

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Groundwater Pumping Assessment Data Package

Special Workshop

April 5, 2018

5:00 PM

City of Ridgecrest Council Chambers

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Groundwater Pumping Assessment Data Package

Contents

Item 1: Special Workshop Agenda

Item 2: IWVGA Staff Report

Item 3: Estimated Costs Required to be Funded by Groundwater Pumping Assessment

Item 4: Determination of Assessment

Item 5: Groundwater Sustainability Plan Schedule

Item 6: Methods to Quantify/Report Groundwater Production (Includes purveyors potentially subject to pumping assessment)

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 1: Special Workshop Agenda

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Ridgecrest City Hall 100 W California Ave., Ridgecrest, CA 93555 760-499-5002

SPECIAL WORKSHOP A G E N D A

Thursday, April 5, 2018
5:00 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Ricca Charlon at (760) 499-5002. Requests must be made as early as possible and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting.

****The public will be allowed to address the Board during Public Comments. The Public Comments portion of the meeting shall be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker with public comment limited to two (2) hours total. Each person is limited to one comment during Public Comments. Time permitting, and at the discretion of the chair, second comments may be allowed.***

****Members of the public wishing to provide comment will need to submit a comment card. Comment cards will be available at the entrance to chambers 30 minutes prior to the meeting until 15 minutes after start of meeting (4:30 – 5:15). Speakers will be heard in order.***

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. STAFF PRESENTATION

- a. Discussion of Groundwater Pumping Fees to Finance Development and Adoption of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan and IWVGA Administrative Costs

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS* - Members of the public wishing to provide comment would need to submit a comment card – **2 hours total time for this item**

4. POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) COMMENTS – **30 minutes total time for this item**

5. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) COMMENTS - **30 minutes total time for this item**

6. IWVGA BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

7. CLOSING COMMENTS

8. ADJOURN

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 2: IWVGA Staff Report

IWVGA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Memorandum

TO: IWVGA Board Members **DATE:** April 5, 2018

FROM: James Worth, IWVGA Staff

SUBJECT: Groundwater Pumping Fees to Finance Development and Adoption of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan and IWVGA Administrative Costs

DISCUSSION

On January 18, 2018, the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority (“IWVGA”) Board of Directors (“Board”) directed IWVGA staff to develop a fee proposal to finance the development and adoption of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (“GSP”). The Board directed that the fee be based on volumetric usage of groundwater and be assessed on pumpers, with the exception of de minimis extractors.

On February 15, 2018, IWVGA staff outlined an initial concept to generate a revenue stream sufficient to finance the development and adoption of a GSP and associated IWVGA administrative costs. Following staff’s presentation, the Board directed and authorized staff to continue working on the development of a groundwater pumping fee proposal and to identify and develop the information needed for an actual proposal, pursuant to California Water Code Section 10730. The following is staff’s recommendation on how to implement the fee.

The elements of the proposed groundwater pumping fee identified by staff are as follows:

Authority to Impose Fees:

Staff recommends the IWVGA Board adopt a fee pursuant to California Water Code Section 10730 (“Section 10730”), which was enacted through the California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”). Section 10730 grants a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“GSA”) the authority to impose a groundwater pumping fee. Section 10730(a) states in part as follows:

- (a) A groundwater sustainability agency may impose fees, including, but not limited to, permit fees and fees on groundwater extraction or other regulated activity, to fund the costs of a groundwater sustainability program, including, but not limited to, preparation, adoption, and amendment of a groundwater sustainability plan, and investigations, inspections, compliance assistance, enforcement, and program administration, including a prudent reserve.

Public Engagement:

Before imposing a fee, a GSA shall hold a public meeting, “at which oral or written presentations may be made” (Section 10730(b)). The GSA must provide notice prior to the meeting, pursuant to California Government Code Section 6066, including the time and place of the public meeting, “a general explanation of the matter to be discussed and a statement that the data required by this section is available.” *Id.* At least 20 days prior to the meeting, the GSA “shall make available to the public data upon which the proposed fee is based. *Id.* After the public meeting, the fee shall be imposed or increased “only by ordinance or resolution.”

Although Section 10730 only requires the IWVGA to hold a public meeting, noticed and published pursuant to California Government Code Section 6066, staff was directed to schedule a Board workshop on April 5, 2018 to provide the public with the opportunity to address the Board on the proposed fee in advance of the public meeting required by Section 10730. Members of the PAC and TAC will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed fee at the workshop. Staff was also directed to make the data upon which the proposed fee is based available to the public no later than March 29, 2018. Notice of the workshop was posted on the IWVGA website (iwvga.org) and published in the Daily Independent.

Gap Funding Requirement:

Expenditures: As the GSA for the Indian Wells Valley Basin, the IWVGA is required to adopt a GSP by no later than January 31, 2020. The IWVGA Water Resources Manager (“WRM”) has estimated that the total cost of developing and adopting the GSP to be about \$3.1 million. Additionally, as part of the Proposition 1 grant funding request, the WRM identified \$646,000 in costs for initial projects benefitting Severely Disadvantaged Communities (“SDAC”). The WRM has identified an additional \$435,250 in estimated costs for the WRM’s support of the IWVGA. IWVGA Administrative Costs and Legal Costs are estimated at \$511,500 which includes \$350,000 for legal expenses moving forward and an expected validation action. The City of Ridgecrest has or expects to provide \$210,466 in services which are referred to as Reimbursable Costs. Finally, a 20% reserve in the amount of \$939,070 is included for unanticipated expenditures.

Revenue: On February 6, 2018, the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) announced its recommendation that IWVGA receive the full Proposition 1 grant award of \$2,146,000 -- \$1.5 million for development of the GSP and \$646,000 for SDAC projects. While the local match requirement for the SDAC projects grant award may be waived, the GSP development grant award requires a \$1.5-million local match. It is estimated more than two-thirds (\$1,157,300) of the local match requirement can be achieved with in-kind services and existing investments by parties in the Basin.

The following table summarizes all of these estimated financial impacts resulting in a total estimated gap funding requirement of \$2,541,586 which the proposed pumping fee would address.

| Budget Items¹ | Estimated Costs |
|--|------------------------|
| EXPENDITURES | |
| GSP Development and SDAC Costs (Prop 1) | \$3,748,600 |
| GSP Preparation | \$3,102,600 |
| Water Conservation and Rebate Program | \$206,000 |
| Water Audit, Leak Detection, & Leak Repair Program | \$440,000 |
| IWVGA Support Costs | \$435,250 |
| IWVGA/TAC/PAC Coordination | \$144,250 |
| Prop 1 Application/Reporting | \$103,000 |
| Schedule/Budget Management | \$52,000 |
| Groundwater Pumping Assessment Support | \$121,500 |
| Database Management Coordination | \$10,000 |
| CASGEM Coordination | \$4,500 |
| IWVGA Administrative Costs | \$161,500 |
| GSA Board Meetings | \$42,000 |
| Consultant Management and GSP Development | \$24,500 |
| Financial Management | \$8,500 |
| Community Outreach | \$21,000 |
| Budget Development & Administration | \$12,500 |
| PAC/TAC Meetings | \$19,000 |
| Travel | \$6,000 |
| Insurance | \$15,000 |
| Conferences/Training | \$3,000 |
| Miscellaneous | \$10,000 |
| City of Ridgecrest Reimbursable Costs | \$210,466 |
| Legal Costs | \$350,000 |
| Reserve | \$939,070 |
| Total Expenditures | \$5,844,886 |
| | |
| REVENUE | |
| Proposition 1 Grant Award | \$2,146,000 |
| GSP Preparation | \$1,500,000 |
| Water Conservation and Rebate Program | \$206,000 |
| Water Audit, Leak Detection, & Leak Repair Program | \$440,000 |
| In-kind Services | \$1,157,300 |
| U.S. Navy/Federal Services | \$1,097,300 |
| IWVWD/City of Ridgecrest Services | \$60,000 |
| Total Revenue | \$3,303,300 |
| TOTAL GAP FUNDING REQUIRED | \$2,541,586 |
| | |

¹ Background information on the Budget Items is included in Item 3 of the Data Package.

Calculation of Fees:

As previously directed by the Board, the standard volumetric fee would be imposed on each impacted well owner pumping groundwater and would be based on the amount of groundwater pumped. Fees would be imposed based on the amount of groundwater pumped in relation to the funds required to develop and adopt the GSP and the additional IWVGA expenditures identified above. The initial calculation of a per acre-feet (“AF”) fee would be based on existing estimates of the aggregate annual groundwater extractions by impacted pumpers.

For example, estimated pumping by impacted pumpers for 2016 is 21,600 AF, as reported to the Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group. A groundwater pumping fee of \$50 per AF would generate \$1,080,000 per year and the required Gap Funding of \$2,541,586 would be met in approximately 29 months. See Item 4 of the Data Package, Determination of Assessment. The proposed fee could include a sunset clause tied to collection of revenue sufficient to fund the Total Gap Funding Requirement identified above. A further noticed public meeting pursuant to Section 10730 would be required to increase the amount of the fee if the Gap Funding requirement increased.

Groundwater Pumping Measurement:

For those wells that have approved meters, groundwater pumping would be measured based on meter readings.² Although the IWVGA has the authority to impose groundwater extraction fees, it will not acquire the authority to require metering of groundwater wells until the GSP is adopted. In light of this, the IWVGA should develop criteria and a procedure for measuring extractions by those non-metered wells. Item 6 of the Data Package includes a memorandum on Methods to Quantify/Report Groundwater Production prepared by the WRM with assistance from the TAC.

Impacted Pumpers Identification:

Existing pumpers who would be assessed the proposed fee are being identified using county records or other available public documents.³ A list of the impacted pumpers subject to the proposed fee are included in Item 6 of the Data Package. Once the fee is adopted, a process for assessing new pumpers who start operations after the fee is implemented should be developed. This process should include notification from the counties following the granting of new well permits.

² The Indian Wells Valley Water District and SVM have meters installed on their wells. It is not presently known how many of the other impacted pumpers have meters.

³ A groundwater sustainability agency, before imposing or increasing a fee pursuant to Section 10730 or 10730.2 relating to a groundwater basin that includes a water corporation regulated by the Public Utilities Commission, shall notify the Public Utilities Commission. [Cal. Water Code Section 10730.1].

Exempted Pumpers:

While the Board's approved motion to develop a fee proposal did not identify federal groundwater extractions, United States Navy ("Navy") and United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") pumping should be excluded. SGMA exempts federal agencies from the requirements of SGMA and prohibits the imposition of fees on de minimis extractors unless regulated pursuant to SGMA.⁴

Fees Collection and Delinquent Account:

Water Code Section 10730.6 of SGMA authorizes the IWVGA to collect groundwater fees imposed pursuant to Section 10730 and provides multiple remedies that the IWVGA may pursue to collect delinquent accounts. It is recommended that all options available pursuant to Section 10730.6 be available to pursue delinquent accounts.

Fee Collection: The IWVGA would send monthly billing invoices to the impacted pumpers and require payment within thirty (30) days of the date of the invoices. Payments would be made to the IWVGA. Payments not made within thirty (30) days of becoming due would be considered delinquent.

Delinquent Accounts: Delinquent accounts shall be liable for interest at the rate of 1 percent per month on the delinquent amount of the groundwater fee and may be liable for an additional 10-percent penalty on the delinquent amount of the groundwater fee. Additional remedies available to the IWVGA include, but are not limited to, (1) commence a lawsuit to collect delinquent fees, interest or penalties; (2) collect delinquent fees, interest and civil penalties under the laws applicable to the County of Kern; and (3) after a public hearing, order an impacted pumper to cease extraction of groundwater until all delinquent fees are paid. The remedies are cumulative and may be pursued alternatively or may be used consecutively.

Recommended Board Action:

Staff recommends that the Board:

1. Authorize staff to schedule the public meeting required by Section 10730(b) to consider and potentially act on imposing the fee, on a date to be determined by the Board.
2. Authorize staff to make the data upon which the proposed fee is based available to the public no later than 20 days before the public meeting.

⁴ For purposes of this Proposal, any reference to groundwater pumpers excludes de minimis extractors, the Navy and BLM unless otherwise specified.

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 3: Estimated Costs Required to be Funded by Groundwater Pumping Assessment

Supporting Attachments

- Prop 1 Application Budget Tables
- IWVGA Support Costs
- City of Ridgecrest Reimbursable Costs Budget Breakdown
- Draft Funding Recommendations

Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority

Estimated Costs Required to be Funded by Groundwater Pumping Assessment

| Budget Items | Estimated Costs |
|--|--------------------|
| Expenditures | |
| GSP Development and SDAC Costs (Prop 1) | \$3,748,600 |
| <i>GSP Preparation ^{1J}</i> | <i>\$3,102,600</i> |
| <i>Water Conservation and Rebate Program ^{1J 2J}</i> | <i>\$206,000</i> |
| <i>Water Audit, Leak Detection, and Leak Repair Program ^{1J 2J}</i> | <i>\$440,000</i> |
| IWVGA Support Costs ^{3J} | \$435,250 |
| <i>IWVGA/TAC/PAC Coordination</i> | <i>\$144,250</i> |
| <i>Prop 1 Application/Reporting</i> | <i>\$103,000</i> |
| <i>Schedule/Budget Management</i> | <i>\$52,000</i> |
| <i>Groundwater Pumping Assessment Support</i> | <i>\$121,500</i> |
| <i>Database Management Coordination</i> | <i>\$10,000</i> |
| <i>CASGEM Coordination</i> | <i>\$4,500</i> |
| IWVGA Administrative Costs | \$161,500 |
| <i>GSA Board Meetings</i> | <i>\$42,000</i> |
| <i>Consultant Management and GSP Development</i> | <i>\$24,500</i> |
| <i>Financial Management</i> | <i>\$8,500</i> |
| <i>Community Outreach</i> | <i>\$21,000</i> |
| <i>Budget Development & Admin</i> | <i>\$12,500</i> |
| <i>PAC/TAC Meetings</i> | <i>\$19,000</i> |
| <i>Travel</i> | <i>\$6,000</i> |
| <i>Insurance</i> | <i>\$15,000</i> |
| <i>Conferences/Training</i> | <i>\$3,000</i> |
| <i>Miscellaneous</i> | <i>\$10,000</i> |
| City of Ridgecrest Reimbursable Costs ^{4J} | \$210,466 |
| Legal Costs ^{5J} | \$350,000 |
| Reserve ^{6J} | \$939,070 |
| Total Expenditures | \$5,844,886 |
| Revenue | |
| Proposition 1 Grant Award ^{1J 7J} | \$2,146,000 |
| <i>GSP Preparation</i> | <i>\$1,500,000</i> |
| <i>Water Conservation and Rebate Program</i> | <i>\$206,000</i> |
| <i>Water Audit, Leak Detection, and Leak Repair Program</i> | <i>\$440,000</i> |
| In-kind Services | \$1,157,300 |
| <i>U.S Navy/Federal Services ^{1J 8J}</i> | <i>\$1,097,300</i> |
| <i>IWVWD/City of Ridgecrest Services ^{1J 9J}</i> | <i>\$60,000</i> |
| Total Revenue | \$3,303,300 |
| TOTAL GAP FUNDING REQUIRED | \$2,541,586 |

Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority

Notes

- 1] From Prop 1 Grant Application. See attached budget tables from Prop 1 Grant Application.
- 2] The Water Conservation and Rebate Program (\$206,000) and Water Audit, Leak Detection, and Leak Repair Program (\$440,000) together are collectively referred to as the SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project for a total of \$646,000.
- 3] Additional IWVGA support costs not eligible for Prop 1 Grant. See attached table for description of costs.
- 4] Reimbursable costs include legal, IT support, and building usage costs.
- 5] Legal costs anticipated to be incurred by IWVGA Special Counsel for a validation action and associated legal costs for GSP development and implementation.
- 6] Reserve is 20% of the total of GSP Development and SDAC Costs (\$3,748,600), IWVGA Support Costs (\$435,250), IWVGA Administrative Costs (\$161,500), and Legal Costs (\$350,000).
- 7] Grant award amounts are assumed from DWR's Prop 1 Draft Funding Recommendations.
- 8] Federal services include numerical modeling and monitoring well installation.
- 9] IWWVD/Ridgecrest services include development of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan.

| Table 5 - Proposal Budget | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Proposal Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development and SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project | | | | | | |
| | Individual Project Title | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund | Other Cost Share | Total Cost | % Cost Share |
| 1 | Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development ¹ | \$1,500,000 | \$1,602,600 | \$0 | \$3,102,600 | 52% |
| | | | | | | |
| | Proposal Total | \$1,500,000 | \$1,602,600 | \$0 | \$3,102,600 | 52% |

1. Sources of funding from the IWVGA (including Kern County, Inyo County, San Bernardino County, Indian Wells Valley Water District, and City of Ridgecrest), Searles Valley Minerals, and from the U.S. Navy. A breakdown of funding sources is provided in Table 4.

Table 4 - Project Budget

Proposal Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development and SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project

Project Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development

Project serves a need of a DAC?:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Cost Share Waiver Request?:

☒ Yes ☐ No

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| Objective 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | Task 1 - <u>Model Development</u> | \$235,072 | \$691,328 | \$0 | \$926,400 |
| | Task 1a - Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model | \$24,137.54 | \$7,262 ¹ | \$0 | \$31,400 |
| | Task 1b - Numerical Groundwater Model (Review Existing Model, Create Sustainable Basin Model Updates and Scenarios, Transport Modeling to Evaluate Groundwater Quality, Evaluate Potential Land Subsidence) | \$210,934.40 | \$63,466 ¹ | \$0 | \$274,400 |
| | Previous and Ongoing Model Development In-Kind Services | \$0 | \$620,600 ² | \$0 | \$620,600 |
| 2 | Task 2 - <u>Salt and Nutrient Management Plan Development</u> | \$20,000 | \$60,000 ³ | \$0 | \$80,000 |
| | Task 2a - Loading Analysis (Existing) | \$0 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$30,000 |
| | Task 2b - Mixing Model Development (Existing) | \$0 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$30,000 |
| | Task 2c - Reporting and Coordination | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 |

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|-------|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| | Objective 2 | | | | |
| 3 | Task 3 - <u>Data Management System</u> Task 3a - Develop a Web-Based GeoDatabase (DMS) Task 3b - Establish Monitoring Protocols and Reporting Standards Task 3c - Populate Database with Historical Data Task 3d - Install Transducers and Telemetry Equipment Task 3e - Integrate GSP Goals and Objectives - Adaptive Management | \$274,737 \$37,436.24 \$23,753.18 \$41,664.16 \$138,137.43 \$33,746.43 | \$82,663¹ \$11,264 \$7,147 \$12,536 \$41,563 \$10,154 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$357,400 \$48,700 \$30,900 \$54,200 \$179,700 \$43,900 |
| 4 | Task 4 - <u>Identify and Evaluate Hydrogeologic Data Gaps</u> Task 4a - Review Existing Model and Monitoring Network Task 4b - Identification and Prioritization of Data Gaps | \$51,273 \$32,593.36 \$18,679.69 | \$15,427¹ \$9,807 \$5,620 | \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$66,700 \$42,400 \$24,300 |
| 5 | Task 5 - <u>Monitoring Wells</u> Task 5a - Design and Location Siting Task 5b - Work Plan and Well Construction Task 5c - Collection of Monitoring Well Data | \$108,619 \$11,453.80 \$0 \$53,886.67 \$43,278.45 | \$509,381 \$3,446 ¹ \$476,700 ⁴ \$16,213 ¹ \$13,022 ¹ | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$618,000 \$14,900 \$476,700 \$70,100 \$56,300 |

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|-------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| 6 | Task 6 - <u>Stream Gages</u> Task 6a - Hydrologic Analysis Task 6b - Design and Location Siting Task 6c - Equipment Purchase, Installation, and Testing | \$114,154 \$16,373.55 \$31,978.39 \$65,801.69 | \$34,346¹ \$4,926 \$9,622 \$19,798 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$148,500 \$21,300 \$41,600 \$85,600 |
| 7 | Task 7 - <u>Weather Stations</u> Task 7a - Design and Location Siting Task 7b - Equipment Purchase Task 7c - Installation and Testing | \$64,725 \$17,603.49 \$27,750.48 \$19,371.53 | \$19,475¹ \$5,297 \$8,350 \$5,828 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$84,200 \$22,900 \$36,100 \$25,200 |
| 8 | Task 8 - <u>Water Quality and Stable Isotope Sampling and Analysis</u> Task 8a - Surface and Groundwater Sampling Task 8b - Perform Geochemical Reaction and Transport Analysis | \$83,559 \$62,649.98 \$20,908.95 | \$25,141¹ \$18,850 \$6,291 | \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$108,700 \$81,500 \$27,200 |
| 9 | Task 9 - <u>Aquifer Tests</u> Task 9a - Prepare Aquifer Test Work Plan Task 9b - Perform Aquifer Testing | \$132,449 \$27,750.48 \$104,698.49 | \$39,851¹ \$8,350 \$31,502 | \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$172,300 \$36,100 \$136,200 |

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|-------|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| | Objective 3 | | | | |
| 10 | Task 10 - <u>Imported Water Study</u> Task 10a - Evaluate Potential Imported Water Sources Task 10b - Evaluate Water Banking Alternatives and Extraction Schedule Task 10c - Evaluate Infrastructure Requirements Task 10d - Prepare Technical Memorandum | \$134,524 \$57,653.35 \$19,217.78 \$19,217.78 \$38,435.57 | \$40,476 ¹ \$17,347 \$5,782 \$5,782 \$11,564 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$175,000 \$75,000 \$25,000 \$25,000 \$50,000 |
| 11 | Task 11 - <u>Recycled Water Study</u> Task 11a - Existing Supply and Demand Analysis Task 11b - Identify Existing Recycled Water Infrastructure and Users Task 11c - Review Regulatory and Institutional Requirements Task 11d - Identify and Evaluate Potential Recycled Water Users Task 11e - Prepare Technical Memorandum | \$46,891 \$5,073.50 \$4,612.27 \$2,613.62 \$15,374.23 \$19,217.78 | \$14,109 ¹ \$1,527 \$1,388 \$786 \$4,626 \$5,782 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$61,000 \$6,600 \$6,000 \$3,400 \$20,000 \$25,000 |

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| Objective 4 | | | | | |
| 12 | Task 12 - GSP Development and Compilation Task 12a - Prepare Executive Summary Chapter Task 12b - Prepare Introduction Chapter Task 12c -Prepare Plan Area and Basin Setting Chapter Task 12d - Prepare Sustainable Management Criteria Chapter Task 12e - Prepare Projects and Management Actions to Achieve Sustainability Goal Chapter Task 12f - Prepare Plan Implementation Chapter Task 12g- Prepare References and Technical Studies Chapter Task 12h - Develop Draft and Final GSP Task 12i - Project Management Task 12j - Stakeholder/DWR Coordination | \$233,996 \$691.84 \$922.45 \$12,453.12 \$23,061.34 \$38,435.57 \$26,904.90 \$1,537.42 \$24,060.67 \$57,499.61 \$48,428.82 \$1,500,000 | \$70,404 ¹ \$208 \$278 \$3,747 \$6,939 \$11,564 \$8,095 \$463 \$7,239 \$17,300 \$14,571 \$1,602,600 | \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | \$304,400 \$900 \$1,200 \$16,200 \$30,000 \$50,000 \$35,000 \$2,000 \$31,300 \$74,800 \$63,000 \$3,102,600 |
| Grand Total (Tasks 1-12) | | | | | |

Notes

1. Funding Source: IWVGA
2. Funding Source: Navy
3. Funding Source: City of Ridgecrest and IWVWD
4. Funding Source: Navy, Searles Valley Minerals, and Kern County

| Table 5 - Proposal Budget | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|
| Proposal Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development and SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project | | | | | | |
| Individual Project Title | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund | Other Cost Share | Total Cost | % Cost Share |
| 1 | Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project | \$646,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$646,000 | 0% |
| | | | | | | |
| | Proposal Total | \$646,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$646,000 | 0% |

Table 4 - Project Budget

Proposal Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development

Project Title: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - SDAC Groundwater Conservation Programs

Project serves a need of a DAC?: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Cost Share Waiver Request?: ☒ Yes ☐ No

| Tasks | | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
|-------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source | Other Cost Share | Total Cost |
| 1 | Task 1 - <u>SDAC Water Conservation and Rebate Program</u> | \$173,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$173,000 |
| | Task 1a - Administration and Project Management | \$22,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$22,000 |
| | Task 1b - Marketing | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 |
| | Task 1c - Rebate Tracking and Reporting | \$13,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13,000 |
| | Task 1d - Rebate Processing | \$83,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$83,000 |
| | Task 1e - Monitoring Plan | \$24,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$24,000 |
| | Task 1f - Billing and Reporting | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,000 |
| 2 | Task 2 - <u>SDAC Water Audit, Leak Detection, and Leak Repair Program</u> | \$440,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$440,000 |
| | Task 2a - Administration and Project Management | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30,000 |
| | Task 2b - Phase 1 : Water Audit | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 |
| | Task 2c - Phase 2: Leak Detection and Repair Program | \$384,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$384,000 |
| | Task 2d - Billing and Reporting | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,000 |
| | Grand Total (Tasks 1-2) | \$613,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$613,000 |

IWVGA Support Costs

| Expenditure | Description | Total Costs (Aug 2017 - Jan 2020) |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| IWVGA/TAC/PAC Coordination | Additional Costs for coordination with the IWVGA, TAC, and PAC not included directly associated with the Prop 1 Grant costs (meeting preparation, coordination calls, meetings, etc.) | \$144,250 |
| Prop 1 Application / Reporting [1] | Costs to Prepare the Prop 1 Grant Application, Coordination with DWR, and Prop 1 Grant Administration (invoice processing, reporting, etc.) | \$103,000 |
| Schedule/Budget Management | Additional Project Management costs to develop and maintain a Microsoft Project schedule with budget tracking following the Navy's Plan of Action and Milestone (POAM) format . | \$52,000 |
| Groundwater Pumping Assessment Support [2] | Assist IWVGA with preparing monthly assessments including estimating pumping from non-metered wells. | \$121,500 |
| Database Management Coordination | Coordination with Ramboll and IWVGA regarding database management development. | \$10,000 |
| CASGEM Coordination | Coordination with DWR, Kern County Water Agency, and IWVGA to transfer CASGEM responsibilities to IWVGA. | \$4,500 |
| TOTAL | | \$435,250 |

[1] Assumes Prop 1 Admin Support begins June 2018.

[2] Assumes Groundwater Pumping Assessments administered for 29 months.

City of Ridgecrest Reimbursable Costs - Budget Breakdown

| Attorney Fees | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Jan. | | \$ 8,842.50 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Feb | | \$ 4,860.00 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Mar | | \$ 7,321.49 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| April | | \$ 5,767.50 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| May | | \$ 2,097.30 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| June | | \$ 630.00 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| July | | \$ 5,308.00 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| August | \$ 2,587.50 | \$ 2,304.49 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Sept. | \$ 2,452.50 | \$ 2,551.87 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Oct. | \$ 2,385.00 | \$ 3,217.50 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Nov. | \$ 8,857.78 | \$ 3,037.50 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Dec. | \$ 4,977.50 | \$ 2,677.50 | \$ 6,500.00 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| | \$ 21,260.28 | \$ 48,615.65 | \$ 78,000.00 | \$ 48,000.00 |
| Total Attorney Costs | | \$ 195,875.93 | | |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Total Attorney Costs | \$ 195,875.93 |
| Total Chambers use costs | \$ 4,960.00 |
| Total IT Support | \$ 9,630.00 |
| 2016-2019 Cost to be reimbursed | \$ 210,465.93 |

| Chamber hours | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|------------------------------------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Jan. | | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Feb | | 3.5 | 3 | 3 |
| Mar | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| April | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| May | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| June | | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| July | | 2.5 | 3 | 3 |
| August | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Sept. | 3.5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Oct. | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3 |
| Nov. | 2.5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Dec. | 2.5 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | 12.5 | 39.5 | 36 | 36 |
| Total Chamber hours X \$40/hour | | 124 | | |
| | | \$ 40.00 | | |
| Total Chamber costs | | \$ 4,960.00 | | |

| IT Support | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Jan. | | \$ 270.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Feb | | \$ 240.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Mar | | \$ 210.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| April | | \$ 210.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| May | | \$ 210.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| June | | \$ 450.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| July | | \$ 180.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| August | \$ 150.00 | \$ 150.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Sept. | \$ 240.00 | \$ 210.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Oct. | \$ 150.00 | \$ 180.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Nov. | \$ 180.00 | \$ 270.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| Dec. | \$ 180.00 | \$ 150.00 | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| | \$ 900.00 | \$ 2,730.00 | \$ 3,000.00 | \$ 3,000.00 |
| Council Chamber IT services include: Audio monitoring and leveling Broadcasting to OTA Channel 41 and Mediacom Channel 6 Broadcasting to City webpage Assistance with PowerPoint presentations Digital copy of event/meeting within 2 business days | | | | |
| Total IT Support | \$ 9,630.00 | | | |

Draft Funding Recommendations
2017 Groundwater Sustainability Plans and Projects Solicitation
February 2018

| Rank | Applicant Name | Application Title | Application Score (Cat 1/Cat2) | Grant Request | Recommended Funding ^a | Grant Request | Recommended Funding ^a | Total Recommended Funding | Total Cost of Proposal |
|------|--|--|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | Arroyo Santa Rosa Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Arroyo Santa Rosa Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 15 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 177,061 | \$ 177,061 | \$ 177,061 | \$ 354,162 |
| 10 | Asian Business Institute Resource Center | Southeast Asian Groundwater and Sustainability Advocacy and Outreach Program | 3 / - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 400,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 400,000 | \$ 1,100,000 |
| | Atascadero Mutual Water Co. | 2017 Atascadero Basin Sustainable Groundwater Proposal | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 809,250 | \$ 809,250 | \$ 809,250 | \$ 1,660,008 |
| | Bear Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Bear Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 177,000 | \$ 177,000 | \$ 177,000 | \$ 177,000 |
| | Bimford Coldwater Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Bimford-Coldwater Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Proposal | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,040,000 |
| 18 | Big Bear Lake Department of Water and Power | Basin Resiliency Summit Well Pumping Plant Project | 7 / - | \$ 782,298 | \$ 782,298 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 782,298 | \$ 782,298 |
| 9 | Bolsa Community Services District | Bolsa Groundwater Recharge Project | 11 / - | \$ 705,000 | \$ 705,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 705,000 | \$ 705,000 |
| | Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation | Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development for the Vina, East Butte, West Butte and Wyandotte Creek Subbasins | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,498,800 | \$ 1,498,800 | \$ 1,498,800 | \$ 1,989,683 |
| | Castaic Lake Water Agency | Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency 2017 Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant Program Category 2 Proposal | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 416,106 | \$ 416,106 | \$ 416,106 | \$ 858,075 |
| | City of Brentwood | Tracy Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development Prop 1 Proposal | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,598,530 |
| | City of Corona | Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for the City of Corona Temescal Subbasin | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 732,338 | \$ 732,338 | \$ 732,338 | \$ 981,977 |
| | City of Modesto | Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for the Modesto Groundwater Subbasin | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,668,090 |
| | City of Paso Robles | Paso Robles Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 3,068,242 |
| | City of Redding | Shasta Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Groundwater Sustainability Planning Grant Proposal | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 983,230 | \$ 983,230 | \$ 983,230 | \$ 1,161,590 |
| | City of San Diego - Public Utilities Department | Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the San Pasqual Valley Groundwater Basin | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 989,550 | \$ 989,550 | \$ 989,550 | \$ 1,979,100 |
| | Columbia Groundwater Authority | Columbia Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,497,400 |
| 10 | Community Water Center | Facilitate Participation of Severely Disadvantaged Community Stakeholders in the Tulare Lake Basin And Develop A Drinking Water Vulnerability Tool | 11 / - | \$ 614,353 | \$ 614,353 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 614,353 | \$ 614,353 |
| | County of Glenn | Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development in the Corning Subbasin | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 999,980 | \$ 999,980 | \$ 999,980 | \$ 999,980 |
| 6 | County of San Diego | San Diego County GSP Development | 12 / 18 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ 4,884,300 |
| | County of San Luis Obispo | 2017 County of San Luis Obispo Sustainable Groundwater Proposal | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,397,125 | \$ 1,397,125 | \$ 1,397,125 | \$ 2,549,379 |
| 3 | Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Cuyama Basin Groundwater Sustainability | 13 / 18 | \$ 648,124 | \$ 648,124 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,148,124 | \$ 2,148,124 |
| | Del Norte County | Smith River Plain Groundwater Basin GSP | - / 10 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 |
| | East Bay Municipal Utility District | East Bay Plain Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,018,000 |
| | Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority | Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Grant | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,176,420 |
| | Elisore Valley Municipal Water District | Elisore Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Groundwater Sustainability Planning Grant Proposal | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,524,199 |
| | Elmore-Piru GSA | Elmore and Piru Basins Groundwater Sustainability Plans | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,045,430 |
| 7 | Freshwater Trust | Engaging Severely Disadvantaged Communities in the Development of the Solano Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | 12 / - | \$ 490,000 | \$ 490,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 490,000 | \$ 490,000 |
| 13 | Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority | Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin - Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development and SDAC Groundwater Conservation Pilot Project | 10 / 18 | \$ 646,000 | \$ 646,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,146,000 | \$ 3,748,600 |
| | Inyo-Water Department, County of | Groundwater Sustainability Planning for the Owens Valley Groundwater Basin | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 713,155 | \$ 713,155 | \$ 713,155 | \$ 865,915 |
| | Kern River Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Kern County Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Support - 2017 Grant Application | - / 15 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 3,072,604 |
| | Lassen County | Big Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 999,185 | \$ 999,185 | \$ 999,185 | \$ 1,045,541 |
| 14 | Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability | Partnering for Equitable Groundwater | 10 / - | \$ 758,000 | \$ 758,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 758,000 | \$ 758,000 |
| 15 | Linda County Water District | Linda County Water District Well 17 Project Funding Application Groundwater Sustainability Planning Grant Program Proposal | 10 / - | \$ 999,500 | \$ 999,500 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 999,500 | \$ 12,272,000 |
| | Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 37, Acton | Fringe Area Antelope Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 4 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 600,000 |
| | Lower Tule River Irrigation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Lower Tule River Irrigation District GSA, SGWP Planning Grant | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 |
| 16 | Madera County Water and Natural Resources | Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and GSP Development for The Chowchilla Subbasin | 10 / 18 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 2,500,000 |
| 11 | Madera County Water and Natural Resources | Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and GSP Development for the Madera Subbasin | 11 / 14 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 2,500,000 |
| | Marina Coast Water District | Monterey Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,173,240 |
| | Mendocino County Water Agency | Phase 2 of the Ukiah Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 764,235 | \$ 764,235 | \$ 764,235 | \$ 967,679 |
| 1 | Merced Irrigation District | 2017 Merced Groundwater Subbasin Sustainability | 14 / 17 | \$ 901,261 | \$ 901,261 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,401,261 | \$ 2,615,274 |
| | Mid-Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Kaweah Sub-Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plans Development | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,587,704 |
| | Mid-Kings River Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP Development and SGMA Compliance Project | - / 15 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,597,130 |
| | Mound Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Mound Basin GSA and GSP | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 758,100 | \$ 758,100 | \$ 758,100 | \$ 1,518,870 |
| 2 | North Cal-Neva Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc. | Big Valley GSP Monitoring and Data Development | 14 / - | \$ 782,344 | \$ 782,344 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 782,344 | \$ 801,375 |
| | North Fork Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Kings Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plans | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 5,364,141 |
| | Padre Dam Municipal Water District | San Diego River Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Development Proposal | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 600,000 | \$ 600,000 | \$ 600,000 | \$ 1,200,000 |
| 10 | Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency | Pajaro Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 11 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,409,865 |
| | Petaluma Valley GSA | Petaluma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,097,308 |
| 9 | Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority | Development of the South American Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Bulletin 118 Subbasin No. 5-21.65) | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 970,693 | \$ 970,693 | \$ 970,693 | \$ 1,941,387 |
| | Sacramento Groundwater Authority | North American Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 994,276 | \$ 994,276 | \$ 994,276 | \$ 2,046,643 |
| 1 | Salinas Valley Basin Ground Water Sustainability Agency | Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 3,040,842 |
| | San Antonio Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | San Antonio Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 9 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 600,000 |
| | San Benito County Water District | Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for GSP Preparation: Bolso, Hollister, and San Juan Bautista Groundwater Subbasins | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 830,336 | \$ 830,336 | \$ 830,336 | \$ 1,160,766 |
| | San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District | Yucca Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 815,100 | \$ 815,100 | \$ 815,100 | \$ 1,358,644 |
| 4 | San Geronimo Pass Water Agency | 2017 Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for the San Geronimo Pass Subbasin | 13 / 18 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 2,625,683 |
| | Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency | Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 3,000,000 |
| | Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency | Santa Margarita Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,011,958 |
| | Santa Rosa Plain GSA | Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,333,314 |
| | Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District | Santa Ynez River Valley Basin GSP Planning and Preparation | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 3,481,015 |
| 8 | Self Help Enterprises - SDACs Project | Self Help Enterprises - SDACs Project | 13 / - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 |
| 19 | Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District | Groundwater Monitoring Implementation Program for the Shasta Valley GSA | 6 / - | \$ 976,884 | \$ 976,884 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 976,884 | \$ 976,884 |
| | Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District | Grant Proposal for the Scott, Shasta and Butte Valley Groundwater Basins GSP Development | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,367,000 | \$ 1,367,000 | \$ 1,367,000 | \$ 1,614,000 |
| | Solano Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency | Solano Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 3,592,000 |
| | Sonoma Valley GSA | Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,240,088 |
| | Southern Sacramento County Agricultural Water Authority | Establishing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan and Governance Structure for the Cosumnes Groundwater Sub-Basin | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,965,000 |
| 10 | Sutter County Development Services | Sutter Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 956,814 | \$ 956,814 | \$ 956,814 | \$ 1,277,442 |
| | Tahama County Flood Control & Water Conservation District | Tahama County Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development Grant Application | - / 17 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,498,960 | \$ 1,498,960 | \$ 1,498,960 | \$ 1,498,960 |
| 12 | The Nature Conservancy | Demonstrating Multi-Benefit On-Farm Managed Aquifer Recharge in the Central Valley | 11 / - | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ 1,194,742 |
| | Tulelake Irrigation District | Protecting Our Groundwater Resource: Securing a Sustainable Future for the Tule Lake Subbasin | - / 15 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 721,120 | \$ 721,120 | \$ 721,120 | \$ 836,800 |
| | Upper Ventura River Groundwater Agency | Upper Ventura River Basin GSA and GSP | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 680,061 | \$ 680,061 | \$ 680,061 | \$ 1,338,896 |
| | Walnut Valley Water District | Sagehen Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 16 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 338,500 | \$ 338,500 | \$ 338,500 | \$ 677,000 |
| 17 | West Stanislaus ID | 2017 Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin | 10 / 14 | \$ 1,178,300 | \$ 1,178,300 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,678,300 | \$ 5,206,688 |
| | West Turlock Subbasin GSA | Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant for the Turlock Groundwater Subbasin | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,249,533 |
| | Western Municipal Water District | Riverside-Arlington Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan | - / 14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 130,000 | \$ 130,000 | \$ 130,000 | \$ 368,225 |
| 5 | Westlands Water District | Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation Project and Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development for the Westside Subbasin | 13 / 19 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 2,997,500 |
| | White Wolf Groundwater Sustainability Agency | White Wolf Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development | - / 18 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 557,998 | \$ 557,998 | \$ 557,998 | \$ 1,560,563 |
| | Yolo County Flood Control and water Conservation District | Yolo Subbasin - GSP Planning and Preparation | - / 19 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 2,033,244 |
| | Yuba County Water Agency | Groundwater Sustainability Plans for the North Yuba Subbasin and South Yuba Subbasin | - / 14 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 893,948 | \$ 893,948 | \$ 893,948 | \$ 1,191,930 |
| | | | | \$ 16,782,264 | \$ 16,182,264 | \$ 69,569,961 | \$ 69,569,961 | \$ 85,752,225 | \$ 150,038,516 |

A. All Category 1 Projects: Applicant shall obtain written (i.e., letter) approval of proposed scope of work from GSA, of respective basin where project is located in, prior to execution of Grant Agreement.

B. Recommended funding less than requested due to significantly high Direct Project Administration (DPA) Costs. Recalculated DPA is provided 17% of Grant Requested, rounded up to nearest \$100K.

C. Critically Over-Draft Basin included in application

D. Applicant submitted an Alternative Plan to DWR for review. Awards will not be finalized until the Alternative Plan approval is determined.

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 4: Determination of Assessment

Supporting Attachments

- IWVGA Groundwater Production Rates – 1975 through Present

Determination of the Groundwater Pumping Assessment Rate

| Gap Funding Required ^{1]} | Assessment Period (Months) | Annual Pumping (AFY) | Monthly Pumping (AF) ^{2]} | Assessment Rate (\$/AF) ^{3]} |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| \$2,541,586 | 29 | 21,600 | 1,800 | \$50 |

AFY = acre-feet per year

AF = acre-feet

[1] See Public Data Package Item 3 for determination of Gap Funding Required.

[2] Monthly pumping is annual pumping (21,600 AFY) divided by twelve months.

[3] Assessment Rate is the Gap Funding required (\$2,541,586) divided by Assessment Period (29 months) divided by Monthly Pumping (1,800 AF).

IWW Ground Water Production Estimates 1975 - Present

| Year | Meadow- brook Farms (e) | Simmons Ranch (f) | China Lake Acres | City of R/C | SVM | IWWWD | Inyokern CSD | NAWS (c) | Neal Ranch | Private Wells | Quist Farms | Orchards (d) | R/C Heights | S. Leroy (a/b) | Annual Totals |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| 1975 | 1516 | | 400 | | 2781 | 2983 | 300 | 5000 | 2000 | | | | 1000 | | 15980 |
| 1976 | 1494 | | 400 | | 2911 | 3099 | 300 | 5000 | 2000 | | | | 1000 | 1600 | 17804 |
| 1977 | 2702 | | 400 | | 3315 | 3063 | 300 | 5000 | 2000 | | | | 1000 | 1600 | 19380 |
| 1978 | 3216 | | 400 | | 3081 | 3357 | 300 | 5000 | 2000 | | | | 1000 | 1600 | 19954 |
| 1979 | 3257 | | 400 | | 3081 | 3402 | 300 | 5154 | 2000 | 2100 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 22294 |
| 1980 | 7515 | | 400 | | 2887 | 3319 | 300 | 4995 | 2041 | 2100 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 26157 |
| 1981 | 10036 | | 400 | | 3065 | 4223 | 300 | 4804 | 2002 | 2100 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 29530 |
| 1982 | 10324 | | 400 | | 2887 | 3963 | 300 | 4450 | 1478 | 2100 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 28502 |
| 1983 | 10087 | | 400 | | 2476 | 4316 | 300 | 4402 | 1752 | 2400 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 28733 |
| 1984 | 10312 | | 400 | | 2307 | 4940 | 300 | 4694 | 1568 | 2400 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 29521 |
| 1985 | 10100 | | 400 | | 2397 | 4981 | 300 | 4002 | 2450 | 2500 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 29730 |
| 1986 | 5389 | | 400 | | 2557 | 5901 | 300 | 4430 | 2353 | 2500 | | | 1000 | 1600 | 26430 |
| 1987 | 4141 | | Purchased by | | 2560 | 7426 | 300 | 4422 | 1447 | 2500 | | | Purchased by | Ranch | 22796 |
| 1988 | 5255 | | IWWWD | | 2560 | 7889 | 173 | 3980 | 1195 | 2500 | | | 500 | Closed | 23552 |
| 1989 | 7064 | | | | 2320 | 8725 | 175 | 4205 | Purchased by | 2650 | | | 525 | | 25639 |
| 1990 | 6187 | | | | 2505 | 8600 | 170 | 3667 | IWWWD | 2650 | | | 525 | | 24304 |
| 1991 | 6737 | | | | 2406 | 7700 | 150 | 3364 | | 2650 | | | 525 | | 23532 |
| 1992 | 7104 | | | | 2528 | 7650 | 141 | 3351 | | 2650 | | | 550 | | 23974 |
| 1993 | 7701 | | | | 2607 | 7800 | 150 | 3411 | | 2650 | | | 575 | | 24894 |
| 1994 | 7504 | | | | 2607 | 8300 | 146 | 3684 | | 2650 | | | 575 | | 25466 |
| 1995 | 7427 | | | | 2710 | 8100 | 125 | 3848 | | 2650 | | | 595 | | 25455 |
| 1996 | 7807 | | | | 2620 | 8504 | 134 | 3367 | | 2650 | | | 600 | | 25682 |
| 1997 | 7800 | | | | 2522 | 8534 | 139 | 2983 | | 2650 | | | 625 | | 25253 |
| 1998 | 7800 | | | | 2527 | 7719 | 102 | 3018 | | 2700 | | | 640 | | 24506 |
| 1999 | 7800 | | | | 2537 | 8242 | 104 | 2541 | | 2700 | | | 690 | | 24614 |
| 2000 | 7800 | | | | 2701 | 8148 | 111 | 2690 | | 2800 | | | 725 | | 24975 |
| 2001 | 8150 | | | | 2732 | 8392 | 97 | 2840 | | 2800 | | | 750 | | 25761 |
| 2002 | 8460 | | | 445 | 2564 | 8865 | 115.6 | 3138 | | 2800 | 750 | | 750 | | 27887.6 |
| 2003 | 9420 | | | 616 | 2561 | 9098 | 126 | 3325 | | 2800 | 750 | | 775 | | 29471 |
| 2004 | 9370 | | | 413 | 2470 | 8992 | 118.4 | 2331 | | 2800 | 750 | | 800 | 950 | 28994.4 |
| 2005 | 9580 | | | 366 | 2504 | 8545 | 135 | 2288 | | 2800 | 750 | | 825 | 1025 | 28818 |
| 2006 | 9460 | | | 385 | 2591.2 | 8864.4 | 135 | 2440 | | 2800 | 750 | | 840 | 1050 | 29315.6 |
| 2007 | 9270 | | | 420 | 2530.4 | 9198.5 | 90.7 | 2533 | | 2800 | 750 | | 840 | 1000 | 29432.6 |
| 2008 | 8957 | | | 392 | 2520.7 | 8564.8 | 118 | 2119 | | 2800 | 750 | | 900 | 1200 | 28321.5 |
| 2009 | 9536 | | | 400 | 2534.5 | 8398.2 | 118 | 1883 | | 2800 | 750 | | 925 | 1125 | 28469.7 |
| 2010 | 9437 | | | 339 | 2586.6 | 7570 | 118 | 1710 | | 2800 | 750 | | 925 | 1050 | 27285.6 |
| 2011 | 9827 | | | 370 | 2457.5 | 7364.25 | 118 | 1734 | | 2800 | 750 | | 925 | 1050 | 27395.75 |
| 2012 | 9876 | | | 348 | 2743 | 7633.45 | 117.927 | 1710 | | 2800 | 750 | | 1062 | 800 | 27840.377 |
| 2013 | 9354 | 918 | | 423 | 2706 | 7531.69 | 117.68 | 1538 | | 2800 | 750 | | 2846 | | 27284.37 |
| 2014 | 7524 | 1,087 | | 392 | 2679 | 7318.7 | 108 | 1618 | | 1100 | 750 | | 4087 | | 26663.7 |
| 2015 | 6517 | 1,003 | | 427 | 2518 | 7050 | 90.532 | 1442 | | 1100 | 750 | | 4387 | | 25284.532 |
| 2016 | 6387 | 918 | | 373 | 2377 | 6411.8 | 102.335 | 1595 | | 1100 | 750 | | 4300 | | 24314.135 |
| Total | 315200 | 3926 | 4800 | 6109 | 110530 | 290681.79 | 7546.174 | 139706 | 26286 | 93250 | 11250 | 33062 | 12000 | 26850 | 1081196.9 |
| Avg. | 7532 | 1003 | 400 | 410 | 2638 | 6933 | 182 | 3369 | 1878 | 2491 | 750 | 1065 | 1000 | 1343 | 25778 |

(a) Spike Leroy ranch started back up in 2004 with approx. 150 acres of alfalfa x 7

(b) 2012 number is an estimate/converted to pistachio 2013

(c) Navy began aggressive water conservation program in 2007

(d) 2013 number based on March 4, 2014 letter to BOS.

2014/2015/2016 data includes 3,700 and 4,000 AF from Mojave Pistacio

"based off the UC Davis Pistachio Cost Study plus dust mitigation."

(e) 2005 Brown Road Farming changed to Meadowbrook Farms

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 5: Groundwater Sustainability Plan Schedule

Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority
GSP Development and SDAC Programs: Schedule Summary 03.22.18

| ID | Task Name | 2016 Qtr 1 | 2016 Qtr 2 | 2016 Qtr 3 | 2016 Qtr 4 | 2017 Qtr 1 | 2017 Qtr 2 | 2017 Qtr 3 | 2017 Qtr 4 | 2018 Qtr 1 | 2018 Qtr 2 | 2018 Qtr 3 | 2018 Qtr 4 | 2019 Qtr 1 | 2019 Qtr 2 | 2019 Qtr 3 | 2019 Qtr 4 | 2020 Qtr 1 |
|----|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | GSP Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Prop 1 Grant Application | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | GSP Support Studies (Recharge Study, Brackish Water Study) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Salt and Nutrient Management Plan Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Data Management System | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Numerical Groundwater Model | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Hydrogeologic Data Gap Evaluation and Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Imported Water /Alternative Sources Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Recycled Water Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | GSP Report Preparation: Develop Initial Draft and Final GSP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Public Hearing and Adoption of Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | SDAC Programs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | SDAC Water Conservation and Rebate Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | SDAC Water Audit, Leak Detection, and Leak Repair Program | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Item 6: Methods to Quantify/Report Groundwater Production

Supporting Attachments

- Table 1: Water Purveyors with Known Production over de Minimis
- Table 2: Potential Water Purveyors with Production over de Minimis

Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority

Methods to Quantify/Report Groundwater Production

The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority (GA) is considering the adoption of a “groundwater pumping assessment”, under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), and California Water Code Division 6 Part 2.74 Chapter 8 Section 10730. The GA Board has set a GA Board meeting and public workshop to publicly discuss the planned groundwater pumping assessment.

In order to levy this assessment, the GA must collect information on active wells within the Indian Wells Valley groundwater basin and collect information on the quantity of water pumped from each relevant well. SGMA provides that wells pumping two (2) acre-feet per year of water or less are considered “de minimis” pumping and will not be subject to this assessment (one acre-foot per year is approximately equivalent to 900 gallons per day). In addition, since SGMA is a state-mandated regulation, it is not enforceable upon federal agencies. Accordingly, any pumping by the United States Navy and the U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is excluded from this assessment.

Quantify/Reporting Groundwater Pumping

The accuracy and completeness of groundwater pumping information within the Indian Wells Valley groundwater basin is extremely important to the GA’s mandate to manage groundwater supplies. The GA strongly recommends that all wells owners within the basin install and maintain accurate water meters on the discharge of all wells.

When the GA adopts a DWR-approved Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the basin, the GA will be in a position to require accurate water meters be installed and maintained on all wells. This requirement is expected to be established during 2020.

It is anticipated the Board will consider adopting this assessment at its May 2018 Board meeting. If adopted at the May 2018 Board meeting, the first month of “assessed” groundwater pumping would be June 2018.

The GA staff is collecting information on all wells within the basin and associated groundwater pumping. The most current list of wells and well owners subject to this assessment is attached as Table 1 – Water Purveyors with Known Production over de Minimis. (Potential Water Purveyors with Production over de Minimis are provided in Table 2). The GA staff will continue to update Table 1 to make it complete and accurate.

For basin wells with meters, well owners would submit production data to the GA. For basin wells subject to assessments without accurate water meters, the monthly groundwater production must be determined using “alternative methods for reporting groundwater pumping”. For wells without accurate water meters, the following alternative methods may be employed by the GA staff to determine monthly groundwater pumping for GA assessment pumpers:

1. Electric Power Use. The well, or wells, must have dedicated electric power meters for the well, or wells (no other power use associated with electric meters). The well owner will provide monthly electric power use for each and a wells served by the electric meter. The GA staff will convert electronic power use to acre-feet of water pumped for GA assessment purposes. (Similar procedure for wells powered by other sources.)
2. Agricultural Use Estimates. For agricultural-use estimates, the well owner must identify all wells used for agricultural irrigation. The well owner must provide accurate agricultural acreage and type of agriculture. The GA staff will use this agricultural information to estimate annual and monthly groundwater pumping. The methods and references used by the GA staff will be provided to the well owner.

3. Comparable Use to Metered Well(s). The GA staff will consider using groundwater pumping information from “metered” wells, for “comparable” uses from “non-measured” wells, based upon the GA staff’s determination of comparability.

Well owners with “non-metered” wells are reminded that if there is dispute with GA staff regarding water use estimates using “alternative methods”, the well owner can elect to install an accurate water meter on their well. The GA will provide assistance to the extent it is capable.

Table 1 Water Purveyors with Known Production over de Minimis

| Water Purveyor | Well Name/Number | Production (acre-feet) [1] |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Indian Wells Valley Water District ^{1J} | 9a | 6,412 ^{3J} |
| | 10 | |
| | 11 | |
| | 13 | |
| | 17 | |
| | 18 | |
| | 30 | |
| | 31 | |
| | 33 | |
| | 34 | |
| | 35 (planned operation in 2019) | |
| City of Ridgecrest | NO DATA | 373 ^{3J} |
| Mojave Pistachio ^{2J} | WP0013816 | 325 ^{4J} |
| | WP0013180 | |
| | WP0014367 | |
| | WP0014430 | |
| Meadowbrook Dairy ^{2J} | WP0014114 | 6,387 ^{3J} |
| | WP0010853 | |
| | WP0009179 | |
| | WP0012242 | |
| | WP0012241 | |
| | WP0013993 | |
| Simmons Ranch | NO DATA | 918 ^{3J} |

| Water Purveyor | Well Name/Number | Production (acre-feet) [1] |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|
| Searles Valley ^{1J} | IWV Well #2 | 2,377 ^{3J} |
| | IWV Well #4 | |
| | IWV Well #30 | |
| | IWV Well #35 | |
| | IWV Well #36 | |
| Quist Farms ^{2J} | WP0002793 | 750 ^{3J} |
| Sierra Shadows Ranch (John Thomas Conaway) ^{2J} | WP0014649 | 373 ^{4J} |
| Amber Glow Ranch (Patricia Davis) ^{2J} | WP0014940 | 48 ^{4J} |
| Art Hickle (Hickle Family Trust) ^{2J} | WP0013463 | 85 ^{4J} |
| Inyokern CSD | NO DATA | 102 ^{3J} |
| Max Hovaten ^{2J} | WP0006416 | 480 ^{4J} |
| | WP0012086 | |
| | WP0014918 | |
| | WP0014919 | |

Notes:

1] Wells provided by Water purveyor.

2] Wells provided in Kern County Environmental Health Database.

3] Production data from Cooperative Group IWV Ground Water Production Estimates 1975-Present. Calendar Year 2016 Data

4] Production from IWV Farmers Group Letter to Kern County dated March 4, 2014. 2013 Data.

Table 2 Potential Water Purveyors with Production over de Minimis

| Water Purveyor ^{1]} | Well Name/Number ^{2]} | Population Served ^{3]} |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| China Lake Acres Mutual Water Company | NO DATA | 60 |
| East Inyokern Mutual Water | NO DATA | 87 |
| Hometown Water Association | NO DATA | 25 |
| Life Water Co-Op | NO DATA | 27 |
| Owens Peak West | NO DATA | 82 |
| Sierra Breeze Mutual Water Company | NO DATA | 150 |
| South Desert Mutual Water Company | WP0011177 | 26 |
| Sweet Water Co-Op | NO DATA | 47 |
| West Valley Mutual Water Company | WP0011598 | 70 |
| Buttermilk Acres | NO DATA | 60 |
| Club Oasis | NO DATA | -- |
| Dune III Mutual Water Company | NO DATA | 119 |
| Gateway Market Water System | NO DATA | 104 |
| Indian Wells Lodge | NO DATA | 47 |
| Sandy's Oasis Mobile Home Park | NO DATA | -- |

1] Purveyor in listing provided by PAC and confirmed in SDWIS database to be active. Other well owners not included in this table are listed in Kern County Environmental Health database with unknown production.

2] Data on Well Names from Kern County Environmental Health Database.

3] Population estimates from SDWIS database.