

Cosumnes Subbasin SGMA Working Group Meeting
Meeting #21
Meeting held August 15, 2018
Prepared by Consensus Building Institute and Water Forum

ACTION ITEMS

Who	What
CBI	Provide an updated version of the Framework Agreement based on Wednesday's Working Group discussion (distributed 8/16)
GSAs	Review revised Framework Agreement and confirm by noon, Monday, 8/20 that the underline/strikethrough is consistent with the changes discussed and agreed to at Wednesday's meeting.
GSAs	Provide agreed-upon name change for the Working Group by noon, Monday, 8/20; otherwise the group can consider a name change at a later date.
CBI	Provide a final, clean copy of the Framework Agreement by 5 pm, 8/20.
GSAs	Seek a resolution endorsing the Framework Agreement from respective boards or decision makers; provide resolution before 9/15.
L. Dorn	Provide a final, clean version of the Cost-Share Agreement based on the 8/15 discussion by 8/20.
GSAs	Seek approval of the Cost-Share Agreement from respective boards or decision makers; provide a signed copy of the agreement before 9/15.

NEAR-TERM TIMELINE

- **By Aug 31:** Final EKI work plan, budget, and timeline are submitted to DWR.
- **By Sept 15:** Each GSA provides its formal resolution endorsing the GSP Development Framework Agreement and signed Cost Share Agreement.
- **Sept 25:** County of Sacramento Board Meeting reviews the EKI contract (based on the endorsed Framework Agreement; signed Cost-Share agreement; and approved EKI workplan, budget, and schedule).
- **Late Sept/Oct:** If the EKI contract is approved, EKI can begin GSP development tasks.

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

Linda Dorn, Sacramento County, reminded the group that the revised scope of work and schedule will need to be submitted to DWR by the end of August.

Grant Administrator/GSA Contractual Relationship

Linda Dorn outlined the major upcoming deadlines ([refer to Near-Term Timeline](#)) for the technical consultant EKI to begin work on GSP development. She explained that all GSAs need to unanimously approve the Framework Agreement and Cost-Share Agreement, as they document the Working Group's decision-making process and GSAs' financial contributions, respectively.

General GSP Development

Linda Dorn and Kerry Schmitz will submit the endorsed Framework Agreement, signed Cost-Share Agreement, and approved EKI workplan, budget, and schedule to the County Board of Supervisors for action at its September 25 meeting. The package will only be submitted for action at the September meeting if all elements have been approved by GSAs prior to September 15.

Participants voiced concerns about additional delays for GSP development. They underscored the importance to receive County approval of the EKI contract at the September 25 County Board of Supervisors meeting or risk another month of delays.

POLICY TOPIC: GSP DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT

The draft Framework Agreement was updated based on discussion at the Working Group's July meeting. GSAs received the [revised Framework Agreement](#) beforehand and were asked to submit final edits before the August meeting. Received edits were minor (e.g., grammar and referring to the technical advisor as "technical consultant").

Working Group members were asked for final input with the intent to reach consensus among GSA representatives to forward the agreement to their respective boards for approval.

Discussion:

GSP Development

- The group discussed how the technical consultant will receive and incorporate new information for GSP development per direction from the Working Group. Participants indicated the intent is for GSAs to jointly seek credible and useful information to include into the GSP to avoid potential competing information and optimize funding / resources. The group agreed the entity who conducted or sponsored the study should present its work to the Working Group and/or technical consultant. The Working Group can then jointly decide on the extent to which that information is used to inform the GSP. Several participants also emphasized that the GSA should notify the Working Group in advance if that GSA plans to conduct a study that may benefit the GSP. Anona Dutton, EKI, noted that this is the initial round of GSP development; the GSAs will have many other opportunities to update and add new information to the GSP during the course of Plan implementation.
- A Working Group member requested greater specificity on how a GSA that chose to develop its own GSP might contract with a technical consultant (either EKI or a different entity) that would not incur additional costs to the Working Group. Working Group members

acknowledged the importance to discuss cost and governance considerations if this scenario occurs; however, those details should be outlined in a coordination agreement and not the Framework Agreement.

- Representatives from SRCD asked for clarification on the additional costs for which a GSA is responsible should it choose to separately develop a GSP. Linda Dorn explained the costs associated with doing a separate coordination agreement and GSP will be paid by the GSA(s) choosing to do the separate GSP; the Prop. 1 grant funds will not cover those costs. A SRCD representative suggested using the same language as the EKI scope of work to capture this clarification.

Attachment 1 – Near-Term Decisions

- Remove topics that have been addressed (e.g., developing cost-share obligations).
- Generalize that long-term governance decisions will occur in Phase 3; remove the specific timing forecast.
- Clarify that the “GSAs” will determine designation of management areas within their jurisdictional areas. A Working Group member said that if a management area designation has cost implications to other GSAs, then those GSAs should be part of that decision.
- A Working Group member suggested specifying particular jurisdictional management areas as early as possible. For instance, designate jurisdictionally-based management areas for entities that have surface water available for groundwater recharge. Working Group members indicated they were willing to discuss jurisdictional management areas as early as appropriate, but the Framework Agreement does not need greater detail than already conveyed.
- Several participants reminded the group that this list of near-term decisions can change as needed.

General Comments

- Consider changing the name of the Working Group to more specifically identify the group’s role supporting the Cosumnes basin.
- Edit requests should be due at least 7 days prior to a meeting, then the finalized documents distributed to the group at least 3-4 days prior.

Outcome: Working Group members agreed that the Framework Agreement (per August 15 meeting edits) can be finalized for GSA approval.

Next Steps: CBI and the County will revise the final draft of Framework Agreement and forward the updated, red-lined document to the Working Group to confirm by August 20 that edits accurately reflect the August 15 meeting discussion. The Working Group can also provide an agreed-upon name change by August 20. CBI will then edit as needed and send the finalized document to Working Group members to forward the [proposed Final Framework Agreement](#) to their respective governing bodies for approval.

Public Comment: Suzanne Pecci suggested the Working Group help ensure GSAs vet concerns and differing opinions before coming to the Working Group meetings for the group to have more effective and efficient dialogue. A SRCD representative noted they did not have all GSA board members at their last meeting and were unable to reach consensus.

POLICY TOPIC: GRANT ADMINISTRATION | EKI SCOPE OF WORK

Per the July Working Group meeting discussion, EKI and Sacramento County updated the scope of work for GSP development. Anona Dutton explained the intent was to minimize changes from the Prop. 1 application; the updated scope of work primarily clarifies EKI's roles and responsibilities. Linda Dorn reviewed the revisions, which are summarized in the [EKI scope of work cover letter](#).

GSAs were asked for input on the revised scope of work, which included the updated [work plan](#), [budget](#), and [project schedule](#). The County needs to submit this scope of work to DWR by the end of August per Prop. 1 grant requirements.

Discussion:

- The group discussed the additional costs a GSA might need to cover when designating management areas. Anona Dutton explained EKI will develop a technical memo containing an overall framework for management areas that will lead to unique values/actions for each management area. GSAs can apply that general framework to develop unique values for their management area(s). The technical memo is a one-time effort; the budget does not cover additional work (e.g., creating new management actions specifically for a particular management area). Those incremental costs will be borne by the GSA(s). A Working Group member requested adding language to clarify EKI will develop a common basin-wide framework.
- A Working Group member requested greater specificity on what incremental conditions would not be covered by the scope of work. Anona Dutton conveyed these specifics are difficult to predict in the next four years. She reiterated the additional tasks for management areas beyond a basic framework as one example; another example would be additional time and effort EKI might spend with a GSA to reach consensus with the rest of the group. EKI will notify the Working Group when EKI's work begins to exceed the anticipated level of effort; the Working Group can then discuss whether that work should be included or considered as incremental costs.
- Representatives from SRCD confirmed that its GSA board gave their Working Group representatives authority to approve EKI's scope assuming there was sufficient clarity on the scope of work associated with management areas. Herb Garms with SRCD confirmed that Sloughouse is comfortable moving forward with the EKI work plan, schedule, and budget, as revised based on Working Group discussions.

Outcome: Working Group members agreed the EKI work plan (per August 15 meeting edits), budget, and project schedule can be finalized.

Next Steps: Linda Dorn is to revise the work plan per the August 15 discussion and submit the EKI work plan, budget, and timeline to DWR by the end of August.

Public Comment: Suzanne Pecci stated that the Working Group's Prop. 1 grant funds should not cover private discussions between EKI and a GSA beyond the original anticipated level of effort.

POLICY TOPIC: GRANT ADMINISTRATION | COST-SHARE AGREEMENT

The Draft Cost-Share Agreement was revised per the July Working Group meeting discussion. The County distributed the revised agreement to the Working Group requesting edits before the August meeting. Linda Dorn stated edits she received were minor ([refer to red-line Cost-Share Agreement](#)).

Working Group members were asked for final input with the intent to reach consensus among GSA representatives to forward the agreement to their respective boards for approval.

Discussion:

- Linda Dorn confirmed the County needs all GSAs to provide a signed copy of the agreement for the September 25 County Board of Supervisors meeting.
- #13. Disputes: Revise existing language to state that an unresolved dispute may be referred to the Cosumnes Working Group “or independent mediator for possible voluntary resolution.”

Outcome: Working Group members agreed the Cost-Share Agreement (per August 15 meeting edits) is ready for GSA approval.

Next Steps: Linda will incorporate Cost-Share Agreement edits per the August 15 discussion and distribute a final, clean copy to the Working Group by August 20. GSAs will seek approval of the Cost-Share Agreement from their respective GSA boards or decisions makers and provide a signed copy of the agreement no later than September 15.

Public Comment: None.

NEXT MEETING

The Working Group will next meet at 9:00 am on September 19 in the Community Room at the Galt Police Department.

Topics may include updates on the Prop. 1 grant administration and EKI work plan, stakeholder engagement and outreach strategy, SRCD proposed basin boundary adjustment update.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Ed Gonzalez, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority
Gary Thomas, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority
Gene Mancebo, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority
Damon Wyckoff, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority
Mike Israel, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority
Amanda Platt, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District
Herb Garms, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District
Jay Schneider, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District
Mark Stretars, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
Leland Schneider, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
Mike Wackman, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District
Rick Wohle, Clay Water District
Gary Silva, Clay Water District
Steven Winkler, City of Galt
Mark Clarkson, City of Galt

Leo Van Warmerdam, Galt Irrigation District
John Mulrooney, Galt Irrigation District
Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County
Linda Dorn, Sacramento County
Rodney Fricke, Sacramento County
Bennett Brooks, CBI
Stephanie Horii, CBI
Anona Dutton, EKI
John Lowrie, Water Forum

Additionally, members of the public and DWR attended the meeting.

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
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	Omochochumne-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
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)

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

Visit cosumnes.waterforum.org for the latest meeting information and materials.