

Cosumnes Subbasin SGMA Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary #5
Meeting held October 11, 2017
Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute

ACTION ITEMS

Who	What
John Lowrie	Share templates for letters of support from GSA governing bodies and from landowners and interested parties.
Tom Gohring	Share cost share information with GSAs
EKI	Follow up with Sloughhouse on Prop. 1 proposal edits; ensure that flexibility around GSP-development is captured in a streamlined fashion.
EKI	Revise draft Prop. 1 proposal based on TAC input; share with TAC + WG in track changes.

DISCUSSION – KEY THEMES

Below is a summary of key themes discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) 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.

WELCOME AND UPDATES

Participants provided the following updates:

- The Southeast Sacramento County Agricultural Water Authority (SSCAWA) took action October 10 to adopt a resolution to serve as Prop. 1 administrative entity for the Cosumnes Subbasin. At an upcoming Working Group meetings, participants will discuss how best to coordinate between the Working Group and SSCAWA as administering entity.
- The Cosumnes Subbasin received state funding for facilitation support services. These funds will cover CBI’s ongoing facilitation work in the subbasin.
- Alison Tang (Alison.Tang@water.ca.gov) will serve as the DWR point of contact for the Cosumnes Subbasin.
- EKI technical consultant Anona Dutton presented on the draft Prop. 1 proposal at the October 2 Amador County Groundwater Management Agency meeting.

GROUNDWATER MODEL + COORDINATION WITH EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN

On September 29, EKI technical consultant Anona Dutton met with the modeling consultant for Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin. Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin is developing a new groundwater model using the Integrated Water Flow Model (IWFM) platform, which is consistent with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) modeling platform. The Eastern San Joaquin model includes all of the Cosumnes Subbasin (at a coarse level) as boundary condition. The modeling consultant anticipates completing the model in February 2018, with documentation available in June 2018.

Anona noted that Sacramento County strongly promotes the use of **SV-Sim** (developed on the SACIWRM modeling platform). There is no “driver” for this option and thus no external schedule.

She further noted that the Cosumnes Subbasin is included in both the Eastern San Joaquin and SV-SIM models. Additionally, the following models also include the Cosumnes Subbasin:

- DWR’s California Central Valley Groundwater and Surface Water Simulation Model (C2VSim)
- USGS’s Central Valley Hydrologic Model (CVHM)
- City of Roseville’s Sacramento Regional Groundwater Model (SRM)
- A custom model developed for the Cosumnes Subbasin for SGMA purposes

EKI recommendation: The Cosumnes Subbasin will benefit from comprehensive evaluation of model options. This evaluation is identified in Phase I of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Work Plan and will include evaluation of spatial extent, benefits and drawbacks, costs, Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) application, etc.

COSUMNES SUBBASIN PROPOSITION 1 DRAFT GSP WORK PLAN

Anona Dutton presented on the status of the Prop. 1 draft GSP Work Plan, which the EKI technical consulting team is developing as a key component of the Prop. 1 grant application. In advance of the meeting, EKI shared the draft Work Plan with TAC and received comments from some GSAs in advance of the TAC meeting.

Grant Components

- **Applicant Information** – SSCAWA serving as the “Applicant” on behalf of the entire Cosumnes Subbasin, with GSAs as “sub-grantees”
- **Authorization** – GSA or Signatory Resolution
- **Eligibility Documentation**
- **Project Justification** – Describing project and technical needs
- **Work Plan** – Detailed by task
- **Budget** – Consistent with Work Plan
- **Schedule** – Consistent with Work Plan and Budget
- **DAC, SDAC, EDA Documentation** – If applicable

Cosumnes Approach to Grant Scope

The Prop 1. Application describes a single “Project,” for which a final coordinated GSP(s) is the project deliverable. GSAs will have multiple opportunities to provide input on GSP development through the following process:



The Work Plan, which is based on GSP regulations, describes an incremental, phase-based approach to GSP development. The timeline for Phases 1-3 is accelerated in order to keep pace

with adjacent subbasins, particularly with regard to model development and sustainability criteria; this includes efforts to address known data gaps related to basin characterization elements.

Work efforts for each Phase involve multiple components:

- Governance/coordination
- Technical implementation
- Stakeholder engagement
- Funding

Phases of GSP Development

Phase 1: 2015-2018	GSP Foundation
Phase 2: 2018-2019	Basin Characterization and Analysis
Phase 3: 2019-2020	Sustainability Planning
Phase 4: 2020-2022	GSP Preparation and Submittal
Ongoing	Project Management and Administration

Comments Received To-Date on Draft Prop. 1 Application

Background/Scope

1. Amador Groundwater Authority suggests **emphasizing the presence of DACs and Tribes** in the Subbasin in the Prop. 1 application. Approximately 18% of the Subbasin population is Disadvantaged Community (DAC) or Severely Disadvantaged Community (SDAC).
2. Sloughhouse RCD submitted redline markups that more explicitly **allow for the development of multiple coordinated GSPs**, with associated incremental costs covered by GSAs and assurance of close coordination. Sloughhouse edits include carefully crafted language that states that if there are multiple GSPs, they will be closely coordinated. While Anona Dutton has heard that DWR has a preference for single GSPs in a basin (this includes a single GSP with multiple chapters), she noted that Sloughhouse's edits are carefully crafted and the approach is consistent with SGMA regulations.

Wyatt Arnold from DWR explained DWR will evaluate Prop. 1 proposals that describe *very well coordinated* multiple GSPs in the same way that it would evaluate a single GSP. He noted that multiple GSPs within a single basin are likely to be more challenging and expensive to develop, while requiring the same data and assumptions and full coordination through a coordination agreement.

GSP options include:

- A single GSP with separate chapters for individual GSAs/management areas; or
- Two separate GSPs with information and data in common, tied together through a coordination agreement.

Decisions about management areas within the GSP come at the start of Phase 3 of the Work Plan (2019). Management areas drawn based on hydrogeology would require

technical information that does not yet exist. One participant suggested three potential management areas: Amador; the area along the Cosumnes River; and areas that are not directly fed by the Cosumnes River, including Clay, Galt ID and the City of Galt. Issues regarding management areas are to be decided during the GSP development process.

Project Management Phase

1. Sacramento County - GSP Project management costs at 5% total budget seems low; suggestion to increase labor hours for the technical consultant in Task 2.

GSP Foundation Phase

1. Sacramento County - Increase the expected number of meetings and labor hours for inter-basin coordination efforts
2. Sloughhouse RCD - Redline markups articulate additional local public and stakeholder outreach efforts to be completed by the individual GSAs

Basin Characterization Phase

1. Sacramento County - Comments largely targeted assumptions in the budget regarding field efforts to fill data gaps and recommend an increased level of effort, including suggestions to:
 - Allot more time to complete pumping tests;
 - Provide greater detail for quality water analyses (e.g. identify constituents) and remove isotopes;
 - Increase water level measurements to twice yearly over a four-year period;
 - Add additional data gap filling effort to monitor surface water-groundwater interactions along the Cosumnes River.

Sustainability Planning Phase

1. Sloughhouse RCD - Redline markups provide for greater flexibility to develop multiple coordinated GSPs; highlight potential inability to agree to basin-wide sustainability goals, projects and management actions; addresses the need for both coordinated and GSA-specific funding mechanisms for GSP implementation; acknowledges that later in the process, each GSA will determine what constitutes “significant” or “unreasonable” undesirable results.

GSP Preparation and Submittal Phase

1. Sloughhouse RCD – Redline markups remove Task 33 (Submit Final GSP to DWR) and Task 34 (Participate in Intrabasin/Interbasin Coordination Efforts). Sloughhouse RCD suggests instead delivering draft GSP to the GSAs, which can then choose to modify the draft and submit a separate coordinated GSP for their exclusive service area(s) if necessary.

EKI will revisit the language in this section to reflect the formal role of GSAs in this context and distinguish between the Working Group and GSAs. Suggested language: “On behalf of the GSAs, the Working Group will...”

Prop 1 GSP Development “Project” Budget

Major Component	Cost
Technical efforts completed through 2017 (EKI grant app preparation, strategic support)	\$100,000 (cost covered by Water Forum)
Preliminary Data-Gap Filling Efforts	\$160,000
Numerical Modeling	\$506,000
GSP Development	\$756,000
Stakeholder / Coordination Services	\$755,000
Water Forum Services	\$463,000
TOTAL COSTS	\$2,740,000

In developing the scope for GSP development, EKI focused on the key steps that the Subbasin must take to develop a GSP that DWR will approve by 2022, while exercising sensitivity around what is both required and realistic by the GSP submittal deadline. The Prop. 1 proposal scopes for basic, preliminary technical work - including limited data gathering such as pumping tests and snapshot water level maps - to meet DWR's GSP requirements. The scope does not include an extensive field map campaign, given the high costs associated with field work and data collection.

The Water Forum asked that an accounting of all SGMA-related funds (including in-kind staff time) that GSAs spent from January 2015 to present be included as cost-share to demonstrate that the subbasin is invested in SGMA implementation.

Discussion - Budget

- The Working Group will need to conduct a re-scoping exercise should the Subbasin receive less than \$1 million in Prop. 1 funding requested.
- The budget assumes that some grant funds will be available to cover administrative costs for the administering entity.
- The Water Forum does not expect reimbursement for in-kind funding that it has provided.
- Sacramento County and other participants commented that \$160k seems to be a low budget for technical data collection.
- Some GSA members expressed interest in trimming facilitation and outreach costs and, instead, shifting some of that funding to technical tasks. Tom Gohring noted that facilitation and outreach is a contract cost covered and authorized by the Water Forum board. Accordingly, these funds cannot be used instead to support technical work.

Outcome – Budget

The subbasin will:

- Proceed with the basic budget as presented to the TAC;
- Review and, as needed, augment budget deficiencies, per Sacramento County comments;
- Look at individual line items to identify whether it is possible to cut some outreach funds and reallocate for technical work;
- Consider incorporating administrative costs incurred by the administrative entity;
- Know there is a possibility that the total project cost could increase.

DAC Waiver: A basin may request a DAC waiver in the presence of a DAC or SDAC, as defined by DWR in the Prop. 1 grant guidelines. Because there are two DACs in the subbasin (in Amador and the western portion of the subbasin), the subbasin could apply for an 18.3% cost-share waiver; however, the waiver would have no effect because the Water Forum is at 1.8x match funding. As such, **the TAC recommends (1) *not* including a DAC waiver in the Prop. 1 application and (2) ensuring that the project narrative highlights the presence of DACs in the subbasin.**

Letters of Support: 20% of the Prop. 1 evaluation score is based on the level of basin-wide support for the Prop. 1 application. At its October 18 meeting, Working Group members will consider recommending their respective governing bodies write letters in support of the Prop. 1 application and SSCAWA as administrative entity. Letters of support should be submitted by Nov. 1 and addressed to SSCAWA.

Next Steps - Prop. 1 Grant Application:

- **Before 10/18** - EKI revise Prop. 1 application based on TAC input
- **10/18** - EKI present revised draft Prop. 1 application to Working Group, at which time GSAs will consider recommending that their respective governing bodies write letters of support for the Prop. 1 application.
- **Week of 11/6** - Submission to DWR
- **December 2017 or January 2018** – Prop. 1 grants disbursed

Public Comment

- Mike Eaton, Cosumnes Coalition, is impressed by the Subbasin's progress and looks forward to working with the Working Group.
- Tim Washburn affirmed that the language the TAC discussed with regard to leaving open the option for multiple GSPs reflects what is captured in the Framework Agreement.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Gene Mancebo, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority

Damon Wykoff, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority

Mike Israel, Amador County Groundwater Management Authority

Herb Garms, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District

Amanda Watson, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District

Jay Schneider, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District

Hanspeter Walter, Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District

Leo VanWarmerdam, Galt Irrigation District

Mark Clarkson, City of Galt

Rick Wohle, Clay Water District

Sue Wohle, Clay Water District

Leland Schneider, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

Mark Stretars, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

Mike Wackman, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County
Tom Gohring, Water Forum
John Lowrie, Water Forum
Aaron Lewis, EKI
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 for the latest meeting information and materials.