

November 8, 2016
Suzanne Pecci,
10212 Equestrian Drive
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Darrell K. Eck, Executive Director
Members of the Board
Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority(SCGA)
827 7th St. Rm 301
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attn: Ramon Roybal

Re: Public Comment for the Record

Dear Mr. Eck and Members of the SCGA Board;

I am submitting this written comment for the record as a member of the public, as a registered voter, and landowner (as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 9027) in SRCD and OHWD, as well as a domestic well owner and resident of the City of Elk Grove and within the boundaries of the Alternate Submittal of SCGA.

I wish to congratulate Philip Williams, Deputy Counsel for Westlands Water District in Fresno and newcomer to our area on his nomination by the SRCD Board of Directors at the October 27, 2016 special board meeting to fill 3 director seats. Two additional members of the general public submitted applications to be considered for nomination to the board. The application was an attachment to the meeting agenda sent out on October 24, 2016, three days before the special meeting. It seemed the directors already had their hearts set on Mr. Williams, apparently liking the fact that he was young and a lawyer, too. From my perspective, it appeared that there was no serious consideration of the two other applicants, both long-time residents of SRCD. Mr. Williams' nomination along with the nominations of two incumbents will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for approval, which is an alternate method of selecting directors allowed by Public Resources Code Section 9314(b)(1), rather than election by eligible voters in the district which is prescribed by the Legislator as the intended method of selection.

It is interesting to me that in the 83 pages of The Sacramento County Index of Elected Officials for 2015-16, SRCD is the only public agency "elected at large"-by the voters- that has an alternate method to fill a vacancy-appointment. It is my understanding that the last election of directors of SRCD by the voters was in 1970. At the OHWD GSA Outreach Meeting of March 17, 2016, in a discussion of voting for directors by residents of the district, Jay Schneider explained that each landowner in the district registered to vote was eligible to vote for directors in SRCD, but that voting by residents was too expensive, that no one was interested in running for the board that it was a thankless task that no body wanted and that if anyone was interested in being on the board, they could come to a board meeting and seek nomination. I could certainly understand the rationale at that time.

Now that SRCD is putting on a new hat, so-to speak, as a GSA in portions of Sloughhouse /Wilton and seeking to become the GSA for OHWD, appointment by the board supervisors may no longer be necessary or even appropriate as the general public is becoming more interested and more aware of the workings of SRCD, as evidenced by the public members submitting requests to be considered for nomination to the their board, and increased public awareness of SRCD in the SGMA and the GSA formation public outreach meetings.

The resolution requesting appointment of directors by the board of supervisors as an alternative to election of directors by eligible voters remains in effect until rescission by the board of directors (SRCD) or until a petition signed by 5% of the registered voters in the district requesting the rescission is received by the elections official, pursuant to Section 9314 (b)(2) of the code. As a district member, I feel it is time to pursue the election of directors of SRCD as they become more relevant to the community in their role as GSA.

As a member of the district, I am disappointed that SRCD did not see this recent nomination process as an opportunity to diversify, become more inclusive, more balanced and open in their selection of candidates as they

seek to become a local GSA. However, the Public Resources Code Section 9301 (a) which states that the board shall consist of 5,7,or 9 directors, allows that the number of directors (currently 5 in SRCD) may be changed by resolution of the board and publication of such intent in a newspaper of general circulation, really a simple process. I am encouraged that when I brought this section of the code up at the meeting, the SRCD board seemed willing, in fact enthusiastic to take the matter up at their January 2017 board meeting. The possibility of appointment of associate directors, a past practice, was also mentioned which I feel would spark local interest and participation which seems to be lacking, according to Jay's past comments.

Perhaps SRCD might also be willing to forward the nomination applications of the two public members who were not selected by the directors as nominees to the board of supervisors in addition to their nominees pursuant to Section 9314(c) of the code which states "It is the intent of the legislature to encourage districts to opt for the selection of directors by election, but where directors are appointed pursuant to subdivision (b), it is the intent of the legislature that the board of supervisors solicit recommendations from within the district , including public, private, and nonprofit entities, and appoint only applicants who have a demonstrated interest in soil and water conservation. In selecting directors pursuant to subdivision (b), the board of supervisors shall endeavor to achieve balanced representation on the board of directors. To avoid undue financial burdens to districts and thereby promote the objectives of this division, the Legislature hereby encourages counties to waive or minimize the charges for cost of elections conducted pursuant to this division." My reading of the code does not preclude such an action by the directors. As a member of the public, I feel this would be viewed as a positive collaborative effort in SRCD's moving forward as a local GSA reaching out to the local community.

Thank you.

Suzanne Pecci