SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Governing Board Meeting
Final Minutes
September 10, 2008

LOCATION: 10545 Armstrong Avenue, Suite 101
Mather, CA 95655
9:04 a.m. to 10:08 a.m.

MINUTES:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Scott Fort called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep.):

Stuart Helfand, Agricultural-Residential
Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners
Edd Smith, Public Agencies Self-Supplied
Scott Fort, Golden State Water Company
Ed Crouse, Rancho Murieta Community Service District

Board Members (Alternate Rep.):

Clarence Korhonen, City of Elk Grove
Walt Sadler, City of Folsom
Albert Stricker, City of Rancho Cordova
Dan Sherry, City of Sacramento
Herb Niederberger, Sacramento County Water Agency
Ruben Robles, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, Executive Director, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
Sharon Andrews, Clerk, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
Ping Chen, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
Brian Gallucci, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority

Others in Attendance:

Joaquin Cruz, East Bay Municipal Utilities District
Rodney Fricke, Aerojet
Ali Taghavi, WRIME

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- **Minutes of July 9, 2008 and August 13, 2008 Board meetings.**

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

- **Minutes of August 28, 2008 WPP Subcommittee meeting.**

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

4. WELL PROTECTION PROGRAM UPDATE/SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

- **Counsel comments**

  Mr. Eck reported that counsel is working on obtaining clarification as to whether or not Prop. 218 and sections 10754 through 10754.3 of the California Water Code apply to the implementation of the Ordinance and the fee. Counsel expressed concern that Prop. 218 restricts property-related fees, defined as "fees imposed as an incident of property ownership." There could be a potential challenge to the fee because it could be construed to be a property-related fee.

  If the Authority were to move forward under the provisions of Prop. 218, it would be required to comply with the following requirements:

  - Specific fee restriction and fee rate calculation requirements established by the proposition; restrictions on what the fee can be used for
  - Methodology used to determine the fee must be equitable
  - Prop. 218 also requires the authority to mail out information regarding the proposed fee to every property owner
  - Hold a hearing at least 45 days after the mailing
  - If written protests are presented by a majority of the affected property owners, reject the fee
  - Hold an election seeking approval for the fee from a majority of affected property owners or two-thirds of the electorate

  Water Code sections 10754 through 10754.3 came into play when the Legislature established requirements for groundwater management plans. The Code states that local agencies that adopt a groundwater management plan may fix and collect fees pursuant to Part 6 of Division 18 of the California Water Code. Also, a local agency may impose assessments to pay for costs incurred for administrative and operating expenses necessary to implement a groundwater management plan.

The final requirement is that before a local agency may fix and collect such fees, the local agency shall hold an election on the proposition of whether or not the local agency shall be authorized to fix and collect those fees. Counsel is concerned that these requirements are applicable to collection of the well impact fee by the Authority.

Counsel did mention that there are a couple of alternatives. First, the Authority can assume these conditions (Proposition 218 or Sections 10754 through 10754.3 of the Water Code) do not apply and proceed with adoption of the Well Protection Program (WPP). A possible consequence of that approach is that there could be a legal challenge to the fee. Should that occur, the Authority is not in a financial position to defend against a legal challenge and would probably have to concede. Conceding could then set a precedent for challenges on other future issues, demonstrating that the Authority is weak.

Secondly, the WPP could be implemented by the individual land use agencies (signatories to the JPA). That would put the fee collection issue outside the realm of the previously mentioned problems associated with Proposition 218 and the Water Code. Land use agencies could condition projects to pay the fee similar to what has been done with the North Vineyard Well Field. Several questions would need to be resolved if the Authority selected this option. First, would the land use authorities want to assume this responsibility? Previous discussions have indicated that all land use agencies would need to participate for the program to be fair and equitable, what if one or more of the land use agencies do not wish to participate under these conditions. Second, how would the program be administered? This includes well registration, collection of the fee, administration of the "Trust Fund," and payment of benefits. Third, what would be the role, if any, of the Authority in this particular process? What is clear is that it will take a significant amount of time to develop whatever the program might be. These seem to be the possibilities that the Authority will need to grapple with if counsel is of the opinion that we are bound by the requirements of Proposition 218 or the Water Code. Mr. Eck indicated that a formal opinion from counsel is forthcoming.

Mr. Helfand stated that, when developers have come before the Vineyard Council, the developers have been informed that one of the conditions the Council is putting on projects for approval is that the developers agree to pay into a trust fund the amount that would be collected for the North Vineyard Well Field. Mr. Helfand indicated that the Council has had absolutely no objections from any of the developers. So it is possible to do it through the developers and say this is what we want as a voluntary thing if we are faced with this Proposition 218 rule.

Mr. Bettis asked if this approach would be through the land use agencies. Mr. Helfand said that in the County prior to getting entitlements developers go to the different CPACs or CPCs with their projects. Payment of this fee is just one of the things we would like to see because otherwise you will have residents in the area fighting real hard that their wells are going to be impacted. A mount of approximately $450 is a lot less than having to go back and having things postponed and fighting all this stuff. It hasn't been a problem; the developers have been agreeable because it's a cost of doing business.

Mr. Korhonen asked about small developments, landowners with five acres trying to split it. Mr. Helfand said they would have to pay the fees when they pull the permits. If they want to get a map, this is one of the conditions of getting a map. Mr. Helfand added that this would end up being a land use agency determination, but it is also a negotiation between the community and the developer.

Mr. Fort told the Executive Director that it is good upfront information and that it gives the Board options, but the Board will still have to wait and see what counsel says. Mr. Eck said that is exactly why he mentioned it because a final opinion has not been given by counsel. Counsel will be consulting with Bob Ryan and John Whisenhunt on how we might be able to approach this. They may have some innovative solutions to solve this particular problem, but counsel felt it was important that the Board be made aware that these challenges do exist and that potentially it could go the other way.

Mr. Bettis asked how these concerns relate to the WPP fee that the Board has been discussing. Mr. Eck said it relates directly to that because it is how that fee is defined, at least in the mind of counsel, and that is what is creating the problem we have been discussing. If the nature of the fee falls within the definition of either the statute or the provisions of Proposition 218, then the Authority would have to go through a voting process throughout the basin if we were to move forward with the ordinance in its present form.

Mr. Niederberger stated that to best understand the problem we need to separate it into two different issues. The first issue is, if the Authority is to proceed on our original course, then we are subject to additional scrutiny. The second issue is, if we proceed on the alternate course, which is to somehow compel the land use agencies to make this fee a condition of approval on future land entitlements, then we avoid the additional scrutiny and certain pitfalls. Mr. Niederberger asked the Board members representing land use agencies, would it be premature to ask if the land use agencies could have an ongoing condition of approval on ongoing entitlements that would require payment of a groundwater protection fee. Is it premature to ask the land use agencies to look into that? It is an ongoing condition of approval with the Sunridge development (as a result of the North Vineyard Well Field), but we're talking about making it somewhat similar for the rest of the Central Basin area (inclusive of the unincorporated County and the Cities of Elk Grove, Folsom, Rancho Cordova and Sacramento). Mr. Niederberger stated that the County would probably not have a problem with making it an ongoing condition of approval, but his question falls back to the cities as to whether or not it would be something that they would be willing to do.

Mr. Korhonen commented that the Authority had talked at one time about getting the support of the Building Industry Association (BIA). If we had the support of the BIA, knowing that it was not an issue, it might be easier to deal with that internally. As you know the City of Elk Grove has not been the most cooperative, but we have a new City Manager and new Council members.

Mr. Niederberger added that he is scheduled to do a presentation to the BIA in the next few months on a couple of different issues. He said that if the Board would like, he would add this topic to the list of issues to be presented to the BIA.

Mr. Helfand said developers know that we are working on this, and that we are trying to level the playing field. It has been voluntary with the developers; they say it's fine if it's a condition of approval. We haven't had anyone fight it. We try to make it a level playing field for everyone, but nobody is getting in as a freebie.

Mr. Stricker said one of the most significant problems is the scheduling meetings which would include all the land use agencies and the BIA, etc. Once that's done then probably the next step is figuring out the mechanism – whether it's through conditions of approval or whether it's through SCGA. That part probably matters less than getting a buy-in from all the stakeholders.

Mr. Smith said the Park District has a variety of lighting and landscape districts. What it has been able to do is get the Board of Supervisors to put into the planning process fees that we will collect in the future from tenants. He asked if that was a viable option.

Mr. Eck responded that if we have to go this particular route, certainly something like that might be worth learning more about to see whether or not it would be something that would work for this process.

Mr. Korhonen asked for an estimate of when counsel can provide the Board with answers, and Mr. Eck said he had hoped it would have been before this meeting. He said he was optimistic that counsel might have some type of response by the end of this week or early next week so that we can report back in October. Mr. Korhonen said if Proposition 218 and the Water Code get in our way, then Darrell will be coming back to the City and selling us on a different approach.

Mr. Fort asked everyone if Herb should add this issue when he talks to the BIA, or if they feel it would be premature. Mr. Sadler said he thought it is right on target because a couple of Board members are stuck over which position they want to take, and we should find out what the BIA position will be. Now we are close enough to know what the fee will be. We have parity with Vineyard, and we have a lot of stuff where we can say it will be like this, so it is an appropriate time to move forward.

Mr. Niederberger responded that he can give the presentation but leave the specifics of the program to the Executive Director to explain.

Mr. Crouse asked Mr. Eck for counsel's opinion in draft form, with "Draft" stamped on it, so that Board members can take that draft opinion and have another attorneys review it to see if there is another slant on it. He said he would hate to have something come to us in final form preventing any changes. Mr. Eck agreed to do that.

- **Subcommittee report.**

- **Text Revisions.**

Mr. Eck said in reference to the August 28 Subcommittee Meeting, some items were also raised by counsel during a review of the Ordinance itself. Others were items that were identified through conversations here at the Board.

The first text revision issue was the use of the word "habitable" in section 2.20.010 of the proposed Ordinance. Counsel was concerned that there could be confusion over how the word habitable is defined. Staff went in and looked at the materials that the County uses. The County Building Permit Application does not use that term, so there clearly is a possibility for a problem.

The application does contain categories that might work such as "custom home," "mobile home," "model home," "new construction" and things like that. These terms would need to be discussed with County staff to see if they meet the intent of "habitable." We also need to have a similar discussion with the other land use authorities to see if they use similar terms so that the language in the Ordinance can be redrafted so that when the fee is to be collected there would be no doubt on the part of the person working behind the counter that they were collecting the appropriate fee in the appropriate instance when it should be collected. Mr. Eck stated there is still some additional work that needs to be done on that, but he thinks there is a way to resolve that issue.

The second item is the language that was included that said that anybody within the basin who was served exclusively by surface water would be exempt from paying the fee, and that would be above and beyond the exemption that was written into the Groundwater Management Plan for the City of Sacramento. The question was, how do you prove that you are exempt from paying the fee? Anybody could come up to the counter and say I am served exclusively by surface water. The challenge for the person behind the counter is that they cannot identify areas that are served exclusively by surface water unless they are delineated by the appropriate water purveyor. After discussing this matter at the Subcommittee, it was agreed that if we revise the language to say that any other property within the Central Basin that is served exclusively by a surface water supply, ***as demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Authority by the applicable land use authority or purveyor***, is exempt from paying the Well Protection Fee. That leaves an opportunity for someone in the future, like the City of Folsom that might have a situation where it has an area that is served exclusively by surface water to come to the Authority and say that we have an area, it's served exclusively by surface water, and it should not have to pay the well impact fee.

Mr. Niederberger said he feels the Board is making this overly complicated because, granted, right now everything in the City of Folsom is surface water, but the deal that is being crafted between SCWA and Folsom is going to entail a certain amount of exchange with groundwater in order for surface water to be

available. In effect, Folsom may say it is getting all surface water, but the fact is we are using groundwater to free up capacity for the surface water that allows them to get the surface water. Mr. Eck added that that condition was recognized as part of the discussion.

Mr. Niederberger said we need to recognize that building permits pulled in the City of Sacramento are not going to be paying the fee and building permits within the Central Basin area. Sacramento County, Folsom, Elk Grove, and Rancho Cordova will be paying the fee. He asked why the Board is trying to make it overly complicated.

Mr. Eck said that option was discussed as part of the discussion at the Subcommittee meeting and added that he would defer to Walt Sadler to clarify the City of Folsom's concerns. Mr. Sadler responded that Folsom does not know at this time what the ultimate water supply is going to be for the Folsom Sphere of Influence (SOI). Mr. Sadler stated that right now it looks like it will be surface water, but added that Mr. Niederberger is correct that there could be some groundwater. Mr. Sadler then said the $400 fee is nothing when compared with the total of all other fees, but he doesn't really know if he wants to go down that path until Folsom and SCWA get further along in describing what the ultimate water supply solution is.

Mr. Niederberger continued that when he was listening to the definition it seemed to be overly complicated when we know that the overall intent is/was to keep the City of Sacramento from having to pay the fee, and anyone else involved with this would end up contributing to the Basin.

Mr. Sadler said he understands where Mr. Niederberger is coming from, but he didn't want our process to get caught up in the in-fighting between the SOI and property owners so just put that there, and we will take care of it internally. As it is now, as far as they are concerned it's all surface water that they're buying.

Mr. Niederberger said that when Folsom goes through its SB 610 process it will be identifying all those water supplies, and that will probably solve what he thought was a confusing issue. He said what he was worried about the Folsom's case because it won't appear that Folsom has any groundwater facilities. It would always appear that Folsom has surface water facilities. So a future developer could say that he/she was not getting any groundwater and was not contributing to the decline of the Basin. But the SB 610 process will identify the sources. Mr. Sadler agreed, saying that would flush it out because Folsom will have to do that.

Mr. Bettis asked when the SB 610 process would occur, and Mr. Niederberger asked when the environmental work is scheduled for the Folsom SOI. Mr. Sadler said the Notice of Intent is out now and Folsom is working up some water supply strategies in that regard.

Continuing, Mr. Eck said that the last section talked about was 2.25.010(b), which made reference to parcels that had an auxiliary water system, that is, parcels that are connected to a municipal water system but also have an operating well in the backyard. Counsel's question was how to demonstrate if this situation actually exists. Staff believes that this information could be obtained through the registration process. A question can be added to that mailer asking whether or not the parcel has an auxiliary water system. Then when staff goes out to do the verification, staff can also verify whether or not that condition exists at the same time. The Subcommittee felt that this was probably the best way to resolve the issue. There would be no text change requirements in that particular instance.

- **Fee collection on new wells.**

In order to provide some context to the discussion on the frequency of well drilling in the Central Basin and the potential collection of fees, staff obtained information from EMD relative to the number of wells drilled over the last ten years. Staff then analyzed this data to determine the number of wells drilled in the Central Basin over the last ten years and then made a determination based on this same data as to the average number of wells drilled each year. According to the analysis, there are approximately 59 wells drilled per year in the Central Basin.

As a refresher from the last Board meeting, staff was interested in looking at the possibility of having the well impact fee collected by EMD when a new well drilling permit was issued. Unfortunately, according to EMD staff, EMD's current well-drilling application permit process does not allow for the collecting or processing of other agencies' fees.

As part of this discussion staff examined EMD's well drilling permit to see if information collected could be used as part of some other approach in collecting the well impact fee. EMD's permit process does collect some very specific information as it relates to the well: whether it's domestic or private, an irrigation or irrigation-agricultural well, or a public water system well. It also records information relative to casing diameter, depth, type of pump, and horsepower.

Mr. Robles asked for clarification as to whether EMD could develop a process. Mr. Eck said they probably could, but there would be a cost involved, and it would be a cost that would have to be borne by the Authority. Mr. Robles asked if EMD would be open to developing a process. Mr. Eck indicated that EMD seems to be receptive to it when the discussion was held, and that it would be something that would have to be pursued with EMD.

Because EMD cannot collect the Authority's fee at this time, the other option that was suggested was through LD&SIR's electrical permit. In reviewing the electrical permit process, staff found that LD&SIR does not collect any information that could be used to calculate the fee. It simply issues a permit that

would allow the inspector to go out and inspect the electrical panel. However, LD&SIR does have provisions in place that would allow an outside agency to collect a fee as long as a process is put in place to define what the fee is for and how it is calculated.

Staff thought that a possible solution to the problem would be to combine elements from both processes, that is, electric permit and well drilling permit. In this case, when the person goes in to pull that the electrical permit for the well, they could take the drilling permit application with them. Information from the drilling permit application could then be used as a basis for calculating and then collecting the fee. That could be an alternative to setting up some type of expanded collection mechanism with EMD.

After discussing the alternatives, as well as the data provided by EMD, the Subcommittee came to the conclusion that the majority of the wells drilled each year are probably ag-res wells, and that the well impact fee in this case would be captured through the building permit for the accompanying home. That would leave a relatively small number of well per year that the Authority might actually collect a fee from under this aspect of the program. After some deliberation, the Subcommittee decided that it did not make sense to go forward, given that the number of the wells and the amount of the fees collected would be relatively small and ultimately could not justify the administrative cost.

Mr. Sadler said that his major concern was that we really don't know from the diameter of the casing what the actual capacity of the well is. If you are trying to relate that back to a fee, it's still a guess. It would be a bookkeeping nightmare. You can put a 16-inch casing in and only get 200 gpm out, or you can get 2500 gpm, depending on where it is and what the formation is like. Then there's the issue of double collection of fees. Remember, when we originally started this process we talked about the possibility of collecting the fee on just new well construction, but it was pointed out that there was already a lot of constructed groundwater capacity out there that has not been utilized. So it was decided to go with the building permits so there would be an immediate revenue stream.

Mr. Fricke interjected that the well permit process requires a log be filed after the well is constructed, and that here is a block on the log that has capacity. So your 16-inch well – if you believe the drillers and if you can get them to actually do it, would have a spot to say whether it is 200 or 2500. Mr. Sadler agreed that they test pump it at that, but that does not necessarily mean that is what it is equipped at. Typically, you will take that data back and decide whether you want to develop it; or whether that maybe too much depending on what your need is. You would almost have to go out there after it is equipped and see what they are getting out of it.

Mr. Eck said that it becomes more challenging to collect the fee after the building permit is issued, just as Mr. Niederberger had described.

Mr. Fort asked if the Board supports the recommendation of the Subcommittee on fee collection for new wells. Members informally agreed.

- **Appeal process for wells outside the benefit area.**

Mr. Eck stated that the Subcommittee began the discussion with an overview of the North Vineyard WPP and went over the provisions. The basic provisions are: that a person own property and have an operating well on said property located within the defined benefit area; the property owner is required to complete a WPP eligibility form and return it within a specified timeframe; and that there will be a verification inspection in accordance with the provisions of the program criteria.

The claim requirements are: that that impacted well has to have been registered and that the property owner submit a claim consisting of a letter explaining the condition of the well, the nature of the claim, and an invoice from a licensed well driller confirming the claim and documenting the cost of repair or replacement.

For the North Vineyard WPP there is no appeal process for claims that are outside the boundary of the benefit area.

The Subcommittee talked about the basis for the well protection fee as related to the Central Basin. The refined impact analysis provided a nexus for the fee based on projected pumping and probable number of wells impacted within the basin, and the impact analysis also defines an area where these impacts are most probable.

As far as a recommended solution, the Subcommittee proposed that the Board review claims submitted from outside the benefit area on a case by case basis and that the burden of proof (that the well was impacted by "new development") would rest with the claimant. Staff in conjunction with the Subcommittee still needs to determine what constitutes proof. There was some discussion about what constitutes proof for the North Vineyard WPP, but there needs to be some additional discussion about what the Authority might expect here. Is it going to be exactly the same or something a bit more?

It was agreed that the current benefit area and the fee amount should remain the same for right now and that the Board could potentially adjust the fee and boundary in the future based on the number and pattern of claims.

Mr. Bettis asked about the gentleman from Sloughhouse (John Garrett) who came to the last Board meeting saying that he had lost his well. Mr. Bettis asked if anybody had spent any time thinking about his claim. The property was well outside the benefit area. It was anecdotal, but he remembered that Mr. Garrett's family lost a domestic well, and they had to lower the well for the home. Was it just because of a local situation where the adjacent landowners put in orchards,

and then they went to wells as opposed to surface irrigation for the orchards. Mr. Bettis said that he believes it was a local depression that caused Mr. Garrett's family's well problem. He asked if that was what happened to the guy in Sloughhouse. If it was a local situation, it wouldn't show up in the refined impact analysis.

Mr. Eck said that he thinks it is possible, and that is part of what the Board might ultimately grapple with if language is inserted in the Ordinance to describe an appeal process.

Mr. Bettis said that it was his understanding that the boundaries of the benefit area were set mainly to save time and money as far as notification, verification, and administrative costs were concerned.

Mr. Niederberger responded that it was, but that it was also to get a handle on what the total potential program payout would be. Mr. Bettis said that was right, but he wouldn't want to exclude people like the gentleman from Sloughhouse. Mr. Eck said that this was the intent of the discussion. He went on to state that in previous discussions it has been pointed out that in establishing the fee we have been able to provide a nexus between the benefit area and the amount of the fee. The other aspect of what the impact analysis does is that, it provides that nexus based on the best available information available today, and that this is where these impacts are going to occur. So when we are discussing a case like Mr. Garrett's that occurs outside of the identified benefit area, then it just becomes a question of how does the Board want to handle that particular situation and when information like that comes forward, and what kind of decision the Board is going to make relative to that information.

Mr. Helfand remarked that that area already has a bunch of existing wells with another 100 wells coming soon. In Sheldon Hills 3, there will be about 35 houses, and 77 houses in Mastuoka. All those homes are on 2.5- to 3.5-acre parcels. Those houses will all be on individual wells.

Mr. Bettis said it seems that the Board would not want to make an appeal process too burdensome because property owners probably couldn't afford to hire somebody to make an independent study. He said that he has worked on a lot of FEMA floodplain maps for FEMA and for people wanting map revisions or doing appeals, and that the person is just kind of out of luck with FEMA. If it is a fairly significant development or a community, people can afford to make those appeals, but a person never can afford an appeal under the FEMA process. He said that he doesn't think the Board wants to go in that direction.

Mr. Eck said that general discussion held in the Subcommittee meeting indicated that there are a lot of situations throughout the Basin where people are not familiar with the well located on their property. There are varying amounts of well information that may or may not be available. He said that he believes those

things need to be factored into whatever decision is made as to what constitutes an adequate level of proof. That will be a part of the discussion conducted by the Subcommittee when it begins crafting something that would describe how this process would work and what the expectations might be.

- **Revision to the Work Plan.**

Mr. Eck said that he had hoped to have information back from counsel, so modification to the work plan is pending a decision by counsel and ultimately the Board on how we are going address the Proposition 218 and Water Code issue. Depending on which direction that goes, it will affect whatever that timetable might be. We should get a response from counsel by the end of next week; then in October staff will come back to the Board with a revised work plan or some suggestions to the work plan on how to address whatever that recommendation by counsel might be.

The Board had no new directions for staff in that regard.

5. EVALUATION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

- **Report back on progress on evaluation of the Executive Director.**

Mr. Fort reported that he was scheduled to meet with Mr. Eck the previous Friday but was unable to do so, but he said they would meet within a few days, and then the evaluation will be brought before the Board at the October meeting.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **Status of AB 303 grant application.**
    - **Grant Agreement.**

      Staff received the completed grant application from State DWR on Monday, and staff is in the process of executing the documents and returning it to State DWR this week.

    - **Consultant Contract.**

      Once the grant agreement has been executed, staff would like to move forward on a contract with WRIME to complete the work that is described in the grant application work plan. Mr. Eck said that he would like concurrence from the Board that staff can go ahead, once staff receives the fully executed agreement from State DWR, with WRIME with the contract to actually perform the work.

      Mr. Sadler said he would move that the Board authorize staff to execute an agreement with WRIME once it has the contract with the State.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Sadler moved, seconded by Mr. Helfand, the motion carried unanimously to approve entering into a contract with WRIME upon receipt of a fully executed grant agreement from State DWR.

- **Expiration of County-Appointed Board Members Terms.**

  Mr. Eck thanked the members for getting their nominations in. The board item with all the nominees appointed by the Board of Supervisors has been submitted and is scheduled to be heard on September 30, 2008, and he added that it is being handled as a consent item and that he does not anticipate any problems.

There being no further comments from the Directors, Mr. Fort adjourned the meeting

By:

Matt D. Fort — Chairperson

10/8/08 — Date

Sharon Anderson

10/15/2008 — Date

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
FORMED
AUGUST 29, 2006
CALIFORNIA