

**SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING**

Wednesday, July 29, 2015; 1:30 PM

10060 Goethe Road

Sacramento, CA 95827

SRCSD/SASD Office Building – Valley Oak Community Room

MINUTES:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Darrell Eck called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep):

Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests

Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners

Tom Nelson, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District

Board Members (Alternate Rep):

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento

Staff Members:

Ping Chen, SCGA

Ramon Roybal, Acting Clerk

Others in Attendance:

Mark Madison, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District

Bruce Kamilos, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District

Jon Goetz, GEI

2. SUB-COMMITTEE PURPOSE

Mr. Eck welcomed everyone and announced that the meeting format would follow a PowerPoint presentation given by Jon Goetz from GEI. Mr. Eck stated that the emphasis of the meeting would focus on the boundary adjustment process as determined by State DWR (DWR).

Mr. Goetz began by describing his role in SCGA's SGMA compliance process as providing the technical background and understanding of the process in addition to documentation of the process for submission to DWR at the time SCGA applies for designation as a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA).

The sub-committee purpose was identified as follows:

- Reach out to potential stakeholders
- Strategize on potential boundary adjustments
- Discuss potential coordination issues
- Discuss and make recommendations on potential changes to the governing JPA
- Other elements relative to the formation of a GSA

Concerning reach out to potential stakeholders, Mr. Goetz explained that the SCGA could rely on the outreach done as part of the Water Forum process which resulted in the creation of SCGA as a significant portion of the outreach required by SGMA. However, since SCGA would be adjusting its boundary to align with Bulletin 118, outreach would be necessary in those areas which would be added to SCGA. Mr. Goetz explained that the outreach would occur at the SCGA Board of Director meetings and that it was the sub-committee's role to identify potential stakeholders and to initiate their participation at said meetings.

Concerning potential boundary adjustments Mr. Goetz explained that it not only concerned SCGA's own boundary but the boundaries of entities adjacent to SCGA.

Mr. Goetz described the coordination issues as relating to how SCGA would get through the SGMA process specifically, how it would reach all of the required milestones in a timely manner.

Mr. Goetz detailed potential changes to the JPA as necessary actions designed to enable SCGA to formally adjust its boundary and to enable a transition to a GSA.

3. SCGA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Goetz provided a summary of DWR's boundary regulations as follows:

- DWR prefers Bulletin 118
- Changes to basin boundary shall be consistent with State's interest
- Types of Basin Modifications
 - Scientific
 - Jurisdictional
- Requires significant supporting information (Article 5 in Draft Boundary Regs)
- High likelihood of basin modification triggering a "Basis for Denial"

Draft Basin Boundary Regulations were released at the end of July to be followed with a public comment period set to close September 1, 2015. Basin Boundary Regulations to be adopted January 1, 2016. Any Basin Modifications are to be submitted within ninety days of adoption of regulations. Every boundary modification proposal must also go through the California Water Commission.

Mr. Goetz stated that his interpretation of the Draft Regulations made it clear that DWR was determined to use Bulletin 118 boundary definitions and that the process described by DWR for a Boundary Modification was extremely time consuming and costly. Mr. Goetz further explained that any potential Boundary Modification was subject to public consensus as well as adjacent agency consensus in addition to strict DWR and Water Commission scrutiny.

Mr. Ewart asked if the South American Subbasin was determined on a scientific or jurisdictional basis or a mixture of both. Mr. Eck replied that he believed it to be based on a scientific rationale. Mr. Ewart asked if the eastern boundary, particularly in the vicinity of the City of Folsom was also based on a scientific rationale. Mr. Goetz replied that it seemed as though it was and that DWR had attempted to include the recharge areas where alluvial deposits met bedrock in that vicinity. Mr. Goetz added that perhaps the subbasin boundary in the Delta region was arbitrary due to the nature of trying to define the geologic features of the area.

Mr. Goetz went through the various types of boundary modifications allowed under the Draft Basin Boundary Regulations. The Scientific Modification was to be based solely on a hydrogeologic justification. The Jurisdictional Modification allowed for three types of modifications: Internal, Consolidation, and Subdivision. Mr. Goetz stated that adoption of a Bulletin 118 boundary as is would require no additional actions to satisfy the Boundary Regulations.

Mr. Madison asked if there was anyone who would object to SCGA adjusting its boundary to align with Bulletin 118. Mr. Madison brought up Omochumen-Hartnell Water District (OHWD) as an example of an entity that may have objections. Mr. Eck replied that he had met with Mike Wackman, OHWD General Manager, but did not get an indication as to whether or not they were going to push for a boundary definition other than Bulletin 118. Mr. Mahon pointed out that OHWD viewed itself as an agricultural interest and that it viewed the Cosumnes Subbasin as more of an agricultural region and the South American subbasin as more inclined towards commercial interests. Mr. Eck replied that such a view might be correct but that in any arrangement, the implementation of a GSA would have to be supported and funded by the stakeholders be they agricultural or commercial.

Mr. Goetz proceeded to identify the particular Boundary Modification process that the Cosumnes Subbasin would be required to follow as a Jurisdictional-Internal modification. Mr. Goetz pointed out that along the entire process public consensus would be required in addition a demonstration of historical groundwater management within the proposed boundary. Additionally, Mr. Goetz highlighted the requirement that such a modification would also require the support of all affected agencies. This implied that SCGA would have to support the proposed modification.

The consensus of the sub-committee was to proceed with a recommendation to the Board that SCGA proceed with adoption of the Bulletin 118 boundary definition for the South American Subbasin and in the event that the Cosumnes Subbasin pursued a Boundary Modification to its basin, SCGA would not support it.

Mr. Goetz summarized that SCGA would proceed with adopting the Bulletin 118 boundary definition and would support any agency who also chose to adopt Bulletin 118 while keeping

an eye on all adjacent groundwater basins with an understanding that SCGA must work with them and to do so without conflict.

Mr. Goetz then stated that additional steps related to adoption of the Bulletin 118 boundary would entail outreach to the stakeholders who would be removed from the SCGA management area and those who would be added. In the case of stakeholders to be removed, Mr. Goetz raised the issue of the Agricultural Water Authority's management area and potential coordination with them on the proper authority via their JPA process to ensure the area is managed appropriately absent of SCGA. In the case of areas to be added to SCGA, Mr. Goetz addressed the delta region and the need to identify and educate affected stakeholders.

Mr. Ewart stated that before a formal recommendation was made to the Board to pursue an adjustment to adopt the Bulletin 118 boundary definition, he would need to vet it with others within the City of Sacramento.

4. STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

Mr. Nelson asked if a new stakeholder attended one of SCGA's public outreach meetings, what would be their level of participation assuming they would not have an actual vote. Mr. Eck replied that a majority of the new stakeholders could presumably be represented by an existing stakeholder group or organization already on the SCGA Board and that those groups would be responsible for communicating and soliciting for their concerns and opinions. Mr. Eck then stated that Rob Swartz with the Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) had suggested the use of an advisory committee. Mr. Eck said that such a committee may become necessary to provide a mechanism for everyone to have a meaningful voice while maintaining an efficient and effective Board meeting.

Mr. Madison inquired as to the targeted timeline for GSA application and suggested that a widespread outreach effort be made via the newspaper and other channels and to conduct town hall style meetings to educate the public on the ramifications of SGMA. Mr. Eck replied that in order to conduct such an effort you would need to know what you expected from it. Mr. Madison stated that he feared if such efforts were not taken then there was a potential for running into crippling opposition. Mr. Goetz clarified that the process was designed to satisfy SGMA and not to justify the actions of SCGA and that if a person or group had an issue with the specifics of what SCGA was attempting to implement, then it was an issue for the State to justify in relation to SGMA. Mr. Goetz then stated that all public outreach including the type suggested by Mr. Madison would be looked upon favorably by the State and that the State should be included in all such meetings. Mr. Goetz then said that all options should be on the table but that an examination of the resources available to conduct outreach in concert with meeting the required deadlines may determine what level of outreach is most appropriate.

With respect to the question of the targeted timeline for GSA application, Mr. Goetz alluded to the June 30, 2017 date established by the legislation but expressed concern over the process of amending the JPA and the establishment of cooperation agreements. Mr. Goetz

stated that three months prior to the June 30, 2017 date would be an appropriate goal for completing all GSA formation tasks to allow time for the intention to establish a GSA to be noticed.

Mr. Madison then asked when Prop. 1 funding would become available. Mr. Goetz replied that it would be at the beginning of 2016. Mr. Madison stated his belief that if SCGA could form a GSA earlier, then it may be placed in a better position to receive Prop. 1 funding which could then be used for public outreach efforts, JPA amendment, and updating the groundwater management plan (GMP). Mr. Goetz replied that his firm was closely tracking developments concerning that source of funding and that he would notify Mr. Eck as soon as it became clear that it was to become available. Mr. Eck then reiterated Mr. Madison's question asking if a local agency must already have formed a GSA in order to be eligible for Prop. 1 funding. Mr. Nelson piggybacked on the question to ask if Prop. 1 funding would be made available for actual GSA formation. Mr. Goetz replied that the State had not necessarily made a decision regarding the funding of GSA formation but that it did recognize that agricultural areas and disadvantaged communities would require assistance in the GSA formation process and therefore such monies would probably become available.

Mr. Goetz then laid out the timeframe for stakeholder identification and outreach for GSA formation as August 2015 to January 2016. Identification of stakeholder issues and building of consensus among stakeholders would run from January 2016 to January 2017. Mr. Goetz also identified parallel issues as it related to the jurisdictional boundary adjustment to Bulletin 118 definition. They included the potential for LAFCo approval, amendment of the JPA, and determination of a water budget, sustainable yield and development of the GSP.

Mr. Goetz pointed out that through the stakeholder identification and outreach effort, existing groups on the SCGA Board may have to expand the extent of their current communication. Mr. Eck stated that SCGA would also have to outreach to stakeholders that had been contacted in the past but who had not shown interest in participating. Mr. Ewart stated that the City of Sacramento had relationships with Tokay Park and Fruitridge Vista Water Companies.

5. ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS ASSIGNMENTS

- 1) Committee members to vet the concept with their respective organizations of lending support to making a formal recommendation to the SCGA Board of Directors to adopt the Bulletin 118 boundary definition of the South American Subbasin as the SCGA boundary. Develop appropriate language for said recommendation.
- 2) Committee members and staff to identify additional stakeholder groups. Acquire contact information.

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:

Jan Orosak
Chairperson

9/21/15
Date

Stu Perb

09-09-15
Date

