

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Governing Board Meeting
Final Minutes
September 8, 2010

LOCATION: 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1212
Sacramento, CA 95827
9:00 a.m. to 10:05 a.m.

MINUTES:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Walt Sadler called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Alternate Rep):

Darren Wilson, City of Elk Grove
Ken Payne, City of Folsom
Walt Sadler, City of Folsom
Elizabeth Sparkman, City of Rancho Cordova
Jim Peifer, City of Sacramento
Herb Niederberger, County of Sacramento
Rick Bettis, Conservation Land Owners
Stuart Helfand, Agricultural-Residential
Ron Lowry, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
David Armand, California-American Water Company
Jose Ramirez, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Scott Fort, Golden State Water Company

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, SCGA
Ping Chen, SCGA
Ramon Roybal, SCGA
Heather Hawke, SCGA

Others in Attendance:

Ali Taghavi, WRIME Inc.
Mark Roberson, Water Forum
Rob Swartz, Sacramento Groundwater Authority
Barrie Lightfoot, Elk Grove Water Service

Member Agencies Absent

Agricultural Interests
Public Agencies Self Supplied
Rancho Murieta Community Services District
Commercial/Industrial Self-Supplied (Vacant)

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

The draft meeting minutes for the meeting held on May 12, 2010 were reviewed for final approval.

Motion/Second/Carried - Mr. Fort moved, seconded by Mr. Bettis, the motion carried unanimously to approve the minutes.

4. **PROGRESS REPORT ON DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (DMS) UPDATE**

Mr. Taghavi announced that, per a discussion with staff from both SGA and SCGA, a decision was made to have one combined data base with appropriate levels of access privileges to each one of the Basin Authorities, as well as each purveyor and or agency within each group. It was explained that this would provide proper access to the database without getting the two data sets mixed up as well as having the proper data entry form for each one of the agencies and each one of the groups. Mr. Taghavi stated that the SCGA data base is near completion as most of the expected data has been received that was expected to be input into the DMS. Mr. Taghavi further announced that a full demonstration of the DMS will be presented at the next Board meeting in November. Mr. Taghavi reiterated that the project was funded by the Local Groundwater Assistance program (AB303) and that the contract was set to end in December 2010, and that it is expected that the project will be completed on time and on budget by December 31st, 2010. Mr. Bettis asked for further explanation of the levels of access as mentioned. Mr. Taghavi explained that currently there is a system administrator charged with overseeing the entire database and that SGA and SCGA would each be designated with a data base administrator for the respective data bases and who would then have the authority to assign users with varying levels of permissions. Within SCGA, if the SCGA appoints a particular person as the administrator then they would assign user privileges to each one of the agencies or the users within the group and the entities would have privileges to either view or edit the data or input data and do their analysis of the data. Mr. Helfand asked why the access to the data base was so restricted. Mr. Niederberger responded that restrictions were necessary to preserve the confidentiality and integrity of the data. Mr. Bettis asked if staff required additional training for fulfilling its role as DMS administrator, if there was sufficient budget to acquire said training and furthermore, if the DMS required updating in the future, if the funding existed for such an item. Mr. Eck responded that the budget accounted for such items and that it would be brought before the Board for their consideration at the appropriate time.

Mr. Niederberger asked if the SCGA DMS would be able to satisfy the requirements called out for in SBX76 regarding groundwater levels. Mr. Taghavi responded that in

terms of groundwater data the answer would be yes although all of the requirements of the legislation have yet to be published.

5. REPORT BACK ON WELL PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. Eck stated that, per an announcement at the May 12, 2010 SCGA Board meeting, a meeting had been arranged by Mr. Sadler with representatives of the Building Industry Association (BIA) to discuss the proposed central basin Well Protection Program (WPP). The meeting was held on May 25, 2010 and in attendance were Mr. Sadler and Mr. Eck representing Groundwater Authority, and Mr. Miller, Mr. Costa, Mr. Rey, Mr. Terren and Mr. Shattuck representing the BIA. The discussion included background information on the development of the Central Sacramento County Groundwater Management Plan (GMP), the participation by the various stakeholder groups in developing the plan, and the need for WPP that would protect existing private well owners from impacts of decreasing groundwater levels caused by new development. Also discussed was stakeholder support for the inclusion of a WPP in the GMP, along with its various components, including the creation of the new fee to be charged at the time of issue of a new building permit, program funding, and the commitment of the part of the Groundwater Authority to move the program forward in accordance of the requirements of the Joint Powers Agreement. Mr. Eck reported that, while the BIA acknowledged their previous support for the implementation of the WPP, they could no longer support the creation of the new fee given that the current real estate market could not withstand additional fees on building permits. Additionally, as reported by Mr. Eck, the BIA representatives felt that the future real estate market would be affected by the magnitude of the current economic conditions, to the extent that there would be a different approach to any fees going forward. Various alternatives were suggested by the BIA representatives relative to how the program could be funded, but they had all been previously discussed by the Authority and found to be impractical. Mr. Eck stated that at the current time there was no reasonable means for funding the WPP and that staff recommended that the Board shelve work on the WPP until such a time as it may be practical to proceed.

Mr. Helfand expressed displeasure at the recommendation to defer the WPP based on the response from the BIA. Mr. Helfand suggested that the Board knew ahead of the meeting that the BIA would not support the program and reiterated his disappointment that the Board was unwilling to move forward without BIA support. He then stated his concern that surface water from the Vineyard Treatment plant would come online before the WPP would be resuscitated which would render the program un-necessary. Mr. Helfand then questioned what the Board would do if it faced opposition to the implementation of any of its other programs in the future.

Mr. Niederberger mentioned that implementation of the WPP was dependant on more than a decision by the Board as there was also jurisdictional issue to consider. He reminded that the fee would have to be enacted and collected by each land use authority which at the current time seemed unlikely to occur. Mr. Niederberger then pointed out that Mr. Helfand had raised an interesting point with respect to the

operation of the Vineyard Surface Water Treatment plant and the WPP. Mr. Niederberger recalled that during the development of the SCGA GMP the WPP was negotiated as insurance on behalf of existing groundwater users, against the assurance of a surface water supply project that at the time, was not certain to be constructed. Mr. Niederberger then proposed that since there is now the assurance that the surface water project will be completed was insurance to protect existing groundwater users still necessary?

Mr. Niederberger alluded to a report that implied that groundwater levels adjacent to the Cosumnes River were rising. He stated that such evidence could serve as a key discussion point for the Board to make a determination on whether an insurance program for the purpose of protecting existing groundwater users was still necessary. Mr. Niederberger proposed to delay a decision on the status of the WPP pending a presentation by Mr. Eck regarding groundwater levels adjacent to the Cosumnes River in order to provide context to the necessity of assurance versus insurance.

Mr. Lowry stated that he was aware of three domestic wells that had recently gone dry on the north side of the Cosumnes River. Mr. Sadler asked Mr. Lowry if he could acquire more information regarding the wells, such as their specific locations and to provide the information at the next Board meeting. Mr. Lowry replied in the affirmative

Motion/Second/Carried - Mr. Niederberger moved, seconded by Mr. Helfand, the motion carried unanimously to delay a decision regarding the status of the Well Protection Program pending a staff report on groundwater levels adjacent to the Cosumnes River at the next Board meeting.

6. INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT FOR SCGA

Mr. Eck reported that the firm Vavrinek, Trine, and Day (VTD) was retained on behalf of SCGA to conduct auditing services for the Fiscal Years ending in 2007, 2008, and 2009; and completed on July 16, 2010. Copies of the reports were provided to all Board members. Mr. Eck reported that all recommendations made in the individual audit reports had been noted and implemented and that the issues identified were primarily related to the posting of reimbursements paid by AB303 grant program and the posting of earned interest. Mr. Eck reported that County administrative staff had taken steps assure that the Authority was on track to complete an audit on an annual basis moving forward.

7. AGRICULTURE/AGRICULTURAL-RESIDENTIAL WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. Eck recalled that at the last meeting it was noted that the Groundwater Authority needed to be more proactive in addressing demand reductions for agricultural and

agricultural-residential water users. Mr. Eck then pointed out that one of the action items listed in section 3.2.4.1 of the groundwater management plan (GMP) states that the basin governance body shall develop best management practices (BMP) for self-served agricultural and agricultural-residential water users. In accordance with the requirements of the GMP, staff requested that the Board establish a subcommittee to study, evaluate, and make recommendations on appropriate water conservation BMP's for agricultural and agricultural-residential water users.

Mr. Bettis stated that he believed that it would be most beneficial to educate urban and agricultural-residential users of water conservation and efficiency practices. Mr. Helfand mentioned that there were many programs in place for agricultural users and questioned whether the Authority should target those users with its resources. Mr. Niederberger added that agricultural users were also compelled towards increased water use efficiency because they have significant costs associated with pumping groundwater. Mr. Lowry responded that he felt that outreach to agricultural-residential users could be beneficial and effective.

Mr. Niederberger mentioned that the subcommittee did not necessarily need to be comprised solely of SCGA Board members.

Mr. Bettis and Mr. Lowry volunteered to sit on Agricultural-Residential Water Conservation Subcommittee and to compile a list of contacts who may be interested in the subcommittee and to provide an update at the next Board meeting.

8. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Eck followed up on the Local Groundwater Assistance Grant PSP, stating that according to the State Department of Water Resources, the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for AB 303 grants will not be released until the January/February 2011 timeframe. Mr. Eck then addressed SBX7 6 which requires all groundwater basins in the state to have groundwater elevations monitored. He pointed out that local agencies that propose to be the recognized monitoring entity in part or all of a basin or sub basin must submit a request to DWR by January 1, 2011 and that it has been suggested that the Groundwater Authority assume the role as the recognized monitoring entity in the Central Basin. Mr. Eck stated that as a follow up to the issue, Groundwater Authority staff met with representatives of the Sacramento Groundwater Authority/Regional Water Authority, the Cities of Roseville and Lincoln, and Placer County Water Agency to discuss coordination and reporting efforts. There was general agreement that a broader, RWA led reporting structure would be beneficial to the region. RWA staff will be seeking input from their Board and also plan to outreach to Sutter County and the South Area Water Council to participate as well. When guidelines are available from DWR in early fall, a final proposal can be developed.

Mr. Eck introduced the new Board appointments for the SCGA.

participate as well. When guidelines are available from DWR in early fall, a final proposal can be developed.

Mr. Eck introduced the new Board appointments for the SCGA.

9. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Niederberger stated that wet irrigation testing for the Freeport Project had begun and that the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) had discharged a small volume of water down the Folsom South Canal. A system option and readiness test will take place in the Spring so that EBMUD can run water through the Mokelumne Aqueduct.

Mr. Bettis asked about the status of Prop 84 proposals being collected by the SGA.

ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming Meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, November 10th, 2010. 10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA; SASD South Conference Room 1212 (Sunset Maple).

By:




Chairperson



Date



Chairperson



Date

