	
4 Calif. Farm Wtr Coalition Information/Outreach	\$ 210,000	16.67% Leg Ops #1; 16.66% Leg Ops #2; 16.67% DIPS; 50% General Membership (Fund #3)
5 Family Farm Alliance	\$ 25,000	
Sub Total	\$ 490,000	100% Leg Ops #1
Other Professional Services:		
Sub Total	\$ -	
Westside Water Resource Plan:		
1 Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Grant	\$ 50,000	100% Leg Ops #1
2 Westside Integrated Water Resources Plan	\$ 150,000	100% Leg Ops #1
3 Consultant SB104 Drought Grant	\$ -	
Sub Total	\$ 200,000	
OTHER:		
1 SFCWA Assessment	\$ -	
2 Strategic Planning	\$ 65,000	
3 SLDMWA Accounting (Direct Expenditure)	\$ -	
4 Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 56,052	
5 General Counsel	\$ 320,000	40% O&M; 5% General Fund; 25% Leg Ops 1; 5% DIPS; 15% Legl Ops 2; 10% AA
6 Deputy General Counsel	\$ 202,064	
7 Water Policy Administator	\$ 121,500	20% General Fund; 50% Leg Ops 1; 15% DIPS; 15% Leg Ops 2
8 Science Manager	\$ 243,000	50% Leg Ops 1; 25% DIPS; 25% Leg Ops 2
9 Science Intern	\$ 23,396	50% Leg Ops 1; 25% DIPS; 25% Leg Ops 2
10 Other Services & Expenses	\$ 15,000	
11 License & Continuing Education	\$ 6,000	
12 Organizational Membership	\$ 7,500	
13 Conferences & Training	\$ 15,000	
14 Travel/Mileage	\$ 30,000	
15 Group Meetings	\$ 8,465	
16 Telephone	\$ 5,000	
DMC/EO&M	\$ -	
Sub Total	\$ 1,122,977	
Total	\$ 4,484,602	

SLDMWA Technical Support
FISCAL YEAR MARCH 1, 2018 - FEBRUARY 28, 2019
DRAFT

Category	Effort	Consultant	Budget	Cost Allocation
Direct Funding Project				
	SJVWIA	\$	50,000	100% Leg Ops 1
	Temperance Flat	\$	100,000	100% Leg Ops 1 or Subject to Activity Agreement Development
	Los Vaqueros III	\$	100,000	100% DIPS
	Rice Field Inundation Food Production (Prop 1 Grant)	\$	100,000	100% Leg Ops 1
	Contingency	\$	200,000	100% Leg Ops 1
	Direct Funding Project Total	\$	550,000	
Coordinated Science/Project Efforts with SWC				
	Delta Following Pilot Program	\$	150,000	100% Leg Ops 1
	Contingency	\$	350,000	60% Leg Ops 1; 5% DIPS; 35% Leg Ops 2
	Coordinated Efforts Total	\$	500,000	
CAMT				
	Essex Partnership	\$	52,500	100% DIPS
	Hansen Environmental	\$	52,500	
	CAMT Total	\$	105,000	
Legal Support				
	[Litigation]	\$	140,500	
	WQCP			25% Leg Ops 1; 75% Leg Ops 2
	Ecological/Biological Support	\$	40,000	
	Modeling Support	\$	5,000	
	Economics Support	\$	4,500	
	COA			50% Leg Ops 1; 50% Leg Ops 2
	Modeling Support	\$	24,000	
	ROC on LTO			100% Leg Ops 1
	Ecological/Biological Support	\$	60,000	
	Modeling Support	\$	5,000	
	Legal Support Total	\$	279,000	

SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY
March 1, 2018 - February 28, 2019
BUDGET EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

Direct Expenses		Total 12/19/2017 Workshop	Total 1/8/18
Legal:			
1	Linneman et al	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000
2	Kronick Moskovits et al	\$ 848,125	\$ 877,625
3	Kronick Moskovits et al (Annual Costs)	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
4	General Counsel	\$ 320,000	\$ -
5	Pioneer Law Group	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000
6	Pioneer Law Group (Annual Costs)	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
7	Technical Support	\$ 279,000	\$ 279,000
8	Legal Contingency	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Sub Total		\$ 1,807,125	\$ 1,516,625
Technical:			
1	Direct Funding Projects	\$ 780,000	\$ 550,000
2	Coordinated Science/Project Efforts with SWC	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
3	Collaborateive Adaptive Management Team (CAMT)	\$ 105,000	\$ 105,000
Sub Total		\$ 1,385,000	\$ 1,155,000
Legislative Advocacy/Public Information Representation:			
1	Federal Representation	\$ 255,000	\$ 255,000
2	State Representation	\$ 60,000	\$ -
	Contingency	\$ 25,000	\$ -
3	Calif. Farm Wtr Coalition Information/Outreach	\$ 210,000	\$ 210,000
4	Family Farm Alliance	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Sub Total		\$ 575,000	\$ 490,000
Other Professional Services:			
Sub Total			\$ -
Westside Water Resource Plan:			
1	Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Grant	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
2	Westside Integrated Water Resources Plan	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
3	Consultant SB104 Drought Grant	\$ -	\$ -
Sub Total		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
OTHER:			
1	SFCWA Assessment	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -
2	Strategic Planning	\$ -	\$ 65,000
3	SLDMWA Accounting (Direct Expenditure)	\$ -	\$ -
4	Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 47,100	\$ 56,052
5	General Counsel	\$ -	\$ 320,000
6	Deputy General Counsel	\$ -	\$ 202,064
7	Water Policy Administator	\$ -	\$ 121,500
8	Science Manager	\$ 195,000	\$ 243,000
9	Science Intern	\$ -	\$ 23,396
10	Other Services & Expenses	\$ 12,500	\$ 15,000
11	License & Continuing Education	\$ 5,000	\$ 6,000
12	Organizational Membership	\$ 6,000	\$ 7,500
13	Conferences & Training	\$ 12,500	\$ 15,000
14	Travel/Mileage	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
15	Group Meetings	\$ 8,465	\$ 8,465
16	Telephone	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
DMC/EO&M			\$ -
Sub Total		\$ 1,321,565	\$ 1,122,977
Total		\$ 5,288,690	\$ 4,484,602

DRAFT BUDGET

Moved under Other

See separate spreadsheet

See separate spreadsheet

Maintains FY18 budget number

Maintains FY18 budget number- No funding for Cultivate California
Maintains FY18 budget number

Total cost for Grant Application and Needs Assessment is \$260K. DWR provided \$130K in advance. FY18 has \$80K (\$50K/DAC and \$30K/WIWRP) Bal of \$50K in FY19
Consultant cost to manage program- FY19- update WIWRP, prepare grant application- FY 20 Administor grant, coordinate with SGMA and DAC
Expect SB 104 grant projects to be complete in FY 18

TBD based on discussion with State Water Contractors
Consultant Services
No budget needed - Completion of SB104 Grant accounting
Assumes 6 offices each at \$600 rent, \$185 parking
Moved from Legal above

Budget and fill based on outcome of Strategic Planning effort - (6 months)
Increased salary to \$180K plus benefits
For 5 months based on \$25/hr includes other related costs
Assumes \$2,500 for 6 employees with offices in Sacramento
Assumes \$1,000 for 6 employees with offices in Sacramento
Assumes Ca Special District Association (CSDA) Membership + \$1,000 for 6 employees with offices in Sacramento
Assumes \$2,500 for 6 employees with offices in Sacramento
Estimate based on budget (\$30,145) to actuals (10-31: \$18,750) for current FY- includes funds for tours and travel (e.g. D.C. trips)
Maintains FY18 Budget
Maintains FY 18 Budget

SLDMWA Technical Support
FISCAL YEAR MARCH 1, 2018 - FEBRUARY 28, 2019
DRAFT

Category	Effort	Consultant	Budget	Notes
Direct Funding Project				
	SJVWIA	\$ 50,000		Per placeholder from Board action
	Temperance Flat	\$ 100,000		Placeholder for possible Activity Agreement Participation (possibly in addition to \$100,000 in FY18)
	Los Vaqueros III	\$ 100,000		
	Rice Field Inundation Food Production (Prop 1 Grant)	\$ 100,000		Recommend, subject to Sac Valley funding and equal recognition
	Contingency	\$ 200,000		For funding of project pursued by others, would require Board action before expending
	Direct Funding Project Total	\$ 550,000		
Coordinated Science/Project Efforts with SWC				Subject to decision on SFCWA contribution
	Delta Fallowing Pilot Program	\$ 150,000		Per Board authorization
	Contingency	\$ 350,000		For funding of project WA pursues with SWC, would require Board action before expending
	Coordinated Efforts Total	\$ 500,000		
CAMT				Recommend seeking contributions from all participants
	Essex Partnership	\$ 52,500		
	Hansen Environmental	\$ 52,500		
	CAMT Total	\$ 105,000		
Legal Support				
	[Litigation]	\$ 140,500		
	WQCP			
	Ecological/Biological Support	\$ 40,000		Assumes 200 hours at \$200 per hour
	Modeling Support	\$ 5,000		Assumes 20 hours at \$245 per hour
	Economics Support	\$ 4,500		Assumes 20 hours at \$225 per hour
	COA			
	Modeling Support	\$ 24,000		Assumes 100 hours at \$245 per hour
	ROC on LTO			
	Ecological/Biological Support	\$ 60,000		Assumes 300 hours at \$200 per hour
	Modeling Support	\$ 5,000		Assumes 20 hours at \$245 per hour
	Legal Support Total	\$ 279,000		