

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Governing Board Meeting
Final Minutes
July 8, 2015

LOCATION: 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1212
Sacramento, CA 95827
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

MINUTES:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Dave Ocenosak called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep):

Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests
Richard Shepard, City of Elk Grove
Mark Madison, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District
Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners
Christine Thompson, Public Agencies Self Supplied
Dave Ocenosak, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company

Board Members (Alternate Rep):

Britton Snipes, City of Rancho Cordova
Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento
Forrest Williams, Sacramento County
José Ramirez, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, Executive Director
Ping Chen, SCGA
Ramon Roybal, SCGA

Others in Attendance:

Brian Frাগiao, City of Elk Grove
Tom Nelson, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District
Rodney Fricke, Aerojet Rocketdyne
Ali Taghavi, RMC Water and Environment
Jim Blanke, RMC Water and Environment
Jafar Faghieh, HDR
Lauren Simonich, Sacramento County Farm Bureau

Carl Werder, Resident
Rob Swartz, Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA)
Mark Salmon, Parsons Brinckerhoff

Member Agencies Absent

City of Folsom
Rancho Murieta CSD
Agricultural-Residential
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
Commercial/Industrial Self-Supplied
California-American Water Company

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Nelson introduced himself and stated that he had been the nominee to represent the Agricultural-Residential groundwater users but that since he also served as a board member for the Florin Resource Conservation District (FRCD) which was also represented on the SCGA Board, the FRCD attorney pointed out that it would have been a conflict of interest. Furthermore, the FRCD attorney also pointed out that per the SCGA JPA the FRCD/EGWD representative must have been a member of their board. The current FRCD representatives were not and Mr. Nelson then announced that he had been nominated as representative for FRCD/EGWD subject to the approval of Elk Grove City Council which was set to convene July 8, 2015.

Mr. Eck followed up by reporting that Omochumne-Hartnell Water District and Rancho Murieta CSD were subject to the same provision of the JPA requiring elected board members to represent those groups and that they were taking steps to comply.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

The draft meeting minutes for the May 13, 2015 Board meeting were reviewed for final approval.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Schubert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, the motion carried unanimously to approve the minutes.

4. UPDATE ON BASIN MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE THRESHOLD DEVELOPMENT AND RECHARGE MAPPING PROJECT

Jim Blanke from RMC Water and Environment was introduced to give a presentation on the BMO threshold development component of BMO Threshold and Recharge Mapping Project. Mr. Blanke had given a presentation on the recharge mapping component of the project at the March 11, 2015 Board meeting. (*Note: Mr. Blanke's presentation can be viewed on the Authority's website for the July 8, 2015 meeting date*)

Mr. Blanke's presentation included steps taken to develop the BMO thresholds and recommendations for improving reliability in the future.

Steps taken to develop the ^{BMO}BOM thresholds were:

- Identify groupings of areas that behave similarly
- Utilize updated SacIWRM Future Conditions Baseline
- Revised urban footprint based on General Plans and other available planning documents Added Folsom Plan Area and Cordova Hills
- Revised non-urban water demands using CropScape
- Revised urban water demands and supplies using UWMP/WSMP
- CASGEM wells incorporated as the most representative of basin conditions
- Historical well data analyzed for applicability
- Thresholds based on future conditions baseline
- Recognized the need to avoid penalizing future benefits yet to be realized
- Placed BMO thresholds in the context of GMP trigger levels

Recommendations for future improvements included:

- Investigate incorporating additional information into bandwidths
 - Current and historical data
 - Physically based thresholds
- Recognize Vineyard SWTP as an existing Trigger Action yet to be fully realized
- Historical groundwater elevations: adjust bandwidth to incorporate all historical data within the 100 - 0% range.
 - Justification – Historical conditions considered appropriate without requiring acquisition of supplemental water supplies and constructing infrastructure
- Current groundwater elevations: Adjust lower threshold so well is within the 100 - 25% range.
 - Justification – Existing conditions considered appropriate without levying assessments
- Utilize available physical thresholds
 - Depth of private wells
 - Historical conditions near rivers

Project Next Steps included:

- Incorporate additional information into bandwidths
- Share revisions with SCGA staff
- Present revisions to Board as part of September 9, 2015 board meeting
- Present information in a draft and final TM
- Implement BMOs under GWMP or GSP

Mr. Bettis asked if update land-use information was utilized to account for future planned development near the Jackson and Mather areas. Mr. Blanke replied that when the future conditions model was updated that they received the latest land-use information from SCWA that included changes in water demands for those footprints.

Mr. Ocenosak asked if the forthcoming SB88 trailer bills which required increased groundwater elevations reporting would include agricultural wells and if so, would such data be available to enhance the groundwater model and thus improve the accuracy of the BMO Thresholds. Mr. Eck replied that in terms of SCGA's CASGEM implementation he did not foresee any significant changes as it concerned that bill.

Mr. Madison asked if there were wells or areas where the groundwater declines had increased to a point that exceeded certain triggers, could it result in the assessments against individual users and would those assessments would be levied before the groundwater sustainability plans were developed or would it be folded into a later groundwater sustainability plan. Mr. Eck replied that the current JPA already enabled the Board to exercise police powers. It would be a matter of the Board choosing to exercise such powers. Such a decision would not be made without the input of the non-JPA signatory representatives.

Mr. Bettis asked Mr. Blanke if he noticed any significant evidence of perched aquifers during development of the thresholds. Mr. Blanke responded that it was not something was analyzed.

5. GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

Mr. Eck provided an overview of the process required for SCGA to become a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The process included consideration of interested stakeholders, identification of basin boundaries, development of coordination agreements with adjacent programs, development of the groundwater sustainability plan, and assessment of regulatory authorities within existing JPA. Mr. Eck then reported that staff had been working with GEI on a roadmap that would identify the milestones that would lead SCGA to become the GSA for the South American Subbasin. Mr. Eck announced that Jon Goetz with GEI would make a presentation addressing those issues. *(Note: Mr. Goetz's presentation can be viewed on the Authority's website for the July 8, 2015 meeting date.)*

Mr. Eck stated that in order to fully develop and complete the tasks necessary to become a groundwater sustainability agency, staff believed that a SGMA committee should be formed to reach out to the various stakeholders, to strategize on the potential boundary issues, to discuss potential coordination issues, and to discuss and make recommendations for potential changes to the governing JPA. The committee would report back to the Board on a regular basis with status reports and for additional direction.

Mr. Bettis asked for discussion on potential challenges that might arise with a district being split between multiple GSA's. Mr. Goetz explained that there was nothing wrong with being split and that it might actually be a positive arrangement as it would enable a district to have a seat on both sides and could serve as a liaison between the two. Mr. Goetz stated that it was occurring with multiple agencies throughout the state.

Mr. Goetz stated that the frequency of the SCGA Board meetings was an important factor on how it would move forward with SGMA. Once the committee is formed, you would

immediately identify stakeholders as changing the SCGA boundary would require significant stakeholder involvement with the boundary expanding in some areas while other areas would be removed. Mr. Goetz said that the GSA process would also involve actions by the respective boards and councils of member SCGA agencies. Then we adopt an agency agreement in terms of a Resolution. Mr. Goetz reiterated that there was not a lot of time remaining for the amount of effort needed for GSA formation. It was envisioned that the sub-committee could meet bi-weekly with a plan to report back to the Board in September. Mr. Goetz stated that SCGA should work to ensure that DWR recognized its past efforts in order to avoid having to go through a similar level of effort that was previously undertaken during the Water Forum process. Mr. Goetz also mentioned that it would be important to monitor for potential grant funding opportunities.

Mr. Eck added that it would be expected that the current representative organizations of the Board would outreach to other related stakeholders that they represent. As an example Mr. Eck said that the Board would rely on the Farm Bureau representative to outreach to others in the agricultural community or for the Industrial Self-Supplied representative to outreach to other similar users such as cemetery districts.

Mr. Ocnosak asked if there might be a need for the Board to meet monthly in order to make timely decisions and actions. Mr. Eck replied that there was language in the JPA that enabled the Board to set the frequency of Board meetings. Mr. Eck suggested that frequency of Board meetings could be assessed by the sub-committee and a recommendation to the Board could be made if necessary.

Mr. Ewart stated that the notion of moving the Authority's boundary to align with Bulletin 118 may have implications on the Water Forum Agreements and sustainable yield. Mr. Goetz responded that the sustainable yield would need to be reevaluated. He stated that recent updates to land-use data and the groundwater model which were conducted through work related to AB 303 grants would facilitate the effort.

Mr. Sheppard asked how groundwater management plans going forward would be made to reconcile with water surface rights. He expressed a concern that there might be big hurdles to achieve such reconciliation. Mr. Goetz replied that the State was focused on groundwater and surface water integration and that the State was creating a new world where it would not allow groundwater operations to impact surface water flows. He further pointed out that the issue was called out in the SGMA legislation.

Mr. Madison asked what would be the final action to solidify or codify the formation of a GSA by the SCGA. He said his understanding of SGMA was that CA DWR would formally accept, but not necessarily approve the final party or parties to become the GSA. Both Mr. Goetz and then Mr. Swartz stated that it was their belief that during the evaluation process of GSA applications DWR would be emphasizing cooperation amongst local interests as an overriding factor to go along with compliance with all other aspects of the legislation and sound technical arguments.

Mr. Goetz commented that the level of resources required by SCGA to operate a GSA under SGMA, along with the makeup of the Board and staffing would significantly increase compared current levels because of the coordination and reporting requirements.

Mr. Bettis said he was curious about the requirement for coordination with adjacent basins and that he understood that the north and central basins are well along in groundwater management efforts and working towards SGMA compliance but was curious about the status of the south basin. Mr. Eck replied that the Cosumnes Subbasin stakeholders had been working on putting together a JPA that they felt was necessary to move that process forward. That JPA document was supposed to go to their respective Boards in the August timeframe. Mr. Eck then mentioned that he was paying attention to the Delta region of Sacramento County which belonged to the Solano Subbasin and that they were in the early stages of organization.

Mr. Ocenosak asked for volunteers to serve on the SGMA sub-committee. Mr. Nelson, Mr. Ewart, Mr. Bettis, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Schubert volunteered.

Motion/Second/Carried – Ms. Thompson moved, seconded by Mr. Sheppard, the motion carried unanimously to establish a subcommittee to assist in the process of establishing SCGA as the groundwater sustainability agency for the South American Sub-basin.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- a) Government Affairs Update – There are numerous bills that have been introduced in the legislature that would amend the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act or otherwise change water law. The Regional Water Authority is tracking bills that relate to local and regional issues. A summary of tracked bills can be found at rwah2o.org. Of interest is AB 617 (Perea) which includes a number of key amendments including no CEQA requirement for the formation of a GSA and allowing private mutual water companies to joint GSAs. SB 385 (Hueso) passed unanimously in the Senate and moves to the Assembly. The bill will provide the opportunity for agencies to have a compliance period to meet the standard for hexavalent chromium. The issue of confidentiality of well logs has been a debate for many years in the Legislature. The issue passed as part of the budget trailer bill. The Department of Water Resources continues to meet with stakeholders in the process of developing regulations to implement the SGMA. Draft regulations relating to basin boundary revisions are expected to be released and presented to the California Water Commission on July 15, 2015. Work is beginning on the regulations for coordination agreements among multiple agencies in a basin and for evaluating groundwater sustainability plans. DWR will convene the Practitioner Advisory Panel (PAP) in June, July, and August to solicit input on the regulations. John Woodling from RWA/SGA is serving as Chair of the PAP and will be working closely with DWR staff to ensure the panel's input is incorporated into the regulations.
- b) June 3, 2015 RWA/SGA Workshop – SGA and RWA convened a meeting on June 3, 2015 of water providers and county government officials in Sacramento, Placer, and Sutter Counties that overlie the North American, South American, and Cosumnes subbasins. Over 40 people attended to discuss and coordinate on implementation of the SGMA in the region. SGMA will require a higher level of coordination among the various groundwater management entities in the future. The group discussed potential changes to basin boundaries as well as the expected make up of groundwater

sustainability agencies (GSA) and their geographic areas. The group decided to meet quarterly to discuss progress. In addition, the group will meet July 16th to discuss the draft regulations for basin boundary revisions.

- c) GAP Committee Meeting – Mr. Eck announced that the committee would meet as planned following the Board meeting.

7. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming Meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, September 9, 2015, 9 am;
10060 Goethe Road, South Conference Room No. 1212 (Sunset Maple).

By:

Paul Pinosak
Chairperson

9/21/15
Date

Walter Peck

09-09-15
Date

