AGENDA

Welcome and Introduction – 10 minutes
  • Meeting Overview
  • Agenda Review

General Updates – 30 minutes
  • GSA filing status and intentions
  • Public workshop – Cosumnes Sub-basin unmanaged areas
  • GSA boundary review
  • Prop 1 timing and requirements
  • Updates from neighboring basins
  • FAQ
  • Other

Technical Scope – 30 minutes
  • Review and discuss initial technical gap analysis to assess data needs, begin outlining a preliminary scope of work for Prop. 1 application

Framework Agreement – 100 minutes
  • Review and provide feedback on initial elements of Framework Agreement
  • Consider drafting strategy and needs for subsequent versions (e.g., drafting team, legal support, etc.)

Next Steps – 10 minutes
  • Meeting schedule

Adjourn

As of 3/9/17
Collaborative Work Group
Meeting Summary #5: March 15, 2017

**Meeting-At-A-Glance:**

- Eligible GSAs continue to make progress towards filing to meet SGMA June 30, 2017, deadline. Sacramento County hearing set for April 11; City of Galt on May 2.
- Eligible GSAs reviewed working draft framework agreement. Initial drafts sections seem to be on point, with GSAs asked to provide specific edits within two weeks. Early discussions on governance suggest emerging preference for equal representation across GSAs, super-majority for most decision-making. Further dialogue needed to confirm governance approach, consider cost-sharing options.
- Strong support for establishing Technical Advisory Committee (TAC); TAC discussions in service of larger Working Group, which is to review and approve recommended actions. TAC participation among GSAs important though level of expertise may vary. Water Forum to prepare draft Terms of Reference describing TAC functions and participation.

**BACKGROUND**

The Water Forum convened the Cosumnes Sub-basin SGMA Work Group to continue discussions related to implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The Work Group, comprising seven eligible Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs), met March 15, 2017, at the Herald Fire Protection District hall, to discuss the following:

- General updates
- Technical Scope – develop a punch list for meeting the Aug 1 grant application deadline
- Framework Agreement – focus on governance and decision making in the working group

The meeting was attended by the following participants: Mike Wackman, Leland Schneider, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District; Mark Clarkson and Alice Clark, City of Galt; Forrest Williams, Sacramento County; Leo Van Warmerdam and John Mulrooney, Galt Irrigation District; Rick Wohle, Clay Water District; Damon Wyckoff and Gene Mancebo, Amador Water Agency; Amanda Watson and Herb Garms, Sloughhouse Water District; Tom Gohring, Lilly Allen and John Lowrie, Water Forum; and Bennett Brooks and Julia Golomb with the Consensus Building Institute. L. Allen drafted the meeting summary.

**DISCUSSION – KEY THEMES**

Below is a summary of key themes discussed and next steps agreed to at the meeting. This summary is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses instead on the main points covered during the group’s discussions.
General Updates

Filing Status
Participants began the meeting discussing current and intended GSA filing status and coverage of “Uncovered Areas.” Seven entities have or are expected to file as GSAs for the Cosumnes Subbasin.

Specific updates included the following:

- Sloughhouse RCD, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Galt Irrigation District and Clay Irrigation District have all filed with the state to become a GSA. Clay's application is still under review by the state and not yet posted to the state's website. Galt Irrigation District filing is intended to cover the uncovered areas inside their district (previously referred to as “white spaces”); B. Brooks noted that there may be a small piece of uncovered ag-res land abutting the Kidco property that needs further outreach and discussion.
- Jackson Valley Irrigation District, Amador County and Amador Water District have executed a Joint Powers Authority to serve as GSA for Amador County lands within the Cosumnes Sub-Basin. They have filed to become a GSA and expect to hold their first JPA meeting within the next month.
- Galt City Council has directed the city to file as GSA for all city land, including its treatment plan west of the city. It is not filing at this time for land within its sphere of influence. A hearing is set for May 2.
- Sacramento County remains open to filing as the GSA for any remaining white spaces within the subbasin. T. Gohring noted that the Board of Supervisors intends to hold a board workshop April 11th to discuss options for representing water users in the uncovered area. The County is also working with the Water Forum to organize outreach to users in uncovered areas.
- North Delta Water Agency could potentially file for a sliver of land in the southwest corner of the subbasin. It is not yet known whether it will file. They were not present at the meeting.

Participants will continue to provide updates at the monthly Working Group meetings.

Public Workshop
The Water Forum will co-host a public workshop with Sacramento County focused on exploring governance options for unmanaged areas within the subbasin. The workshop will be held March 15, 2017, from 6:30-8pm in Galt. A mailer (Attachment A) has been sent to all landholders in the uncovered area; the Sacramento County Farm Bureau, the Cosumnes Preserve and the Lower Cosumnes Resource Conservation District also assisted with outreach. The county reiterated its willingness to serve as GSA if needed, but also noted its interest in first hearing feedback about local stakeholder preferences and concerns related to governance. One possible option to be considered: the County files in the near-term to ensure the subbasin is in compliance with the June 30 SGMA deadline; longer-term governance options are considered post-June 30 (consistent with DWR regulations).

GSA Boundary Review
L. Allen will continue to review GSA boundary lines and highlight issues to affected parties. A. Watson noted that Sloughhouse is having conversations with DWR about boundary issues related to Bulletin 118 and is working towards resolution. Amador County is also aware of and working through issues related to minor boundary adjustments with Sloughhouse.
Prop 1 Timing and Requirements
Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) funding through Prop 1 will be available to eligible GSAs later this year. The group discussed strategies to ensure they are in a position to submit a competitive grant application Aug 1. It was acknowledged that the subbasin’s CASGEM filing needs to be submitted and updated to be eligible for the grant. The City of Galt is taking a motion to the city council in April to help fulfill this requirement; the basin will then begin CASGEM implementation and monitoring.

Updates from Neighboring Basins
T. Gohring noted that South American basin and the North American basin are working together to create a new groundwater model and are interested in partnering with Cosumnes basin to cost share and broaden the modeled area. B. Brooks noted that the Eastern San Joaquin subbasin is also developing a model that is expected to incorporate adjacent subbasins. Working Group members offered mixed reactions to the updates. On one hand, there is cautious interest in learning more about both modeling efforts and exploring the potential for cross-subbasin synergies. At the same time, there are concerns that any cross-subbasin collaboration not diminish the Cosumnes’s voice in model design and assumptions. The group requested a presentation from the adjacent basins to better understand the modeling approach, as well as the role the Cosumnes GSAs would have in shaping its work.

B. Brooks also noted that Eastern San Joaquin County is drafting a “letter of understanding” to explain its role relative to uncovered areas within its subbasin. B. Brooks will follow with Eastern San Joaquin County to see whether its draft letter might offer helpful options with the Cosumnes Subbasin’s unmanaged areas.

Subbasin FAQ Outreach Material
J. Golomb reviewed the most recent version of the FAQ outreach material, which was updated based on prior Working Group feedback. The group confirmed its use, with only minor changes, for use at the March 15 public workshop. A final version will be distributed to Working Group members for their use in outreach within their areas.

### NEXT STEPS:
- L. Allen to continue to track boundary issues on the SGMA portal.
- L. Allen to follow with Galt ID regarding possible sliver of uncovered ag- res land
- T. Gohring to provide update to DWR (Hong Lin) on status of subbasin’s CASGEM filing.
- T. Gohring to request an informational briefing on the model used in the American Basin
- B. Brooks to work with the Eastern San Joaquin subbasin to arrange for a future presentation; receive copy of county “letter of understanding”
- Water Forum continues to track Prop. 1 process and timing; keep Working Group apprised

Technical Scope
J. Lowrie presented a timeline and needs for a technical advisory committee (TAC), which is envisioned as a subset of the Working Group focused on developing a successful Prop.1 grant
application in the near-term and, in the longer-term, guiding the ongoing technical work needed to develop a groundwater sustainability plan. The TAC is intended to enable in-depth technical discussions in a timely fashion and without burdening the full Working Group.

The initial discussion on the TAC highlighted the following key points:

- Working Group oversight of the TAC is important. As a subset of the Working Group, the TAC would be responsible for developing approaches and recommendations for subsequent consideration by the full Working Group. The TAC would not make decisions independent of Working Group review and input.
- Working Group members agreed that each GSA should be provided an opportunity to have a representative on the TAC, although the level of expertise may vary among the GSAs.
- Consistent participation on the TAC is important to developing a common knowledge base among its members, but some flexibility is needed (e.g., naming primary and alternate members) given some GSAs limited resources.
- The Water Forum is prepared to cover the near-term costs of a modeling specialist, in addition to J. Lowrie’s time, to help the Working Group develop its Prop. 1 grant application. Longer-term funding is to be determined at a later date.
- One Working Group member suggested that designating some areas within the subbasin as disadvantaged area communities (DAC) may result in higher priority funding. Another member cautioned that this designation could also result in negative impacts to the agricultural community that warrant serious consideration.

Based on the discussion, the Water Forum is to develop and distribute prior to the April meeting a description of the TAC that highlights its role; tasks and timeline; relationship to the Working Group; participation criteria, responsibilities and time requirement; and funding needs/plan. Working Group members will be asked to suggest TAC members prior to the April meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEXT STEPS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• J. Lowrie to develop and disseminate a working description of the Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working Group members to review and provide comment on the working description, as well as suggest candidate TAC members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Framework Agreement**

B. Brooks led a discussion on the Draft Framework Agreement (Attachment B) and Near-Term Interim Governance Options (Attachment C) with Working Groups members. Key discussion points included the following:

- The initial Framework Agreement draft looks largely on point and is helpful in propelling Working Group progress. More time is needed for participants to review and comment on the initial draft language.
- Each GSA’s decision-makers will need sufficient time to review and confirm a near-final Framework Agreement. Participants agreed that it will be important for each GSA to pre-brief decision-makers on the evolving draft so any concerns can be surfaced early enough for discussion and resolution among Working Group members.
Working Group members did not finalize a possible near-term governance structure at the meeting, but the following ideas appeared to garner broad support: (1) equal representation among all GSAs to ensure no entity is “advantaged” over another; (2) up to 2 representatives for each GSA but only 1 vote per GSA; and (3) rely on a super-majority for decision-making rather than requiring 100% consensus (though more discussion is needed to identify decision rules for specific actions).

Amador County representatives confirmed that its newly formed JPA would be representing the county as its GSA and, despite the fact that the JPA comprises several entities, would expect to have just one vote (similar to the other GSAs).

Several participants recommended looking at the South Sacramento County Agricultural Water Agency (SSCAWA) as a possible model and framework for governance. More discussion is needed to understand the viability of that option.

The Working Group did not have time to discuss initial cost-share options.

The group also spent some time discussing possible strategies for folding broader stakeholder interests into GSA deliberations. Options mentioned included: each GSA is responsible for ensuring effective outreach to its relevant stakeholders; the GSAs establish some kind of joint advisory body to inform its deliberations; or, key stakeholder interests are included in some capacity alongside decision-makers. While Working Group members underscored the importance of and reiterated their commitment to meaningful stakeholder engagement and involvement, there was broad agreement that discussion is best deferred until the GSAs are better organized and less ad-hoc.

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Working Group members are to provide to B. Brooks comments on initial framework agreement draft language by Wednesday, March 29
- B. Brooks is to update and send out prior to the April Working Group meeting a revised and expanded preliminary framework agreement based on Working Group member recommended edits and initial discussion of near-term interim governance approaches

**Wrap-Up and Next Steps:**

B. Brooks noted that the Work Group should anticipate monthly meetings between now and July 1, 2017, to ensure sufficient progress on a framework agreement and other near-term tasks. The next Working Group meeting is Wednesday, April 19, from 9-12 p.m.

For questions regarding this meeting summary, please contact T. Gohring or L. Allen at the Water Forum.
Public Workshop:
Managing Groundwater in the Cosumnes Subbasin

The Water Forum, in cooperation with the Sacramento County Farm Bureau, the Lower Cosumnes Resource Conservation District, the Cosumnes Preserve, Sacramento County and others, invites you to attend a public workshop to share your thoughts on how your area can best implement the state’s new sustainable groundwater management law.

Why you are receiving this invitation:
The 2014 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act calls for local areas to form their own governance structures to manage groundwater use and promote local control. You work, live or own property in a portion of the Cosumnes Subbasin that currently does not yet have a local body designated to manage groundwater use.

Why you should care:
Local groundwater users have the opportunity to shape the subbasin’s approach to groundwater management. This is a critical opportunity to provide input to the county and others on what type of voice you want to have in the process. Decisions on governance for your area must be made by this spring to avoid triggering potential state regulatory action.

Sacramento County Supervisor Don Nottoli will be there to provide the County’s perspective on groundwater management. Sacramento County staff, who have the responsibility for managing the area in the absence of any other governance options, will also be participating.

Need more information?
Call John Lowrie at the Water Forum at 916-808-1994.

We look forward to seeing you there. Please tell others about it.
Cosumnes Subbasin SGMA Working Group
Draft Framework Agreement – Working Outline

The draft below, prepared by the Water Forum and the Consensus Building Institute at the direction of the Cosumnes Subbasin Working Group, is a first-cut, work-in-progress intended to spark discussion among parties and propel progress.

Consistent with Working Group guidance, this draft is intended to reflect emerging directions and ideas surfaced at Working Group meetings to-date, as well as incorporate cross-cutting themes from CBI’s assessment interviews with the eligible GSAs. It also integrates ideas from SGMA-related discussions elsewhere in the state, consistent with Working Group direction to the Water Forum and CBI to “help us to not reinvent the wheel.”

The framework is intended to guide the Working Group’s near-term discussions and, in particular, enable action over the next 6-12 months to support the technical work needed to begin characterizing the subbasin. To the extent this framework proves helpful, it is possible parties may wish to use this to guide discussions beyond the near-term timeframe. Eventually, this framework is expected to be replaced by an MOU, MOA, JPA or some other document intended to more formally codify parties’ roles and responsibilities, governance, funding, outreach and implementation approaches.

Where there has been sufficient Working Group discussion to-date to frame recommended approaches, we have incorporated draft language for the group’s consideration. Where there has not been sufficient discussion, we have instead opted to lay out options for the group’s deliberation. The topics covered in this framework are intended to address the following main points previously discussed with the Working Group:

• A commitment among the eligible GSAs to work collaboratively on one unified GSP, while allowing for distinct management zones within each GSA’s respective jurisdiction.
• A set of guiding principles to inform and guide Working Group deliberations and encourage collaboration and consensus.
• A set of discussion protocols to foster effective and constructive discussions and make the best use of everyone’s time and resources.
• A near-term cost-sharing and implementation mechanism to support the technical work necessary to characterize the subbasin and inform development of a GSP.
• A near-term governance structure that ensures equitable representation and puts a premium on consensus-based decision-making while acknowledging the imperative to take actions in order to minimize the potential for state intervention.
• A roadmap that outlines key benchmarks and timeframes for developing a GSP by the state-imposed 2022 deadline.
• A process to foster meaningful engagement and input by affected parties and the public.

The draft below, prepared by the Water Forum and the Consensus Building Institute at the direction of the Cosumnes Subbasin Working Group, is a first-cut, work-in-progress intended to spark discussion among parties and propel progress. It has not yet been reviewed or endorsed by the Working Group. This document is intended to support discussion at the 3/15/17 Cosumnes SGMA Working Group meeting and is not for broad distribution.
Purpose
The purpose of this Framework Agreement is to outline and confirm the interim process the parties (outlined in the following section) will use to work collaboratively to begin developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Cosumnes Subbasin.

This agreement is intended to guide the parties’ deliberations over the next 6-12 months, though it may be used over a longer time period if beneficial. Prior to 2022, this agreement is to be replaced by an MOU, MOA, JPA or other vehicle intended to more formally codify governance, funding, outreach and implementation approaches.

This agreement is not effective until endorsed by all parties. The intention is to have a final draft of this framework agreement completed by mid-May 2017 to support formal adoption by all parties’ governing bodies prior to July 1, 2017.

This agreement may be amended or revised with the agreement of all parties. Parties also have the right to withdraw from this agreement with sufficient notice and discussion. Financial obligations incurred prior to withdrawal are to be honored.

Overarching Approach
Under California law, SGMA requires the Cosumnes Subbasin to form a groundwater sustainability agency or agencies (GSAs) by June 30, 2017, and have a groundwater sustainability plan (GSP) in place by 2022.

The following agencies (referred to as the parties in this agreement) have either filed or expressed their intention to file with the state to form a GSA within the Cosumnes Subbasin: Omochumne-Hartnell Water District; Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District; Galt Irrigation District; Clay Irrigation District; City of Galt; Amador County (Joint Powers Authority pending); and Sacramento County. Parties to the agreement may change based on pending governance decisions for the currently unmanaged areas within the subbasin.

These parties commit to working cooperatively with the goal of developing a single integrated GSP to foster plan effectiveness, coordination and efficiencies. Parties recognize that the GSP may include distinct management areas to foster implementation and monitoring by each GSA within its respective jurisdiction.

Parties further recognize the importance of engaging stakeholders and the broader public in discussions related to GSP development and implementation and commit to putting in place a transparent and inclusive process to foster the consideration of the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the basin.
Finally, parties will work to identify an entity to take the lead on administrative aspects related to near-term GSP development.

**Guiding Principles**

Parties agree to the following principles to inform and guide Working Group deliberations, foster constructive discussions, promote a clear and shared set of expectations, and encourage collaboration.

- **Craft a GSP that respects local jurisdictions while building subbasin-wide approach.** Parties are committed to working together to develop an integrated and effective GSP, while respecting each GSA’s interest and expertise to oversee implementation within its unique jurisdiction or distinct planning areas.

- **Recognize mutual interdependence.** Parties recognize the value of both the agricultural and urban sectors in supporting a vibrant region and will work to foster dialogues that acknowledge and build on this interdependence. This includes acknowledging past contributions towards sustainable groundwater management while maintaining a forward-looking dialogue.

- **Commitment to collaborate.** All parties agree to work together in a constructive manner to meet SGMA requirements based on a locally driven approach. No one is to benefit at the expense of others, and all parties agree to negotiate in good faith – communicating their interests, honoring commitments and acting consistently across different forums.

- **Strive for consensus.** SGMA demands close collaboration and coordination among the GSAs if the subbasin is to develop a credible and effective GSP. Parties will strive for consensus throughout the process. The definition of consensus spans the range from strong support or neutrality to abstention to “I can live with it.” Disagreements will be seen as problems to be resolved rather than battles to be won.

- **Rely on credible process.** To foster effective dialogues, parties agree to mutually support a transparent and inclusive process where parties: (1) have a voice through balanced representation and effective meeting protocols; (2) commit to rely on credible data and clear criteria to inform decision-making; and (3) commit to resolve differences but include mechanisms to avoid impasse. Additionally, the convening/facilitation team is to work in service of all parties.

- **Build progress through incremental agreements.** Participants will use preliminary agreements on issues as the basis for progress towards final agreement. The Working Group will revisit preliminary agreements when new information emerges and again when finalizing overall recommendations.

- **Support effective and efficient processes.** Parties are committed to building off existing structures and past work, where practicable, to leverage past investments and make the best use of everyone’s time and resources.
• **Accommodate uncertainties.** Parties recognize that actions both within and outside the sub-region may impact GSP development and even affect basin boundaries. Parties agree to work adaptively to track and accommodate for such uncertainties.

**Collaborative Protocols**
The facilitator/convening team will work with participants to create a problem-solving environment through the following collaborative protocols:

• **Broad participation**
  o Strive to attend meetings consistently; we need everyone at the table
  o Contribute your thoughts, but share time so everyone can participate
  o Seek opportunities to share your perspectives and understand the perspectives of others
  o Listen hard to what others are saying; we need to figure out together what are the better ways forward

• **Honest but respectful engagement**
  o Be as honest, fair and candid as possible (we need to understand what each other is thinking), but engage professionally
  o Respect ideas offered by others; all ideas and points of view have value
  o If you hear something you do not understand, ask questions to clarify
  o If you hear something you do not agree with, help people understand your concerns
  o Avoid personal comments; refrain from characterizing other’s remarks

• **Forward-looking dialogue**
  o Creative thinking and problem-solving are essential to success; try to think about problems in a new way
  o Seek to integrate ideas across participants; marry a concern with a solution
  o Focus on issues, not personalities

**Near-Term Cost-Share Options**
• See separate discussion document

**Near-Term Governance**
• See separate discussion document
Roadmap for Developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan

- To be discussed at April meeting

Stakeholder Outreach and Engagement

To foster the consideration of the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the subbasin, the parties agree to the following:

- Parties are committed to an inclusive and transparent process that proactively seeks the engagement and input of potentially impacted parties as identified in SGMA.
- Parties will work collectively to develop an agreed-upon outreach plan, but each GSA is responsible for guiding efforts within their respective jurisdictions.
- Parties recognize the value in developing shared messages to ensure consistency; joint participation in outreach efforts is encouraged to foster consistency in message and concretely demonstrate the parties’ coordinated effort.
- Parties recognize the need to conduct outreach in the near-term to better understand additional representation needs (e.g., environmental, tribal, other) beyond the signatories to this agreement. Parties commit to the revisit near-term governance structure, as necessary, to account for feedback.

Media Contacts

- To be drafted (if seen as necessary)
Framework Agreement
Near-Term Interim Governance Options

Task:
Identify governance to be used to make near-term interim decisions regarding GSP development. Governance includes participation, representation and decision-making protocols.

Near-term decision-making is intended to focus primarily on (1) identifying technical resources needed to begin characterizing sub-basin groundwater sustainability; (2) pursuing state grant funding to support technical work; and (3) securing the needing technical resources and beginning technical work. The Working Group may opt to use the interim governance framework to address other decisions related to ongoing GSP development.

Working Group Feedback To-Date:
Discussions with the Working Group to-date and feedback from the assessment interviews with the eligible GSAs have highlighted the following perspectives and considerations:

- Parties articulate a shared interest in balanced participation among GSAs within the Cosumnes Sub-Basin.
- Parties generally (but not universally) recommended equal representation from all parties; there appeared to be flexibility among parties as to the number of representatives from each party (1-2 reps from each party were most frequently recommended). Call from some to ensure agriculture has a strong voice given potential economic impact to growers.
- The Working Group should strive for consensus as SGMA is grounded in an inherently collaborative approach. Consensus, several interviewees stressed, doesn’t mean that you get everything you want; rather, it means that “you can live with” the outcome. That said, most of those interviewed suggested there should a fallback of a super-majority (two-thirds or 75%) to avoid stalemates. Simple majority (51%) is also to be avoided to ensure there is at least broad support for all decisions. Some saw a need for unanimity on a select suite of issues (budget, increase in fees, financial).
- The Intention is to establish the ultimate governance structure between now and 2022 as a part of plan development. The transition to long-term governance needs to happen prior to Plan adoption in 2022 but can be earlier if preferred.
- Representation of currently unmanaged areas may need to evolve as conversations among affected water users evolve.
- Several interviewees raised the need for a mechanism to fold in the perspectives of affected non-GSA parties (e.g., environmental or tribal interests).
Strategies Identified Elsewhere:
A review of SGMA-related charters and agreements developed or under consideration elsewhere offer a range of approaches. The list below is intended to represent a sampling of approaches based on our review of a subset of these ongoing SGMA dialogues. Our list should not be considered comprehensive as we do not have access to or were unable to review all materials under discussion. We encourage Working Group members to bring other governance examples to inform our discussions.

- **EXAMPLE 1:** Kings River East Groundwater Sustainability Agency Formation
  MOU; Special Act District or JPA in future
  - **Representation:** Parties to the Agreement: Counties, Cities, Water Districts and Community Service Districts
    - GSA Governing Body
      - 1 member chosen by Alta
      - 1 member chosen by County of Fresno
      - 1 member chosen by County of Tulare
      - 1 member chosen by Cities (@ public meeting of mayors)
      - 1 member from the special districts engaged in water activities (listed in MOU)
      - 1 member from special districts that provide drinking water (PUDs and CSDs)
      - 1 member to represent ag (chosen by 4 of the other 6 board members; nominations from 3 ag organizations)
  - **Voting:**
    - All actions would be adopted at noticed public hearings by a majority vote of the board.

- **EXAMPLE 2:** Vina Sub-basin
  MOU. Between Butte County, Rock Creek Reclamation District and the City of Chico
  - **Representation:**
    - Three parties of Butte County, Rock Creek Reclamation District and the City of Chico
    - Additional agencies with service area boundaries outside the jurisdiction of the Parties may join and incorporate their service area boundaries or portions thereof into the Vina SGMA Partners upon the mutual consent of all Parties
  - **Voting:**
    - All actions undertaken by the Vina SGMA Partners are done by unanimous consent of the Parties; however in unanimous consent is not possible, a majority vote of the Parties is required
    - In the event of an impasse or disagreement, the Parties shall use their best efforts to find a mutually agreeable result. To this effect, the Parties
shall consult and negotiate with each other in good faith in an attempt to reach a solution that is mutually satisfactory. If the Parties do not reach a solution, then the matter shall be submitted to a non-binding arbitration or mediation within a reasonable period of time.

• **EXAMPLE 3: Santa Ynez River Valley Groundwater Basin**
  
  MOU. Among GSA qualified agencies (City of Buellton, the Santa Barbara Water Agency and the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District)

  - **Representation:**
    - Three parties: City of Buellton, the Santa Barbara Water Agency and the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District
    - One vote per GSA; represented by person or person from their respective entities; County Water Agency is ex-officio member; non-voting status
  
  - **Voting:**
    - Since there are only two voting members, a unanimous vote will be required

• **EXAMPLE 4: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin**
  
  JPA. Five general members and two associate members.

  - **Representation:**
    - Parties to the Agreement: Counties, Cities, Water Districts and Community Service Districts. A separate public entity. JPA general members include the City of Ridgecrest, County of Inyo, County of Kern, County of San Bernadino, and Indian Wells Valley Water District. Associate members include the US Department of the Interior and the US Navy Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake.
    - Each General Member is afforded one voting Director seat on the Board.
  
  - **Voting:**
    - Aside from very routine matters, Board business requires a majority vote of the Directors and the concurrence of no less than two of the Directors for City of Ridgecrest, County of Kern and/or Indian Wells Valley Water District.
    - The adoption of a GSP will require a super majority vote.
    - Associate Members have a representative, non-voting seat on the Board.

• **EXAMPLE 5: Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency**
  
  JPA. A separate public entity. JPA members include the Central Water District, the City of Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, and the Soquel Creek Water District.
o **Representation:**
  - The Agency will be governed by an 11-member Board of Directors consisting of the following:
    - 2 representatives appointed by the governing board of each JPA member (totaling 8 representatives)
    - 3 representatives of private well owners within the boundaries of the Agency – appointed by majority vote of the JPA member directors.

o **Voting:**
  - One vote per director; alternates allowed
  - Unless otherwise specified, decisions require affirmative vote of simple majority
  - Unanimous vote required to approve any of the following: (1) capital expenditures of $100,000 or more; (2) annual budget; (3) GSP for the Basin or any amendment thereto; (4) levying of assessments or fees; (5) issuance of indebtedness; or (6) any stipulation to resolve litigation concerning groundwater rights within or groundwater management for the Basin.

- **EXAMPLE 6: Salinas Valley GSA** – The GSA’s legal structure will be a JPA in the interim, at a minimum. A more permanent agency, with the same governance structure, could be identified by legislative act in the future.

  o **Representation:** 11-seat Governing Board of Directors – *Interim Board is seated until October*
    - **11 Seats** (representing public and private interests): City of Salinas; South County Cities; GSA-eligible Agencies; Disadvantaged Communities / Small Public Water Systems; CA Public Utilities Regulated Water Companies; Agriculture (4 seats, representing diverse interests and geographies); Environment; Public Member

  o **Voting:**
    - One director = one vote
    - Simple majority (6 of 11 votes) for routine business
    - Supermajority (8 of 11 votes) for major decisions, e.g. the groundwater sustainability plan, annual budget, regulations, and fees
    - Supermajority Plus for groundwater extraction restrictions and fees [must include 3 Agricultural Directors votes]
    - The supermajority and agricultural voting requirements are intended to build consensus within the governing board and among groundwater users, creating incentives to come together to solve problems to meet sustainability targets. These voting provisions recognize that agricultural interests are extremely varied across the basin and must build unanimity to advance measures and achieve sustainability.