

**SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)**  
**Well Protection Program Sub-Committee Meeting**  
**Final Minutes**  
**March 27, 2008**

**LOCATION:** 9280 West Stockton Boulevard, Suite 220  
Elk Grove, CA 95758  
2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting commenced at 2:20 p.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep.)

Stuart Helfand, Agricultural-Residential  
Ron Lowry, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

Staff Members

Darrell Eck, Executive Director, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority  
Ramón Roybal, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority  
Ping Chen, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority

**2. Public Comment**

None

**3. Well Protection Program Criteria**

The subcommittee reviewed Section 2.20.010, Fees and Charges, of the Well Protection Program (WPP) Ordinance per Ron Lowry's comments at the March 12, 2008 SCGA Board meeting. At this meeting Mr. Lowry questioned the number of fees that an individual could be charged if multiple building permits were pulled on their property (e.g., barn, accessory building, in-law quarters, etc.).

During the discussion Mr. Lowry reiterated that the Ordinance should provide an exemption for buildings that do not use water such as barns and sheds. Darrell Eck pointed out that during the March 12, 2008 Board meeting Mel Johnson had suggested that the term "habitable" be added somewhere in the description of Fees and Charges. After additional discussion the members of the subcommittee recommended the following changes to the draft Ordinance (added text is represented by *bold italics*).

**For Section 2.20.010 Fees and Charges:**

Prior to issuing a building permit for new *habitable* construction or a well drilling permit for a new well in the Central Basin Well Protection Program Area a well protection fee shall be paid.

Mr. Eck then presented the Draft Technical Memorandum for the *Refined Impact Analysis for Well Protection Program (WRIME, March 14, 2008)* and highlighted the figures displaying parcels where wells could potentially be impacted under pumping conditions described in the original Impact Analysis. Mr. Eck explained that the refined analysis provided a probability of potential impact to any given parcel and that the highest probability of impact was 25-percent. Mr. Eck further explained that the purpose of the analysis was to provide the Board with sufficient information to assist them in determining a benefit area on a parcel level and that the analysis can also provide staff with sufficient information to prioritize parcels for registration based on the probability of potential impact. Stuart Helfand suggested that the Authority provide a means to automatically register parcels covered under the North Vineyard Well Protection Plan. Mr. Eck suggested that it was possible to add appropriate language to the Draft Ordinance under Chapter 2.25 Eligibility.


Mr. Eck presented tables (see attached) containing preliminary estimates of the WPP fee based on the estimated number of impacted wells and associated costs (updated to 2008 dollars) provided in the Impact Analysis contained in the Groundwater Management Plan. The estimates were then presented in two separate tables dependent on the minimum and maximum term (5 years versus 14 years) of the WPP as described Chapter 2.35, Sunset Provision, of the Draft Ordinance. Mr. Eck asked the subcommittee members if the tables presented the WPP fee data in a manner that was easily understood. Both Mr. Lowry and Mr. Helfand concurred in the affirmative. Mr. Helfand suggested using "Scenario C" of both the 5- and 14-year WPP plans, averaging their respective total costs and then adding a 10-percent miscellaneous cost, as a method for deriving the ultimate WPP fee.

Mr. Helfand mentioned that the year of installation was requested on the registration mailers for the North Vineyard WPP. He suggested that the same information could be collected for the Central Basin WPP and used to assist in the prioritization of field visits as an alternative to using the Refined Impact Analysis data. His suggestion was based on the logic that the older wells will be the ones most likely to be impacted.

**4. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss meeting adjourns at 3:30 p.m.

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

4/9/08  
Date

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_

4/9/08  
Date