

**Cosumnes Subbasin SGMA Working Group + Technical Advisory Committee
Joint Meeting
Meeting #18**

Meeting held May 16, 2018
Prepared by Consensus Building Institute

ACTION ITEMS

Who	What
M. Wackman	Prepare letter to DWR confirming grant administrator shift from SSCAWA to County
L Dorn	Prepare letter to DWR seeking extension on 45-day Cosumnes Subbasin grant response given anticipated Tech Consultant selected schedule
GSAs	Seek board commitment (prior to June WG meeting) to minimum cost share (\$7,768/year for Amador, OH, SRCD; commitment to % of budget for Clay/Galt ID)
GSAs	Send comments on technical consultant RFQ to Linda Dorn by May 21 COB.
L. Dorn	Update existing language based on Working Group feedback (underscoring Tech Consultant working in service of Working Group; other suggested language to be provided by GSAs)
L. Dorn, Water Forum, CBI	Take stock of recommended edits to RFQ; if non-substantive, Dorn releases RFQ; if substantive, send suggested revisions to all GSAs for email confirmation
GSAs	By 5/23, nominate up to 1 member for each GSA to serve on Finance Subcommittee
L. Dorn	Organize Finance Subcommittee discussion to get input into draft contract language
L. Dorn	Develop a master contract between Sac. County and each GSA.
CBI	Update Framework Agreement to reflect Working Group input; bring draft to June meeting.
Water Forum or EKI	Confirm process for Cosumnes Subbasin to be considered to be part of ESJ stakeholder body - is a formal application needed? Does ESJ anticipate viewing such an application favorably?
L. Dorn, M. Wackman, EKI	Outline potential grant application focus; distribute to GSAs for comment
EKI	Find out from DWR whether grant application can be amended without losing spot in queue
GSAs	Provide feedback on grant application outline - (1) live with it; (2) live with it with changes; (3) not in favor of submitting
T. Gohring/EKI	Based on GSA feedback (if positive), decide if submittal is worthwhile and affordable

SRCD	Discuss GSP approach at its 5/18 Board meeting; provide update to GSAs, Water Forum
Water Forum	Finalize and submit Plan Notification form based on SRCD direction: If one GSP, submits language as currently drafted (including caveat for future changes in GSP direction). If separate GSPs, submit on behalf of other 6 GSAs.

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 and any action items.

GENERAL UPDATES

Proposition 1 Grant Status

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) sent the official Proposition 1 grant award to SSCAWA, the applicant of record. According to DWR’s letter, SSCAWA has 45 days to submit any changes to the workplan, budget or schedule and to complete the required environmental information form. However, the technical consultant selection process will take at least 45 days and the new technical consultant may negotiate the scope of work and contract with Sacramento County, the Prop. 1 grant administrator for the Cosumnes Subbasin. Alison Tang, DWR, confirmed that the Working Group should provide DWR with the timeline for technical consultant selection and an explanation of why an extension makes sense for the subbasin.

Outcome: Working Group participants directed Sacramento County to submit two letters to DWR to outline the Working Group’s timeline for technical consultant selection and requesting an extended timeline in order to revise the scope of work after the technical consultant is selected.

Near-Term Coordination with Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin

[View slide 7.](#) Eastern San Joaquin is forming a Stakeholder Advisory Committee by application, with participant selection by the JPA board. The committee will begin meeting in June.

Outcome: EKI will confirm a Cosumnes Subbasin seat on the Eastern San Joaquin Technical Advisory Committee.

Cosumnes River Study

[View slide 8.](#) The UC Laboratory Fees Research Program recently awarded Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) \$3.7 million in funding to develop a hydrologic model of the Cosumnes River in efforts to model projected surface water supply and groundwater recharge conditions along the Cosumnes River under various climate change scenarios. This collaborative study, led by Jeff Dozier (UC Santa Barbara), includes researchers from LBNL, LLNL, UC Davis, UC Irvine, UCLA and UC Merced. Named “Headwaters to Groundwater: Resources in a Changing Climate,” this study will develop a high-resolution numerical model of the Cosumnes River and underlying aquifers to “provide information that can be used to optimize water storage, water quality, and groundwater

sustainability as precipitation varies, temperatures warm, and population grows.” The study focuses on surface water-groundwater interactions and conjunctive use/management scenarios to optimize sustainable management of Cosumnes River and local aquifer system. This work is compatible with the Cosumnes Working Group’s work on GSP development and will provide a significant source of highly relevant data for GSP development.

Update from South American Subbasin

In the South American Subbasin, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA), Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District (SRCD) and Omochumne-Hartnell Water District (OHWD) continue to participate in facilitated meetings. These entities are in the process of bringing the following interim proposal to their respective boards: SRCD and OHWD will step back from their possible plans to submit a request for basin boundary modification and SRCD will withdraw its application to serve as GSA in areas covered by OHWD. SRCD’s negotiating representatives expressed support for a single GSP in the South American Subbasin.

GSP Development Cost Share

The Water Forum presented an updated GSA cost share estimate for GSP development. The Water Forum reduced the estimated budget by \$240k, thereby reducing the annual GSA cost share contribution from \$20k per GSA to less than \$8k per GSA per year. These figures assume the following additional sources of funding: \$1 million from the Proposition 1 grant award, \$500k from Sacramento County, and \$100k from the City of Galt.

The reduced costs came from (1) Basin analysis -- EKI has completed several pre-planning tasks as part of its technical advisor responsibilities; additionally, \$90k of SRCD in-kind costs had been under basin analysis; (2) Project management costs decreased by \$55k because Sacramento County is not requesting project management costs to cover its role as Prop. 1 grant administration; rather, Sacramento County is donating project management as an in-kind contribution.

Outcome

Participants agreed to move forward with the following cost share approach:

- Amador, SRCD and OHWD will request from their respective boards a minimum cost share contribution of \$7,768/year.
- Clay Water District will bring its board a recommendation to allocate 50% of its annual budget to cost share.
- Galt Irrigation District will gauge what amount it is able to contribute and will come back to the Working Group with a viable amount.
- The City of Galt offered to frontload its cost share payments in order to help with cash flow.
- The budget will likely have a \$50k gap. The Water Forum requests that the Working Group move forward and anticipate over the next four years of GSP development the technical consultant can economize by \$50k or that the Working Group can come up with \$50k. Participants agreed to move forward despite the relatively small funding gap so that the subbasin can bring a technical consultant under contract and begin GSP development.

Governance for GSP Development

During the previous Working Group meeting (April 18), GSAs expressed interest in resolving the Working Group’s near-term governance in order to move onto substantive work. At the Working Group’s request, the Water Forum looked at governance options guided by parameters such as population, land, water use, and other factors; the Water Forum ultimately concluded that it will be difficult for any of these factors to accurately guide governance until the technical consultant begins conducting analysis and therein generates reliable data. Following the previous meeting, participants also agreed to review the Working Group’s existing Framework Agreement and identify whether pieces of the agreement need to be amended or augmented in order to work moving forward. Additionally, participants agreed to review a document that summarizes the Consensus Building Institute’s research into other basins’ approaches to governance.

In returning to consideration of governance options for GSP development, Working Group participants agreed that (1) the Working Group’s existing Framework Agreement seems to function well and (2) governance needs may change over the course of GSP development, as the type of decisions made during Phases 1 and 2 of GSP development will likely differ from those made during Phases 3 and 4.

GSAs shared the following input on how to proceed with governance for GSP development:

<p>Amador County Groundwater Management Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For big ticket items, Amador supports one vote per GSA while striving for consensus; ➤ Concerned that any use of any given parameter to determine voting would favor one GSA over another; ➤ Important to differentiate between fiscal and non-fiscal items; ➤ The Amador County Board supports use of the existing Framework Agreement throughout plan development, with minor updates. 	<p>Sacramento County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Prefers to use the current governance structure throughout GSP development. ➤ In the process of GSP development, establish a new governance structure to guide plan implementation. ➤ Governance check-ins utilize significant Working Group time and energy; as such, recommendation for limited and efficient check-ins regarding governance. ➤ Advocates for simplicity in governance, i.e. 1 GSA, 1 vote.
<p>SRCD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Supports a minor update to the Framework Agreement for use through Phase 2 of GSP development. ➤ Suggested that the Working Group revisit governance at the start of Phase 3, which is when the Working Group will begin to consider approaches to plan implementation. 	<p>Galt Irrigation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Current governance works fine; recommends updating the Framework Agreement as needed and continuing to utilize it. ➤ Can live with SRCD’s idea of revisiting governance in advance of Phase 3. ➤ There is more at stake around governance for implementation. ➤ Critical to establish good data and good information.

<p>OHWD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Concerned about getting sidetracked by governance discussions ➤ Recommends moving forward through Phase 3 and then discussing long-term governance. 	<p>Clay Water District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Keep it simple ➤ Can live SRCD’s proposal to revisit governance in advance of Phase 3
---	--

While many GSAs prefer for the Framework Agreement to largely cover the next four years of GSP development, Working Group members are willing to revisit governance at the end of Phase 2/start of Phase 3, by which point the Working Group will have more and better data as well as experience working together.

Additionally, at a later point the Working Group will revisit its approach to stakeholder engagement in order to maximize effective involvement from stakeholders who can provide meaningful input. A member of the public expressed her support for establishing a stakeholder advisory group and noted that public interest in local SGMA implementation will only increase moving forward.

Outcome: Based on Working Group guidance, CBI will (1) Update the Framework Agreement to last at least through Phase 2; and (2) Guide a brief, bounded check-in on governance after Phase 1 via phone calls between CBI and individual GSAs (rather than via an in-meeting discussion, so as to maintain Working Group focus on substantive discussions).

Technical Consultant Selection Process

- Sacramento County serves as the Prop. 1 grant administrator and works at the direction of the Working Group.
- All GSAs approved the draft RFQ for technical consultant and agreed to send any minor edits to Linda Dorn by COB on May 21.
- Sac. County will aim to release the RFQ by May 25 at latest.
- Working Group participants recommend forming a **finance sub-committee** to review contracts and expenses; everything will come back to the Working Group for approval.
- Dorn will develop a master contract between Sac. County and each GSA.

Selection process: Issue RFQ for 30 days; print one hard copy of applications per GSA and mail to GSAs; the Selection Committee will meet one week later (tentatively on June 25) to rank applications.

Next steps: GSAs send any comments on RFQ to Linda Dorn by May 21 COB. If all comments are non-substantive, Dorn will integrate edits and issue the RFQ without coming back to the Working Group. Additionally, by May 25 each GSA will designate up to one representative per GSA to serve on the finance subcommittee.

EKI Presentation: DWR Technical Services Grant

[View slides 3-5](#). DWR has released its Technical Support Services (TSS) application.

- TSS applications are submitted through an online portal, which is made available after consultation with DWR
- “Funding will be prioritized based on identified need,” with initial priority given to critically overdrafted basins (CODs)
- Initial funding availability of ~\$2 million will “likely be exhausted” by CODs, but non-COD Basins are still encouraged to apply
- Future funding for TSS may become available at a later date
- A potential Cosumnes Subbasin TSS grant application could focus on installation of monitoring wells and/or further characterization of existing monitoring network (e.g., screen interval delineation via borehole video logging), but specific wells / sites would need to be identified beforehand

The application process is two-phased:

(1) TSS General Application – completed on behalf of the Basin

- One application per Basin, to be submitted by a designated “Basin Coordinator”
- Includes general questions about the SGMA process, current funding programs within the Basin (e.g., How many GSPs?)
- Applicants must describe “the most challenging technical needs of the Basin,” and how the GSAs are collaborating to meet those needs

(2) TSS Well Service Request Form – completed for each “Project” (i.e., monitoring well installation/service)

- One application submitted for each well service request (e.g. installation, geophysical logging, borehole video)
- Requires specific details about proposed site location, landowner contacts, nearby wells and/or previous subsurface investigations, etc.
- Well installation needs to be planned ahead of time, including desired well & screening interval depths, target aquifer zones, etc.
- Applicants must describe services that can be provided by the GSA(s) during installation, including permitting needs, access arrangements, traffic control, etc.

Dutton noted that the Cosumnes Subbasin has existing data gaps that could be addressed through a monitoring well. She further noted that the subbasin must determine whether it will prepare one or more GSPs before it is eligible to pursue funding opportunities such as this. A member of the public commented that it would be useful for the Working Group to identify its data needs and to share these needs with researchers working in the Subbasin.

Next Steps: Mike Wackman, Anona Dutton and Linda Dorn will develop a TSS application outline, with the aim of identifying items that would not require significant grant development efforts. They will then share this outline with GSAs for feedback; if all GSAs can live with the proposed application, Gohring and Dutton will determine whether the application is worth pursuing. If so, the Water Forum will modify EKI’s scope to develop the grant application and will cover all associated costs.

GSP Public Notification Requirement

Many Working Group participants expressed the importance of moving forward with the GSP public notification submittal to DWR. At its upcoming board meeting, SRCD will determine whether to develop its own separate GSP or move forward with the development of a single, subbasin-wide GSP. If SRCD chooses to continue with a single GSP, the Water Forum will file a single public notification submittal for all seven GSAs. If SRCD decides to develop its own separate GSP, the Water Forum will file a submittal for six GSAs (excluding SRCD) and SRCD would file its own submittal.

Next Steps: Unless at its May 18 board meeting SRCD decides to prepare its own GSP, the Water Forum will file a single, basin-wide GSP notice of intent that includes language in question 6 describing the basin's option to develop a second GSP in future.

EKI PRESENTATION – DWR Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystem Mapping Tool

[View slides 9-18](#). EKI presented a preview tools and resources currently available via the DWR SGMA Portal.

DWR'S SGMA Data Viewer - [link](#)

- New “master SGMA database” made publicly available by DWR
- Can be accessed on the Data and Tools page of DWR's SGMA website.
- Includes statewide and local datasets and will be regularly updated with new information as it is submitted by GSAs to DWR's SGMA Portal
- All datasets are available for download
- Will serve as DWR's foundation for data compilation, sharing, and dissemination in SGMA

The tool includes the following information and datasets: Soil recharge ratings, statewide land use data (2014), interconnected surface water, DWR climate change dataset, land subsidence, water quality data, integrated CASGEM and water library data, and individual well information.

The **Natural Communities dataset** is a statewide dataset that is locally refined and intended to guide planning around groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs). DWR and the Nature Conservancy (TNC) have released independent guidance documents outlining their recommended processes for working with the GDE dataset. There is a trend of GDEs along the Cosumnes River.

NEXT MEETING

Participants expressed support for shifting away from process discussions and more into substantive conversations, in an effort to keep pace with neighboring basins. In the coming months, the Working Group and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will resume separate meetings (perhaps a two-hour TAC meeting immediately followed by a Working Group meeting).

The Working Group and TAC will next jointly meet at 9:00 am on Wednesday, June 20 in the Community Room at the Galt Police Department.

GLOSSARY

Below is a list of commonly used terms:

CBI	Consensus Building Institute - The organization that facilitates SGMA implementation in the Cosumnes Subbasin
DWR	California Department of Water Resources w

EKI	The firm that currently serves as independent technical consultant for the Cosumnes Subbasin
Galt ID	Galt Irrigation District (link) - One of the seven GSAs in the Cosumnes Subbasin
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
OHWD	Omochumne-Hartnell Water District (link) - One of the seven GSAs in the Cosumnes Subbasin
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFQ	Request for Qualification
Prop. 1	Proposition 1
SCGA	Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (link)
SGMA	California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (link)
SRCD	Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District - One of the seven GSAs in the Cosumnes Subbasin
SSCWA	Southeast Sacramento County Agricultural Water Authority (link)
TAC	Cosumnes Subbasin Technical Advisory Committee – An advisory body, with representatives from each of the seven GSAs, that develops recommendations for approval by the Working Group.
WF	Sacramento Water Forum (link)
Zone 13	

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 for the latest meeting information and materials.