

**SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Wednesday, March 12, 2014; 9:00 am

10060 Goethe Road

Sacramento, CA 95827

(SASD South Conference Room No. 1212 – Sunset Maple)

The Board will discuss all items on this agenda, and may take action on any of those items, including information items and continued items. The Board may also discuss other items that do not appear on this agenda, but will not act on those items unless action is urgent, and a resolution is passed by a two-thirds (2/3) vote declaring that the need for action arose after posting of this agenda.

The public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board on any item of interest before and during the Board's consideration of that item. Public comment on items within the jurisdiction of the Board is welcomed, subject to reasonable time limitations for each speaker.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL – 9:00 a.m.**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT:** Members of the public who wish to address the Board may do so at this time. Please keep your comments to less than three minutes.
- 3. CONSENT CALENDAR**
  - Minutes of January 8, 2014 Board meeting.  
*Action: Approve Consent Calendar items*
- 4. BUDGET REPORT**
  - Status of the 2013-2014 budget.  
*Action: Receive and file.*
- 5. FISCAL YEAR 2014/2015 BUDGET**
  - Planning for the 2014/2015 fiscal year budget.  
*Action: Appoint a budget committee to prepare a budget recommendation for the 2014/2015 fiscal year.*
- 6. 2012/2013 AUDIT REPORT**
  - Presentation by Bill Konigsmark, Accounting Manager.  
*Action: Receive and file.*
- 7. UPDATE ON GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION PROGRESS AT AEROJET**
  - Presentation by Alex MacDonald with the Regional Water Quality Control Board on groundwater remediation activities associated with Aerojet/Boeing.  
*Action: Information presentation.*
- 8. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES SELECTION POLICY**
  - Presentation by staff on the proposed Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy.

*Action: Adopt the Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy.*

**9. REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

- Information presentation – Groundwater Data Policy: SCGA staff.

*Action: Make recommendations as necessary.*

**10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- a) Local Groundwater Assistance Grant
- b) Questionnaire for the Groundwater Accounting Program (GAP)
- c) Form 700

**11. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Upcoming meetings –**

**Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting –** Wednesday, May 14, 2014, 9 am; 10060 Goethe Road, South Conference Room No. 1212 (Sunset Maple).

**AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSENT CALENDER**

**BACKGROUND:**

Minutes of the January 8, 2014 SCGA Board meeting.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Approve Consent Calendar items.*

**SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)**  
**Governing Board Meeting**  
**Draft Minutes**  
**January 8, 2014**

**LOCATION:** 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1212  
Sacramento, CA 95827  
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

**MINUTES:**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Bruce Kamilos called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep):

Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests  
Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners  
Christine Thompson, Public Agencies Self Supplied  
David Armand, California-American Water Company  
Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company

Board Members (Alternate Rep):

Darren Wilson, City of Elk Grove  
Britton Snipes, City of Rancho Cordova  
Jim Peifer, City of Sacramento  
Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District  
Todd Eising, City of Folsom  
Forrest, Williams Jr., Sacramento County Water Agency  
Jose Ramirez, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, Executive Director  
Heather Peek, Clerk  
Ping Chen, SCGA  
Ramon Roybal, SCGA

Others in Attendance:

Mark Roberson, Water Forum  
Rob Swartz, SGA  
Tim Goodwin, Brown and Caldwell  
Joe Turner, Brown and Caldwell

Ali Taghavi, RMC Water and Environment  
Jim Blanke, RMC Water and Environment  
Rodney Fricke, Aerojet Corp.  
Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento  
Jafar Faghieh, HDR  
Mike Koza, Sacramento County Department of Waste Management

Member Agencies Absent

*Agricultural-Residential  
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District  
Rancho Murieta Community Services District*

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

The draft meeting minutes for the November 13, 2013 Board meeting were reviewed for final approval.

*Motion/Second/Carried* – Mr. Bettis moved, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the motion carried unanimously to approve the minutes.

**4. BUDGET REPORT**

Mr. Eck provided an update for the first quarter of the fiscal year budget 2013/2014. Mr. Eck reported that the approved budget for fiscal year was \$554,050 and that expenditures as of the end of September 30, 2013 were \$56,449, leaving a balance of \$497,601 which accounted for roughly ten percent expenditure for the fiscal year. Mr. Eck stated that a report for the first half of the fiscal year would be provided at the March 2014 board meeting.

*Action: Receive and file.*

**5. SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY BASIN  
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE THRESHOLD DEVELOPMENT AND RECHARGE  
MAPPING PROJECT**

Mr. Eck stated that as a reminder, the project would provide a tool for the implementation of Basin Management Objective (BMO) #2, as identified in the Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) which calls for maintaining specific groundwater elevations within all areas of the basin consistent with the Water Forum Solution. Additionally, the tool would provide a groundwater recharge map for the basin as required by AB 359. Mr. Eck recalled that at the

March 14, 2012 Board meeting, a detailed presentation on the scope of work including the cost was provided. Mr. Eck further described the aim of BMO #2 as quantifying the overall groundwater levels of the basin and in order to maintain an acceptable operating range or threshold of groundwater levels. Mr. Eck referred to Appendix B of the GMP for further detail. Mr. Eck then stated that the project would use historical data and integrative hydrologic model simulations to establish a bandwidth for various groundwater levels throughout different locations within the basin. The resulting bandwidth would be integrated with the Authority's Hydro DMS. Mr. Eck then described the recharge map component as seeking to improve the conceptual understanding of the groundwater basin through identification of sources of groundwater recharge as well as the relative magnitude of each source. Mr. Eck reminded that the project is partially funded by an AB 303, Local Groundwater Assistance grant with additional funding provided by the Authority as approved in the 2013/2014 fiscal year budget. Mr. Eck reported the total project cost as \$249,780 with \$199,824 funded via the AB303 grant and \$50,156 supplemented by SCGA. Mr. Eck stated that State DWR was in the process of executing the final funding agreement and that staff would need to secure consulting support in order to meet the project demands of early 2014. Mr. Eck reported that after careful consideration, staff recommended hiring RMC through a non-competitive selection process. The staff recommendation was based on RMC's extensive previous work, related directly to the current project, under a previous Local Groundwater Assistance grant used to develop the Hydro DMS. Mr. Eck then said that RMC additionally had extensive experience in the development of the integrative hydrologic model used to develop the threshold concepts contained in Appendix B of the GMP as well as development of the scope of work for the current project and grant application. Mr. Eck then stated that RMC's extensive body of work demonstrated its unique knowledge and ability to complete the project within the timeframe outlined in the scope of work. Staff recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with RMC to implement the project.

Mr. Williams asked, relative to the past two years of drought and concurrent water conservation programs, how the evaluation resulting from the project might change with the additional possibility of future dry years. Mr. Eck responded that with the current project along with the work that had already been completed in building the HyrdoDMS would provide the Groundwater Authority and the various stakeholders with the ability to see exactly where the potential challenges might exist in the basin given the current conditions.

Mr. Bettis asked if the recharge portion of the project would examine potential projects for enhanced recharge existing in addition to natural recharge sources.

Mr. Eck replied that the requirements of AB359 specified the analysis of natural recharge but that as progress is made in the development of the Groundwater Accounting Program (GAP), the ability to analyze artificial recharge would come into play. Mr. Eck stated that the current process was primarily focused on natural recharge and that the interest from the perspective of the State was to facilitate responsible land-use planning.

Mr. Ramirez mentioned the Board package did not contain a full report of the scope of work, schedule, and budget pertaining to the project and that it should be a part of the entire package for review. He also asked if a legal counsel had reviewed the proposal given that staff was proposing a noncompetitive bid process to select the consultant for an amount approaching \$250,000.

Mr. Eck replied that there had been no specific conversation with legal counsel regarding an opinion on the noncompetitive consultant selection process. Mr. Eck further stated that a similar approach had been taken previously relative the AB303 grant. Mr. Eck then said that if there was a need from Board members to see scope, budget, and schedule, that it could certainly be provided and reminded that the information was presented to the Board a number of months previously.

Mr. Kamilos said that it made sense to use RMC based on their background with the project and the Authority.

Mr. Ramirez clarified that he was not opposed to the selection of RMC, stating that his opinion was that they were a good firm, but that his overall concern was not having run the sole source selection through legal counsel.

Mr. Schubert asked if the \$50,000 supplemental contribution from the Groundwater Authority was a part of the Authority's approved budget. Mr. Eck replied in the affirmative. Mr. Schubert then asked if an analysis was done to compare what another firm may charge as a stand-alone cost for the project relative to RMC's in-depth experience with the project's development.

Mr. Eck mentioned that staff had not done an analysis to that particular degree but had discussed various consulting firms within the region and what their experience had been relative to working on similar types of projects and what degree of learning curve might be associated with selecting another firm to perform what was specified in the scope of work for the current project. Staff did not determine a specific dollar value for how much more it might cost however, it was obvious that the cost would be higher. The learning curve would be significant and in addition to extra cost, time was a consideration given the scope and schedule of the project agreed upon with State DWR and RMC would be equipped to commence work from day one.

Mr. Kamilos asked if the cost was based on a set price or based on billable hours. Mr. Eck replied that it was the firm cost that was submitted to State DWR and that DWR had reviewed and agreed to the scope of work, schedule, and budget. Mr. Eck then stated that previous experience with RMC resulted in the project completed on time and on budget, and with no changes in the scope of work or with modifications of cost.

Mr. Ramirez asked if anything from the March 14, 2012 project description provided to the Board had changed. Mr. Eck replied that the schedule had been altered to simply reflect the actual start date.

Mr. Ramirez asked when the term of the grant would end and also thought a delay to pass this motion until the next Board meeting would be a good idea. He also stated he'd like to see a draft Department of Water Resources (DWR) agreement and follow that up with legal counsel. Mr. Blanke, RMC, replied that the end date for the contract would be December of 2015.

Mr. Eck asked if the Board would tentatively approve the item based on a favorable opinion from legal counsel.

*Tentative Motion/Second/Carried* – Ms. Thompson moved, seconded by Mr. Wilson, the motion carried unanimously to tentatively approve entering into a contract with RMC, contingent on legal counsel's review and opinion and on staff providing the scope of work, schedule, and budget to interested Board members.

*Action: Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with RMC.*

## **6. SACRAMENTO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT AND WATER WELL REHABILITATIONS**

Mr. Kamilos distributed information demonstrating what the Elk Grove Water District (EGWD) ran into during their most recent water well rehabilitation project. Mr. Kamilos warned that everyone should be made aware of the increased scrutiny that all water purveyors were coming under, relative to well rehabilitation projects, by existing regulatory agencies. Mr. Kamilos stated that EGWD commenced an acid treatment as part of a routine water well rehabilitation project had gone through our the typical channels such as obtaining a discharge permit via the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) accompanied by a work plan. Mr. Kamilos stated that SRCSD was accommodating in issuing the permit. Mr. Kamilos described the typical requirements to batch water in a holding tank so that the waste would then be released in a none continuous flow through tanks. Another condition was to provide lab test results of aluminum, arsenic, copper, manganese and zinc from the initial batch of the holding tank and the final batch of the holding tank. The pH of the discharge wastewater to the sanitary sewer system must be equal to or greater than a pH of 5 and less than a pH of 12.5. Another condition was that the flow rate of the discharged waste water should not exceed 200 gallons per minute (GPM) into the sanitary sewer line. Mr. Kamilos then described an arrangement of two 20,000 gallon baker tanks and a 1,000 gallon water buffalo tank adjacent to the groundwater well under rehabilitation . Mr. Kamilos then described the sequence of events stating that prior to any acidization of the well; EGWD received a customer complaint filed with the Sacramento County Environmental Management Department (EMD) on the basis that the project could generate hazardous waste. Mr. Kamilos stated that it was never disclosed who filed the complaint but that in EGWD's interpretation; the complaint was of a suspicious nature. The complaint resulted in an inspector from EMD to show up at the site unannounced, along with the inspector from SRCSD. Mr. Kamilos asserted that the EMD inspector made the following statement: "This is the first time they we've ever been called out on a water well rehabilitation project." Mr. Kamilos then reported that the inspector then stated that if the well fluids at the "point of

origination” had a pH or 2 or less, then the fluid would be considered a hazardous waste. Additionally, the inspector stated that if the well fluid constituents tested for in a CAM-17, exceeded the thresholds listed in Title 22 it would also be considered a hazardous waste. Mr. Kamilos said that a discussion with the inspector ensued regarding the proper interpretation of the “point of origination” for the EGWD project. EGWD argued that the “point of origination” should have been where SRCSD took ownership of the well flows (downstream of the holding tanks) at the point where goes discharge entered the sanitary sewer pipe. The inspector argued that the “point of origination” was at the well itself where the water would be coming up out of the well. Mr. Kamilos explained that this caused a conflict with EGWD’s standard practice and for that matter, with other purveyor’s common practice, which was to treat the water originating from the well in the adjacent tanks mentioned previously thus the water exiting said tanks and being discharged to the sanitary sewer, would meet all regulatory standards. Mr. Kamilos stated that EGWD then met with SRCSD in what was a positive meeting to come to a common understanding followed by a meeting with EMD in an attempt to accomplish the same understanding. Mr. Kamilos reported the meeting with EMD as contentious to the point where EGWD abandoned the meeting. It was EGWD’s interpretation that EMD had commenced a program to closely investigate and regulate water well rehabilitation with greater scrutiny. EGWD did not feel as though it had been singled out rather, it was something that is going to be occurring region-wide. EGWD asked EMD if they could be issued an annual project based permit to allow for the treatment of fluids in a water buffalo tank. EMD’s response was the requirement of a discharge tank conducive to being utilized as a “transportable treatment unit” for transport to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) which would be responsible for the issue of a treatment permit. Mr. Kamilos concluded that EMD had thus absolved themselves from giving a definitive answer and essentially required that DTSC become involved as well. Mr. Kamilos opined that everyone would be facing a higher level of scrutiny from the regulators and that everyone should be aware of it as it would affect the conduct of business and hopefully there would be push back in order to find some middle ground to allow purveyors to safely perform their projects within the level of the law.

***Action: Information presentation.***

## **7. REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Mr. Eck conducted a review of Chapter 6, Claims and Chapter 7, Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Mr. Schubert asked if an insufficient claim would be directed to the Executive Director and if he or she would make the determination and also whether or not the Board would be notified of all claims, rejected or not rejected. Mr. Eck replied that there was no specific language regarding those issues but that he would want to make sure the Board was informed.

*Action: Make recommendations as necessary.*

## **8. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- a) Local Groundwater Assistance Grant – Mr. Eck said the Groundwater Authority was working with CA DWR to complete the grant funding agreement and anticipated signing within the month. Mr. Eck reported that there were a few comments from County Counsel and staff was working through those with CA DWR. The amount of the grant was \$199,824.
- b) Questionnaire for the Groundwater Accounting Program (GAP) – Only two of the questionnaires had been returned. Mr. Eck requested that they be submitted by February 5<sup>th</sup>.
- c) Groundwater Workplan Concept Paper – The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) released a Groundwater Workplan Concept Paper in October of 2013, outlining a framework under which the Water Board's groundwater activity would be organized. The Water Board identified five key elements for effective groundwater management, thresholds, monitoring and assessments, governance, funding and enforcement. ACWA provided comments on the five recommended elements in a letter to SWRCB on December 18, 2013, in which they emphasized that local management of groundwater resources was their preferred approach. Mr. Eck stated that many of the concepts contained in the Water Board's paper derived from work that the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) completed a few years previously. Mr. Eck reported that some of that material was presented to the Groundwater Authority Board at the May 12, 2010 Board meeting via discussion of the California's Water and LAO Primer (October 2008) and Liquid Assets: Improving Management of the State's Groundwater Resources (March 24, 2010). The concept paper that was put together fits well into what those LAO documents discussed. Mr. Eck stated that it would be important for everyone to be aware of what the State is planning for relative to groundwater management.
- d) Form 700 – Mr. Eck reminded the Board that forms were due April 1, 2014, with an original wet signature.

## **9. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Bettis stated his concern regarding groundwater water levels given the drought condition, and believed that a closer look at how the basin was behaving should be occurring. He expressed particular concern related to the drought condition effects on Aerojet contamination plume.

Mr. Ramirez requested that staff to provide more complete Board packages for future meetings particularly for items addressing project budgets, schedules, and scope of work.

Mr. Schubert followed up on Mr. Bettis' comments and expressed concern regarding increased groundwater pumping in the Central Basin as a result of the dry year conditions. He alluded to his agency's proximity to the Aerojet contamination plume and potential effect on their wells. Mr. Schubert also expressed a concern that part of his agency's drought contingency plan was to exchange water with neighboring agencies and that this year those opportunities may not exist.

Mr. Swartz added that at [www.bewatersmart.info](http://www.bewatersmart.info) they are tracking each agency's current drought contingency threshold. The site provides the ability to see regionally, the water conservation measures implemented by water purveyors and the percent reduction being called for.

Mr. Williams announced that the Sacramento County Water Agency was moving towards implementing a voluntary twenty percent water conservation measure.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Upcoming Meetings –**

**Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting** – Wednesday, March 12, 2014, 9 am; 10060 Goethe Road, South Conference Room No. 1212 (Sunset Maple).

By:

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**AGENDA ITEM 4: BUDGET REPORT**

**BACKGROUND:**

2013-2014 Budget Status:

Approved budget for fiscal year 2013-2014	\$554,050
Expenditures as of December 31, 2013 (50% of budget year)	\$ 93,917
Balance	\$460,133

Expenditures are at 17-percent for the fiscal year.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Receive and file.*

SCGA - Sacramento Groundwater Authority  
 FUND 096B - Fund Center 0960001  
 Fiscal Year 2013/14 AP6 (50% of year expended)  
 Financial Status Report

Acct No.	Account Title	2008-2009 Actuals	2009-2010 Actuals	2011-2012 Actuals	2012-2013 Actuals	2013-2014 Final Budget	Encumbrance Rollovers	2013-2014 Appropriations	AP 3 YTD	Increase thru AP 6	AP 6 YTD	Plus Enc	2013-2014 YTD
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>													
20202900	Business Conference	0	0			1,000		1,000	-	-			0
20203500	Ed/Training Srv	0	0			0		0	-	405.00	405.00	-	0
20203804	Workplace Amenities	0	0			0		0	-	-		-	0
20203805	Food Purch/Service (Board Meetings)	728	0			0		0	-	-		-	0
20205100	Insurance - Liability	0	0			6,000		6,000	-	-		-	0
20206100	Membership Dues	0	0			5,000		5,000	-	-		-	0
20207600	Office Supplies/Postage	0	0	44		400		400	-	-		-	0
20208500	Printing Svcs	0	0			1,000		1,000	-	-		-	0
20250500	Accounting & Financial Svcs.	0	7,020	8,400	5,130	7,000	1,870	8,870	-	570.00	570.00	1,300.00	1,300
20253100	Legal Svcs 124146	4,722	1,236	45		5,000		5,000	-	-		-	0
20255200	DERA - Environmental Svcs. 123265	0	0			0		0	-	-		-	0
20259100	Other Professional Svcs	87,036	66,734	27,479	17,945	325,000		325,000	10,820.00	1,687.50	12,507.50		10,820
<i>Internal Billable Orders: (See this worksheet, third tab for Order details)</i>													
20293401	AFS acctg svcs	0	1,510	630	510	750		750	257.49	257.29	514.78	595.96	853
20293403	Water Supply-Labor (W) - WR Staffing for SCGA 22246	122,600	112,437	148,986	102,587	103,400		103,400	44,246.09	33,838.54	78,084.63	31,915.37	76,161
20293403	Water Supply-Labor (W) - Well Protection Program for SCGA 22244	28,313	0			57,000		57,000	-	-		-	0
20293403	Water Supply-Labor (W) - WR Staffing (Admin & Finance) for SCGA 22587	3,206	0			21,000		21,000	1,125.72	469.05	1,594.77	8,405.23	9,531
20293403	SCWA Z41 Drainage Staff Time 22897	0	0			1,500		1,500	-	-		1,000.00	1,000
20293404	AFS Contract Desk labor 20801	0	0			0		0	-	-		-	0
20293405	Water Quality Svcs. - (Clerk to the Board)	0	0			20,000		20,000	-	-		-	0
20293400	PW-Work Request Charges	154,119	113,947	149,616	103,097	203,650	0	203,650	45,629.30	34,564.88	80,194.18	41,916.56	87,546
20291900	GS Contract Management Srvs	0	0	0		0		0	-	240.54	240.54	200.45	200
<b>Subtotal 20 Object</b>		<b>246,605</b>	<b>188,937</b>	<b>185,584</b>	<b>126,172</b>	<b>554,050</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>555,920</b>	<b>56,449.30</b>	<b>37,467.92</b>	<b>93,917.22</b>	<b>43,417.01</b>	<b>99,866.31</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>246,605</b>	<b>188,937</b>	<b>185,584</b>	<b>126,172</b>	<b>554,050</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>555,920</b>	<b>56,449.30</b>	<b>37,467.92</b>	<b>93,917.22</b>	<b>43,417.01</b>	<b>99,866</b>
<b>REIMBURSEMENTS</b>													
59599100	Operating Transfers In		0			0		0	-	-	-	-	0
<b>TOTAL REIMBURSEMENTS</b>			<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>REVENUE</b>													
94941000	Interest Income	(29,685)	(4,741)	(2,862)	(3,436)	(2,000)		(2,000)	-	-	-	-	0
94941100	Contributions	(263,336)	(267,146)	(264,048)	(254,492)	(244,222)		(244,222)	(214,222.00)	(214,222.00)	(214,222.00)	-	0
95956900	State Aid - Other Misc. AB 303 Grant Revenue (\$249,964)	0	(130,927)			(200,000)		(200,000)	-	-	-	-	0
96969900	Srv Fees Others	0	0			0		0	(30,000.00)	(30,000.00)	(30,000.00)	-	0
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>		<b>(293,021)</b>	<b>(402,814)</b>	<b>(266,910)</b>	<b>(257,928)</b>	<b>(446,222)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(446,222)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(244,222.00)</b>	<b>(244,222.00)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Acct 20259100 - Other Professional Svcs Detail</b>													
93371	Water Resources & Information Mgmt. - AB303 Grant App. Prep. & Submittal		0			10,000		10,000	-	-	-	-	0
93405	Water Resources & Information Mgmt. - Refinement of the Central Basin WPP		0			10,000		10,000	-	-	-	-	0
93714	Water Resources & Information Mgmt. - Local Ground Water Assistance Prog.			27,479	17,945	50,000		50,000	10,820.00	1,687.50	12,507.50	-	10,820
	Water Quality Testing (lab, data collection)					5,000		5,000					0
93544	AB303 Data Management System Update Consultant (WRIME)	87,036	66,734			250,000		250,000					0
<b>Total - Acct 20259100</b>		<b>87,036</b>	<b>66,734</b>	<b>27,479</b>	<b>17,945</b>	<b>325,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>325,000</b>	<b>10,820.00</b>	<b>1,687.50</b>	<b>12,507.50</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,820</b>
		(46,416)	(213,877)	(81,327)	(131,756)			109,698	56,449	(206,754)	(150,305)		

**SCGA - Sacramento Groundwater Authority**  
**FUND 096B - Fund Center 0960001**  
**Fiscal Year 2013/14 AP6 (50% of year expended)**  
**Working Capital Analysis Report**

<b>Dollars</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Source</b>
\$927,376	cash in treasury-ending balance	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$71,126	Accounts Receivable	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	Due from other funds	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	Inventory	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	GR/IR Clearing	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	Sales tax due	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
(\$1,688)	warrants payable	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	stale dated warrants	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	claims payable	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$3,352	Deposits from Others	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
\$0	Due to other funds	COMPASS Trial Balance by Fund
<b>\$1,000,167</b>	<b>Working Capital Available as of end of Accounting Period</b>	



**Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority  
Financial Statement  
As of December 31, 2013**

**Expenditures**

Environmental Svcs.	-
Other Professional Svcs. - Water Resources & Information Mgmt. - AB303 Grant App. Prep. & Submittal	12,507.50
Salaries	80,194.18
Ed/Training	405.00
Food Purchases/Service	-
Insurance - Liability	-
Office Supplies/Postage	-
Printing Svcs.	-
Accounting & Financial Svcs.	570.00
Legal Svcs.	-
General Services Contract Management	240.54
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b><u>93,917.22</u></b>

**Total Expenditures SCGA** **93,917.22**

**Revenue**

Contributions from Other Agencies	214,222.00
Interest Income	-
State Aid - Other Misc.	30,000.00
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b><u>244,222.00</u></b>

**Under/(Over) Spent** **150,304.78**

**AGENDA ITEM 5: FISCAL YEAR 2014/2015 BUDGET**

**BACKGROUND:**

In order to have the budget for the 2014/2015 fiscal year in place by the beginning of the fiscal year the budget will need to be approved by the Board at their May 14, 2013 meeting. To facilitate this, staff is requesting that the Board appoint a budget committee to work with staff in making a budget recommendation to the Board for the 2014/2015 fiscal year. Additionally, water purveyors are requested to submit groundwater pumping data for 2013 to assist in the budget development process.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Appoint a budget committee to prepare a budget recommendation for the 2014/2015 fiscal year.*

**AGENDA ITEM 6: 2012/2013 AUDIT REPORT**

**BACKGROUND:**

Information presentation on the annual audit of the Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 by Bill Konigsmark, Accounting Manager.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Receive and file.*

**AGENDA ITEM 7: UPDATE ON GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION  
PROGRESS AT AEROJET**

**BACKGROUND:**

Remediation of contaminated groundwater in and around the Aerojet/Boeing project site has been of particular interest to SCGA since adoption of the Groundwater Management Plan in 2006. With on-going implementation of the “remedy” through various operable units in and around the project site it is timely that the Board should be updated on Aerojet/Boeing’s progress. Alex MacDonald, program manager for clean-up operations, will provide an update on these activities.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Information presentation.*

**AGENDA ITEM 8: ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES  
SELECTION POLICY**

**BACKGROUND:**

In the September 11, 2013 Board meeting several questions were raised in relationship to how contracts are or should be awarded by the Authority. This issue was raised again during the January 8, 2014 Board meeting. In order to have a uniform understanding of how architectural and engineering services are procured staff is recommending that the Board adopt the Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy.

The proposed policy defines the meaning of architectural and engineering services and provides examples of what could be potentially included as part of these services. The proposed policy also allows a consultant providing services at a cost of \$50,000 or less to be selected pursuant to a selection process determined by the Executive Director. Architectural and engineering services that would cost more than \$50,000 will be obtained by a competitive proposal process by issuance of Request for Proposals or the issuance of a Request for Qualifications, as determined by the Executive Director, and a contract for such services will be subject to the approval of the Board of Directors. The policy also provides a provision where the Board may wave or amend the policy at any time, and may waive the competitive proposal process in cases where an engineering firm has satisfactorily performed the previous stage of a project, has acquired extensive background and working knowledge of the work performed, is a highly-recognized authority in the field or area of work to be performed, or is the only-known available highly-recognized authority.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Adopt the Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy.*

# SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

## POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

Policy Type : Operations  
Policy Title : Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy  
Policy Number : 300.2  
Date Adopted : March 12, 2014  
Date Amended :

### **Architectural and Engineering Services Selection Policy**

The procurement of architectural and engineering services for the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority will be on the basis of documented competence and qualifications for the types of services to be performed, and at a fair, competitive and reasonable price.

For the purposes of this policy, the term "architectural and engineering services" means any specialized services performed by firms or persons who are qualified, by education, experience, licenses or certification in a particular field. Types of services may include, but are not limited to: architectural, landscape architectural, environmental, engineering, land surveying, and construction project management services.

Architectural and engineering services that would cost \$50,000 or less will be obtained pursuant to a selection process determined by the Executive Director. Architectural and engineering services that would cost more than \$50,000 will be obtained by a competitive proposal process by issuance of a Request for Proposals or the issuance of a Request for Qualifications, as determined by the Executive Director, and a contract for such services will be subject to approval of the Board of Directors. The Executive Director will recommend to the Board of Directors selection based on documented competence and qualifications for the types of services to be performed, and at a fair, competitive and reasonable price, and not based solely on the lowest-cost proposal submitted. The Board may waive or amend this policy at any time, and may waive the competitive proposal process in cases where an engineering firm has satisfactorily performed the previous stage of a project, has acquired extensive background and working knowledge of the work to be performed, is a highly-recognized authority in the field or area of work to be performed, or is the only-known available highly-recognized authority.

A written description of the selection process, including selection rationale, list of firms on a selection short-list, basis of selection and determination of project fee/cost will be submitted by the Executive Director to the Board with each contracting recommendation.

**AGENDA ITEM 9: REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**BACKGROUND:**

At the May 8, 2013 Board meeting it was stated that there was a need to educate new Board members on the Authority's Policies and Procedures and that existing Board members could benefit from a refresher. It was also recognized that this process would provide both the Board and staff an opportunity to assess current policies and make changes as necessary. To date the Board has completed their review of Policy 100.1, Rules of Procedure. Today's review will cover Policy 300.1, Groundwater Data Policy; this is the last remaining policy.

Once the review is completed staff will incorporate any recommended changes and bring them back to the Board on May 14, 2014 for your approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

*Action: Make recommendations as necessary.*

# SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

---

Policy Type : Operations  
Policy Title : Groundwater Data Policy  
Policy Number : 300.1  
Date Adopted : November 9, 2011  
Date Amended :

---

## 1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this Groundwater Data Policy (“Policy”) is to establish a methodology for the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (“Authority”) to receive data from member agencies and to respond to data requests that ensures the confidentiality of the data are maintained.

## 2.0 Scope

This Policy applies to all groundwater data that are currently in the possession of the Authority or that the Authority will acquire in the future.

## 3.0 Recitals

- 3.1. WHEREAS, the Authority is a joint powers agency formed pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (Cal. Gov’t Code section 6500, et seq.) and acts pursuant to the authority of its member agencies; and
- 3.2. WHEREAS, the mission of the Authority is to manage, protect and sustain the groundwater resources of the basin of Sacramento County south of the American River consistent with the Water Forum Agreement for the benefit of the water users within the basin, and to coordinate with other management entities and activities throughout the region; and
- 3.3. WHEREAS, the Authority, in carrying out its mission, has need to acquire groundwater data (e.g. well location, geological information, water quality and water level data) from its member agencies and compile the data in a data management system; and
- 3.4. WHEREAS, the member agencies have developed or acquired confidential, technical and proprietary information relating to well construction, groundwater data and water quality information (“Confidential Information”) and that all parties wish to ensure that the Confidential Information which may be

disclosed pursuant to this Policy is treated in strictest confidence consistent with the requirements of law; and

- 3.5. WHEREAS, such Confidential Information is not general public knowledge, is proprietary and/or confidential and is being disclosed on a limited basis, voluntarily, under the terms and conditions of this Policy; and
- 3.6. WHEREAS, the Authority has received requests from both the public and its member agencies for the groundwater data it has acquired; and
- 3.7. WHEREAS, member agencies have requested the Authority to respond to a data request on its behalf; and
- 3.8. WHEREAS, the California Public Records Act (Gov't Code section 6250, et seq.) declares that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in the state; and
- 3.9. WHEREAS, notwithstanding the intent of the California Public Records Act, the Act also exempts numerous types of information from public disclosure, including
  1. geological and geophysical data (Gov't Code section 6254(e));
  2. well completion reports (Cal. Water Code section 13752);
  3. disclosure of a public record to a public agency pursuant to an agreement to treat the material as confidential (Gov't Code section 6254.5(e)); and
  4. any information where, based on the particular facts of the case, the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record (Gov't Code section 6255); and
- 3.10. WHEREAS, the Authority and its member agencies agree that subject to the discretion of the individual member agency, such Confidential Information is exempt from public disclosure but may be disclosed on a limited basis pursuant to the statutory provisions cited above, and they further agree not to dispute or in any manner contest or object to a member agency's determination or policy or policies in this regard; and
- 3.11. WHEREAS, the Authority, as a public agency subject to the California Public Records Act, is in need of a written Policy for acquisition of data from its member agencies and to respond to internal and external data requests that ensures the confidentiality of the data are maintained.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. Member agencies shall provide groundwater data to the Authority under a claim of confidentiality and shall have all documents marked as confidential.

2. All data submitted to the Authority by a member agency shall be pursuant to an agreement to treat the material as confidential.
3. The Authority shall maintain all groundwater data as confidential, pursuant to the claims at the time of submission. Only persons authorized in writing by the Executive Director of the Authority shall obtain the confidential information on behalf of the Authority and only for the purposes that are consistent with existing law.
4. The Authority shall immediately notify a submitting member agency of any request for information from a member of the public in order to allow sufficient time to assert any exclusions or privileges that may be available by law.
5. The Authority may not disclose any data to the public without the express authorization of the submitting member agency.
6. The Authority may assert any applicable exclusion or privilege, either on its own behalf or on behalf of a member agency.
7. If any information is required to be disclosed pursuant to law or court order, the member agency shall work with the Authority to comply with the disclosure request while limiting the disclosure in a manner to preserve the confidential and proprietary nature of the Confidential Information.
8. To the extent that a Public Record Act request is made of the Authority and the Authority has been unable to convince the requestor to seek the data directly from the member agency, the member agency/agencies whose data are being sought shall fully and completely defend, indemnify and hold Authority harmless for its costs with respect to asserted exclusions or privileges.
9. The Authority shall disclose groundwater data to a member agency on the condition that the member agency agrees in writing to protect the confidentiality of the records and to limit their disclosure to persons who are employed or retained by the agency and who have signed an agreement to maintain the confidentiality of the records.
10. The Authority shall disclose groundwater data to a public agency only if the public agency requires the information to perform its legally mandated duties and the public agency agrees in writing to protect the confidentiality of the records and to limit their disclosure to persons who are employed or retained by the agency and who have signed an agreement to maintain the confidentiality of the records.

**AGENDA ITEM 10: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- a) Local Groundwater Assistance Grant
- b) Questionnaire for the Groundwater Accounting Program (GAP)
- c) Form 700

**March 12, 2014**

**TO: SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY BOARD**

**FROM: DARRELL ECK**

**RE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- a) **Local Groundwater Assistance Grant** – The DWR grant funding agreement is complete and should be signed within the next few weeks. Once signed staff will move forward with RMC to begin the work. The Groundwater Authority will receive \$199,824 from this grant to implement the *Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority Basin Management Objective Threshold Development and Recharge Mapping Project* discussed previously.
- b) **Questionnaire for the Groundwater Accounting Program (GAP)** – Staff submitted a “first stage” stakeholder questionnaire to Board members at the November 13, 2013 Board meeting. The purpose of the questionnaire was to help better define the GAP and to facilitate future discussions by both the GAP committee and the Board on both the GAP’s content and purpose. To date four questionnaires have been returned. As the questionnaire will be the subject of discussion in upcoming GAP committee meetings please review the questions with your respective organizations and return your responses to Ramon Roybal at Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority, 827 Seventh Street, Room 301, Sacramento, CA 95814 or via e-mail at [roybalr@saccounty.net](mailto:roybalr@saccounty.net) by April 4, 2014.
- c) **Form 700** – At the beginning of each year the State of California requires designated positions within the Groundwater Authority to file a Conflict of Interest Form 700 (see Groundwater Authority Policy 100.2 for disclosure categories). The forms are to be submitted to the SCGA office no later than April 1, 2014. Please address them c/o Ramon Roybal, 827 Seventh Street, Room 301, Sacramento, CA 95814. Forms can be located on line at the following website.

<http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.php?id=500/>