

MORE STATE AND LOCAL ATTENTION TO *Financing* CAN ADVANCE *Sustainable Groundwater Management*

Molly Bruce, Michael Kiparsky

APRIL 2025
Supplemental
Information



CLIMATE & ENERGY



WATER



OCEANS



LAND USE

This document contains Supplemental Information for the issue brief, *More state and local attention to financing can advance sustainable groundwater management*, available at: law.berkeley.edu/SGMA-financing. These materials clarify data relevant to our inquiry, including the Rubric our team used to evaluate Plans for the quality of their attention to financing criteria (Table 1), descriptive characteristics and outcomes for a sample of Plans we reviewed, including their scores according to our Rubric (Table 2), and each sample Plan’s Rubric results (Tables 3 through 17).

Table 1: Rubric used to evaluate Plans’ attention to financing. For the Rubric with grades for all sampled plans, see the project page at law.berkeley.edu/SGMA-financing.

| | | SCORE |
|--|--|----------|
| Specificity & Level of Detail | | P |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | | |
| Does the Plan calculate each project’s cost? | | |
| Legal/Process-Based Considerations | | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | | |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | | |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | | |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | | |
| Portfolio Resilience | | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | | |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | | |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | | |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | | |
| Total | | |

Table 2: Characteristics and outcomes of Plans selected for review, including each Plan's current and initial status according to DWR, whether DWR has designated the groundwater basin that each Plan covers as critically overdrafted, the basin priority DWR has assigned to the basin covered by the Plan, the hydrologic region in which the relevant basin is located, whether the Plan is a GSP or Alternative to GSP, as defined by SGMA, and each Plan's score according to our evaluation Rubric.

| CHARACTERISTICS AND OUTCOMES | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| <i>Plan</i> | <i>Current status</i> | <i>Initial status</i> | <i>Designated as critically overdrafted?</i> | <i>Basin priority</i> | <i>Hydrologic region</i> | <i>Plan type</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| Chowchilla | Inadequate | Inadequate | Yes | High | San Joaquin River | GSP | 20 |
| Madera | Review in progress | Inadequate | Yes | High | San Joaquin River | GSP | 23 |
| Merced | Review in progress | Incomplete | Yes | High | San Joaquin River | GSP | 16 |
| Orange County | Approved | Approved | No | Medium | South Coast | Alternative | 27 |
| North San Benito | Approved | Approved | No | Medium | Central Coast | GSP | 17 |
| South American | Approved | Approved | No | High | Sacramento River | GSP | 28 |
| Central Kings | Review in progress | Incomplete | Yes | High | Tulare Lake | GSP | 13 |
| Westside | Review in progress | Incomplete | Yes | High | Tulare Lake | GSP | 19 |
| Cosumnes | Approved | Approved | No | Medium | Sacramento River | GSP | 10 |
| Sierra Valley | Approved | Approved | No | Medium | North Lahontan | GSP | 26 |
| Eastern San Joaquin | Review in progress | Incomplete | Yes | High | San Joaquin River | GSP | 17 |
| Pajaro Valley | Approved | Approved | Yes | High | Central Coast | Alternative | 32 |
| Butte Valley | Approved | Incomplete | No | Medium | Sacramento River | GSP | 12 |
| Colusa | Approved | Incomplete | No | High | Sacramento River | GSP | 13 |
| Santa Clara | Approved | Approved | No | High | San Francisco Bay | Alternative | 9 |

Table 3: Review of Santa Clara Valley Alternative.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|----------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 0 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 0 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 1 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 9 |

Table 4: Review of Cosumnes GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 1 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 0 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 1 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 1 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 1 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 10 |

Table 5: Review of Butte Valley GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 0 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 2 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 12 |

Table 6: Review of Central Kings GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 1 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 1 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 2 |
| Total | 13 |

Table 7: Review of Colusa GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 1 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 2 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 1 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 2 |
| Total | 14 |

Table 8: Review of Merced GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 3 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 2 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 2 |
| Total | 16 |

Table 9: Review of North San Benito GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 0 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 1 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 1 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 3 |
| Total | 17 |

Table 10: Review of Eastern San Joaquin GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 3 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 2 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 0 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 0 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 2 |
| Total | 17 |

Table 11: Review of Westside GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 1 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 1 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 19 |

Table 12: Review of Chowchilla GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 2 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 2 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 20 |

Table 13: Review of Madera GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 2 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 3 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 1 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 2 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 1 |
| Total | 23 |

Table 14: Review of Sierra Valley GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 1 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 1 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 3 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 3 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 3 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 3 |
| Total | 26 |

Table 15: Review of Orange County Alternative.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 3 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 3 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 1 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 3 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 2 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 1 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 3 |
| <i>Total</i> | 27 |

Table 16: Review of South American GSP.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 3 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 2 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 2 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 2 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 3 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 1 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 3 |
| <i>Total</i> | 28 |

Table 17: Review of Pajaro Valley Alternative.

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | SCORE |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Specificity & Level of Detail</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund operation and administrative costs? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify how it plans to generate revenue to fund individual projects/management actions? | 2 |
| Does the Plan calculate each project's cost? | 3 |
| <i>Legal/Process-Based Considerations</i> | |
| Does the Plan reference Propositions 218, 26, or 13, or any other legal limitations revenue generation may encounter? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans for complying with legal limitations on revenue generation? | 3 |
| Does the Plan allocate responsibility for acquiring funding to a particular entity? | 3 |
| Does the Plan discuss the impacts that revenue generation will have to individuals, communities, and other stakeholders? | 3 |
| <i>Portfolio Resilience</i> | |
| Does the Plan identify multiple funding sources? | 3 |
| Does the Plan have a contingency or backup funding? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify plans to re-evaluate costs in the future? | 3 |
| Does the Plan identify actions already underway to generate revenue? | 3 |
| Total | 32 |

UC Berkeley
Center for Law, Energy
& the Environment



UC Berkeley Law
Center for Law, Energy & the Environment
clee.berkeley.edu
X: @CLEEBerkeley
FACEBOOK: @CLEEBerkeley
INSTAGRAM: @CLEEBerkeley
LINKED IN: [Center for Law, Energy & the Environment](https://www.linkedin.com/company/center-for-law-energy-and-the-environment)