



**SACRAMENTO GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY**  
**Regular Board Meeting**  
**Final Minutes**  
**April 14, 2011**

---

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Marx called the meeting of the Board of Directors to order at 9:00 a.m. at the Regional Water Authority/Sacramento Groundwater Authority office. Individuals in attendance are listed below:

### Board Members

Randy Marx, Fair Oaks Water District (Chair)  
Andy Soulé, California American Water  
Sandy Kozlen, Carmichael Water District  
Chuck Rose, Citrus Heights Water District  
Ken Payne, City of Folsom  
Jim Peifer, City of Sacramento  
Herb Niederberger, County of Sacramento  
Rich Allen, Del Paso Manor Water District  
Brett Gray, Natomas Central Mutual Water Company  
David Simpson, Orange Vale Water Company  
Neil Schild, Sacramento Suburban Water District  
Pam Tobin, San Juan Water District  
Jack DeWit, Agriculture  
Rink Sanford, Self Supplied Industry

### Staff Members

John Woodling, Rob Swartz, Nancy Marrier, Cecilia Partridge and Chris Sanders (Legal Counsel).

### Others in Attendance

Alan Driscoll, Sharon Wilcox, Walt Sadler, Darrell Eck, Ali Taghavi, Tom Gray, Al Dains, Bob Churchill, John Townsel, Rob Roscoe, Chris Petersen, Shauna Lorance, Dave Ocenosak and Chris Bowles.

## **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

### **3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

The minutes of the February 10, 2011 meeting.

Motion/Second/Carried (M/S/C) Mr. Kozlen moved, with a second by Mr. Schild, that the consent calendar items be approved.

### **4. FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 BUDGET**

Mr. Woodling reported that the budget committee met on March 15, 2011 to discuss and review the proposed SGA fiscal year 2011-2012 (FY12) budget. The FY12 Budget Committee members include Sandy Kozlen, Carmichael Water District; Chuck Rose, Citrus Heights Water District; Jim Peifer, City of Sacramento; Randy Marx, Fair Oaks Water District; Neil Schild, Sacramento Suburban Water District; and Pam Tobin, San Juan Water District. After discussion, the Committee directed staff to bring the proposed budget to the Board for action and to approve revisions to the Financial Designation Policy (400.2).

Mr. Woodling talked about the FY12 fee model, groundwater pumping trends, operating revenues and expenses, a staffing proposal, the SGA consulting budget and the financial designation policy. The budget was developed with no changes in the rate setting formula. While the rate setting formula did not change, each agency's specific fee depends on the changes in connections and groundwater pumping from the previous year. In the proposed budget, the minimum base administrative fee is \$6,740 plus 85 cents per connection for connections over 6,000. The total base administrative fee would contribute approximately 39% to the overall budget. The pumped groundwater fee per acre-foot will remain the same at \$4.00 per acre foot. The total groundwater fees would contribute approximately 61% to the overall budget.

The proposed budget included the \$250,000 Local Groundwater Assistance Grant Program, which is expected to be finalized in FY11. The budget also includes 30% of a proposed full-time, entry level staff person that would work primarily on the RWA water efficiency program, SGA activities, and other RWA subscription programs. The scope of duties would include: grant application preparation; grant program tracking; member agency data collection; routine data analysis; routine GIS analysis; response to members and the public; routine website updates; and general program and project support. The RWA Board will take action on the staffing proposal in May.

The proposed budget maintains the principles adopted during the FY11 budget process. Staff salaries include 50% of four full time positions and 30% of a new project management assistant for a total of 2.3 FTEs for SGA. A 2% increase in the base salaries budget (before addition of the new position) is included as a

placeholder. Decisions on changes in staff compensation are under the authority of RWA, which will adopt its budget in May. Common costs for staffing, office, some professional fees, and other expenses are shared with RWA at 50/50. It is anticipated that SGA revenues will be approximately \$14,350 less than expenses. The expenses in excess of revenues will be funded by assigned funds.

The SGA consulting budget reflects \$65,000 in out-sourced support activities in FY12, which includes completing the biennial report, grant application assistance, maintaining the data management system, regional contamination, monitoring water quality levels, and banking and exchange. This amount anticipates lowering the total consultant budget by \$26,500, mainly due to the new project management assistant position being added at RWA.

The operating fund is targeted at approximately 8 months for FY12. For the future budget years, it is anticipated the undesignated funds will be used to fund expenses in excess of revenues within the policy guidelines. Budget projections drop the operating fund down to approximately 4.5 months by FY16. The Budget Committee recommended the SGA designation policy guidelines be amended to change the target balance to 4 to 6 months from the current 2 to 4 month reserve policy.

M/S/C Mr. Kozlen moved, with a second by Ms. Tobin, to adopt Resolution No. 2011-01 to fund the administrative and program budgets for FY 2011-2012, and providing for the collection of said funds and to approve revisions to the Financial Designation Policy 400.2.

## **5. UPDATE ON THREATS TO GROUNDWATER QUALITY SUSTAINABILITY STUDY**

Mr. Swartz reminded members that SGA was awarded a \$249,930 grant through the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Local Groundwater Assistance Grant Program (AB 303 Grant) in June, 2008. The study conducted an assessment of the various threats to the long-term sustainability of groundwater quality underlying the SGA area. Commencement of the work was delayed for nearly a year due to the State's suspension of funds resulting from its ongoing fiscal concerns. In late 2009, SGA was notified that it was authorized to commence work again on the project. The grant was previously expected to be completed by May 15, 2011, but DWR has granted an extension to July 15, 2011.

Mr. Swartz reported that the basic data collection phase of the project has been completed, and the analysis phase is underway. At the February SGA Board meeting, staff and Kennedy/Jenks provided an overview of the basic data collected and the approach to analyzing the data to define the vulnerability of the SGA area. Mr. Swartz focused on the modeling exercise that was conducted to assess the threats associated with the known contaminant plumes in the SGA area. He explained that the project objective was to use the SacIRWM Particle Tracking Module to simulate the temporal and spatial movement of regional contamination

plumes in the SGA area for a 105-year hydrologic period. Regional contamination plumes that have been simulated include Aerojet, Boeing, McClellan, Mather and the Sacramento Railyard. Mr. Swartz showed how the potential movement of plumes with and without conjunctive use was estimated. Mr. Swartz gave a summary of how the plumes are tracked under different conditions and the expected future containment and movement of the plumes.

## **6. GROUNDWATER DATA POLICY**

Mr. Woodling explained that prior to the February SGA Board meeting, staff met with a couple of water purveyors about concerns over providing data to SGA and the mechanism by which SGA releases or is compelled to release the data. In February the SGA Board requested that staff draft a policy regarding data management for further discussion. The draft policy was handed out to the Board.

Potential options in the draft policy included: 1) member agencies would provide the data to SGA under a claim of confidentiality; 2) SGA may not fill any requests for data without the authorization of the member agency; 3) SGA shall only release data on the condition that the recipient agrees in writing to maintain the confidentiality of all information; 4) if information is required to be disclosed pursuant to a court order, the member agency shall work with SGA to comply with the request while limiting the disclosure in a manner to preserve confidentiality; and 5) the confidentiality agreement shall apply to any consultant working on behalf of SGA and the consultant shall sign a non-disclosure agreement.

Mr. Swartz mentioned that SGA has released data occasionally in the past when there is a legitimate request and that SGA releases and shares data with the permission and knowledge of the agencies involved. Of particular concern is how to handle requests for data that is viewed as confidential (for example, well completion reports).

Chris Sanders, SGA legal counsel, said that the primary question for the board is how SGA wants to approach the issue. He explained that as a public agency there is an obligation to release a certain amount of information that SGA has within its control. However, there are certain exceptions to releasing information. SGA has access to data supplied to public agencies and general information that cannot be categorized as confidential. If data that is supplied to SGA is confidential and the supplying water agency does not want the information released that should be made known to SGA. SGA should not have to decide what is and what is not confidential.

There was discussion regarding the issue of confidentiality and secondary data. It was agreed that the quality of the secondary data cannot be guaranteed by SGA because they are not the originator of the data. It was suggested that a standard release agreement form for any data requested from SGA include a disclaimer protecting SGA. Revisions will be made to the draft policy and brought back to the board for action in June.

## 7. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

**LAO Report from Assembly Groundwater Oversight Hearing** – Mr. Woodling reported that staff attended the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee hearing on groundwater management issues held on Tuesday, February 1, 2011. Assemblymember Huffman opened the meeting by commenting that while California is often the leader on many important issues, we are severely lagging behind the rest of the nation in our approach to regulating groundwater usage. Mr. Woodling said that Mr. Huffman indicated that the hearing was just an initial step in what he saw as being a long process and Mr. Huffman concluded the hearing with a somewhat rhetorical inquiry as to why California has continued to maintain its disconnect between the way in which surface water and groundwater rights are treated.

**ACWA Groundwater Framework** – On April 4, 2011 ACWA released “Sustainability from the Ground Up: A Framework for Groundwater Management in California.” SGA staff participated on the review team during document development and SGA was highlighted as a success story of local groundwater management in the document.

**Legislation/Regulatory Update** – Mr. Woodling said that AB 359 (Huffman) is essentially the same as last year's AB 2304, which SGA supported. The bill requires groundwater management plans to include a map of the recharge area for a basin. SB 263 (Pavley) would make well drillers reports, now confidential, public records. There was discussion voicing concerns about the outcome of this bill and the need to monitor its progress. It was suggested that homeland security issues with this bill be raised and brought to the attention of legislators.

In non-groundwater related legislation, Mr. Woodling reported that RWA staff drafted a letter of support in concept for SB 200 (Wolk) which provides specific assurances that a Delta solution developed from the Bay Delta Conservation Plan process would not redirect negative impacts on others.

**SRCS D Municipal Supply Monitoring Requirements** – Mr. Woodling reported that the new NPDES permit approved in December 2010 for SRCS D wastewater discharges includes a requirement to monitor sources from the municipal water supply system. SRCS D staff and SGA staff will meet with the Central Valley Regional Board to discuss how to best comply with this monitoring requirement on the afternoon of April 14, 2011.

**California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Update** – DWR recently provided an update to the agencies that requested to serve as lead monitoring entities for a region and indicated that the review process was still ongoing to approve monitoring entities. DWR anticipates that its website for submitting CASGEM monitoring plans and data will be live around mid-May, 2011.

Monitoring plans are due by summer and 2011 data must be submitted by January 1, 2012. SGA staff has been coordinating with staff representing Placer County and the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority on submitting consistent monitoring plans. SGA has also requested that member agencies with potential monitoring points contact SGA regarding incorporating those into the monitoring plan.

**SGA Board Appointments** – SGA Board Appointments were made by the Sacramento City Council on February 22, 2011.

## 8. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

Mr. Kozlen presented copies of an e-mail to ACWA, an article on groundwater management and a letter to the Delta Stewardship Council regarding the Delta Plan's second draft.

Ms. Tobin thanked Rob Swartz for his SGA presentation to the San Juan Water District Board on contamination in the region. She mentioned that the report was very informative, articulate and was well received by the members of district's board at a recent meeting.

Mr. Rose thanked everyone who has been assisting the Rio Linda/Elverta Community Water District in their efforts to continue to serve the public.

### **Adjournment**

With no further business to come before the Board, Chair Marx adjourned the meeting at 10:42 a.m.

By:

---

Chairperson

Attest:

---

Nancy Marrier, Finance and Administrative Services Officer