

**Cosumnes Subbasin SGMA Working Group**  
**Meeting Summary #13**  
**Meeting held October 18, 2017**  
**Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute**

**ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Who</b>	<b>What</b>
Each GSA	Submit letter of support for Prop. 1 application <b>by 11/1</b>
Working Group	Seek Prop. 1 letters of support from other orgs <b>by 11/1</b>
Working Group	Send any Prop. 1 technical corrections or final suggested language changes to Anona Dutton and copy <b>all</b> Working Group members
Working Group	Provide cost-share information to Anona by <b>10/25</b>
Working Group	Conduct outreach <b>for 10/24 + 10/26</b> public workshops [Sloughhouse RCD, SSCWA, Sacramento County, City of Galt, Galt ID]
CBI	Work with Water Forum to confirm TAC and Working Group meeting schedule for remainder of 2017
CBI	Send electronic version of UCS Groundwater Toolkit [view: <a href="#">English</a>   <a href="#">Spanish</a> ] to Working Group
Water Forum	Distribute term sheet for SSCAWA/Water Forum Prop. 1 agreement and share draft contract language when available.
Water Forum	Edit grant application and work plan to directly address Galt ID eligibility issues
Water Forum	Share DWR confirmation of SSCAWA eligibility with Working Group
Water Forum	Resend draft letter of support to GSAs, for use with their respective governing bodies
Water Forum	Send Prop. 1 application evaluation criteria to Working Group
Water Forum	Work with Mike Wackman to gather additional GID eligibility info as needed
Water Forum	Draft candidate language for secondary contracts (SSCAWA with GSAs)
Water Forum	Include with Prop. 1 application each GSA's resolution approving framework agreement
EKI	Remind GSAs to submit post-2015 cost-share information and clarify categories of applicable costs
EKI	Make the following revisions to Prop. 1 application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make final revisions to Work Plan to ensure strong alignment with DWR evaluation criteria while being consistent with key guidance to date (e.g., retain flexibility of one vs. multiple GSPs)</li> <li>• Draft new language addressing Galt ID eligibility; circulate to all GSAs for comment</li> <li>• Highlight innovate outreach approaches (e.g. Amador Facebook posts)</li> </ul>

**DISCUSSION – KEY THEMES**

Below is a summary of key themes discussed at the meeting. This summary is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the group's discussions.

## GENERAL UPDATES

### Public Workshops

On October 12, Amador County hosted the first of a series of three October public workshops on SGMA implementation in the Cosumnes Subbasin. The public workshops are an opportunity for the Water Forum to provide an overview of SGMA purpose and requirements, share the current direction of the Prop. 1 proposal, solicit public input, and receive feedback on the Working Group's public outreach approach. Public workshops will support the Prop. 1 application by demonstrating the subbasin's commitment to public engagement.

While several Working Group members and others directly involved in SGMA implementation attended the October 12 workshop, no members of the public attended. However, Amador County Supervisor Richard Forster posted live updates about the meeting on Facebook. Members of the public responded to the Facebook posts with real-time questions and comments; Working Group members then responded to the posts. EKI technical consultant Anona Dutton recommended that the Prop. 1 application highlight the subbasin's innovative approaches to public engagement and include screenshots of Supervisor Forster's Facebook posts from the public workshop. The Working Group will consider live-streaming future meetings that are held in the Amador council chambers.

Working Group members suggested the following strategies to inform the public about future workshops:

- Post meeting announcements in the "upcoming events" section of local newspapers (e.g. the Ledger Dispatch, a biweekly newspaper for Amador County). The River Valley Times will run an article about the upcoming SGMA workshop in Wilton.
- Use simple outreach messaging with a compelling hook (e.g. invoke "fees and taxes on your wells").

Tom Gohring received the following feedback on his Amador Public Workshop presentation:

- Start the presentation with a compelling hook
- Include less technically dense information

### Department of Water Resources (DWR) Facilitation Grant

DWR awarded \$50k in grant funds to support CBI facilitation services in the Cosumnes Subbasin. The funds may be used between now and the end of the fiscal year (June 2018). The Prop. 1 budget estimates that over next four years the subbasin will spend \$400k for facilitation and outreach and assumes that the subbasin will not receive additional DWR facilitation support.

### Coordination with Eastern San Joaquin

Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin fully executed its JPA earlier in the week. EKI technical consultant Anona Dutton met with the modeling consultant for Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin to receive an update about E. San Joaquin's current work to develop a groundwater model using the Integrated Water Flow Model platform (consistent with DWR's C2VSIM platform). Eastern San Joaquin's model includes all of the Cosumnes Subbasin at a very coarse level in order to set as boundary condition. The model is in development and will be complete in early to mid-2018, with documentation to follow. Dutton recommends that the Cosumnes Subbasin continue to track Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin's efforts to develop its groundwater model.

Phase I (early- to mid-2018) of the Cosumnes Subbasin's Work Plan for GSP development includes a comprehensive analysis of options for groundwater modeling platforms.

### Technical Advisory Committee Updates

At its meeting a week earlier, the Cosumnes Subbasin Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed components of the subbasin’s Prop. 1 grant application, including the work plan, budget and cost share for GSP development. The TAC also discussed Prop. 1 letters of support to be submitted by GSAs and other stakeholders.

TAC members raised key questions related to budget and cost share:

- Does the budget include all administrative and administrative entity costs?
- Does the budget include adequate scope for technical work?
- Can funds for stakeholder outreach and engagement be reallocated toward technical work?

Based on TAC input, EKI made the following edits to the draft work plan:

- The needs statement now highlights the presence of Disadvantaged Communities and tribes;
- Edited language to clarify GSAs’ actions in their respective jurisdictional areas versus basin-wide;
- Incorporated nuanced language to provide more explicit flexibility regarding the development of one GSP or multiple, closely-coordinated GSPs for the subbasin. Following robust TAC discussion on this issue, Hanspeter Walter further refined Sloughouse RCD’s edits to the Work Plan to deemphasize the issue of multiple GSPs while still providing for significant flexibility.
- Reduced the budget for technical consultant and increased the budget for data collection.

### Other Updates

- The Water Forum fully executed EKI’s contract for independent technical advisory services for the Cosumnes Subbasin. EKI’s primary scope of work is to develop the work plan and budget for the Cosumnes Subbasin Proposition 1 grant application. The EKI team is led by Vice President Anona Dutton.
- The Water Forum sent SSCWA a model administrative entity contract. Working Group members request transparency with regard to the functioning of the administrative entity. To this end, the Water Forum will share a draft administrative entity contract and terms sheet with the Working Group.
- Three entities in the South American Subbasin (Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Sloughouse RCD and Sacramento County Groundwater Authority) filed to form overlapping GSAs. The Water Forum hopes to bring the entities together to resolve the overlap. CBI facilitator Gina Bartlett will support the discussions.

## COSUMNES SUBBASIN PROPOSITION 1 GRANT APPLICATION

The Working Group reviewed the components of the Prop. 1 grant application, including the [revised draft work plan](#), [proposal summary](#) and [budget](#), all of which are posted online.

**DWR will use the following 19-point criteria to evaluate Prop. 1 grant applications:**

4 points	Does the proposal describe a well-coordinated plan that encompasses the entire basin?
2 points	Do the budget and schedule demonstrate that the project will be completed by 1/31/22?
4 points	Has the applicant addressed all items requested in the project justification section of

	attachment 3?
2 points	Does the applicant explain the technical need for the project?
4 points	Does the application contain a detailed work plan for developing, preparing and submitting a complete GSP?
2 points	Does the application contain a complete budget that is reasonable to execute the Work Plan?
1 point	Does the level of effort described in the Work Plan + Schedule seem reasonable?

**Process for GSP Development:** The Work Plan describes a process by which the Cosumnes technical advisor will systematically construct the GSP with maximum TAC and Working Group input at each step. EKI anticipates that for each major task, the technical consultant will present data analysis and findings to the TAC or Working Group and receive feedback that the consultant will then incorporate into a technical memorandum. The content of technical memoranda will be converted into a chapter or section of the draft GSP.

**One vs. Multiple GSPs:**

- According to DWR, a Prop. 1 application that describes multiple, well-coordinated GSPs will be given the same consideration as an application that describes plans for a single GSP.
- While Sacramento County prefers that the subbasin develop a single GSP, it agreed to the revised language that leaves open the possibility to develop multiple GSPs.
- The work plan will note that any incremental costs associated with developing multiple GSPs would be covered by the individual affected entities.
- Working Group members agreed to strike the section of a footnote that states that costs associated with GSP development “are expected to be relatively minor.”

**Galt Irrigation District Compliance:** Technical Consultant Anona Dutton raised concern about whether Galt Irrigation District meets DWR’s eligibility requirements for Prop. 1 applicants. The Water Forum previously attempted to engage DWR and the Bureau of Reclamation on this issue. Dutton recommended and Working Group members agreed that the Prop. 1 application should directly address the subbasin’s interpretation as to why Galt ID meets the application eligibility requirements. Dutton will craft this language and share with the Working Group.

**Prop. 1 Budget:** Tom Gohring presented the [budget for GSP development](#), which will be included in the Prop. 1 application. Based on GSA input received at the October TAC meeting, the Water Forum increased the budget for data gathering efforts in Phase III and trimmed other technical components that existing work efforts can supplement. Gohring noted that the technical consultant’s participation in two meetings per month (preparation for and attendance at monthly TAC and Working Group meetings) accounts for a large portion of the consultant’s total estimated costs; thus, should the subbasin receive significantly reduced Prop. 1 funding, the subbasin may seek cost savings by reducing the number of meetings that the technical consultant attends. Participants further suggested that some of the budget allocated for stakeholder outreach and engagement be re-allocated to support technical work. The Water Forum Board earmarked funds specifically for outreach and facilitation; these contributions are not fungible, and as such cannot be re-budgeted as cash to carry out additional technical work.

Dutton requested documentation of GSA expenditures dating back to January 2015. Expenditures incurred between January 2017 through the end of June 2017 will count toward GSA cost share, and expenditures from July 2017 onwards are reimbursable.

**Proposed Cost Share:** The Prop. 1 application states that GSAs will fund \$857,700 of the total budget, but does not outline the cost share breakdown among GSAs. Tom Gohring presented the following draft cost-share break-down:

*Proposed Cost Share Breakdown - draft*

Total (over four years)	\$2,730,000
Prop. 1	-\$1,000,000 (TBD)
Water Forum	<u>-\$822,295</u>
GSAs	\$857,700
Sac County	-\$500,000
City of Galt	<u>-\$100,000</u>
Other five GSAs	\$260,000
Average GSA (over four years)	\$52,000
Average GSA per year	\$13,000

Further discussion on potential cost-share approaches is needed once there is greater clarity on the extent of Prop. 1 funding available to the subbasin.

**Working Group members reviewed the following key roles for GSP development:**

*Roles required for Prop 1 app*

- Applicant Point of Contact (grant applicant) - a representative of SSCAWA
- Project Representative (individual responsible for the project agreement) - a representative of SSCAWA
- Project Manager (day-to-day project contact) - John Lowrie, Water Forum

*Other roles*

- Media Point of Contact - Presently the Water Forum; the Working Group will revisit this role when it reviews the Framework Agreement and develops a successor governance agreement.
- Contract Selection Committee – A representative of each GSA will serve on a selection committee that will develop interview questions, hold interviews and select contractors; the Working Group will ratify all hiring decisions. This is the same process by which the subbasin hired EKI as technical consultant.

As administrative entity, SSCAWA’s role is to interface with DWR on grant administration, in service of the Working Group. Bennett Brooks with CBI recommended that the Working Group draft a document that articulates the relationship between the Working Group, SSCAWA and the Water Forum, with a focus on roles, not individuals. The Water Forum will develop a draft subsidiary contract for use between SSCAWA and the seven GSAs.

**Prop. 1 Letters of Support:** John Lowrie requested that each GSA submit a letter of support or formal resolution endorsing SSCAWA as administrative entity for the subbasin. Working Group members confirmed that each GSA is prepared to submit letter of support for grant application. Omochumne-Hartnell Water District and Amador County Groundwater Management Agency have already submitted letters of support.

Additionally, Working Group members will seek letters of support from the following entities, to be submitted by November 1:

- Amanda Platt: Amador RCD
- Amanda Platt: Cosumnes Coalition (Mike Eaton + Melinda Frost-Hurzel)
- Amanda Platt: Rancho Murietta
- Amanda Platt: Cosumnes Preserve
- Damon Wykoff: Buena Vista Rancheria
- Gene Mancebo: Amador County
- Gene Mancebo: EBMUD
- Gene Mancebo: City of Ione
- Jay Schneider: Cattlemans
- Jay Schneider: South Sacramento RCD
- Jay Schneider: Reclamation District 800
- Jay Schneider: Cosumnes Council
- Jay Schneider: South Sacramento Council (CPAC)
- John Mulrooney: SMUD
- Kerry Schmitz: Sacramento County
- Kerry Schmitz: SCGA
- Mike Wackman: Wine Grape Commission
- Mike Wackman: Lodi Grape Growers Association
- Mike Wackman: Farm Bureau
- Tom Gohring: Water Forum
- Tom Gohring: Wilton Rancheria

**Key Outcomes:** Working Group participants noted that their greatest shared interest is to submit a strong, strategically crafted Prop. 1 application that will receive as much funding as possible. Participants agreed that the near-final Prop. 1 application outlines a thoughtful work plan and budget that will adequately support the subbasin in producing its GSP. Anona Dutton will continue to refine the needs statement without impacting its substance. Rodney Fricke will send small, technical, non-substantive edits to EKI and copy all Working Group members. GSAs and other interested parties will submit letters of support by November 1. EKI and the Water Forum plan to package and submit the complete Prop. 1 application by **November 6**.

### **UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE**

The TAC will not meet in December. The Working Group may cancel its December 20 meeting. Visit [cosumnes.waterforum.org](http://cosumnes.waterforum.org) for the latest meeting information.

### **MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

Damon Wykoff, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority  
Ed Gonzalez, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority  
Gary Thomas, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority  
Gene Mancebo, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority  
Hanspeter Walter, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District  
Herb Garms, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District  
Jay Schneider, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District

John Mulrooney, Galt Irrigation District  
Rick Wohle, Clay Water District  
Mark Stretars, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District  
Mike Wackman, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District  
Leland Schneider, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District  
Steve Winkler, City of Galt  
Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County  
Rodney Fricke, Sacramento County  
Tom Gohring, Water Forum  
John Lowrie, Water Forum  
Anona Dutton, EKI  
Bennett Brooks, CBI  
Julia Golomb, CBI

*For questions regarding this meeting summary, please contact Tom Gohring at the Water Forum or Julia Golomb at the Consensus Building Institute.*

Visit [cosumnes.waterforum.org](http://cosumnes.waterforum.org) for the latest meeting information and materials.