

Board Members

Richard Valle
Doug Verboon
Rusty Robinson
Robert Thayer
Kimber Regan

**Staff**

Chuck Kinney, General Manager
Laurie Avedisian-Favini,
General Counsel
Catherine Venturella, Clerk

Regular Meeting Agenda

Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026
Time: 1:00 p.m. or soon there after
Place: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS, Kings County Government Center
1400 W. Lacey Boulevard, Hanford, California 93230

☎ (559) 852-2362 ❖ bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us ❖ website: <https://www.midkingsrivergsa.org>

The meeting can be attended on the Internet by clicking this link:

<https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/280452117778360?p=QCTuSbrpJWie9LeD7e>

or by sending an email to bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us on the morning of the meeting for an automated email response with the Microsoft Teams meeting link information. Members of the public attending via Microsoft Teams will have the opportunity to provide public comment during the meeting. Remote Microsoft Teams participation for members of the public is provided for convenience only. In the event that the Microsoft Teams connection malfunctions or becomes unavailable for any reason, the Board of Supervisors reserves the right to conduct the meeting without remote access. *Microsoft Teams will be available for access at 12:55 p.m.*

Members of the public who wish to view/observe the meeting virtually can do so on the internet at:

www.countyofkingsca.gov and click on the "Join Meeting" button or by clicking this link:

https://youtube.com/live/J_Q59oq1Uvk?feature=share

****Members of the public viewing the meeting through YouTube will not have the ability to provide public comment.**

Members of the public may submit written comments on any matter within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction, regardless of whether it is on the agenda for the Board's consideration or action, and those comments may become part of the administrative record of the meeting. Comments will not be read into the record, only the names of those who have submitted comments will be read. Written comments should be directed to bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us email by 8:00 a.m. on the morning of the noticed meeting to be included in the record, those comments received after 8:00 a.m. may become part of the record of the next meeting. E-mail is not monitored during the meeting. To submit written by U.S. Mail to: Kings County Board of Supervisors, Attn: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Kings, 1400 W. Lacey Blvd., Hanford, CA 93230.

1:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL – Clerk

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

UNSCHEDULED APPEARANCES

This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the Board's jurisdiction, and which are not already on the agenda. The Board will not answer questions impromptu, and concerns or complaints will be referred to appropriate staff. For items which are on the agenda, members of the public will be provided with an opportunity to address the Board as each item is brought up for discussion. Speakers should limit their comments to not more than two (2) minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of the minutes from the regular meeting for May 12, 2026.

CONSENT CALENDAR

All items listed under the consent calendar are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. If a Board member has questions, requests additional information, or wishes to comment on an item, the vote should not be taken until after questions have been addressed or comments made, and the public has had an opportunity to comment on the Consent Calendar items.

None

REGULAR CALENDAR

- A. Stakeholder Advisory Committee update – Chip Mello, Committee Member
- B. Update to the Mid-Kings River GSA Board of Directors meeting schedule for 2026 – Chuck Kinney, General Manager
- C. Update to the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model – Chuck Kinney, General Manager
- D. Revised Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) - Chuck Kinney, General Manager
- E. Tulare Lake Subbasin Point of Contact – Chuck Kinney, General Manager
- F. Update on State Water Board and DWR communication- Amer Hussain, Engineer
- G. Update on the well registration efforts within the Watermark system – Amer Hussain, Engineer
- H. Update on the website revisions – Amer Hussain, Engineer
- I. Update on outreach efforts – Amer Hussain, Engineer

BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS OR REPORTS

On their own initiative, Board Members may make a brief announcement or a brief report on their own activities. They may ask questions for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code Section 54954.2a).

- ♦ Board Correspondence
- ♦ Correspondence and Information on Future Agenda Items

CLOSED SESSION

- ♦ None

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2026 at 1:00PM.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Mid-Kings River GSA office at (559) 852-2362 by 9:00 a.m. on the Monday prior to this meeting.
--

<i>Agenda backup information and any public records provided to the Board after the posting of the agenda will be available for the public to review at the Board of Supervisors office, 1400 W. Lacey Blvd, Hanford, for the meeting date listed on this agenda.</i>

Board Members

Richard Valle
Doug Verboon
Rusty Robinson
Robert Thayer
Kimber Regan

**Staff**

Chuck Kinney, General Manager
Laurie Avedisian-Favini,
General Counsel
Catherine Venturella, Clerk

Regular Meeting Action Summary

Date: Tuesday, May 12, 2026
Time: 1:00 p.m. or soon there after
Place: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS, Kings County Government Center
1400 W. Lacey Boulevard, Hanford, California 93230

☎ (559) 852-2362 ❖ bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us ❖ website: <https://www.midkingsrivergsa.org>

The meeting can be attended on the Internet by clicking this link:

<https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/289858038293829?p=nIZRo1Wbe06Cx2QUxb>

or by sending an email to bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us on the morning of the meeting for an automated email response with the Microsoft Teams meeting link information. Members of the public attending via Microsoft Teams will have the opportunity to provide public comment during the meeting. Remote Microsoft Teams participation for members of the public is provided for convenience only. In the event that the Microsoft Teams connection malfunctions or becomes unavailable for any reason, the Board of Supervisors reserves the right to conduct the meeting without remote access. *Microsoft Teams will be available for access at 12:55 p.m.*

Members of the public who wish to view/observe the meeting virtually can do so on the internet at:

www.countyofkingsca.gov and click on the "Join Meeting" button or by clicking this link:

https://youtube.com/live/J_Q59oq1Uvk?feature=share

****Members of the public viewing the meeting through YouTube will not have the ability to provide public comment.**

Members of the public may submit written comments on any matter within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction, regardless of whether it is on the agenda for the Board's consideration or action, and those comments may become part of the administrative record of the meeting. Comments will not be read into the record, only the names of those who have submitted comments will be read. Written comments should be directed to bosquestions@co.kings.ca.us email by 8:00 a.m. on the morning of the noticed meeting to be included in the record, those comments received after 8:00 a.m. may become part of the record of the next meeting. E-mail is not monitored during the meeting. To submit written by U.S. Mail to: Kings County Board of Supervisors, Attn: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Kings, 1400 W. Lacey Blvd., Hanford, CA 93230.

1:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL – Clerk

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ALL MEMBERS PRESENT

UNSCHEDULED APPEARANCES

This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the Board's jurisdiction, and which are not already on the agenda. The Board will not answer questions impromptu, and concerns or complaints will be referred to appropriate staff. For items which are on the agenda, members of the public will be provided with an opportunity to address the Board as each item is brought up for discussion. Speakers should limit their comments to not more than two (2) minutes.

John Chamberlin, Kings County Fire Chief, stated that he is here today to update the Board on the artificial intelligence international power plant expansion that will be taking place and be a part of Naval Air Station Lemoore in Kings County. He expressed his concerns regarding the amount of water that these types of centers take to cool and how much energy they consume.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of the minutes from the regular meeting for April 14, 2026.**

ACTION: APPROVED AS PRESENTED (DV, RT, RV, KR, RR - Aye)

CONSENT CALENDAR

All items listed under the consent calendar are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. If a Board member has questions, requests additional information, or wishes to comment on an item, the vote should not be taken until after questions have been addressed or comments made, and the public has had an opportunity to comment on the Consent Calendar items.

None

REGULAR CALENDAR

- A. Stakeholder Advisory Committee update – Garrett Gilcrease, Chairperson**

Chip Mello, Advisory Committee member, provided the Board with an update regarding the stakeholder committee's progress. Mr. Mello stated the current concern is getting the 218-election passed and funds needed for financing Mid-Kings GSA. Overall, they are still moving in a generally positive direction.

- B. Update on interactions with the State Water Board Staff – Amer Hussain, Engineer**

PUBLIC: Mark Kairis, City of Hanford Mayor, expressed his concerns on doing this same thing in the past and how can we believe this time it will be successful. Amer replied that he is confident this time is different than past attempts and he believes everyone will be able to work through the current issues and have a successful outcome. He stated well registration has been positive which does also make a difference.

ACTION: UPDATE ONLY. NO OFFICIAL ACTION TAKEN.

Overview of the Prop 218 process – Becca Quist, Provost & Pritchard

PUBLIC: NONE

ACTION: UPDATE ONLY. NO OFFICIAL ACTION TAKEN.

- D. Study Session - Draft Budget discussion to begin the Prop 218 process – Amer Hussain, Engineer**

PUBLIC: NONE

THE BOARD RECEIVED AN UPDATE AND NO OFFICIAL ACTION WAS TAKEN.

BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS OR REPORTS

On their own initiative, Board Members may make a brief announcement or a brief report on their own activities. They may ask questions for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code Section 54954.2a).

NONE

- ♦ Board Correspondence: **NONE**
- ♦ Correspondence and Information on Future Agenda Items: **NONE**

CLOSED SESSION

- ♦ **None**

ADJOURNMENT

**The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2026 at 1:00PM.
THE MEETING WASL ADJOURNED AT 2:32 P.M.**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Mid-Kings River GSA office at (559) 852-2362 by 9:00 a.m. on the Monday prior to this meeting.
--

<i>Agenda backup information and any public records provided to the Board after the posting of the agenda will be available for the public to review at the Board of Supervisors office, 1400 W. Lacey Blvd, Hanford, for the meeting date listed on this agenda.</i>



Date: June 9, 2026 December 16, 2025

To: Board of Directors

From: Mid Kings River GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Subject: Update to the Mid-Kings River GSA Board of Directors meeting schedule for 2026.

Background

At your December 16th, 2025 Regular Board meeting the 2026 regular meeting schedule was approved. Staff is proposing to update the calendar to accommodate the Prop 218 election process. It is recommended that the July meeting be rescheduled as shown below to be held on July 28, 2026 so that your Board can consider adopting the Final Engineer's Report which is required for the Prop 218 process. It is also recommended that the September meeting be scheduled as shown below to be held on September 29, 2026 so that a Public Hearing can be held for the tabulation of ballots from the Prop 218 election and possibly set an assessment rate. Separate special meetings to hear larger or more complicated items, or for other legally required reasons, may still need to be scheduled on an as needed basis. The following is the proposed updated list of dates for MKRGSA meetings for 2026 at 1:00 p.m., the calendar is as follows:

January 13, 2026

March 10, 2026

April 14, 2026

May 12, 2026

June 9, 2026

~~July 14, 2026~~ [July 28, 2026](#)

August 11, 2026

[September 29, 2026](#)

October 13, 2026

November 10, 2026

December 8, 2026

Request

Approve the updated meeting schedule for 2026.



Date: June 9, 2026

To: Board of Directors

From: Chuck Kinney, General Manager

Subject: Update to the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model

Background

In 2022, Luhdorff & Scalmanini was selected by the Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to prepare an integrated hydrologic model for the Tulare Lake Subbasin. The contract was held by the El Rico GSA and cost sharing to pay for those services were applied pursuant to “the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan” which was entered into on September 1, 2017 by the five GSAs within the Tulare Lake Subbasin. The State Water Board has been clear when speaking with other subbasins in the area that their desire is for a subbasin to have strong coordination and preferably a single Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to ensure sustainability for a subbasin. Within discussions amongst the General Managers for the five GSAs of the Tulare Lake Subbasin it was agreed that the best opportunity for success in getting out of probation, would occur if we agreed to the development of a single GSP. As part of that approach, it was also agreed that the Integrated Hydrologic Model should be updated to incorporate more current hydrology, update the surface water routing dataset during the historical simulation period, and recalibrate the model. This Model will then be used to assess whether groundwater level sustainable management criteria (SMCs) are correlated to subsidence SMCs. In addition the Model will be used to develop revised groundwater level SMCs that correlate to existing subsidence SMCs. Since the scope of work is an extension of the contract which the El Rico GSA holds with Luhdorff & Scalmanini, staff are requesting your approval to move forward with the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model Update. The cost associated with this update (\$196,143) would be shared amongst the five GSAs pursuant to the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan which was entered into on September 1, 2017. The Mid-Kings River GSAs portion pursuant to that agreement is 19.084% which would come to a total of \$37,431.93. Attached is the scope of work which is being proposed for the update of the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model.

Request

The General Manager requests the Board of Directors authorize the expenditure of \$37,431.93 to pay for the Mid-Kings River GSAs portion of the total cost to update the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model as agreed upon in the “the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan”.

May 08, 2026

LSCE File No: 26-1-069

Name: XXXXX

Address: XXXXX

E-mail: XXXXX

SUBJECT: SCOPE OF WORK – UPDATE OF
TULARE LAKE SUBBASIN INTEGRATED HYDROLOGIC MODEL

Dear Mr. XXXXX,

As requested, Luhdorff and Scalmanini, Consulting Engineers are pleased to provide this scope of work and estimated budget to update the Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model (Model). The objective of this scope is to extend the Model simulation period through the 2025 water year to encompass more current hydrology, update the surface water routing dataset during the historical simulation period, and recalibrate the Model. The Model will then be used to assess whether groundwater level sustainable management criteria (SMCs) are correlated to subsidence SMCs. In addition, the Model will be used to develop revised groundwater level SMCs that correlate to existing subsidence SMCs, if necessary. Following the Model update and recalibration, a subsequent scope of work will be developed that describes the scenarios necessary to evaluate the linkage and relationship between subsidence and groundwater level SMCs. The tasks included in this scope of work are described below.

SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work is organized in the following five tasks:

- (1) Data Acquisition, Compilation, and Analysis
- (2) Numerical Flow Model Update and Calibration
- (3) Model Projection Update
- (4) Technical Memorandum
- (5) Project Management, Meetings, and Communication

Task 1 Data Acquisition, Compilation, and Analysis

This task focuses on gathering, compiling, and evaluating data throughout the TLSB and adjacent Subbasins which overlap the existing model domain for three water years (2023-2025). In addition, surface water data for water years (1992-2022) will be revisited and updated as appropriate. This task will be similar as previous efforts and involve outreach to

TLSB groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) and other entities to obtain the requisite data to extend the model simulation period and update surface water data.

Task 2 Numerical Model Update and Calibration

This task includes updating the current TLSB numerical flow model that was developed by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE, 2024a) by adding three water years' worth of data and updating surface water data for water years (1992-2022) from Task 1. The addition of the 2023 through 2025 water years to the TLSB Model will incorporate the wet year hydrology that occurred during those three years on average, in contrast to the last three years (2020 through 2022) water years in the existing model that represented critical to dry hydrologic conditions. In addition, the addition of water years 2023 through 2025 will also enable the model to simulate the effect of GSP projects and management actions that were implemented during this time frame.

The model calibration will focus on groundwater levels and subsidence, similar to the calibration focus for the existing Model. Per GSP guidelines, model recalibration will include an analysis of model sensitivity and summary of model fit statistics.

Model results post-processing and analysis will be conducted in different forms (water budgets and critical head distribution). The model will be able to support analyses on different scales (e.g., subbasin wide or GSA scales).

Task 3 Model Projection Update

Task 3 will include the update of the three model projections spanning a 50-year period (Baseline Projection and two Climate Change Projections) that had been developed previously (LSCE, 2024b). The update is based on task 2 product which includes surface water data update, associated calibrated parameters of the flow model, and other inputs that required to run the models. The updated TLSB numerical models will have the capability to provide information on the relationship between subsidence and groundwater levels/critical head in the aquifer system in order to refine, if necessary, current groundwater level SMCs to subsidence SMCs.

Task 4 Technical Memorandum

LSCE will prepare a Technical Memorandum (TM) including a description of the work conducted and the results of the numerical model, summary of pertinent water budgets and other output results similar to what was produced for the existing model. The TM will be provided in draft for client review/comment. Comments will be addressed in a revised TM.

Task 5 Project Management, Meetings, and Communication

This task provides program management and administrative activities such as: (i) contractual arrangements, (ii) ongoing examination regarding adherence to the scope, cost estimate, and

schedule, (iii) coordination of staff resources, (iv) meeting preparation and attendance (v) billing review, and (vi) additional scoping and costing, as requested by client.

References

*Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers. **2024a.** Model Report 2025 Update – Tulare Lake Subbasin Integrated Hydrologic Model. Prepared for El Rico GSA, Mid-Kings River GSA, South Fork Kings GSA, Southwest Kings GSA, and Tri-County Water Authority GSA-Tulare Lake. November 8, 2024.*

*Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers. **2024b.** TLSB Numerical Model – Climate Projections. November 18, 2024.*

Cost Estimate

Cost estimates for individual tasks and the overall effort are provided in **Table 1**. We propose completing the work as scoped and bill on a time and material basis in accordance with our 2026 Schedule of Fees (attached), subject to change on a calendar year basis. Should the cost of services exceed this estimate, we would report the status of completed work, estimate additional cost, and receive authorization from client before proceeding.

Table 1: Cost Estimate

Task Description		Cost by Task
Task 1	Data Acquisition, Compilation, and Analysis	\$68,632
Task 2	Numerical Model Update and Calibration	\$53,968
Task 3	Model Projection Update	\$20,928
Task 4	Technical Memorandum	\$27,865
Task 5	Project Management, Meetings, and Communication	\$21,750
Sub Total		\$193,143
Direct Cost (lump sum) [1]		\$3,000
Grand Total		\$196,143

[1] Includes mileage and travel, reproduction, postage, incidentals. All deliverables will be submitted in electronic file format.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to prepare this scope of work.

Sincerely,

Luhdorff and Scalmanini
Consulting Engineers

draft

Till Angermann, PG, CHG
Sr. Principal Hydrogeologist

Mohamed Nasser, PhD
Senior Engineer

Attachment:

LSCE 2026 Schedule of Fees

2026 SCHEDULE OF FEES

ENGINEERING AND RELATED FIELD SERVICES

Professional*

Senior Principal	\$297/hr.
Principal Professional.....	\$269/hr.
Supervising Professional	\$258/hr.
Senior Professional	\$230/hr.
Project Professional	\$206/hr.
Staff Professional	\$181/hr.

Technical

Data Management Specialist	\$181/hr.
Senior GIS Analyst	\$181/hr.
GIS Specialist	\$130/hr.
Engineering Assistant/Scientist.....	\$125/hr.

Project Admin Support

Word Processing, Clerical	\$110/hr.
Digital Communications Specialist.....	\$125/hr.
Project Administrator	\$125/hr.

Professional or Technical Testimony	200% of Regular Rates
Technical Overtime (if required)	150% of Regular Rates
Outside Services/Rentals	Cost Plus 15%
Services by Associate Firms	Cost Plus 15%
Prevailing Wage Rate	\$215/hr
Vehicle Use	\$0.73/mi (or curr. IRS rate)
Subsistence	Cost Plus 15%
Copies	\$0.20 ea.
Field Equipment Rental	
Pressure Transducer	\$10/day
Ultrasonic Flow Meter	\$150/day
Multiparameter Sonde	\$125/day
Field Materials	As-Incurred

* Engineer, Geologist, Hydrogeologist, and Hydrologist

Send invoice payments to Accounts Receivable, 500 1st Street, Woodland, CA 95695 or accountsreceivable@lsce.com



Date: June 9, 2026

To: Board of Directors

From: Chuck Kinney, General Manager

Subject: Revised Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)

Background

In 2024, Geosyntec prepared a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Tulare Lake Subbasin. In April of 2024 the State Water Board placed the Tulare Lake Subbasin into probation and in May of 2024, the Mid-Kings River GSA submitted the draft GSP to the State Water Board staff for review, but due to a court injunction comments on that draft have not been delivered back to the Tulare Lake Subbasin. Following the Tulare Lake Subbasin being placed into probation the five Tulare Lake Subbasin GSAs decided it would be best if each GSA prepared an individual GSP. Over the past two years each GSA worked to develop their individual GSPs, but recognized that the State Water Board when dealing with other subbasins in the area desired those subbasins to have strong coordination and preferably a single Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to ensure sustainability for a subbasin. In recent discussions amongst the General Managers for the five GSAs of the Tulare Lake Subbasin it was agreed that the best opportunity for success in getting out of probation, would occur if we agreed to the development of a single GSP. In order to accomplish this task the General Managers thought it was best to utilize existing consultants (Geosyntec and Luhdorff & Scalmanini) which the five GSAs already have working on their GSP. The scope of work has been coordinated between the two consultants to ensure that tasks are specifically assigned to each consultant which will help to expedite the revisions made to the Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP. Tri-County Water Authority (TCWA) has agreed to serve as the lead agency to coordinate the preparation of the revised GSP. The cost associated with the revised Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP (\$1,192,204) would be shared amongst the five GSAs pursuant to "the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan" which was entered into on September 1, 2017. The Mid-Kings River GSAs portion pursuant to that agreement is 19.084% which would come to a total of \$227,520.21. Attached are the scope of work from both Geosyntec and Luhdorff & Scalmanini which are being proposed for the revised Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP.

Request

The General Manager requests the Board of Directors authorize the Mid-Kings River GSA to participate in the creation of a single GSP for the Tulare Lake Subbasin and also authorize the expenditure of \$227,520.21 to pay for the Mid-Kings River GSAs portion of the total cost to revise Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP as agreed upon in the "the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan".

June 3, 2026

Ms. Deanna Jackson
Tri-County Water Authority
944 Whitely Avenue
Corcoran, CA 93230

**Subject: Proposal to Prepare
Revised Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP**

Dear Ms. Jackson:

Geosyntec Consultants, Inc., (Geosyntec) has prepared this proposal for the preparation of the Revised Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The revised GSP is required to address the issues and comments from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) managers have agreed that the Tri-County Water Authority (TCWA) will serve as the lead agency to coordinate the preparation of the revised GSP.

Geosyntec will work closely with the GSAs and affiliated agencies, as needed, to prepare the revised GSP. In addition, we will closely coordinate with Luhdroff & Scalmanini (LSCE) for the development of the revised GSP. LSCE has prepared a similar proposal and cost estimate summarizing their work scope. Both firms have coordinated to ensure that our proposals are aligned and avoid duplication of services.

In general, Geosyntec will take the lead project coordination role with the GSAs and lead the outreach efforts. While LSCE's experience in surrounding basins will be used to address SWRCB priorities.

SCOPE OF WORK

Our scope of work will focus on updating the GSP, responding to SWRCB's comments and findings in the 2024 Final Staff Report. The scope is presented below and briefly describes the tasks associated with the GSP update. The scope of services presented are fairly broad to allow flexibility in responding to the comments and preparing the revised GSP.

Task 1: Stakeholder Engagement and Meetings

Geosyntec will coordinate with the GSA managers and the SWRCB in preparation of the revised GSP. This coordination will extend to communication and meetings with SWRCB and Department of Water Resources (DWR).

Task 1.1. Coordination Meetings

- Weekly meetings to track progress and resolve issues
- 43 meetings

Task 1.2. Weekly Technical Meetings

- Weekly meeting with LSCE to discuss technical issues related to the GSP
- 43 virtual meetings

Task 1.3. Meetings with the GSAs

- Biweekly meetings with GSAs to provide updates and address policy issues
- 20 virtual meetings

Task 1.4. Meetings with SWRCB

- Monthly meetings with SWRCB to discuss technical issues and GSP development
- 6 virtual meetings

Task 1.5. Stakeholder Outreach

- Four public workshops to present the revised GSP to stakeholders
- Two in-person workshops and two virtual workshops

Task 2: Project Coordination

As discussed above, Geosyntec will be the lead for project coordination. This includes reviewing adherence to scope and schedule.

Task 3: Prepare Revised GSP

An initial draft revised GSP will be prepared for review by the GSA managers. The initial draft is expected to include a revised Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) chapter with modified figures and tables. As much as possible, existing figures and tables will be used, but it is anticipated that some new figures and tables will be required. Some chapters will require only minor

modifications, but others—including the SMC, monitoring programs and projects, and management actions—will require substantial modifications.

Task 3.1. Executive Summary

- Lead Author: Geosyntec and LSCE
 - Revision of executive summary for Chapters and Sections Geosyntec is lead author
 - Review of executive summary for Chapters and Sections LSCE is lead author
 - ;

Task 3.2. Section 1 – Introduction

States the purpose of a GSP (as defined by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act), regulatory framework, subbasin overview, description of the sustainability goals, GSA information, and describes the framework for the interim operating agreement.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review and update Section 1, as necessary

Task 3.3. Section 2 – Plan Area

Provides a written description of the Plan Area, including a summary of the jurisdictional areas and other features depicted on area maps.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review and update Section 2, as necessary

Task 3.4. Section 3 – Basin Setting

Describes the geologic setting and hydrogeologic conceptual model for the Tulare Lake Subbasin, prepared under the direction of a professional geologist or engineer, consistent with GSP regulations. Information presented will include a summary of prior studies by the Subbasin and others, as well as groundwater conditions, water budget information, and details specific to each GSA.

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.5. Section 4 – Sustainable Management Criteria

Under this task, the existing SMC will be assessed in the context of the deficiencies outlined in the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report. SMC will be revised, as appropriate, based on the deficiencies and corrective actions. This task has been split into subtasks to align with the five applicable sustainability indicators.

Task 3.5.1. Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review and revise SMC for chronic lowering of groundwater levels
 - Conduct impacts analysis on beneficial users based on minimum thresholds
 - Discuss relationship with SMC for other sustainability indicators
 - Develop exceedance policy
 - Update well mitigation policy based on impacts analysis
 - Update and develop figures, tables, appendices

Task 3.5.2. Reduction of Groundwater Storage

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.5.3. Degraded Water Quality

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review and revise SMC for groundwater quality
 - Conduct impacts analysis on beneficial users based on MTs
 - Review publicly available groundwater contamination data for possible SMC locations
 - Develop exceedance policy
 - Update well mitigation policy based on impacts analysis
 - Update and develop figures, tables, appendices

Task 3.5.4. Land Subsidence

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.5.5. Interconnected Surface Water

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review and revise SMC for interconnected surface water
 - Map candidate interconnected reaches
 - Identify groundwater dependent ecosystems associated with surface water systems

- Review and compile datasets
- Identify data gaps
- Create plan to address data gaps

Task 3.6. Section 5 – Monitoring Network

This task will assess the existing monitoring networks for groundwater levels, groundwater storage, groundwater quality, land subsidence, and interconnected surface water. The deficiencies outlined by the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report, as they relate to the monitoring networks, will be addressed. The monitoring networks will also be revised, as needed, based on the modifications made to other chapters within the GSP. This task is divided into subtasks based on the applicable sustainability indicators.

Task 3.6.1. Monitoring Network for Groundwater Levels

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.6.2. Monitoring Network for Groundwater Storage

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.6.3. Monitoring Network for Water Quality

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review existing monitoring network
 - Ensure the network is spatially and vertically distributed to monitor impacts to beneficial uses and users, including domestic
 - Identify and address data gaps and a timeline to fill GSA-identified data gaps
 - Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices

Task 3.6.4. Monitoring Network for Land Subsidence

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Geosyntec to provide technical review and supporting documentation

Task 3.6.5. Monitoring Network for Interconnected Surface Water

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Quantify the locations, timing, and magnitude of streamflow depletion
 - Evaluate surface water monitoring needs
 - Evaluate groundwater monitoring needs

- Identify representative monitoring site locations associated with connected reaches
- Identify and address data gaps and a timeline to fill GSA-identified data gaps
- Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices
- Collaborate with LSCE in identifying wells that can be monitored for both GWL and interconnected surface water

Task 3.7. Section 6 – Projects and Management Actions to Achieve Sustainability Goal

Under this task, the Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) developed in the 2020 and 2022 GSPs for each GSA will be revisited. These PMAs will be updated, as needed, and new PMAs will be added, where appropriate. The well mitigation and exceedances policies will also be incorporated into the PMAs for each GSA.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review existing PMAs with each GSA
 - Assist GSAs to identify and develop candidate projects
 - Assist GSAs to identify and develop management actions
 - Update and develop figures and tables

Task 3.8. Section 7 – Plan Implementation

This task will address and describe the updated Plan Implementation that includes GSP implementation costs, schedule, identify funding options/alternatives, data management system, annual reporting, and periodic evaluation. This task will also include updating the well mitigation policy and development of the exceedance policy.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - Review existing policies and recommendations to coordinate
 - Develop the basin-wide well mitigation plan
 - Develop the basin-wide exceedance policy
 - Identify funding mechanisms
 - Address anticipated fee structure and financial planning
 - Update and develop figures and tables

Task 4 GSP Review and Finalization

This task encompasses the final technical review, addressing GSA and public comments, and finalization of the GSP. The following work will be completed under this task by Geosyntec:

- Conduct final technical review of the compiled GSP
- Address comments arising from Geosyntec’s final technical review of the compiled GSP (one round of comments)
- Address one round of comments from GSAs (one round of comments)
- Address comments from public comment period (one round of comments)

Geosyntec will lead the formatting and compiling of the final document with support from LSCE

SCHEDULE

Based on the anticipated completion of the updated groundwater flow model in November 2026, the current schedule is to have a draft GSP completed by February 1, 2027 for GSA review, and the final document submitted by March 30, 2027. This schedule is subject to change based on discussion with the GSAs and the SWRCB.

FEES

A summary of the estimated fees for the project is presented by task in Attachment A. The work will be performed on a time-and-materials basis in accordance with the Geosyntec 2026 Rate Schedule. The fees presented are our best estimate at this time and may vary for each task. However, we will not exceed the total amount without prior authorization.

AGREEMENT

The work is being conducted in accordance with the existing Master Service Agreement (MSA) between TCWA and Geosyntec. The terms and conditions of the MSA are still in effect and are incorporated by reference.

Ms. Deanna Jackson – Tri-County Water Authority
June 3, 2026
Page 8

CLOSURE

While we have already proceeded with the work based on prior authorization, please sign below to formalize the agreement.

Geosyntec appreciates the opportunity to continue to serve Tulare Lake Subbasin and for allowing us to provide a proposal for preparing the revised GSP. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Amer Hussain at (559) 497-2013.

Sincerely,



Amer A. Hussain, P.E.
Senior Principal Engineer

Enclosure:

Attachment A – Summary of Fees for GSP Update

Attachment B – 2026 Schedule of Fees

Ms. Deanna Jackson – Tri-County Water Authority
June 3, 2026
Page 9

By its signature below, the Tri-County Water Authority, on behalf of the Tulare Lake Subbasins GSAs, is authorizing Geosyntec Consultants to proceed in accordance with this Proposal, and agrees to the Services, Schedule, and Compensation described above and the terms and conditions of the existing Professional Services Agreement as incorporated as reference.

Name

Signature and Date

Attachment A – Summary of Fees for GSP Update

Task	Estimated Fees
Task 1 Stakeholder Engagement and Meetings	
Task 1.1 Coordination Meetings	\$21,500
Task 1.2 Weekly Technical Meeting	\$21,500
Task 1.3 Meetings with GSA	\$10,000
Task 1.4 Meetings with SWRCB	\$30,000
Task 1.5 Stakeholder Outreach	\$20,000
Task 2 Project Coordination	\$25,000
Task 3 Prepare Revised GSP	
Task 3.1 Executive Summary	\$5,000
Task 3.2 Introduction	\$5,000
Task 3.3 Plan Area	\$10,000
Task 3.4 Basin Setting	\$10,000
Task 3.4 SMCs	\$150,000
Task 3.5 Monitoring Network	\$60,000
Task 3.6 PMAs	\$120,000
Task 3.8 Plan Implementation	\$50,000
Task 4 Final GSP	\$40,000
TOTAL	\$578,000

June 03, 2026

DRAFT
Project No. 26-1-097

Mr. Jeof Wyrick
El Rico GSA
1001 Chase Ave.
Corcoran, CA 93212
Email: JWyrick@jgboswell.com

SUBJECT: DRAFT Scope and Budget for Tulare Lake Subbasin Revised Groundwater Sustainability Plan

Dear Mr. Wyrick,

The purpose of this letter is to provide the Tulare Lake Subbasin with a proposed Scope of Services, Budget, and Schedule to support the revised Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

The goal for this revised GSP is to address the issues and concerns raised by the SWRCB in advance of them issuing an interim plan, that will govern the management of the Subbasin to a sustainable condition by 2040 and beyond. The scope of services below outlines the approach LSCE proposes in collaboration with Geosyntec for the development of a revised GSP.

SCOPE OF SERVICES – A RESPONSE TO REGULATORY FEEDBACK

The Tulare Lake Subbasin is a critically over-drafted Subbasin located in Kings County. This Subbasin is managed by five groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs). On January 29, 2020, the five Subbasins submitted a single groundwater sustainability plan (2020 GSP) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to comply with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

In January 2022, the 2020 GSP was given an incomplete determination by DWR. The 2020 GSP was revised and submitted to DWR in July 2022 (2022 GSP). This 2022 GSP was deemed inadequate by DWR. In March 2023, DWR referred the Tulare Lake Subbasin to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). In March 2024, State Board Staff released their final staff report (2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report), recommending the Tulare Lake Subbasin for probation. On April 16, 2024, the Tulare Lake Subbasin was placed into probation by the SWRCB. The 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report highlighted 15 deficiencies in the GSP centered around groundwater levels, subsidence, and water quality. The summary table of deficiencies and corrective actions is included as **Attachment A**.

The proposed scope and budget herein aim to address these deficiencies in a revised GSP. Although the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report identified deficiencies in three different sustainability indicators, they touched on consistent core themes. Staff found that minimum thresholds were not protective of all beneficial users, impacts on beneficial users and uses were poorly defined, monitoring was lacking or

inadequate, and no path clear to sustainability by 2040 was outlined. Addressing these overarching themes across deficiencies is expected to lead to revisions throughout the entire GSP.

The Basin Setting chapter will need to be revised with updated data which will set the stage for the sustainable management criteria (SMCs) and monitoring network. The methodologies behind the SMCs will need to be evaluated in the context of beneficial users and uses and may need to be revised, leading to changes in the quantitative SMCs. Ensuring that the SMCs for one sustainability indicator do not inadvertently impact another may require revising SMCs for sustainability indicators that did not have deficiencies associated with them (for example, modifications to groundwater level SMCs may result in changes to the subsidence and groundwater storage SMCs).

Modifications to the SMCs would also result in new impacts analyses for all sustainability indicators. Updates to monitoring networks may also be required to ensure all beneficial users are being protected. Lastly, these changes will ultimately lead to revisions to the Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) and the well mitigation policy and the development of an exceedance policy.

The scope outlined below provides a high-level overview of the tasks to be completed in the revision of the Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP. These tasks are derived from the identified deficiencies and corresponding corrective actions documented in the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report. In addition, the scope of work includes tasks to address additional content that the SWRCB has prioritized since the development of the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report that was conducted in other subbasins such as Kern County and Delta-Mendota Subbasins. The scope and budget begin May 1, 2026, and continue through March 2027.

Task 1. Stakeholder Engagement and Meetings

LSCE will aid the TLSB team for stakeholder's communication and engagement support as part of efforts to develop the amended GSP. As part of the stakeholder support, LSCE will provide meeting materials and presentations related to tasks that LSCE undertakes as part of GSP development. Presentations may occur through in-person attendance at meetings or by remote attendance during video conference meetings.

Throughout the development of the amended GSP, and for purposes of this proposal, the following types and frequency of meetings have been priced and are included in this proposal. Subtasks are provided for ease of budgeting.

Task 1.1 – LSCE Internal Meetings

- Weekly internal meetings to track progress and resolve issues
- 48 meetings for duration of project

Task 1.2 – Weekly Technical Meetings

- Weekly meetings with Geosyntec to discuss technical issues related to the GSP
- 48 virtual meetings – in person meetings are not included in the budget

Task 1.3 – Meetings with GSAs

- Monthly meetings with GSAs and Geosyntec to discuss progress of the GSP and address policy issues
- Preparation of meeting materials including status updates and presentation slides
- 20 virtual meetings – in person meetings are not included in the budget

Task 1.4 – Meetings with SWRCB

- Monthly technical meetings with SWRCB staff to discuss technical issues, address deficiencies and corrective actions, and GSP development updates
- Preparation of technical materials and presentation slides for meetings
- 10 virtual meetings; budget does not include in-person meetings

Task 1.5 – Public Workshops

- Four total public workshops to present the revised GSP to community stakeholders.
- Two of the four workshops will be in person workshops and the remaining two will be virtual
- LSCE's scope is limited to participation in the workshops and preparation of English language presentation materials.

Task 2. GSP Revision

The revised GSP will align with the deficiencies and corrective actions as noted in the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report released in March 2024. Subtasks under this task correspond to GSP chapters. Each subtask specifies which firm will lead technical development and which firm will provide review and support. The lead author will prepare and update the relevant figures, tables and appendices for each chapter or section.

Task 2.1. Executive Summary

- Lead Author: Geosyntec and LSCE
 - Revision of executive summary for Chapters and Sections LSCE is lead author
 - Provide review

Task 2.2. Section 1 – Introduction

States the purpose of a GSP as defined by SGMA, regulatory framework, subbasin overview, description of the sustainability goals, GSA information and describes the framework for the interim operating agreement.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE to provide technical review

Task 2.3. Section 2 – Plan Area

Provides a written description of the Plan Area, including a summary of the jurisdictional areas and other features depicted on area maps.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE to provide technical review

Task 2.4. Section 3 – Basin Setting

Describes the geologic setting and hydrogeologic conceptual model for the Tulare Lake Subbasin, prepared under the direction of a professional geologist or engineer, consistent with GSP Regulations. Information presented will include a summary of prior studies by the Subbasin and others as well as groundwater conditions, water budget information and details specific to each GSA.

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Review model report and align hydrogeologic conceptual model with numerical model update
 - Update basin setting with updated data as appropriate
 - Update figures, tables and appendices
-

Task 2.5. Section 4 – Sustainable Management Criteria

Under this task, the existing Sustainable Management Criteria (SMCs) will be assessed in the context of the deficiencies outlined in the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report. SMCs will be revised as appropriate based on the deficiencies and corrective actions. This task has been split into subtasks to align with the five applicable sustainability indicators.

Task 2.5.1 Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE role:
 - Provide review and technical support for chronic lowering of groundwater levels
 - Provide review and technical support on impacts analysis on beneficial users based on MTs
 - Ensure alignment with SMCs for groundwater storage and subsidence
 - Ensure alignment with monitoring network
 - Support development of exceedance policy
 - Provide review and support in updating well mitigation policy based on impacts analysis

Task 2.5.2 Reduction of Groundwater Storage

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Review and revise SMCs for groundwater storage
 - Ensure SMC alignment with SMCs for chronic lowering of groundwater levels

- Conduct impacts analysis for beneficial use based on MTs
- Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices

Task 2.5.3 Degraded Water Quality

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE to provide technical review

Task 2.5.4 Land Subsidence

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Review critical infrastructure list
 - Review and revise SMCs to address SWRCB deficiencies
 - Conduct impacts analysis on beneficial uses, users, and critical infrastructure
 - Collaborate with public agencies
 - Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices

Task 2.5.5 Interconnected Surface Water

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE to provide technical review

Task 2.6. Section 5 – Monitoring Network

This task will assess the existing monitoring networks for groundwater levels, groundwater storage, groundwater quality, land subsidence, and interconnected surface water. The deficiencies outlined by the 2024 Final SWRCB Staff Report as they relate to the monitoring networks will be addressed. The monitoring networks will also be revised as needed based on the modifications made to other chapters within the GSP. This task is divided into subtasks based on the applicable sustainability indicators.

Task 2.6.1 Monitoring Network for Groundwater Levels

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Assess the existing monitoring network in the context of the GWL SMCs
 - Ensure the network is spatially and vertically distributed adequately to monitor impacts to beneficial users
 - Revise the monitoring network as needed
 - Collaborate with Geosyntec to identify wells that can be monitored for both GWL and GWQ
 - Identify data gaps and a timeline to fill identified data gaps by the GSAs
 - Update and develop figures, tables and appendices

Task 2.6.2 Monitoring Network for Groundwater Storage

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Assess the existing monitoring network and revise as needed

- Ensure adequate distribution of the network to assess changes in groundwater storage and compliance with SMCs
- Identify data gaps and a timeline to fill identified gaps by the GSAs
- Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices

Task 2.6.3 Monitoring Network for Water Quality

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE will provide technical review
 - Collaborate with Geosyntec in identifying wells that can be monitored for both GWL and GWQ

Task 2.6.4 Monitoring Network for Land Subsidence

- Lead Author: LSCE
 - Assess and revise current monitoring network to address deficiencies
 - Ensure network is spatially distributed to monitor for impacts to beneficial users and uses and capture undesirable results
 - Collaborate with agencies engaged in existing monitoring efforts
 - Identify data gaps and a timeline to fill identified gaps by the GSAs
 - Update and develop figures, tables, and appendices

Task 2.6.5 Monitoring Network for Interconnected Surface Water

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE will provide technical review

Table 2.7. Section 6 – Projects and Management Actions to Achieve Sustainability Goal

Under this task, the Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) developed in the 2020 and 2022 GSPs for each GSA will be revisited. These PMAs will be updated as needed and new PMAs will be added where appropriate. The well mitigation and exceedances policies will also be incorporated into the PMAs for each GSA.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE will provide technical review

Task 2.8. GSP Section 7 – Plan Implementation

This task will address and describe the updated Plan Implementation which will include GSP implementation costs, schedule, identify funding options/alternatives, data management system, annual reporting and periodic evaluation. This task will also include updating the well mitigation policy and development of the exceedance policy.

- Lead Author: Geosyntec
 - LSCE will provide technical review

Task 3 – GSP Review and Finalization

This task encompasses the final technical review, addressing GSA and public comments, and finalization of the GSP. The following work will be completed under this task by LSCE:

- Conduct final technical review of the compiled GSP
- Address comments arising from Geosyntec’s final technical review of the compiled GSP (one round of comments)
- Address one round of comments from GSAs (one round of comments)
- Address comments from public comment period (one round of comments)

LSCE assumes that Geosyntec will lead the formatting and compiling of the final document with support from LSCE as needed.

Task 4. Project Management

This task provides for project management and administrative activities such as ongoing examination regarding adherence to the scope, cost estimate, and schedule, invoicing, and billing review.

PROJECT BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

LSCE’s estimated cost to complete the scope of work outlined in this proposal is based on our current understanding of the project and our prior experience with GSP development and revisions. Our estimated budget for this work is \$614,204.

Table 1 provides the cost estimate for the full project term. The estimate includes a summary of costs by subtask, labor hours by employee classification, applicable billing rates, and anticipated direct and indirect expenses. LSCE will invoice monthly on a time-and-materials basis in accordance with our 2026 Schedule of Fees (**Attachment B**).

Fees shall remain in effect for the full contract period. LSCE will not proceed with any work that deviates from the approved scope and budget until approval to proceed is granted. LSCE has commenced work as of May 2026 on Task 1 with Geosyntec. The tasks outlined in this scope are expected to be completed by the end of March 2027. This schedule is dependent on coordination efforts with SWRCB staff and Tulare Lake Subbasin GSAs during the proposed schedule.

This scope of work, budget and schedule does not include preparation for SWRCB meetings that address the probationary status of the TLSB as the schedule for such a meeting has not been finalized at the time of the preparation of this scope of work.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to prepare this scope of work and cost estimate in support of Tulare Lake Subbasin’s GSP revisions.

Mr. Jeof Wyrick

June 03, 2026

Page 8

DRAFT

Sincerely,

LUHDORFF AND SCALMANINI
CONSULTING ENGINEERS



Will Halligan, PG
Senior Principal Hydrogeologist



Mary Morkin-Garica, PG
Senior Hydrogeologist



Pavan Dhaliwal
Senior Hydrogeologist

Attachment(s):

Table 1: Cost Estimate

Attachment A: Summary Table of Proposed Deficiencies and Potential Actions to Address Deficiencies

Attachment B: 2026 Schedule of Fees for Engineering and Field Services

Table 1: Cost Estimate
Tulare Lake GSP Support

Task Description		Cost by Task
Task 1 - Meetings and Outreach		
Task 1.1	Internal Meetings	\$47,784
Task 1.2	Weekly Technical Meetings	\$36,336
Task 1.3	Meetings with GSAs	\$19,740
Task 1.4	Meetings with SWRCB	\$30,280
Task 1.5	Public Workshops	\$10,388
Task 2 - GSP Revisions		
Task 2.1	Executive Summary	\$7,896
Task 2.2	Introduction	\$3,948
Task 2.3	Plan Area	\$3,948
Task 2.4	Basin Setting	\$74,296
Task 2.5	SMCs	\$165,340
Task 2.6	Monitoring Networks	\$128,980
Task 2.7	PMA's	\$7,896
Task 2.8	Plan Implementation	\$4,868
Task 3 - Response to Comments and Finalizing GSP		\$54,624
Task 4 - Project Management		\$12,880
SUM		\$609,204
Direct Cost (travel, lodging, other as applicable)		\$5,000
TOTAL		\$614,204



Attachment A

TULARE LAKE SUBBASIN PROBATIONARY HEARING FINAL STAFF REPORT

Appendix A – Summary Table of Proposed Deficiencies and Potential Actions to Address Deficiencies

March 2024

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency Groundwater Levels (GL)-1 – The 2022 GSP does not clearly describe the groundwater level conditions that would result in an undesirable result for the basin.	The GSP Regulations require a GSA to “describe...the processes and criteria relied upon to define undesirable results applicable to the basin.” This description must include the cause of past or potential undesirable results, “the criteria used to define when and where the effects of the groundwater conditions cause undesirable results,” and the potential effects of undesirable results on groundwater uses and users and land uses and property interests (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.26).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The 2022 GSP has not addressed the deficiency related to the definition of the undesirable result for lowering groundwater levels; it does not provide additional detail nor quantitative analysis describing the prevalence and effects of the three types of impacts to beneficial uses and users that would constitute an undesirable result.	Potential Action GL-1 – Define the undesirable result for the chronic lowering of groundwater levels consistent with SGMA. Meaningfully engage with users in the subbasin to seek and incorporate feedback on the definition of an undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels specific to the subbasin and protective of drinking water users.
Deficiency GL-2 – The GSAs did not consider all beneficial uses and users in setting SMC for groundwater levels in the 2022 GSP or adequately describe the impacts of criteria on beneficial uses and users. MTs in the A-zone would allow for significant and unreasonable water level declines.	The GSP Regulations require GSAs to set their MTs for chronic lowering of groundwater levels at “the groundwater elevation indicating a depletion of supply at a given location that may lead to undesirable results” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (c)(1)). In describing MTs, GSPs must describe how MTs “may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (b)(4)). MOs for chronic lowering of groundwater levels must be based on the same metrics and monitoring sites used for MTs. MOs must “provide a reasonable margin of operational flexibility under adverse conditions” (Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 342.30, subds. (c) & (d)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The GSP does not describe the impacts to beneficial uses and users under the given definition of undesirable results. There are issues for all three aquifer zones and the R-zone. For the A-zone, the approach will allow for significant and unreasonable conditions to occur. For the B-zone, the MTs are on average about 65 feet lower than the most historical groundwater elevations. For the B- and C-zones, it is unclear whether impacts to agricultural and industrial wells are considered undesirable results. Additionally, the well impact analysis did not consider agricultural or industrial users, and therefore it is unclear how the approach will avoid significant and unreasonable impacts for these users. For the C-zone, the approximations used for the elevation of the E-clay may lead to greater impacts that occur sooner than expected, and some wells may have been incorrectly assigned to the B-zone (and therefore subject to the B-zone SMC), rather than the C-zone. For the R-zone, it is unclear why the R-zone would be managed separately from the A-zone, and the SMC were not adequately established for this area. The 2022 GSP did not update any groundwater level MOs for any aquifer zone. Board additional issues: A Board staff analysis determined that nearly a third (31%, or 650 wells) of the 2,080 domestic wells with adequate information for analysis would be dry at MTs, and nearly a quarter (23%, or 12 wells) of the 53 public supply wells with adequate information for analysis would be dry at MTs. Virtually all wells in the A-zone would go dry at the proposed MTs. In the B-zone, a significant number of older, shallower wells or wells not reflected in the OSWCR dataset, all of which are excluded from the analysis, may still be in use and could be at risk of dewatering if groundwater levels declined to the MTs.	Potential Action GL-2 – Fill data gaps in the subbasin water budget and use the data to update the SMC to avoid undesirable results. • Potential Action GL-2a – Further investigate and quantify components of the basin water budget inflows and outflows to support resolution of basin overdraft. • Potential Action GL-2b – Set groundwater level sustainable management criteria to protect drinking water wells from dewatering at the minimum threshold elevations. Describe how minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests relative to 2015 conditions.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GL-3 – The monitoring network does not provide sufficient coverage to monitor for impacts to beneficial uses and users in the three aquifers in the subbasin (due to data gaps in A-zone coverage and inconsistent sampling).	The GSP Regulations require GSPs to include a description of the monitoring network objectives for the basin including how the GSA will “monitor impacts to the beneficial uses or users of groundwater” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.34, subd. (b)(2)). GSAs “may designate a subset of monitoring sites as representative of conditions in the basin or an area of the basin...”, known as Representative Monitoring Sites (RMSs; Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 344.36). GSAs identify MTs, MOs, and Interim Milestones at these sites. "The designation of [an RMS] shall be supported by adequate evidence demonstrating that the site reflects general conditions in the area” (Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.36, subds. (a) & (c)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The GSP does not identify any RMS wells in the R-zone, the shallow aquifer zone near the Kings River. Without data regarding this area, the GSAs will not be able to monitor or manage groundwater conditions in that area. Board additional issues: The RMS wells for which the GSAs report data have changed from year-to-year, and the GSAs’ inconsistent use of RMS locations may mask whether undesirable results in particular areas are occurring. The GSAs identified 70 RMS wells in the 2020 GSP and 56 in the 2022 GSP, and then reported groundwater levels for 49, 50, and 53 RMS wells in the WY-20, WY-21, and WY-22 Annual Reports, respectively. Some sites are monitored only once a year and very few sites are monitored more than twice a year.	Potential Action GL-3 – Fill data gaps in the groundwater level monitoring network. • Potential Action GL-3a – Use a consistent set of monitoring network wells from year to year. • Potential Action GL-3b – Establish additional monitoring wells in the A-zone and establish monitoring wells in the R-zone to monitor impacts to drinking water users and begin gathering data on surface water-groundwater interactions.
Deficiency GL-4 – The 2022 GSP’s discussion of well impact mitigation lacks important details and the GSP does not explain how well impact mitigation fits into the GSAs’ approach for avoiding undesirable results.	Although SGMA and the GSP Regulations do not require development of a well impact mitigation plan, many GSAs have proposed to couple such plans with MTs to allow for greater groundwater level declines while avoiding undesirable results.	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The Mitigation Plan Framework proposed in the 2022 GSP does not provide details on how claims for well mitigation will be evaluated. The Mitigation Plan Framework does not say whether impacted agricultural or industrial wells will be mitigated, nor whether wells in the C-zone will be mitigated at all. The DWR 2022 GSP Inadequate Determination states, “Department staff do not believe sufficient details related to the framework have been provided; therefore, are unable to assess whether the GSAs have established sustainable management criteria based on a commensurate level of understanding of the basin setting or whether the interests of beneficial uses and users have been considered.” Board additional issues: The Mitigation Plan Framework (Appendix D) suggests that GSAs will not mitigate impacted public supply wells, irrigation wells, or industrial wells. Due to the lack of details, Board staff cannot assess how the future mitigation plans may work in tandem with SMC to avoid undesirable results related to chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Potential Action GL-4 – Establish accessible, comprehensive, and appropriately funded well impact mitigation programs that mitigate impacts to wells affected by lowering of groundwater levels and degradation of water quality. • Potential Action GL-4a – Develop well mitigation programs with clear triggers, eligibility requirements, metrics, and funding sources. (This action supports addressing both Deficiency GL-4 and Deficiency GWQ-5b.) • Potential Action GL-4b – Evaluate how small farms wells will be impacted.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GL-5 – The 2022 GSP does not describe a feasible path for halting chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Each GSP is required to include a description of the projects and management actions the GSA has determined will achieve groundwater sustainability in the basin. The description must include project management actions, summary of data used to support proposed actions, and a review of the uncertainty associated with the basin setting when developing projects or management actions (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.44). More fundamentally, for basins in a condition of overdraft, the GSP “shall describe projects or management actions, including a quantification of demand reduction or other methods, for the mitigation of overdraft” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.44, subd. (b)(2)). GSPs need to include a description of the management of groundwater extractions and recharge to ensure that chronic lowering of groundwater levels or depletion of supply during periods of drought is offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.44, subd. (b)(9)). In reviewing GSPs, DWR must consider, among other questions, “whether sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions are commensurate with the level of understanding of the basin setting, based on the level of uncertainty, as reflected in the plan” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 355.4, subd. (b)(3)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: If the GSP retains MTs that allow for continued groundwater level decline, then the GSP should explain the anticipated effects of that decline on beneficial uses and users and should clearly explain whether PMAs have been identified to address impacts to those uses and users. The 2022 GSP does not have any discussion on how PMAs were factored into the establishment of the MTs for groundwater levels. If the GSP does not include PMAs to address impacts to uses and users, then it should clearly explain the rationale and analysis that led to that decision. Board additional issues: Board staff has determined that the 2022 GSP does not demonstrate that projects and management actions are feasible or sufficient to prevent undesirable results. The 2022 GSP relies substantially on new surface water supplies to mitigate overdraft, but the GSP does not assess the feasibility of new supply projects based on water availability and climate change impacts to surface supplies. The 2022 GSP does not contain a groundwater allocations plan, though it indicates that groundwater assessment and allocation plans will be developed in 2023 and implemented in 2025 (2022 Tulare Lake Subbasin GSP Addendum, Table 6-5). Otherwise, demand management actions in the 2022 GSP appear voluntary and therefore unlikely to provide sufficient contingency in case GSAs fail to secure new supplies or overdraft is greater than estimated.	Potential Action GL-5 – Plan ahead for drought conditions and commit to managing demand. • Potential Action GL-5a – Evaluate the feasibility of proposed supply augmentation projects. • Potential Action GL-5b – Develop basin-wide allocations or utilize another demand management structure to help bring the subbasin into balance and meet basin sustainability goals. • Potential Action GL-5c – Identify key indicator wells in each aquifer, with sufficient spatial coverage to represent beneficial uses and users in each aquifer and identify groundwater levels that will trigger specific demand management.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GL-6 – The GSAs do not consider the effects on other sustainability indicators, such as groundwater storage, subsidence, degradation of groundwater quality, and depletions of interconnected surface water.	In describing MTs, a GSA must explain “how the [GSA] has determined that basin conditions at each minimum threshold will avoid undesirable results for each of the sustainability indicators” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (b)(3)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The DWR Inadequate Determination noted that the B-zone MTs at most of the RMS wells are substantially below historical lows, which are in turn often below 2015 levels. Consequently, “given these changes, Department staff believe the revised GSP should have included an updated discussion on impacts to other sustainability indicators, such as subsidence.” DWR also noted that, for C-zone MTs, “the GSAs did not consider...effects on groundwater storage and subsidence.” Board additional issues: Board staff notes that the 2022 GSP did not describe the effects of MTs on degradation of groundwater quality if groundwater levels decline to the MTs in the A-, B-, and C-zones. The potential migration of de-designated water if groundwater elevations decline to MTs was not addressed in the 2022 GSP. Board staff also notes that declining groundwater levels may result in the migration of shallow constituents into wells. Additionally, declining groundwater levels may require existing wells to be deepened; newly deepened wells may be impacted by an existing constituent of concern, prohibiting the intended beneficial use for those wells. The 2022 GSP also does not discuss the impact of MTs in the R-zone and the A-zone on depletions of interconnected surface water.	Potential Action GL-6 – Describe the relationship between MTs for each sustainability indicator. Revise groundwater level MTs as necessary to avoid undesirable results for other sustainability indicators.
Deficiency Land Subsidence (LS)-1 - The 2022 GSP does not clearly describe the subsidence conditions that would result in an undesirable result for the basin.	The GSP Regulations require a GSA to “describe...the processes and criteria relied upon to define undesirable results applicable to the basin.” This description must include the cause of past or potential undesirable results, “the criteria used to define when and where the effects of the groundwater conditions cause undesirable results,” and the potential effects of undesirable results on groundwater uses and users, land uses, and property interests (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.26).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: “The GSP has not defined the limits of what is considered economically feasible nor the tolerable amount of subsidence for the critical infrastructure.” This is problematic, because the 2022 GSP defines an undesirable result as “the significant loss of functionality of critical infrastructure or facility, so the feature(s) cannot be operated as designed, requiring either retrofitting or replacement to a point that is economically unfeasible.” Board additional issues: None.	Potential Action LS-1 – Clearly define the subsidence conditions that would result in an undesirable result for the basin and provide enough detail that associated MTs can be determined (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 354.28).

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency LS-2 - The GSAs did not consider all beneficial uses and users in setting quantitative criteria for subsidence in the 2022 GSP or adequately describe the impacts of criteria on beneficial uses and users. • Deficiency LS-2a – MTs were not established based on avoiding undesirable results. • Deficiency LS-2b – Some MTs appear to exceed subsidence limits set in other pre-existing agreements. • Deficiency LS-2c – MOs and IMs were not established.	Minimum thresholds are the numeric values used to define undesirable results. Measurable objectives are specific, quantifiable goals for the maintenance or improvement of groundwater conditions to achieve the sustainability goal for the basin. The GSP Regulations state that MTs for land subsidence should identify the rate and extent of subsidence that substantially interferes with surface land uses and may lead to undesirable results. These quantitative values should be supported by: the identification of land use or property interests potentially affected by land subsidence; an explanation of how impacts to those land use or property interests were considered when establishing minimum thresholds; and maps or graphs showing the rates and extents of land subsidence defined by the minimum thresholds (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (c)(5)). MOs for land subsidence must be based on the same metrics and monitoring sites used for MTs. MOs must “provide a reasonable margin of operational flexibility under adverse condition.” (Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 342.30, subds. (c) & (d)). GSAs must also establish interim milestones (IMs) for each sustainability indicator, “using the same metric as the measurable objective, in increments of five years.” These IMs support the GSP’s description of “a reasonable path to achieve the sustainability goal for the basin within 20 years of implementation” (Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 342.30, subd. (e)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • LS-2a - The DWR Inadequate Determination found that “the GSAs have not established minimum thresholds based on the level of subsidence that would substantially interfere with land surface use and avoid undesirable results.” Instead, the 2022 GSP established MTs by estimating the cumulative subsidence that would occur by 2040 if GSAs took no action, and then adjusted the estimated subsidence based on the anticipated benefits of projects and management actions. • LS-2b - The DWR Inadequate Determination notes that MTs for eight RMS appear to exceed the maximum subsidence allowed along the California Aqueduct per an agreement with the DWR State Water Project managers. • LS-2c - The DWR Inadequate Determination found that “measurable objectives have not been established for subsidence.” Instead, the 2022 GSP claimed that the “measurable objective for subsidence will ultimately be achieved through the MTs and MOs set for groundwater levels and storage, which is expected to result in decreasing subsidence over time.” Board additional issues: • LS-2a - The 2022 GSP indicates that subsidence MTs are listed in GSP Table 3-2; however, GSP Table 3-2 does not list MTs. Instead, it lists baseline and implementation subsidence values. Board staff therefore must interpret that the implementation subsidence values are the minimum thresholds based on MT methodology language. MTs are fundamental to GSPs and should not be left to interpretation. • LS-2b – None. • LS-2c – Board staff note that, because MTs and MOs will need to be updated, IMs will need to be updated as well.	Potential Action LS-2 – Develop quantitative criteria that avoid undesirable results and conform with other legal agreements. • Potential Action LS-2a – Define and clearly list MTs based on the level of subsidence at each RMS that would cause the undesirable results conditions that the GSAs are trying to avoid. • Potential Action LS-2b – Ensure MTs conform with current agreements with other agencies. • Potential Action LS-2c – Establish MOs that avoid undesirable results and provide operational flexibility so that potential future droughts do not cause MT exceedances. Establish IMs that provide a reasonable path to achieving sustainable management.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency LS-3 – The GSAs did not adequately consider the impacts of subsidence on flood protection infrastructure.	MTs for land subsidence must be supported by, in part, “identification of land uses and property interests that have been affected or are likely to be affected by land subsidence in the basin, including an explanation of how the [GSA] has determined and considered those uses and interests, and the [GSA’s] rationale for establishing minimum thresholds in light of those effects” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (c)(5)(A)). The GSP must also include a description of beneficial uses and users in the basin, “the types of parties representing those interests, and the nature of consultation with those parties” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.10, subd. (a)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Infrastructure Impacts - The 2022 GSP did not adequately consider the impacts of subsidence on flood protection infrastructure. Specifically, the DWR Inadequate Determination noted problems with how the GSP considered impacts from reduced crown elevations and differential subsidence. • Lowered Crown Elevations - The 2022 GSP states that “the elevation of the flood protection levees and the elevation of the flood-prone areas (i.e., floodplain) generally decrease uniformly. With little or no differential movement between the crown of the levee and the floodplain, the performance of the levee is unaffected.” The DWR Inadequate Determination found that the GSP “fails to mention that if subsidence occurs, there is a risk of reducing the conveyance capacity of the channels and reduction of freeboard.” • Differential Subsidence - The 2022 GSP states that “levees are flexible earthen structures that can tolerate typical differential longitudinal settlement that occurs due to variability of soils in their foundation. As such, there is very little literature on performance limits of levees affected by differential settlement along their longitudinal axis.” DWR notes that “Regulations do not differentiate between residual and differential subsidence; therefore, total subsidence must be considered.” • Failure to coordinate with flood management agencies - The DWR Inadequate Determination found that the 2022 GSP did not adequately coordinate with flood management agencies, despite being asked to do so. Board additional issues: • Infrastructure Impacts - Areas with increased subsidence rates landside of levees can experience higher inundation if flooded. • Lowered Crown Elevations - Reduced channel capacity also increases risk of slope failure and piping through and under the levee due to increased hydraulic head above the landside levee toe. • Differential Subsidence - The extent and magnitude of differential settlement from foundational soils is substantially different than the extent and magnitude of differential subsidence. Moreover, the uncertainty of impacts of longitudinal differential subsidence should be a reason for GSAs to minimize subsidence, especially in areas where levees may be constructed with dispersive soils (soils which may easily dissolve into solution and erode), which substantially increase risks of piping in cracks through levees. • Failure to coordinate with flood management agencies - None; however, Board staff note that the 2022 GSP noted conversations with flood management agencies but failed to explain how those conversations were considered in developing SMC.	Potential Action LS-3 – Consult with flood management agencies and expand the GSP’s analysis of land subsidence impacts on flood infrastructure. • Potential Action LS-3a – Engage with flood management agencies. • Potential Action LS-3b – When establishing undesirable results and MTs, evaluate the impacts of reduced channel capacity, uncertainty around longitudinal differential subsidence, and increased inundation depths.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency LS-4 – The GSP does not provide adequate implementation details.	Each GSP is required to include a description of the projects and management actions the GSA has determined will achieve groundwater sustainability in the basin. The description must include project management actions, summary of data used to support proposed actions, and a review of the uncertainty associated with the basin setting when developing projects or management actions (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.44). In reviewing GSPs, DWR must consider, among other questions, “whether sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions are commensurate with the level of understanding of the basin setting, based on the level of uncertainty, as reflected in the plan” and “whether the projects and management actions are feasible and likely to prevent undesirable results and ensure that the basin is operated within its sustainable yield” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 355.4, subd. (b)(3), (b)(5)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: The DWR Inadequate Determination found that the 2022 GSP did not provide adequate project and management action detail to “determine if projects and management actions will assist in minimizing and avoiding subsidence in the Subbasin beyond 2040.” DWR further noted that “two monitoring sites (LEMA and CRCN) have exceeded their identified cumulative allowable subsidence.” Board additional issues: None.	Potential Action LS-4 – Plan ahead to avoid significant and unreasonable land subsidence. • Potential Action LS-4a – Develop a plan to trigger management actions when subsidence exceeds defined thresholds, especially near critical infrastructure/facilities. • Potential Action LS-4b – Update the Well Registration Program to meet subsidence goals in the subbasin; Do not allow new wells in areas where subsidence threatens critical infrastructure. • Potential Action LS-4c – Develop infrastructure mitigation programs with clear triggers, eligibility requirements, metrics, and funding sources.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency Groundwater Quality (GWQ)-1 – The 2022 GSP’s definition of an undesirable result is not consistent with GSP Regulations. • Deficiency GWQ-1a – The 2022 GSP does not clearly describe the water quality conditions and impacts that would result in an undesirable result for the basin. • Deficiency GWQ-1b – The triggers for determining an undesirable result set by the 2022 GSP would result in delayed identification of an undesirable result and therefore delayed management of the basin. • Deficiency GWQ-1c – The GSP does not describe how it would determine whether significant and unreasonable degradation of water quality was associated with basin management.	The GSP Regulations require a GSA to “describe...the processes and criteria relied upon to define undesirable results applicable to the basin.” This description must include the cause of past or potential undesirable results, “the criteria used to define when and where the effects of the groundwater conditions cause undesirable results,” and the potential effects of undesirable results on groundwater uses and users and land uses and property interests (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.26).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Deficiency GWQ-1a Neither the water quality undesirable result nor its impacts to beneficial uses and users is adequately described. The 2022 GSP describes the undesirable results as “...significant and unreasonable reduction in long-term viability of domestic, agricultural, municipal, or environmental uses over the planning and implementation horizon of this GSP.” DWR staff note that “it is unclear... what constitutes a significant and unreasonable reduction in viability of groundwater use for the identified beneficial uses,” and specifically note that it is unclear what “long-term viability means to the GSAs.” • Deficiency GWQ-1b - The GSAs would "not be actively monitoring the Subbasin to avoid an undesirable result..." GSAs will not evaluate constituent data to determine if undesirable results may be occurring unless analysis indicates a positive trend. This trend analysis, however, will not even be conducted until “at least six samples have been collected for each analyte at each representative monitoring site.” Some analytes at some monitoring sites are sampled only once every four years, indicating that trend analysis would sometimes not be conducted until the year 2046. • Deficiency GWQ-1c - The GSP does not describe how it will determine the “causal nexus”, essentially, whether degradation of water quality is associated with basin management. The GSP describes an undesirable result occurring only if it is “stemming from a causal nexus between groundwater-related GSP activities... and a degradation in groundwater quality...” Board additional issues: • Deficiency GWQ-1a - Without a clear description of impacts that are significant and unreasonable, GSAs and Board staff cannot evaluate whether MTs or broader quantitative definitions of an undesirable result that would guide day-to-day basin management are appropriate for avoiding undesirable results. • Deficiency GWQ-1b - Board staff is also concerned that trend analysis may result in avoiding undesirable results on paper only, no matter the impacts to beneficial uses and users. Depending on the analysis time period, monitoring frequency, the selected confidence interval, and other technical details, trend analysis may delay or effectively prevent identification of undesirable results. Unless trends are detected, the 2022 GSP identifies an undesirable result only when a full quarter of all wells exceed MTs for two consecutive measurements. • Deficiency GWQ-1c – The 2022 GSP lacks crucial, related information on (1) the impact of projects and management actions on water quality, and (2) the impact of subsidence on water quality.	Potential Action GWQ-1 – Update the definition of an undesirable result to be consistent with GSP Regulations. • Potential Action GWQ-1a – Clearly describe the water quality conditions and impacts that would result in an undesirable result or the basin. • Potential Action GWQ-1b – Do not rely on trend detection or other methods that may delay identification of undesirable results. • Potential Action GWQ-1c – Explain how the “causal nexus,” as outlined in the GSP, will be evaluated. Add information about the impacts of basin management on groundwater quality. Include the criteria and evidence to be used to make the determination that significant and unreasonable degradation of groundwater quality is or is not caused by basin management.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GWQ-2 – Minimum thresholds set by the 2022 GSP are not consistent with GSP Regulations. • Deficiency GWQ-2a – The 2022 GSP establishes minimum thresholds that exceed regulatory water quality thresholds without explaining how that would not cause significant and unreasonable results or impacts to beneficial uses and users. • Deficiency GWQ-2b – Some MTs are inexplicably based on data that may represent undesirable results. • Deficiency GWQ-2c – The GSP does not explain how it quantifies “current conditions,” yet uses current conditions to justify establishing MTs that exceed MCLs or SMCLs. • Deficiency GWQ-2d – MTs are sometimes set to the highest detected concentrations. • Deficiency GWQ-2e – MTs at some wells are based on data from wells nearby the RMS wells, rather than from the RMS wells themselves, without justification.	The GSP Regulations require GSAs to base their MTs for degradation of water quality on “the number of supply wells, a volume of water, or a location of an isocontour that exceeds concentrations of constituents determined by the Agency to be of concern for the basin.” Also, GSAs must consider “local, state, and federal water quality standards applicable to the basin” in setting MTs (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (c)(4)). In describing MTs, GSPs must describe how MTs “may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.28, subd. (b)(4)). The plan may, but is not required to, address undesirable results that occurred before, and have not been corrected by, January 1, 2015.	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Deficiency GWQ-2a – The 2022 GSP establishes many MTs that exceed primary MCLs or upper SMCLs yet does not explain how exceeding health- or quality-protective standards is not an undesirable result. While GSAs are not required to address undesirable results for groundwater quality that occurred prior to January 1, 2015, pre-2015 undesirable results should still be identified and MTs established accordingly. • Deficiency GWQ-2b – The 2022 GSP appears to establish MTs from historical data when current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs; however, the DWR Inadequate Determination notes that this historical data ranges from 2000 to 2020, which “may include data that would be considered undesirable results.” • Deficiency GWQ-2c – None. • Deficiency GWQ-2d – None. • Deficiency GWQ-2e – The DWR Inadequate Determination notes that some MTs are calculated with data from nearby wells. DWR staff note that 1) it is not clear why MTs for a specific RMS would be based on data from other wells, and 2) the GSP does not provide supporting information, making review of nearby data impossible. Board additional issues: • Deficiency GWQ-2a – None. • Deficiency GWQ-2b – GSAs should not use exceedances between 2015 and 2020 to establish MTs that exceed MCLs or SMCLs or may otherwise indicate undesirable results. • Deficiency GWQ-2c – The 2022 GSP appears to establish MTs from historical data when current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs; however, Board staff note that the GSP does not appear to explain how it determines current conditions. For example, it does not explain how many exceedances the GSP requires before it concludes that current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs or whether it relies on a percentage of exceedances. This information is crucial for reviewing divergence from established, health-protective standards like MCLs. • Deficiency GWQ-2d – Board staff note that the 2022 GSP appears to set MTs at the highest observed concentration in these cases. While GSAs are not required to address undesirable results for groundwater quality that occurred before 2015, Board staff strongly object to using the highest detected concentration as a baseline for pre-2015 conditions. • Deficiency GWQ-2e – The GSP does not clearly indicate which MTs rely on nearby data. Without supporting information, these MTs cannot be reviewed to assess whether use of nearby well data is appropriate.	Potential Action GWQ-2 – Update minimum thresholds to be consistent with GSP Regulations. • Potential Action GWQ-2a – Establish minimum thresholds that do not inexplicably exceed regulatory water quality thresholds. • Potential Action GWQ-2b – Don’t base pre-2015 conditions and MTs on current conditions; use pre-2015 conditions instead. • Potential Action GWQ-2c – Fully explain how pre-2015 conditions are characterized. • Potential Action GWQ-2d – Do not establish MTs that would allow for substantial degradation of water quality. • Potential Action GWQ-2e – Do not use data from nearby wells when developing MTs without justification.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GWQ-3 – Measurable Objectives set by the 2022 GSP for groundwater quality are not consistent with GSP Regulations. • Deficiency GWQ-3a – The 2022 GSP allows MOs that exceed regulatory water quality thresholds (e.g., MCLs) without explaining how that would not cause significant and unreasonable results or impacts to beneficial uses and users. • Deficiency GWQ-3b – Some MOs are inexplicably based on data that may represent undesirable results. • Deficiency GWQ-3c – The GSP does not explain how it quantifies current conditions, yet the GSP uses current conditions to justify establishing MOs that exceed MCLs or SMCLs. • Deficiency GWQ-3d – MOs are sometimes effectively set to 95th percentile concentrations. • Deficiency GWQ-3e – MOs at some wells are based on data from wells nearby the RMS wells, rather than from the RMS wells themselves, without justification. • Deficiency GWQ-3f – The 2022 GSP establishes measurable objectives that may vary over time without explanation of how that would provide operational flexibility while avoiding significant and unreasonable results or impacts to beneficial uses and users.	MOs for water quality degradation must be based on the same metrics and monitoring sites used for MTs. MOs must “provide a reasonable margin of operational flexibility under adverse conditions” (Cal Code Regs., tit. 23, § 342.30, subds. (c) & (d)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Deficiency GWQ-3a – The 2022 GSP establishes many MOs that exceed primary MCLs or upper SMCLs yet does not explain how exceeding health- or quality-protective standards is not an undesirable result. While GSAs are not required to address undesirable results for groundwater quality that occurred prior to January 1, 2015, pre-2015 undesirable results should still be identified and MOs established accordingly. • Deficiency GWQ-3b – 2022 GSP appears to establish MOs from historical data when current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs; however, this historical data ranges from 2000 to 2020. While GSAs are not required to address undesirable results for groundwater quality that occurred prior to 2015, GSAs are responsible for addressing degradation of water quality after 2015. GSAs should therefore not use exceedances between 2015 and 2020 to establish MOs that exceed MCLs or SMCLs or may otherwise indicate undesirable results. • Deficiency GWQ-3c & 3d – None. • Deficiency GWQ-3e – Some MOs are calculated with data from nearby wells. • Deficiency GWQ-3f – The MO approach results in “dynamic measurable objectives that may change from year to year.” Specifically, if MOs are always set to the 95th percentile, then they will become less protective of water quality as water quality degrades, because the 95th percentile will increase along average concentrations increase. Moreover, if average concentrations increase steadily without significant variation, it is possible for indefinite degradation of water quality to never exceed MOs. Board additional issues: • Deficiency GWQ-3a & 3b – None. • Deficiency GWQ-3c – The 2022 GSP appears to establish MOs from historical data when current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs; however, the GSP does not explain how it determines current conditions. It does not explain how many exceedances the GSP requires before it concludes that current conditions exceed MCLs or SMCLs, or whether it relies on a percentage of exceedances. The 2022 GSP appears to assess current conditions from data between 2000 and 2020. GSAs should therefore not use exceedances between 2015 and 2020 to justify abandoning MCLs. • Deficiency GWQ-3d – The 2022 GSP appears to set some MOs at concentrations representing the 95th percentile. Board staff interpret that MOs are effectively set at concentrations that are higher than 95% of all other observed concentrations. These concentrations do not actually represent current conditions and that managing to these MOs would result in degradation of groundwater quality. • Deficiency GWQ-3e –It is not clear why MOs for a specific RMS would be based on data from other wells. The GSP does not provide supporting information, making review of nearby data impossible. It appears the GSP does not clearly indicate which MOs rely on nearby data. • Deficiency GWQ-3f – None.	Potential Action GWQ-3 – Update MOs to be consistent with GSP Regulations. • Potential Action GWQ-3a – Establish measurable objectives that do not inexplicably exceed regulatory water quality thresholds. • Potential Action GWQ-3b – Don't base pre-2015 conditions and MOs on current conditions; use pre-2015 conditions instead. • Potential Action GWQ-3c – Do not establish MOs that would allow for substantial degradation of water quality. • Potential Action GWQ-3d – Do not inexplicably use data from nearby wells when developing MOs. • Potential Action GWQ-3e – Do not use measurable objectives that may vary over time.

Deficiency	What SGMA Requires	Deficiency Summary	Potential Actions to Correct the Deficiency
Deficiency GWQ-4 – The water quality monitoring plan in the 2022 GSP is not consistent with GSP regulations. • Deficiency GWQ-4a – The GSP does not monitor or manage the aquifer below the de-designated zone. • Deficiency GWQ-4b – The proposed monitoring frequency is insufficient to detect short-term and seasonal trends. • Deficiency GWQ-4c – The proposed monitoring network does not adequately monitor key aquifers. • Deficiency GWQ-4d – The proposed sampling plan relies entirely on other agencies, despite temporal and spatial data gaps in those networks.	The GSP Regulations require GSPs to include a description of the monitoring network objectives for the basin including how the GSA will “monitor impacts to the beneficial uses or users of groundwater” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.34, subd. (b)(2)). The monitoring network must be “capable of collecting sufficient data to demonstrate short-term, seasonal, and long-term trends in groundwater and related surface conditions, and yield representative information about groundwater conditions as necessary to evaluate [GSP] implementation” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.34, subd. (a)). Data collected must be of “sufficient quality, frequency, and distribution” to characterize and evaluate groundwater conditions (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.32).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Deficiency GWQ-4a – The DWR Inadequate Determination finds that “the GSAs are not monitoring zones which fall outside the de-designated areas” and that “the GSAs are overextending the de-designated area”. The 2022 GSP does not monitor the aquifer below the de-designated area. The de-designation resolution includes a depth boundary; the aquifer below the de-designated area has not been de-designated and should therefore be monitored. • Deficiency GWQ-4b – The 2022 GSP has not explained how the proposed monitoring frequency is sufficient to demonstrate short-term and seasonal trends. • Deficiency GWQ-4c – There are data gaps in the 2022 GSP monitoring network. • Deficiency GWQ-4d – The DWR 2022 GSP Inadequate Determination notes that, while GSAs can leverage other programs that monitor water quality, the GSP fails to “explain how activities in those programs are consistent with SGMA and the GSP Regulations...”. Board additional issues: • Deficiency GWQ-4a – None. • Deficiency GWQ-4b – Board staff note that nearly a third of wells appear to be sampled for arsenic only once every four years. Additionally, it is not clear in which seasons wells will be sampled, given irregular sampling frequencies (e.g., three or nine times a year). • Deficiency GWQ-4c – The monitoring plan does not include sampling wells known to be screened in the A aquifer zone at all, while only three wells known to be screened in the B aquifer zone are included in the planned sampling. Additionally, the GSAs do not know which aquifer six of its wells are screened within, and therefore, they do not know which aquifer the samples represent. • Deficiency GWQ-4d – GSAs have a statutory obligation to avoid undesirable results associated with degradation of water quality, no matter the availability of other sampling programs that they can leverage.	Potential Action GWQ-4 – Update the water quality monitoring plan in the 2022 GSP to be consistent with GSP regulations. • Potential Action GWQ-4a – Monitor and manage the aquifer below the de-designated zone. • Potential Action GWQ-4b – Increase monitoring frequency and better describe monitoring schedules. • Potential Action GWQ-4c – Adequately monitor key aquifers. • Potential Action GWQ-4d – Add GSA monitoring capacity.
Deficiency GWQ-5 – The proposed management actions do not address to water quality degradation. • Deficiency GWQ-5a – Additional sampling is not triggered when MTs are exceeded. • Deficiency GWQ-5b – Well mitigation plans do not address MT exceedances.	Each GSP is required to include a description of the projects and management actions the GSA has determined will achieve groundwater sustainability in the basin. The GSAs must include projects and management actions “that may be utilized to meet interim milestones, the exceedance of minimum thresholds, or where undesirable results have occurred or are imminent” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 354.44, subd. (b)(1)).	DWR Inadequate Determination summary: • Deficiency GWQ-5a – None. • Deficiency GWQ-5b – None. Board additional issues: • Deficiency GWQ-5a – The 2022 GSP does not include management actions that are responsive to MT exceedances. It is difficult to understand how the GSAs can avoid significant and unreasonable impacts from degradation of groundwater quality if MT exceedances don’t trigger additional monitoring to better characterize risks to drinking water users. • Deficiency GWQ-5b – It is difficult to understand how GSAs can avoid significant and unreasonable impacts from degradation of groundwater quality if the GSAs have not even developed—let alone implemented—a well mitigation plan to address MT exceedances.	Potential Action GWQ-5 – Plan additional sampling when water quality is degraded. Potential Action GL-4a – Develop well mitigation programs with clear triggers, eligibility requirements, metrics, and funding sources. (This action supports addressing both Deficiency GL-4 and Deficiency GWQ-5b.)

2026 SCHEDULE OF FEES ENGINEERING AND RELATED FIELD SERVICES

Professional*

Senior Principal	\$297/hr.
Principal Professional.....	\$269/hr.
Supervising Professional	\$258/hr.
Senior Professional	\$230/hr.
Project Professional	\$206/hr.
Staff Professional	\$181/hr.

Technical

Data Management Specialist	\$181/hr.
Senior GIS Analyst	\$181/hr.
GIS Specialist	\$130/hr.
Engineering Assistant/Scientist.....	\$125/hr.

Project Admin Support

Word Processing, Clerical	\$110/hr.
Digital Communications Specialist.....	\$125/hr.
Project Administrator	\$125/hr.

Professional or Technical Testimony	200% of Regular Rates
Technical Overtime (if required)	150% of Regular Rates
Outside Services/Rentals	Cost Plus 15%
Services by Associate Firms	Cost Plus 15%
Prevailing Wage Rate	\$215/hr
Vehicle Use	\$0.73/mi (or curr. IRS rate)
Subsistence	Cost Plus 15%
Copies	\$0.20 ea.
Field Equipment Rental	
Pressure Transducer	\$10/day
Ultrasonic Flow Meter	\$150/day
Multiparameter Sonde	\$125/day
Field Materials	As-Incurred

* Engineer, Geologist, Hydrogeologist, and Hydrologist

Send invoice payments to Accounts Receivable, 500 1st Street, Woodland, CA 95695 or accountsreceivable@lsce.com



Date: June 9, 2026

To: Board of Directors

From: Chuck Kinney, General Manager

Subject: Tulare Lake Subbasin Point of Contact

Background

On April 7, 2026, the State Water Resources Control Board officially ended the state intervention process for the Delta-Mendota Subbasin. Because local Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) successfully addressed previous deficiencies, the Board voted to return the subbasin to the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) for ongoing oversight. The Delta-Mendota Subbasin utilized a single point of contact to represent all of the GSAs within the subbasin when communicating with the State Water Resources Control Board and their staff. By utilizing a single point of contact for the entire subbasin communication with the State was coordinated and concise which aided the Subbasin to gain trust with State staff and assist in helping to ensure revisions made to the GSP would address the concerns of the State. Because of the success of the Delta-Mendota Subbasin, Tulare Lake Subbasin GSA General Managers believe that it would be advantageous to hire a single point of contact to represent the Tulare Lake Subbasin with communications between the State Water Resources Control Board and their staff. While considering this position the GSA General Managers believe that Stacie Ann Silva would be the best candidate to be the point of contact for the Tulare Lake Subbasin, in large part because of her education and unique background in particular her knowledge and interactions related to SGMA within multiple subbasins.

Tri-County Water Authority (TCWA) has agreed to hold the contract with Stacie Ann Silva to have her represent the Tulare Lake Subbasin when communicating with the State Water Resources Control Board and their staff. The cost associated with the contract of services (\$120,000 annually) would be shared amongst the five GSAs pursuant to "the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan" which was entered into on September 1, 2017. The Mid-Kings River GSAs portion pursuant to that agreement is 19.084% which would come to a total of \$22,900.80. Attached is the proposal for consulting services.

Request

The General Manager requests the Board of Directors authorize the hiring of Stacie Ann Silva to be the Point of Contact with the State for the Tulare Lake Subbasin and also authorize the expenditure of \$22,900.80 to pay for the Mid-Kings River GSAs portion of the total cost to hire Stacie Ann Silva as agreed upon in the "the Interim Operating Agreement for the Tulare Lake Subbasin to Develop and Implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan".



June 1, 2026

Deanna Jackson
Executive Director
Tri-County Water Authority GSA – Tulare Lake
Acting on Behalf of the Tulare Lake Subbasin

Delivered Via E-mail Only

Re: Proposal for Consulting Services

Dear Ms. Jackson:

Altum Aqua Logic, LLC (“Altum”) is pleased to submit this proposal for consulting services to the Tri-County Water Authority GSA – Tulare Lake in its capacity as the contract holder on behalf of the Tulare Lake Subbasin (the “Subbasin”). This letter and any subsequent modifications contemplated herein will describe all of the proposed terms of our engagement. When executed by an authorized representative of the Subbasin, this letter and any subsequent modifications contemplated herein will constitute an agreement between Subbasin and Altum to be construed in accordance with California law.

Our services under this agreement will support solely Subbasin’s collective efforts related to the State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”) Probationary process. No services in support of individual Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (“GSAs”) within the Subbasin and unrelated to efforts to revise the Groundwater Sustainability Plan(s) will be provided under this agreement; to the extent individual GSAs desire Altum’s assistance, it will be provided pursuant to separate agreements between Altum and that entity.

As of the drafting of this proposal, the Subbasin is on probation with SWRCB under SWRCB obligations outlined in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”) and is actively considering alterations to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan(s) for the Subbasin (“GSP”). The Subbasin consists of five GSAs: El Rico GSA, Mid-Kings River GSA, South Fork Kings GSA, Southwest Kings GSA, and Tri-County Water Authority GSA – Tulare Lake (“Subbasin Members”).

We propose the following categories of services to be provided by Altum under this agreement:

Category 1 – SWRCB Process Support

Under Category 1 – SWRCB Process Support, Altum will serve as the main point of contact between the Subbasin and SWRCB board and staff members. Altum will engage with SWRCB board and staff on behalf of the Subbasin and manage SWRCB board and staff communications with the Subbasin. Altum will arrange Subbasin Members communications with SWRCB board and staff and, where appropriate, facilitate those conversations.

If requested, Altum will manage the GSP revision timeline, including communicating with technical consultants on the development timeline for key GSP components. Where appropriate, Altum may attend and participate in technical group meetings.

If requested, Altum may participate in public meetings with SWRCB board and staff as a representative of the Subbasin.

Category 2 – Meeting Facilitation Support

Under Category 2 – Meeting Facilitation Support, Altum will attend Subbasin managers meetings, either in person or virtually with in person attendance whenever it is feasible. When requested, Altum will facilitate and moderate meetings and conversations including those between Subbasin Members, Subbasin Members and SWRCB, Subbasin technical consultants and SWRCB, and/or any other mutually agreeable meetings related to the Subbasin SWRCB probation process. Altum will participate in discussions with Subbasin Members regarding the SWRCB probation process and any related documentation or materials.

If requested, Altum may participate in public outreach meetings as facilitation support.

Category 3 – General Strategic Advice

Altum will provide general, strategic and resource management support to the Subbasin as requested. Category 2 services include “high level” review of GSP drafts, feedback on GSP related documents and/or policies, collaboration with technical consultants on key GSP issues, and general strategic guidance related to the SWRCB probation process. Altum expects this support to be delivered via phone call or e-mail to Subbasin GSAs. When requested, Altum will provide a monthly report of activities to include, at minimum, meetings attended, documents and/or policies reviewed, and a summary of communications with SWRCB.

Term of Engagement

The term of this engagement will begin upon execution of the agreement and end on December 31, 2026, unless terminated by either party. Our engagement may be terminated at any time for any reason by either party with written notice, effective as of the date the notice is received. If and when our services conclude, our fee will be prorated, billed, and due for the partial services rendered. This agreement may be extended with mutual written agreement from both parties.

Fees and Billing

Altum's fee for strategic support under this agreement will be \$10,000 per month, payable in advance each month.

Our statements are payable upon presentation, with payment expected within 30 days. We reserve the right to impose a late charge of 0.833% per month on all amounts not paid within 30 days. In the event any legal action or collection activity is necessary to enforce the terms of this agreement, the prevailing party in such action will be entitled, as part of its remedy to payment for reasonable costs and attorney fees incurred in connection with that action. In addition, we have the right to suspend all services for the Subbasin if statements are not paid within 30 days. Our continuing to provide services during any such delinquency is not a waiver of our ability to suspend services at any time thereafter.

We do not charge for routine out of pocket expenses such as normal long-distance telephone calls, automobile travel within California, facsimile transmissions and in-house photocopying. Should we anticipate a need to incur extraordinary out of pocket expenses in connection with our work for Subbasin, we would obtain approval in advance and bill them to you at our cost.

Information and Work Product

We take our obligations to safeguard your private information seriously, so we want to take this opportunity to confirm our commitment to maintaining the confidentiality of confidential information. No voluntary disclosure of any of your data or information not already part of the public domain will be made without your permission unless we are legally required to make such disclosure. Please remember, however, that communications between us are not privileged. We will promptly advise Subbasin if any of your information is requested of us.

Upon full and final payment of all amounts due Altum in connection with this engagement, all right title, and interest in the deliverables (including, but not limited to, reports, notes and other documents, including all documents on electronic media) that contain confidential information provided by, or pertaining to, Subbasin ("Client Property") will become the sole and exclusive property of Subbasin.

Except for Subbasin Property, Altum will retain sole and exclusive ownership of all right, title and interest in all of Altum's work papers, proprietary information, information and documents developed by Altum, information and documents based upon publicly available data, processes, methodologies, know-how and software (the "Altum Property"), including such information as existed prior to the delivery of the services under this agreement and, to the extent such

information is of general application, anything that Altum may discover, create or develop during the performance of the services under this agreement.

To the extent Altum's deliverables to Subbasin contain Altum Property, upon full and final payment of all amounts due Altum in connection with this engagement, Subbasin shall have a non-exclusive, non-assignable, royalty-free, perpetual license to use such Altum Property in connection with the deliverables and the subject of the engagement and for no other or further use without Altum's express, prior written consent. Altum's deliverables are to be used solely for the purposes intended by this engagement and may not be disclosed, published or used in whole or in part for any other purpose.

Other Matters

Altum will not (and cannot) provide legal, engineering, or lobbying services. However, we will coordinate our services with whoever you select to provide those services to you, should they be necessary.

No voluntary disclosure of any of your data or information not already part of the public domain will be made without your express written permission unless we are legally required to make such disclosure. We will promptly advise you in writing if any of your information or data is requested of us, so that you may seek a protective order or other appropriate remedy at your expense, and in the event such protective order or other remedy is not obtained, any disclosure of your information or data by us will be limited to the extent required by applicable law.

We cannot make any promises or guarantees about the outcome of the matters as to which you have asked us to assist you, and nothing in this letter or in our statements to you should be so construed. When we provide you our opinion as to the probable outcome of any matter, it is with the understanding that our opinion is just that, and not a promise or guarantee. We cannot make any warranty, either express or implied, as to any recommendations or professional advice.

We provide services on a wide variety of water-related matters to other clients, some of whom are or may in the future operate in the same geographic and industry areas in which you are operating or may operate. By executing this agreement, you are acknowledging that we are free to work with those other clients on matters unrelated to you and that it is possible that we might take positions on behalf of other clients that are not consistent with yours. We will, of course, at all times avoid overt conflicts of interest and we will promptly notify you if we become aware that any such conflict arises.

Altum's liability to Subbasin for any claim or action arising in connection with services provided to Subbasin, whether in tort, contract, strict liability or otherwise, is limited to \$50,000 or the amounts paid to Altum by Subbasin, whichever is greater.

This agreement shall not be assigned, and no obligations hereunder may be delegated by either party without the prior written consent of the other, which may be withheld for any reason. This agreement may not be amended, modified or otherwise waived except pursuant to a written instrument executed by the parties.

Approval

If the foregoing meets with your approval, please sign and date one copy of this agreement and return it to us. Please retain the other copy for your records. We will begin working with you immediately upon your execution of this agreement.

In executing this agreement, Altum and the Subbasin Members agree to operate in good faith and with mutual respect.

If you have any questions concerning our fee and expense arrangements or procedures or the scope of our services, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Stacie Ann Silva
Principal Owner
Altum Aqua Logic, LLC

Accepted terms and conditions for engagement of Altum Aqua Logic, LLC:

Tri-County Water Authority GSA – Tulare Lake
Acting on behalf of the Tulare Lake Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agencies

By: _____

Date: _____

Attachment: Silva Resume 260601

STACIE ANN SILVA

(559) 967-1804 | sas@altumaqua.com

EDUCATION

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY CARUSO SCHOOL OF LAW

Master of Legal Studies
Dispute Resolution Concentration
Class of 2022

CAL POLY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

B.S. in Ag Systems Management
Minor in Agribusiness
Minor in Water Policy
Class of 2018

SKILLS

Solutions-Oriented Approach
Cross-Culture Dispute Resolution
Conflict Mediation
Agency Research
Effective Communication
Data Management
Project Management
Water Risk Analysis
Water Supply Analysis

COURSEWORK

Administrative Law
Agribusiness Credit & Finance
Agriculture Policy
Conflict and Dispute Resolution
Contract Law
Environmental Law
Irrigation Water Management
Property Law
Public Policy and Administration
Water Resource Law and Policy

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

ALTUM AQUA LOGIC, LLC

Principal Owner
July 2022 - Present

- Function as sole executive of consulting firm
- Analyze and Interpret ongoing implementation of CA Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) at client, local, and state levels
- Track and Report on status of public agency activities in 90+ GSAs in 50+ subbasins
- Develop comprehensive understanding of key California water issues, including SGMA, Colorado River, and HRL
- Assist clients with implementation and involvement in key water issues

NEW CURRENT WATER & LAND, LLC

Senior Associate and Special Programs Manager
June 2018 - July 2022

- Led client project implementation: Kaweah Regional Conservation Investment Strategy
- Reviewed all submitted Groundwater Sustainability Plans and communicated document quality to clients
- Tracked SGMA implementation activities for clients
- Identified potential implications of agency actions and determined risk of noncompliance with SGMA
- Assessed and Communicated client risks and opportunities related to water supply and SGMA

OUTSIDE EXPERIENCE

SEQUOIA RIVERLANDS TRUST

Board Chair | December 2024 - Present
Board Director | December 2023 - Present

CAL POLY ALUMNI - FRESNO CHAPTER

Member | September 2018 - December 2024

SOROPTOMIST INTERNATIONAL OF CLOVIS

Treasurer & Member | August 2022 - Present

CAL POLY CORPORATION

Corporation Board Director | 2017 - 2018