

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

Wednesday, September 14, 2016; 9:00 am

10060 Goethe Road

Sacramento, CA 95827

(SRCSD/SASD Office Building South Conference Room No. 1212–Sunset Maple)

Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for interpreting services, assistive listening devices or other considerations should be through Ramon Roybal by calling (916) 874-6826 (voice) and CA Relay Services 711 (for the hearing impaired), no later than five working days prior to the meeting.

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.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL – 9:00 A.M.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: Members of the audience may comment on any item of interest to the public within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Groundwater Authority. Each person will be allowed three minutes, or less if a large number of requests are received on a particular subject. No action may be taken on non-agendized items raised under “Public Comment” until the matter has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. If a member of the public wants a response to a specific question, they are encouraged to contact any member of the Board or the Executive Director at any time. Members of the audience wishing to address a specific agendized item are encouraged to offer their public comment during consideration of that item.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- Approve minutes of the July 13, 2016 Board meeting, July 20, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee meeting and, the August 18, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee meeting.

Recommended Action: Approve Consent Calendar items.

4. UPDATE ON THE ALTERNATIVE SUBMITTAL

- Presentation on progress made on the Alternative Submittal.

Recommended Action: Informational Item

5. STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH FOR THE ALTERNATIVE SUBMITTAL

- Developing the Alternative Submittal within a compressed schedule has made it necessary to develop a separate public outreach process during the public draft review period. Staff has been working with the Water Forum to provide focused facilitation on the Alternative Submittal to specific stakeholder groups. Tom Gohring, Executive Director of the Water Forum, will provide an informal presentation on the proposed facilitation activities.

Recommended Action: Informational Item

6. STATUS REPORT ON AMENDING THE JPA

- Board Resolution No. 2016-05 recommended the signatory entities amend the Groundwater Authority's Joint Powers Agreement

Recommended Action: Informational Item

7. MEETING WITH RANCHO MURIETA CSD

- Status of the Rancho Murieta Community Services District relative to continuing participation on the Groundwater Authority Board.

Recommended Action: Refer discussion on Rancho Murieta Community Services District's fiscal year 2016-2017 budget contribution to the SGMA Subcommittee for additional consideration.

8. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Budget Subcommittee Meeting
- SGMA Subcommittee Meeting
- Legislative Update
- GAP Proposal

9. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, October 12, 2016, 9:00 am;
10060 Goethe Road, SRCSD/SASD Office Building South Community Meeting
Room No. 1205 (Valley Oak).

AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSENT CALENDER

BACKGROUND:

The Board package includes draft minutes of the July 13, 2016 Board meeting, the July 20, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee meeting and, the August 18, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Action: Approve Consent Calendar items.

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Governing Board Meeting
Draft Minutes
July 13, 2016

LOCATION: 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1205
Sacramento, CA 95827
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

MINUTES:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members (Primary Rep):

Tom Nelson, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District
Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests
Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company
Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners
Christine Thompson, Public Agencies Self-Supplied
Carl Werder, Agricultural-Residential
Ron Lowry, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
Dave Ocnosak, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Board Members (Alternate Rep):

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento
Forrest Williams, Sacramento County
Brian Fragio, City of Elk Grove
Allen Quynn, City of Rancho Cordova

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, Executive Director
Sarah Britton, Legal Counsel
Ping Chen
Ramon Roybal

Others in Attendance:

Jonathan Goetz, GEI
Mark Madison, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District
Bruce Kamilos, Florin Resource Conservation District/Elk Grove Water District
Jesse Roseman, The Nature Conservancy
José Ramirez, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Charlotte Mitchell, Farm Bureau
Melinda Frost-Hurzel, Trout Unlimited/Cosumnes Coalition

Rodney Fricke, GEI
Jim Blanke, RMC Water and Environment
Lisa Dills, Southgate Recreation and Park District
Suzanne Pecci, Domestic Well Owner Elk Grove
Ron Pecci, Domestic Well Owner Elk Grove
Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County Water Agency
Amanda Bishop, Sacramento County Clerk of the Board
Nat Martin, California State University, Sacramento
Stephanie Studdert, Sacramento County Clerk of the Board
Tom Gohring, Water Forum
Hong Lin, CA DWR
Wyatt Arnold, CA DWR
Alex Peterson, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
Kristal Daris Fadtke, Depart of Fish and Wildlife

Member Agencies Absent

*Rancho Murieta CSD
Commercial/Industrial Self-Supplied
California-American Water Company*

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Nelson stated his appreciation for the implementation of the microphone and speaker system during the meetings.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

The draft meeting minutes for the June 8, 2016 Board meeting and June 22 16, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee meeting were reviewed for final approval.

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FORMATION OF THREE GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCIES IN AREAS OF THE SOUTH AMERICAN SUBBASIN (PORTIONS OF BULLETIN 118-03 BASIN 5-21.65) (CONTINUED FROM JUNE 8, 2016)

Mr. Eck reminded the Board that the item had been discussed a couple times previously without a formal action but that all public comment both written and oral had been received and attached as a part of the current Board package. Mr. Eck then stated that all required noticing requirements had been met for the scheduled public hearing.

Mr. Ewart then opened the public hearing and asked for any public comments.

Jay Schneider commented as a land owner/resident and constituent of the Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District, and the South Sacramento Agricultural Water Authority. Mr. Schneider stated that the South Sacramento Agricultural Water Authority had an adopted groundwater management plan dating from 1997 and updated in 2002 that was active and ongoing and covered the area east of Grantline Road. Mr. Schneider said that he did not believe that SCGA should or even had the authority to be the groundwater authority over the South Sacramento Agricultural Water Authority adopted plan area. Mr. Schneider then stated that, most importantly, the historical division line had been Grantline Road and that the constituents of that area wanted to be represented by their own locally elected groups and to participate in the activities of the Cosumnes watershed. Mr. Schneider strongly encouraged SCGA not to become a GSA within the Cosumnes watershed stating that he believed that it would defer any meaningful work until June 2017 at which time the landowners would likely continue to work directly with State DWR as they do with other issues like surface water rights, stream alteration permits, and everything else related to agriculture unlike the urbanites on the other side of Grantline Road. Mr. Schneider then said that with the decision of DWR to deny the Basin Boundary Modification and SCGA's corresponding request to delay further consideration of moving the boundary line until 2018 would further delay meaningful work until after that time. Mr. Schneider commented that two-hundred thousand dollars that SCGA had budgeted could have been spent on collaborating with Sloughhouse RCD and Omochumne –Hartnell WD on determining the sustainable yield of both basins based on the revised boundary line to the watershed line and on any buffer area that each could have agreed to stand-off on until the future. Mr. Schneider stated that there were two paths that could be taken, one was completely adversarial and the other would be working together. Mr. Schneider then stated that after the drought of 1977 the landowners in that area went before the State Water Board to discuss water rights on the Cosumnes River and that they came very close to filing for adjudication and that it was still on the table. Mr. Schneider said that SCGA was creating a completely adversarial situation that would do nothing to sustain the groundwater and would only create animosity and difficulty to make any meaningful progress under SGMA. Mr. Schneider stated that there was no horror story in letting the local districts form their own GSA's as they had applied to do, that there was no downside to working with them, that they were not out to take water away and that it would be only positive if SCGA changed its course and started to work with them.

Amanda Platt, District Manager for Sloughhouse RCD, advocated for SCGA to continue working with Sloughhouse RCD on a partnership that would result in avoiding overlapping GSAs including an overlap with OHWD. Ms. Platt referred to the idea that the landowners wanted to be represented locally and that Sloughhouse RCD and OHWD could provide the representation.

Suzanne Pecci, homeowner within the Omochumne-Hartnell WD and Sloughhouse RCD proposed GSA area stated that she appreciated the landowner's efforts to form GSAs but that it appeared that there was only about six months of preparation that had gone into something that was going to last forty or fifty years in terms of groundwater sustainability. Ms. Pecci said that she believed that there might be a place later in time for GSAs out in the Elk Grove and Sloughhouse areas but that more planning needed to be put into it. Ms. Pecci then stated

that in addition to the other land owners being discussed, domestic well owners were are part of it and that they did not know what their part was specifically, how they would be involved and how the water that they use would be involved in the plan. Ms. Pecci stated that not knowing those answers was the reason for her opposition to Sloughhouse RCD and OHWD's actions. Ms. Pecci stated that she understood the legacy of the landowners who traced their history back to their forefathers and who settled and farmed the land but that times had changed and that things were more diverse and that other development plans were moving forward such as a large Indian casino. Ms. Pecci stated that she felt that they all needed to settle down and sit back and move forward with an agency that would provide stability and that has a plan, money, and staff.

Ms. Thompson referred to questions from the State to Sloughhouse RCD and OHWD regarding their plans for future growth and whether or not they had addressed those questions. Ms. Platt responded that those issues were new to Sloughhouse RCD as it had been an Ag based group for fifty years but that they were prepared to move forward to address those issues although it was a long learning curve similar to what SCGA and many other organizations faced. Ms. Platt stated that although they did not have all the answers currently, Sloughhouse RCD was dedicated to continuing to represent the area while shifting in ways that it needed to in order to meet those goals.

Mr. Schneider replied that Sloughhouse RCD had facilitated the Cosumnes River Task Force, facilitated a regional Irrigated Lands Program, developed a response to the 1979 drought hearings, and participated in the Water Forum Process for the South Basin. Mr. Schneider stated that those examples demonstrated Sloughhouse RCD's long history of responding to and taking the lead in confronting problems. Mr. Schneider then stated that it was a false narrative to say that Sloughhouse RCD and OHWD were not capable of meeting the SGMA challenge.

Ms. Pecci responded that she appreciated the experience Mr. Schneider had alluded to and that her and her neighbors had benefitted from the flood protection that they had provided but explained that she felt that it was the wrong type of experience for what was required under SGMA. Ms. Pecci stated that there should be a broader base to start with, that the smaller GSAs could develop plans that would eventually fit within a larger plan. Ms. Pecci said that parts of those districts were more isolated but that their plans would have to deal with domestic well owners who were faced with being urbanized.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Schneider if he believed that the hydrogeologic boundary was along Grantline Road. Mr. Schneider replied that the watershed boundary was along Grantline Road and that engineering report showed that the underground basin boundary was somewhere between the Cosumnes River and Grantline Road and actually closer to Grantline Road and definitely not the Cosumnes.

Mr. Ewart then closed the public hearing and opened up deliberations of the three resolutions separately.

Mr. Nelson announced that he was going to abstain from voting on the resolution covering Area 1 because his district was considering formation of a GSA in the same area.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the motion carried to adopt the Resolution to form GSA 1. Mr. Nelson abstained from the vote.

Relative to GSA Area 2, Mr. Lowry stated that it would be premature for SCGA to move forward in the area due to Omocuhmne-Hartnell WD's interest in the same area.

Mr. Schubert shared a quote from a study done by UC Berkeley Water Law that advocated for broad participation and consideration of a range of stakeholders for effective management under SGMA.

Mr. Eck reminded that the notifications for GSA formation by Sloughhouse RCD and OHWD had already been made and that if SCGA took no action then those entities would become the exclusive GSAs for those areas by August 4th.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Werder, the motion carried to adopt the Resolution to form GSA 2. Mr. Lowry and Mr. Mahon opposed.

Mr. Werder asked if Rancho Murieta CSD had made a statement as to which GSA it preferred to participate in between SCGA or Sloughhouse RCD. Mr. Eck replied that Darlene Gillum had communicated Rancho Murieta's desire to withdraw from SCGA but that the issue was ongoing and that he planned to meet with Ms. Gillum to further discuss it.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Werder moved, seconded by Mr. Schubert, the motion carried to adopt the Resolution to form GSA 3. Mr. Lowry and Mr. Mahon opposed.

5. NOTICE OF SCGA'S INTENT TO DEVELOP AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN SUBMITTAL

Mr. Eck introduced Jon Goetz with GEI Consultants who provided an update on the Alternative Plan submittal and coordination with State DWR. Mr. Goetz pointed out the draft notice for an Alternative Plan submittal that was included in the Board package. Mr. Goetz then reported that staff's approach to the Alternative Plan was to follow the draft GSP regulations as the actual language of the legislation did not provide much direction regarding Alternative Plans. Mr. Goetz recalled from previous discussions the two main options for the Alternative Submittal being, use of the SCGA GMP for those areas of the basin already covered by SCGA and second, demonstration of ten years of sustainability for those areas of the basin not currently covered by SCGA. Mr. Goetz reported that the meeting with State DWR was productive and that it was clear that both DWR and SCGA were on a learning curve relative to the plan submittal. Mr. Goetz further reported that DWR had acknowledged the unique situation of the South American Subbasin given the extent of SCGA's coverage and management of a majority of the basin over the past ten years. Mr. Goetz stated that it was recognized that the Delta was somewhat hydrogeologically distinct from the managed portion of the subbasin. Mr. Goetz stated that DWR acknowledged the quality of SCGA's GMP, the short timeframe allowed for Alternative Plan submittal, and referenced the fact that there was only one opportunity for submittal of an Alternative Plan. Mr. Goetz stated that DWR would be cautious in its analysis of and an Alternative Submittal that was based on an existing GMP. Mr. Goetz then went over a tentative outline of SCGA's Alternative Plan

submittal. Mr. Goetz said that more dialogue with DWR would be necessary. Mr. Goetz reported that outreach to the Delta was planned for August 10th in order to introduce the Alternative Plan concept, what it meant for the Delta, and SCGA's role with the hope that Delta interests would become engaged in SCGA's Alternative Plan process. Additionally there would be an interested stakeholder process with the goal to gather input.

Mr. Ewart asked for clarification on the Alternative Plan's role on SCGA's current management area south of the Cosumnes River. Mr. Goetz replied that the Alternative Plan was required to include SCGA's existing management area but that those areas south of the Cosumnes River would be treated differently and that the Alternative Plan would not apply. Mr. Goetz stated that SCGA would continue to have an interest in those areas but not necessarily as a lead entity.

Mr. Schneider commented that the Alternative Plan had the appearance of being imposed upon the areas of potential overlap and that it was based on a plan that was not publically discussed and not according to SGMA. Mr. Schneider then stated that the California Water Commission had ruled that Alternative Plans would have to be functionally equivalent to a GSP and that the modeling must open-source so that no one could have secret programs anymore. Mr. Schneider stated that the alternative to filing an Alternative Plan was to follow the GSP process so that SCGA would fundamentally adhere to SGMA. Mr. Schneider stated that he did not understand why SCGA thought it could put a plan over an area where it did not have jurisdiction specifically in the area west of Interstate 5. Mr. Schneider said that SCGA was taking a course of action that would cost a lot of money, created a lot of adversity, and accomplish nothing.

Jesse Roseman with the Nature Conservancy asked about the two track approach of applying for a GSA and an Alternative Plan specifically if there were other agencies taking a similar approach. Mr. Roseman also asked if there was a difference in enforceability between a GSP and Alternative Plan and for an explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of an Alternative Plan. Mr. Roseman also wanted to confirm that agencies south of the Cosumnes River would be allowed to form a GSA in the area covered by SCGA's GMP area. Mr. Eck replied that it made sense to take advantage of the five-year stakeholder process that was responsible for the formation of the SCGA Board and GMP, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of dollars that were invested in that process. Mr. Eck stated those efforts could serve as the foundation for an Alternative Submittal in order to carry forward with sustainable groundwater management. Mr. Eck stated that he did not believe that there was a difference in the enforceability between a GSP and Alternative Plan based on the State's requirement of functional equivalency of an Alternative Plan. Relative to the formation of both a GSA and Alternative Plan in other areas of the State, Mr. Eck stated that DWR could better answer the question but that he understood that there were a lot of unique variables across that State that would have to be dealt with based on their specific nature.

Hong Lin with State DWR commented that she participated in the meeting with SCGA and State DWR. Ms. Lin said that the basis for Alternative Plans was an acknowledgement by the State that groundwater management across the State varies and that there are entities that have invested a lot of money into developing pretty good plans and thus it did not make sense to force those entities to repeat those efforts or do redundant work. Ms. Lin then stated

that SCGA's approach to demonstrate ten years of sustainability meant that the local entities had determined that the basin was already being managed sustainably and that if there were data gaps the State would work with the local agency to address them. Ms. Lin stated that in general the benchmark to be used was substantial compliance such that there was enough data to demonstrate sustainability. Ms. Lin then clarified that the functional equivalent requirement applied specifically to Articles 5 and 7 of the SGMA legislation with an emphasis on the six undesirable results identified in Article 5. Ms. Lin said that the Alternative Plan would have to demonstrate management actions to address any undesirable results or otherwise show that they did not exist. Ms. Lin then pointed out that Alternative Plans required coordination with adjacent basins.

Mark Madison with the Florin Resource Conservation District asked if it made sense to wait five years and develop a GSP rather than spend two hundred thousand dollars now to develop something that was to be functionally equivalent to a GSP. Mr. Eck replied that the question was discussed during the budget development process for the current fiscal year and it was determined that the cost of developing a full GSP would be significantly greater than an Alternative Plan. Mr. Eck then stated that from an economic perspective that it was in the best interest of SCGA to pursue an Alternative Plan.

Ms. Platt stated Sloughhouse RCD's concern regarding the application of an Alternative Plan over the area for which it had applied to be a GSA, specifically how it might affect their ability to develop a GSP for that area and how the determination of a sustainable yield would be conducted. Ms. Platt mentioned that the identified recharge areas as discussed by Mr. Goetz were of particular concern. Ms. Platt then asked for clarification of the Alternative Plan's roll over areas south of the Cosumnes River within SCGA's current management area. Mr. Ewart suggested that Sloughhouse RCD submit a formal written letter asking for clarification and that he would ask staff to develop a response that would include a discussion of governance versus the plan.

Mr. Werder asked Ms. Lin for clarification of the one-time opportunity for Alternative Plan submittal. Ms. Lin replied that an Alternative Plans could be submitted until January 1, 2017 and if submitted, then State DWR would have up to two years to make a decision on whether or not to accept the plan. Ms. Lin stated that it was not envisioned that DWR would make a decision to flatly reject a properly submitted plan without dialogue with the submitting agency concerning data gaps or management actions to address undesirable results.

Mr. Nelson asked what would happen if a decision was not made by DWR regarding and Alternative Plan submittal prior to the June 2017 deadline for GSA formation. Ms. Lin stated that a local agency would have up to one hundred eighty days after the decision regarding and Alternative Plan to file for GSA formation. Ms. Britton clarified that, specific to the overlap condition in the South American Subbasin, non-compliance of GSA formation would not be enforced until a decision was made regarding the Alternative Plan submittal plus one hundred eighty days in the event that the decision occurred after the June 2017 deadline.

Mr. Schneider asked if an Alternative Plan could be applied over the unresolved, overlapping GSA areas. Ms. Lin replied that it could be applied due to SCGA's authority as an existing JPA within the South American Subbasin including the overlap areas.

6. SGMA SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT AND JPA RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Eck introduced the recommended actions stemming from the June 22, 2016 SGMA Subcommittee where the discussion included the need to revise the existing charter of the SGMA Subcommittee versus the formation of a Governance Subcommittee. Mr. Eck summarized the recommendations as follows:

1. Recommendation to direct the SGMA Subcommittee to expand its original scope/charter to include 1) Alternative Plan submittal, including working with Delta interests and identification of potential changes to the governing JPA; 2) Overlapping GSAs, including strategy to resolve overlapping GSA issue; 3) Coordination agreements, as recommended for inter-basin coordination; 4) Issues related to governance, including modifications of the JPA and modification of the County staffing contract with SCGA.
2. Specific to further JPA revisions, recommendation to defer wholesale modifications of the JPA until the Alternative Plan is either approved or denied and GSA formation is complete.
3. Specific to revisions of County staffing contract with SCGA, recommendation to defer modification to the staffing contract until the Alternative Plan is either approved or denied and GSA formation is complete.

Mr. Nelson asked for clarification regarding the potential timeline for recommendations two and three being potentially two and a half years out from January 2017. Mr. Williams replied that general discussion during the committee meeting had referred to such a timeframe when the milestones were identified.

Mr. Schubert explained that the reasoning for deferring wholesale changes to the JPA included a recollection that the development of the current JPA required about five years and it could be assumed that a similar process could require a significant amount of time. Mr. Schubert then stated that the idea was to form the GSA and figure out the governance structure then modify the JPA and staffing to meet those needs. Mr. Schubert stated that it would be premature to modify the JPA at this time.

Mr. Bettis added that the deferral of modifying the JPA was also made in consideration of the burden on staff to work through the GSA and Alternative Plan submittal processes.

Mr. Ewart stated that the recommendations were being brought before the Board in order to acknowledge the concerns raised by FRCD and to not have FRCD feel as though its concerns were being held back in the subcommittee. Mr. Ewart said that the recommendations acknowledged the importance of FRCD's concerns but that those items should be deferred until there was more certainty of what needed to be done and to allow staff to complete the work previously discussed.

Mr. Williams stated that item three was being introduced in response to FRCD's stated concern that staff was conflicted in their roles as County employees. Mr. Williams pointed out that FRCD was the only organization that had expressed that concern and that the subcommittee wanted to ensure that staff was allowed to work through the GSA and Alternative Plan process without disruption.

Mr. Nelson asked why work on the JPA could not start in July 2017 if the Alternative Plan would have already been submitted and the overlapping GSA issue would have been resolved. Mr. Nelson said that he liked the organization and the work it had done but that there were changes that needed to be made in order to carry it forward and that those changes needed to be addressed as soon as possible.

Ms. Thompson advocated for compromise and for the Board to work together to get through the issues that it was currently facing. She stated that threatening to pull out of the process because an agency did not get what they wanted was not the right way to accomplish what needed to be done. Ms. Thompson stated that the Board should utilize the current governance structure because it was effective although there were minor changes that could be made later to improve upon it. Ms. Thompson said that the focus should be moving forward with the plan and on resolving the differences with OHWD and Sloughhouse RCD.

Mr. Schubert pointed out that recommendations two and three served to do exactly what Mr. Nelson had advocated for except that they provided a milestone rather than a date certain. Mr. Schubert suggested modifying recommendation two to state that whenever the milestones were reached then work on JPA modifications could begin as needed. Mr. Schubert stated that one example of a modification to the JPA might be adding Sloughhouse RCD as a member organization.

Mr. Williams stated that FRCD's potential action to file as a GSA would delay the very process and milestones that were being discussed.

Mr. Werder stated that deferring changes to the JPA and staffing ran the risk of deferring a burden to a later time when implementation of a GSA and Alternative Plan would be taking place. Mr. Werder stated that all of the issues should be addressed so that SCGA did not find itself unable to implement a plan should DWR approve it. Mr. Ewart replied that part of the reasoning behind the recommendations was that SCGA already had the necessary authorities and staffing in place to implement an Alternative Plan.

Mr. Williams stated that he would have a difficult time supporting the changes advocated by FRCD if it continued to pursue GSA formation as such an action would work against the best interest of SCGA and would call into question in his mind as to FRCD's motives.

Mr. Nelson stated that he was still not comfortable with the ambiguous nature of the milestones that were identified.

Mr. Madison stated that FRCD appreciated the subcommittee's work to accommodate its concerns and that the only issue that he had with the recommendations was with the furthest extent of the possible milestone completion dates and that he felt that it would be too late to begin the process of modifying the JPA. Mr. Madison also stated that the changes that he envisioned for the JPA were not minor tweaks.

Mr. Schneider stated that it would be too late to establish governance until after the completion of the plan because the governing body of the plan would have no say in the development of the plan.

Mr. Ewart clarified Mr. Schubert's recommended modification to recommendations two and three to insert the word 'potential' prior to 'wholesale' for recommendation two and prior to 'modification' for recommendation three.

Motion/Second/Carried – Ms. Thompson moved, seconded by Mr. Schubert, the motion carried unanimously to revise the SGMA Subcommittee's original scope/charter to include 1) the Alternative plan submittal process; 2) Overlapping GSAs; 3) Coordination agreements; and, 4) Issues related to governance including modifications to the governing JPA and the County staffing contract with SCGA.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Schubert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, the motion carried to defer potential wholesale modifications to the governing JPA until the Alternative Plan is either approved or denied and GSA formation is complete. Mr. Nelson voted in opposition.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Schubert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, the motion carried to defer potential modification of the County staffing contract until the Alternative Plan is either approved or denied and GSA formation is complete. Mr. Nelson voted in opposition.

7. ON-CALL SERVICE CONTRACT EXTENTION WITH GEI FOR SUPPORT RELATED TO SGMA COMPLIANCE

Mr. Eck reminded that there was an existing on-call services contract with GEI that included time from either Jon Goetz or Rodney Fricke. Mr. Eck explained that given the planned level of effort to occur over the next five months with the development of the Alternative Plan as had been discussed previously, staff was proposing to extend the existing contract in the amount of \$220,000 to allow GEI to continue providing the level of support needed and that the amount was consistent with the FY2016/17 approved budget.

Mr. Nelson asked if the amount was intended only for development of the Alternative Plan. Mr. Eck replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Werder asked how many times the contract was extended. Mr. Eck replied that it was the second time. Mr. Werder asked if there was a limit to the number of extensions. Ms. Britton replied that there was no limit as long as the Board made the appropriate findings each time to be compliant with its professional services policy.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Schubert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, the motion carried unanimously to authorize the Executive Director to extend the current engineering services contract with GEI with an additional budget of \$220,000.

8. POTENTIAL STATE DWR FUNDING FOR FACILITATION SERVICES IN THE SOUTH AMERICAN SUBBASIN

Mr. Eck introduced Tom Gohring, Executive Director of the Water Forum who made a presentation regarding potential funding opportunities for facilitation services related to SGMA activities in the South American Subbasin.

Mr. Gohring stated that the Water Forum had been around for a significant amount of time and had a lot of experience in facilitating activities in the region including groundwater management preparation and development of governance. Mr. Gohring stated that the Water Forum was available to help out with those activities in both the South American and Cosumnes Subbasins and that a couple of conversations had begun. Mr. Gohring reported that the conversation in the Cosumnes basin focused on the status of GSA preparation and the status of the white space and that there was an interest expressed to continue the effort for GSP development. Mr. Gohring reported that the conversation in the South American Subbasin had centered on the GSA overlap issue. Mr. Gohring distributed an informational memo that he explained contained information regarding DWR funding support of local agency dialogues seeking to meet the requirements of SGMA. Mr. Gohring stated that the Water Forum had funding to provide facilitation support in both basins but that if they were successful in acquiring funding support from DWR then it would extend the amount of support the Water Forum could provide. Mr. Gohring then asked for comments regarding the memo which he would include with the application to DWR.

Ms. Pecci asked Mr. Gohring if Water Forum support services could be extended to the domestic well owners in the Sheldon area. Mr. Gohring replied in the affirmative.

9. AUGUST 10, 2016 BOARD MEETING

Mr. Ewart introduce an action to cancel the August 10, 2016 Board meeting.

Motion/Second/Carried – Mr. Schubert moved, seconded by Mr. Williams, the motion carried unanimously to cancel August 10, 2016 Board Meeting.

10. BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Eck reported that at the June 8, 2016 Board meeting the Board tasked the Budget Subcommittee to begin work on the 2017/2018 fiscal year budget to address anticipated reductions in future SCWA funding and other issues raised by various Board members.

Mr. Eck stated that staff would like the Board chair to confirm subcommittee membership and chair, to begin work on a budget recommendation for the Authority's fiscal year 2017-2018 annual budget.

The chair, with input from the Board decided to carry over the budget subcommittee members from the previous year with the exception of replacing the City of Folsom representative with Todd Eising, also from the City of Folsom. The subcommittee members

were determined to be; Brett Ewart, Bruce Kamilos, Paul Schubert, Todd Eising, Tom Mahon, and Forrest Williams.

Mr. Schubert suggested amending the recommended action to read: The Board chair will confirm the Budget Subcommittee membership and chair *and the purpose will be to* prepare a budget recommendation for the Authority's fiscal year 2017-2018 annual budget.

11. CLERK OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eck stated that the Board had not had a Clerk for a long while with Ramon Roybal being appointed as Interim Clerk the previous year. Mr. Eck said that with the preparation of the Alternative Plan, in addition to other activities, more of Mr. Roybal's time would be needed for assisting in those other areas. Mr. Eck reported that staff had met with the County Clerk of the Board and felt that it could provide the appropriate clerking services required by the Board.

Mr. Ewart thanked Mr. Roybal for serving as the Clerk and asked if the new Clerk could be introduced. Stephanie Studdert introduced herself as the person who would serve as the Clerk.

Motion/Second/Carried – Ms. Thompson moved, seconded by Mr. Bettis, the motion carried unanimously appoint County Clerk as Clerk of the Board in accordance with Section 13(b) of the Joint Powers Agreement.

12. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Eck announced that the next SGMA Subcommittee meeting would be held on July 20, 2016 at 1 pm. Mr. Eck then announced that there were a number of Board members whose terms were expiring. Mr. Eck reported the expiring terms as belonging to Agricultural Interests, Agricultural-Residential, California American Water Company, Conservation Landowners, County of Sacramento, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Public Agencies Self-supplied, Rancho Murietta CSD, and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District. Mr. Eck then announced that SCGA staff had participated in mediation meeting hosted by the Water Forum on June 29th. Mr. Eck stated that in attendance at the meeting were representatives from Omochumne-Hartnell, Sloughhouse RCD, Sacramento County Water Agency, and Water Forum. Mr. Eck reported the discussion topics included ground rules, potential areas of agreement, fears of the participating parties, and opportunities for coordination. The next meeting was being scheduled for some time in August. Mr. Eck then announced that State DWR had announced that it would recommend denying the basin boundary modification proposed by OHWD and Sloughhouse RCD. Mr. Eck reported that a public hearing would be held by DWR on July 19th the present the rational for its decisions and provide an opportunity for public comment. DWR would then finalize basin boundary modifications in late August and prepare an update to Bulletin 118 in early September along with initiation of a basin prioritization process. Mr. Eck then mentioned that Sloughhouse

RCD had a scheduled a special board meeting the next day from 3-5 pm at the Rancho Murieta CSD office.

13. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

Mr. Bettis stated his appreciation of Omochumne-Hartnell's participation on the SCGA Board and the proactive efforts that they had done historically to manage water in their district.

Mr. Werder stated that Maureen Kerner with the Sacramento State Office of Water Programs had emailed an announcement that the stormwater recharge project had been awarded Prop 1 grant funding. Mr. Werder then recalled that he had previously asked for a list of dates of region activities and requested that Mr. Eck make a list available.

ADJOURNMENT

Brett Ewart adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Upcoming Meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, September 14, 2016, 9 am;
10060 Goethe Road, South Conference Room No. 1212 (Sunset Maple).

By:

Chairperson

Date

Date

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Sub-Committee Meeting
Draft Minutes
July 20, 2016

LOCATION: 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1213
Sacramento, CA 95827
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

MINUTES:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Paul Schubert called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members:

Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company
Tom Nelson, FRCD/EGWD
Rick Bettis, Conservation Landowners
Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests
Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento
Forrest Williams, County of Sacramento

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, SCGA
Lisa Travis, Legal Counsel
Ping Chen, SCGA
Ramon Roybal, SCGA

Others in Attendance:

Mark Madison, FRCD/EGWD
Bruce Kamilos, FRCD/EGWD
Jonathan Goetz, GEI
Rodney Fricke, GEI
Jay Schneider, Sloughhouse RCD
Wyatt Arnold, State DWR
Amanda Bishop, Sacramento County Clerk's Office
Stephanie Studdert, Sacramento County Clerk's Office

2. Public Comment

Jay Schneider spoke as a land owner regarding the boundary line adjustment stating that they would appreciate SCGA working with Omochumne-Hartnell and Sloughhouse RCD to agree on a boundary adjustment and spend the resources of the representative groups to

define an area of overlap where there is reason for both water basins and watersheds to agree to coordinate on the SGMA restrictions and uses and best management practices within that area. Mr. Schneider elaborated that the local representatives would represent the land owners in the Cosumnes basin and SCGA would represent those residents on the west side of the Cosumnes basin as set forth in the boundary line adjustment and thus all other the resources would be much better spent.

Mark Madison asked about the status of Rancho Murieta CSD and what was being done to keep them with SCGA. Mr. Eck replied that he would be coordinating a meeting with Rancho Murieta CSD to discuss the issues and to try and convince them to reconsider.

Mr. Nelson announced that FRCD would be holding its regular meeting the next Wednesday with an item to consider forming a GSA and that his recommendation would likely be to not proceed with GSA formation.

Mr. Williams reported that he had attended the most recent Sloughhouse RCD board meeting where that board took an action to file for a GSA that would overlap with Omochumne-Hartnell WD's GSA. Mr. Williams then said he attended a following OHWD board meeting where they expressed some discomfort over Sloughhouse's action but did not make any decision to object to it and that the concept was that both parties would be protecting each other at the negotiating table. Mr. Schneider clarified that the area of Sloughhouse's overlap with OHWD was just that area where SCGA also overlapped.

3. Update on Alternative Plan Submittal

Jon Goetz and Rodney Fricke with GEI provided a presentation (*Note: the presentation given by Mr. Goetz and Mr. Fricke can be viewed on the Authority's website for the July 20, 2016 meeting date*). The presentation covered the following topics:

- Questions being asked in Public Meetings
- State DWR Basin Boundary Modification Public Workshop
- State Board Letter
- State DWR Best Management Practices Website and Survey
- Approach to Alternative Submittal
- Delta Outreach

Mr. Williams asked if the Alternative Plan submittal was bypassing CEQA. Mr. Goetz replied in the negative. Mr. Williams followed up by stating that it was being presented to Omochumne and Sloughhouse that the Alternative Plan process was somehow bypassing CEQA and that he wanted it to be on the record that it was not.

Mr. Williams asked for clarification on where the Alternative Plan would apply. Mr. Fricke responded that it would only cover the South American Subbasin.

In response to Mr. Goetz's discussion of questions being asked about SCGA's SGMA compliance actions, Mr. Ewart recalled that he had expressed a desire to provide a

definitive written response to the questions concerning the Alternative Submittal and the boundaries of the Alternative. Mr. Williams concurred.

Mr. Goetz distributed a letter authored by the State Water Resources Control Board in 2015 in response to the San Louis Obispo County Public Works Director who had asked what would happen if the State Board were to step in and enforce non-compliance. Mr. Goetz stated that the letter served to provide an understanding of the measures the State Board might take in a situation of non-compliance and would be valuable to consider when making decisions regarding SGMA compliance.

Mr. Schneider commented as a constituent of Omochumne-Hartnell and Sloughhouse RCD that he was under the impression that a GSA with a GSP would be exempt from CEQA but that an Alternative Plan was not exempt because it would be considered a project due to the enforcement of existing restrictions that would have been responsible for a sustainable basin. Mr. Schneider then commented on the possible intervention by the Water Board in response to non-compliance stating that groundwater pumpers were going to be metered and thus it was not going to be a burden on any agricultural water pumper. Mr. Schneider then said that the other onerous regulations would have a disastrous political impact as the home owners in those areas would want to know why and who obstructed the local groups from becoming a GSA. Mr. Schneider then said that he thought there would be a CEQA requirement that would have been avoidable like all the other things that could have been negotiated if SCGA would have gone to the table. Mr. Schneider then stated that his observation of the presentation demonstrated that the SCGA area consisted of all urban water use while in his area they were all agriculture and individually maintained wells and septic systems. Mr. Schneider said that they had water available to use along the Cosumnes River with a little infrastructure improvement to use in-lieu of groundwater when available and they also have past experience with using the Folsom South Canal to get surface water down to the Arnold area that was discussed during the presentation. Mr. Schneider added that the plumbing system existed to get surface water to that area if they could just move forward. Mr. Schneider commented that the decision by DWR to deny the basin boundary modification seemed like it was done to give the County more time to come up with a reason and that it just delayed the process of formulating a GSP for the Cosumnes basin because they would not want their local districts to waste money by starting to develop a plan on one side of the river that would not apply to the same farmers and ranchers on the other side of the river.

4. Action Items/Next Steps Assignments

Next SGMA Subcommittee meeting scheduled for August 18, 2016 at 1 pm.

Follow up with JPA signatories regarding recommended JPA amendment. Mr. Schubert suggested providing some standard language that could be used as part of a board package to help facilitate the process.

Further discussion about the 5-year plan addressing data gaps, future actions and improvements, finance, and governance to occur at future SGMA Subcommittee meeting.

Distribute SCGA comments regarding of GSP Best Management Practices. Wyatt Arnold from State DWR commented that the solicitation of comments regarding BMPs was intended to facilitate prioritization of the BMPs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schubert adjourned the meeting at 3:05 pm

Upcoming meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, September 14, 2016, 9:00 am;
SASD South Conference Room 1212 Sunset Maple.

By:

Chairperson

Date

Date

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA)
Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Sub-Committee Meeting
Draft Minutes
August 18, 2016

LOCATION: 10060 Goethe Road, Room 1213
Sacramento, CA 95827
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

MINUTES:

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Paul Schubert called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

The following meeting participants were in attendance:

Board Members:

Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company
Tom Nelson, FRCD/EGWD
Tom Mahon, Agricultural Interests
Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento
Forrest Williams, County of Sacramento
Carl Werder, Agricultural-Residential

Staff Members:

Darrell Eck, SCGA
Sarah Britton, Legal Counsel
Ping Chen, SCGA
Ramon Roybal, SCGA

Others in Attendance:

Bruce Kamilos, FRCD/EGWD
Jonathan Goetz, GEI
Rodney Fricke, GEI
Amanda Platt, Sloughhouse RCD
Mike Eaton, Cosumnes Coalition
Melinda Frost-Hurzel, Cosumnes Coalition
Suzanne Pecci, Domestic well-owner
Charlotte Mitchell, Farm Bureau

2. Public Comment

Mr. Nelson asked for an update on the progress of the approval process for the recommended JPA modification. Mr. Eck replied that the standard language had been drafted and provided and that staff had received an inquiry from the City of Folsom.

3. Update on Alternative Plan Submittal

Mr. Eck stated that the discussion would continue from where the last SGMA Subcommittee meeting had left off and in addition would include an update of the activities that had occurred since the last meeting and would address new information that had been gathered. Mr. Eck then presented Mr. Goetz who provided a presentation (*Note: The presentation given by Mr. Goetz can be viewed on the Authority's website for the July 20, 2016 meeting date*). Mr. Goetz began by reporting that much of the work that had been focused on in the past month was putting together the ten years of operation within the sustainable yield analysis. Mr. Goetz then reported that staff had also participated in consultation with State DWR and a Delta outreach meeting with Reclamation Districts. Mr. Goetz then stated that he would discuss the details of what the SGMA regulations required and how they defined a water budget.

Mr. Nelson asked if the Delta Reclamation Districts were accepting of the proposal to be covered by an Alternative Plan. Ms. Britton replied that the approach seemed to nicely dovetail their interests with SCGA's in that SCGA would need to acquire data from that area which in turn would likely demonstrate the disparate management of groundwater from the rest of the subbasin while aiding to build the case of ten years of sustainability. Those Delta interests would then be able to refer to the Alternative Plan to help support their potential argument for a separate subbasin. Ms. Britton then stated that she felt that it was a successful meeting because there was a sense that by their support of SCGA it would in turn help them for the rest of their efforts.

During the discussion of the ten years of sustainability analysis discussion by Mr. Goetz, Mr. Schubert asked for conformation that the Alternative Plan would not be required to remedy the hydraulic disconnection of the Cosumnes River with groundwater with it being a historical condition and that rather, the plan would have to demonstrate that no new impacts had occurred in the ten year period of analysis. Mr. Goetz replied that Mr. Schubert was correct and that 2015 was considered the baseline year to which the plan would be managing to. Mr. Goetz added that all of the undesirable results would have to be accounted for and that there were caveats with all of them depending on the local agencies acceptance of undesirable results and DWR and the Water Commission's interpretation of the basin. Ms. Britton added that the analysis was a ten year look back with staff using the ten most recent years to demonstrate sustainability and thus the disconnection of the Cosumnes River would be viewed as a pre-existing condition for under which the basin was managed sustainably. Ms. Britton added that it did not preclude actions that would enhance the condition of sustainability but that it was not required for the purposes of the Alternative Plan at the present time.

Mr. Werder asked if SCGA's GMP was going to be updated as it was ten years old and a lot had changed in that time including the drought. Ms. Britton replied that SCGA was legally prohibited from updating the GMP. Mr. Werder then asked if there could be an addendum to the GMP. Mr. Goetz replied that SCGA would end up with something similar to an updated GMP but under a different name such as the South American Groundwater Sustainability or Management Plan. Mr. Goetz stated that there was no requirement to produce a GSP under an Alternative but that the intent of staff was to

update the GMP to something new and that it was accounted for in the finance plan. Mr. Goetz clarified that the Alternative was not the mechanism that would provide any updates but would rather direct SCGA as an entity to go forward with the idea that there would be an update and collect the data gaps. Mr. Fricke added that the 5-year period following the submittal of the Alternative would be the venue through which those data gaps and updates would begin to be addressed. Mr. Werder stated that he felt that basing a plan on a ten year old document was like building a house on a false foundation. Melinda Frost-Hurzel added that there were changes in the upper Cosumnes River Watershed that should be considered. Mr. Goetz stated that he envisioned that a reviewer of the plan would likely notice that the GMP was ten years old and might ask the question of how the applicant accounted for present conditions. Mr. Goetz then said that the functionally equivalent portion of the document is where he would address changed conditions in a narrative format.

Mr. Ewart asked if staff felt that the Alternative Submittal process was still on track to be completed within the given time frame and that the last thing he would want is to find out in mid-December that it was not going to come together. Mr. Eck replied that the process was still on track but that things would have to progress quickly and smoothly. Mr. Schubert asked what could derail the process. Mr. Eck replied that if there were substantial issues or concerns that were not necessarily being addressed that needed to be. Ms. Britton added that the two meetings with State DWR were productive such that SCGA was able to communicate its approach and DWR was able to provide direction and expectations to allow SCGA hone in on framework that would have a good chance of being approved.

Mr. Ewart asked for clarification that a draft of the Alternative Plan would be brought to the SCGA Board for approval in early December. Mr. Eck pointed out that it was planned that there would be a public hearing held by the SCGA Board in December regarding the Alternative Plan.

Ms. Frost-Hurzel commented that she sought to provide a different perspective and that she was engaged in watching the San Joaquin County SGMA process as well and was struck by the differences in approach. Ms. Frost-Hurzel stated that SCGA was focusing on older data and a ten year old management plan that contained a lot of actions that were never taken whereas San Joaquin County, who perhaps being motivate by a much more dire situation, seemed to be approaching the process more as an opportunity as a way to re-think everything. Ms. Frost-Hurzel said that SCGA seemed to be taking the approach of taking old data, re-manipulating and refining it to say what it needed to say rather than taking a step back to look at the big picture and ask what are the resources and opportunities and new technologies available to do something beneficial for the region. Ms. Frost-Hurzel then stated that her experience in conducting work along the entire watershed that the upstream conditions had changed and that the assumptions used for upstream conditions might no longer be valid. Ms. Frost-Hurzel stated that the Cosumnes Coalition had an objective to see actions that would change the effects on the Cosumnes River. She then said SCGA's utilization of framework that was ten to fifteen years old was inaccurate and that her organization would speak to it. Ms. Frost-Hurzel then recalled that similar to when they first presented to SCGA that they sought to take a

collaborative approach to take advantage of the new technologies and ways to approach some of the problems and to opportunities to fix things. Mr. Ewart asked for examples of the opportunities and technologies available. Ms. Frost-Hurzel replied that Elk Grove's dry-well program was an example as well as looking at negotiating with upstream water rights holders or a cyclic groundwater recharge system such as storm water diversion within the Omochumne-Hartnell area but that SCGA would have to acknowledge that it sought those objectives.

Mr. Eaton stated that he did hear anything about proactive approaches to the undesirable results on the Cosumnes and asked if it was envisioned that there would be something more added to the Alternative that would indicate that SCGA had received the message that they had been delivering the past few months. Mr. Eck replied that DWR had a specific approach that it wanted to take but that identifying the technologies and opportunities available would be part of a dynamic process going forward and that the overall process was not going to be static. Mr. Eck said that there were a certain amount of things that needed to be accomplished as a part of the Alternative Submittal process prior to December. Mr. Eck then referred to the section of the proposed Alternative Plan that would seek to list perspective projects and stated that information on such projects was wanted. Mr. Eck said that the list might not contain a lot of project specific detail initially but that there would be an opportunity to discuss the specifics of what a project might be and how it would be ultimately developed but that there would not be time to do it before December. Mr. Eck said that SCGA did want the suggestions and insight of the Cosumnes Coalition because there were a lot of opportunities for different kinds of projects that could be done and supported and for which broad regional collaboration processes could be developed in order to secure grant funding and to support moving things forward. Ms. Frost-Hurzel replied that they wanted to stay engaged in a helpful way but that there was a concern when they heard that SCGA's argument was going to be essentially that everything was ok. Ms. Britton stated that SCGA had directly held that conversation with the State in consideration of the concerns expressed during the Coalition's presentations to the Board and that she understood from the State's response was that the legal framework for what had to be proven or shown for an Alternative Plan relative to that ten-year lookback of operating within the sustainable yield, was just that, a lookback. Ms. Britton continued by stating that they had confronted the State and told them that there were interested parties that had a lot of thoughts for projects that should be engaged in and so the concept of a menu of options for those projects was envisioned to be included. Ms. Britton then said that the alternative plan itself did not prevent the existing entity under its JPA and continuing implementation of the existing GMP from investigating and continuing to move forward on those projects. Ms. Britton said that those activities would actually help the agency in its required annual reporting should the Alternative be accepted. Ms. Britton stated that just because the plan itself would be characterized in a lookback sense, that it did not mean adoption of static mentality rather it was just a response to what the State was looking for in the submittal. Ms. Frost-Hurzel replied that there could be some dialogue in the future to discuss how it could be framed to include some place holders and that unfortunately there was a legacy of objectives not actually being followed though upon.

Mr. Eaton asked if it had been considered that the ten year lookback should include a lookback at the changes in conditions on the Cosumnes and how have the undesirable results changed in that ten year period and what would be the forecast based on the current plan status of how they might continue to change.

Mr. Ewart asked Mr. Eck if he envisioned a time for a formal solicitation of ideas and thoughts from interested parties. Mr. Eck replied that it was something that was being planned for as a part of the submittal process as reflected by one of the chapters of the plan.

Amanda Platt with the Sloughhouse RCD stated that the Alternative Plan was a concern for the District as there would be an adjacent basin working on a different timeline and concerns of how coordination and reconciliation of the two plans would occur in addition to the risk of overlap of the Alternative Plan should it extend into the Cosumnes basin. Ms. Platt then asked about the status of coordination efforts between the adjacent basins and asked for an update on the written response that was directed to staff at the July Board meeting to address Sloughhouse RCD's concerns specifically, how the SCGA management area that extends into the Cosumnes basin would be affected by the Alternative Plan. Ms. Britton replied that DWR was very clear in communicating that it would allow only one plan per basin and thus the Alternative Submittal would cover only the South American Subbasin. Ms. Britton stated that the Alternative Plan would have as an attachment the existing SCGA GMP but that it would only be referred to as it pertained to management within the South American Subbasin. Ms. Platt asked if that explanation could be put into writing in the form of a clarification letter. Mr. Ewart recalled that he had asked staff to put together a written letter that would explain those issues to the best of their current understanding and that it could possibly be CC'd to DWR so that everyone could feel comfortable. Mr. Williams added that he would like the letter to clarify that the Alternative would be tiering off of something that already existed as was nothing new.

4. Action Items/Next Steps Assignments

- a. Letter from staff to Sloughhouse RCD regarding the extent of the Alternative Plan relative to the Cosumnes Subbasin. Mr. Williams stated that there were additional points of clarification that he wanted to make such as the fact that the Alternative Plan would not be in violation of CEQA. Mr. Mahon added that it could also clarify where the boundary was located between the basins. Mr. Goetz said that he would like to see the letter address the coordination of a common model or set of modeling assumptions in consideration of DWR's future analysis of the interaction between the basins and how each basin's plan addresses that interaction. Ms. Platt added that a meeting to discuss those issues would be welcomed if time permitted.
- b. Mr. Kamilos stated that FRCD would like to receive a regular update on the status of the recommended JPA amendment. Mr. Williams replied that the earliest County action on the item would be December.

- c. Next SGMA Subcommittee meeting tentatively scheduled for October 5, 2016 at 1 pm.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schubert adjourned the meeting at 3:05 pm

Upcoming meetings –

Next SCGA Board of Directors Meeting – Wednesday, September 14, 2016, 9:00 am;
SASD South Conference Room 1212 Sunset Maple.

By:

Chairperson

Date

Date

Date

AGENDA ITEM 4: UPDATE ON THE ALTERNATIVE SUBMITTAL

BACKGROUND:

Following up on the presentation made to the Board on July 13, 2016, Jon Goetz and Rodney Fricke will provide a brief presentation on progress with the Alternative Submittal and on-going coordination efforts with State DWR.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended Action: Information Item

AGENDA ITEM 5: STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH FOR THE ALTERNATIVE SUBMITTAL

BACKGROUND:

SGMA legislation requires public participation in the development of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Working within the compressed schedule of the Alternative Submittal and the increased level of coordination required with State DWR, SCGA has strived to follow similar public notification and participation steps in the development, adoption, and implementation of an Alternative Submittal through its regular noticed Board and SGMA subcommittee meetings. Even with this effort it has become apparent that something more needs to be done. Staff has been working with the Water Forum to provide focused facilitation on the Alternative Submittal to specific stakeholder groups. This action will take place in parallel with the development of the Alternative Submittal. Tom Gohring, Executive Director of the Water Forum, will provide an informal presentation on the proposed facilitation activities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended Action: Informational Item.

AGENDA ITEM 6: STATUS REPORT ON AMENDING THE JPA

BACKGROUND:

At the June 8, 2016 meeting the Board adopted Resolution No. 2016-05 recommending that the governing bodies of the signatories to the Groundwater Authority's JPA consider and approve the First Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement Between the City of Elk Grove, the City of Folsom, the City of Rancho Cordova, the City of Sacramento, and the County of Sacramento. This item provides a status report relative to progress made by the signatories on amending the JPA.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended Action: Informational Item

AGENDA ITEM 7: MEETING WITH RANCHO MURIETA CSD

BACKGROUND:

On June 28, 2016 Rancho Murieta Community Services District (District) sent a letter to the SCGA Executive Director indicating that the District wished to “terminate its membership and seat on the Authority governing board.” At the July 13, 2016 board meeting a member of the Board asked about the status of the District and it was reported that staff was in the process of scheduling a meeting with District management to discuss the above referenced letter. Staff met with Darlene Gillum, General Manager of the District, on August 26, 2016 to discuss the matter.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended Action: Refer discussion on Rancho Murieta Community Services District’s fiscal year 2016-2017 budget contribution to the SGMA Subcommittee for additional consideration.

AGENDA ITEM 9: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

BACKGROUND:

- Budget Subcommittee Meeting
- SGMA Subcommittee Meeting
- Legislative Update
- GAP Proposal