

Glenn Groundwater Authority

Groundwater Sustainability Agency

PO Box 351, Willows, CA 95988 | 530.934.6501

Meeting Minutes

Glenn Groundwater Authority Board of Directors

February 8, 2021 | 1:30 pm

LOCATION: Teleconference

Pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Orders N-29-20 this meeting was conducted by teleconference. The meeting was accessible via telephone, computer, smartphone or tablet.

Director Members Present:	Alternate/2 nd Alternate Directors	Agency Representing:
X Grant Carmon	Tom Arnold	County of Glenn
X Bruce Roundy	Pete Carr	City of Orland
	Ed Vonasek (2 nd)	City of Orland
X Gary Hansen (Vice Chair)	X Evan Markey	City of Willows
George Nerli	X Leslie Nerli	Glide Water District
X John Amaro (Chair)	Thad Bettner	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
X Charles Schonauer	X Emil Cavagnolo	Orland-Artois Water District
	X Andrea Jones (2 nd)	Orland-Artois Water District
X Randy Hansen	Wade Danley	Kanawha Water District
	Michael Alves (2 nd)	Kanawha Water District
X Mark Lohse	Seth Fiack	Monroeville Water District
X Gary Enos	X Lance Boyd	Princeton-Codora-Glenn Irrigation District/ Provident Irrigation District

Others in attendance:

Lisa Hunter, GGA/Glenn County; Valerie Kincaid, GGA Counsel; Jaime Lely; Joshua Dowell; Mary Fahey, CGA; Byron Clark, Davids Engineering, Inc.; Arne Gustafson; Cork McIsaac; Gina Nicholls, Nossaman; Holly Reimers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Gary Hansen called the meeting to order at 1:51 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken and indicated above.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- *Approval of meeting minutes from January 11, 2021.

The meeting minutes from January 11, 2021 were approved as presented.

Motion: Bruce Roundy, Second: Gary Enos, Vote: 8-0 (one member- no audio)

Roll Call Vote

Grant Carmon: AYE

Bruce Roundy: AYE

Gary Hansen: AYE

John Amaro: NO AUDIO

Charles Schonauer: AYE

Randy Hansen: AYE

Mark Lohse: AYE

Gary Enos: AYE

Leslie Nerli: AYE

4. PERIOD OF PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

5. STAFF UPDATES

Lisa Hunter indicated a Program Manger Report is included in the meeting packet. She highlighted the Golden State Risk Management Authority trainings and reminded Board members that Fair Political Practices Commission Form 700s are due April 1. Ms. Hunter will be sending invoices to the self-bill parcels for tax year 2020/2021 which also includes the City of Orland and City of Willows agreed upon amounts for parcels within the cities. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and Department of Water Resources (DWR) presented on a multi-benefit recharge pilot project in January. Staff met with the group to narrow down potential areas within the GGA that may benefit from this program and is also coordinating a meeting between TNC/DWR and GGA Counsel to discuss the potential project and review questions raised at the GGA Executive Committee. Staff will report the outcomes of the meetings.

6. FINANCIAL REPORT

- a. *Review and accept Monthly Activities Report.
- b. *Review and consider approval of claims.

Ms. Hunter reviewed the Monthly Activities Report. There was a motion to approve the Monthly Activities Report as presented.

Motion: Grant Carmon, Second: Bruce Roundy, Vote: 8-0 (one member- no audio)

Roll Call Vote

Grant Carmon: AYE

Bruce Roundy: AYE

Gary Hansen: AYE

John Amaro: NO AUDIO

Charles Schonauer: AYE

Randy Hansen: AYE

Mark Lohse: AYE

Gary Enos: AYE

Leslie Nerli: AYE

There was a motion to approve the claims as presented.

Motion: Bruce Roundy, Second: Gary Enos, Vote: 8-0 (one member- no audio)

Roll Call Vote

Grant Carmon: AYE

Bruce Roundy: AYE

Gary Hansen: AYE

John Amaro: NO AUDIO

Charles Schonauer: AYE

Randy Hansen: AYE

Mark Lohse: AYE

Gary Enos: AYE

Leslie Nerli: AYE

7. FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ANNUAL AUDIT

- a. *Accept *Glenn Groundwater Authority Groundwater Sustainability Agency Financial Statements and Supplementary Information Year Ended June 30, 2020.*

Ms. Hunter stated Joey Judson, CliftonLarsonAllen Staff, provided a presentation on the draft report at the December meeting. She has provided input on the Management Discussion and Analysis portions and completed review of the report. The report is included in the meeting packet. Leslie Nerli asked a question regarding the change in position and whether it related to the lapse in billing and receiving. Ms. Hunter noted it is the changes from last year to this year and billings and amounts received may have a role in that figure. She indicated she could follow up on a more specific response if desired. Mr. G. Hansen stated it appears to be a thorough audit and looks good.

There was a motion to accept the Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Audit as presented.

Motion: Bruce Roundy, Second: Charles Schonauer, Vote: 8-0 (one member- no audio)

Roll Call Vote

Grant Carmon: AYE

Bruce Roundy: AYE

Gary Hansen: AYE

John Amaro: NO AUDIO

Charles Schonauer: AYE

Randy Hansen: AYE

Mark Lohse: AYE

Gary Enos: AYE

Leslie Nerli: AYE

8. REQUEST EXTENSION TO GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN DEADLINE

- a. *Consider approving a letter or directing Staff to draft a letter to the Governor requesting an extension to the January 31, 2022 deadline to submit the Groundwater Sustainability Plans for medium and high priority subbasins.

Ms. Hunter indicated there are some that feel the COVID-19 restrictions have made public engagement throughout the SGMA process difficult and limited. At the December 2020 CGA meeting, the Board directed staff to write a letter to the Governor requesting an extension to the January 31, 2022 deadline to submit the GSP. The letter was approved in January and a copy was sent to the GGA.

Valerie Kincaid mentioned a few agencies have sent similar letters. The GSP deadline is a statutory deadline and therefore, the request would be sent to the Governor rather than DWR. She was not sure if an extension would be granted. It has been difficult to sit face-to-face and discuss the plan, but she thinks the GGA is doing a great job of getting stakeholder input and the process takes time.

Bruce Roundy asked if this has been done throughout the State and how long would the extension be? Ms. Kincaid replied that others have requested an extension, but none have been given to date. You could ask for six months or one year. It seems unlikely that it would be granted because it is statutory. Mr. Roundy suggested

checking with the consultants to see where we are in the process and what they recommend. Ms. Kincaid noted that would be appropriate. Ms. Nerli referenced the CGA letter included in the meeting packet and said it was less about the technical work and more about the outreach and public participation. Ms. Hunter confirmed CGA has already submitted the request for a one-year extension. She also confirmed Ms. Nerli's analysis that the CGA letter is more about the outreach and less about technically being able to complete the GSP by the deadline. Mr. Roundy suggested it would be helpful for GGA to submit a letter to be in lock-step with the CGA. Grant Carmon agreed that it would be in our benefit to submit a letter as long as we are still on track to meet the deadline if it is denied. Gary Enos agreed.

Chuck Schonauer made a motion to write a letter similar to the CGA requesting a one-year extension due to the lack of outreach as a reason for the request. It was clarified the letter references the COVID pandemic.

Motion: Charles Schonauer, Second: Randy Hansen, Vote: 8-0 (one member- no audio)

Roll Call Vote

Grant Carmon: AYE

Bruce Roundy: AYE

Gary Hansen: AYE

John Amaro: NO AUDIO

Charles Schonauer: AYE

Randy Hansen: AYE

Mark Lohse: AYE

Gary Enos: AYE

Leslie Nerli: AYE

9. COLUSA SUBBASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

- a. Receive update on Plan development, activities, and outreach.
- b. Receive update on GSP Development Grants (Proposition 1 and Proposition 68).
- c. Receive update on Project Agreements.
- d. Receive an update on the Well Monitoring Pilot Program.
- e. Discussion on Management Areas.

Ms. Hunter mentioned updates can be found in the Program Manager Report as well as the synopsis in the meeting packet for this item. The January Davids Engineering memo is included which provides a summary of activities. Collecting and considering public comments is an important component of GSP development. The consultant team has created a spreadsheet called the Administrative Record spreadsheet to track comments as they are received. A copy of the spreadsheet is included in the meeting packet and this information will be shared at future meetings as well. The document is being maintained in a "box" account and can be viewed at the following link: <https://app.box.com/s/2w5ewrd7qmw3b8ngcslbg9wlsithey40>. She also noted the Projects and Management Actions submittal form is available online and she encouraged sharing the form with others and submitting project ideas.

Ms. Hunter referenced the **GSP Development Grants** and **Project Agreements** summaries that are included in the meeting packet including the amounts expended and remaining for each. She mentioned the invoice to DWR for the grant was submitted in January 2021. CGA holds the contract with DWR, but works closely with the GGA. She also highlighted that DWR retains 10% of the total invoiced. CGA currently bears the burden of holding the 10% retention and the GGA has been reimbursed fully for project work. Future discussion may take place to share that burden. Project Agreements include the two agreements with Davids Engineering for the

Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model and Water Budget Project and for the GSP Development Project. Summaries for the projects are included in the meeting packet and a summary of activities is included in the monthly status update memo.

Ms. Hunter shared that the public workshop for the **Well Monitoring Pilot Program** took place January 25 and the recording can be found on the Colusa Subbasin SGMA Facebook page. The program flyer and application are in the meeting packet and she encouraged all to share the information. A few applications have been received.

Ms. Hunter noted that David Kehn, the GGA TAC representative, had a conflict and is unable to participate in today's **Management Areas (MA)** discussion, although, he has been communicating with staff and legal counsel on the pros, cons, and considerations in preparation of this item. She referenced the materials included in the meeting packet. The CGA is holding a special board meeting to have focused discussion on this item. GGA may wish to do the same, in which consultant support would be available. Mary Fahey, CGA staff, summarized the discussion from the Joint TAC meeting which is included in the meeting packet as well.

Ms. Nerli noted we don't have any thresholds yet and it is unclear where an MA would make sense. She also asked for confirmation that the GSP could be amended. Ms. Kincaid responded that if it is not obvious as to where a MA would be, the discussion usually comes up after Minimum Threshold (MT) discussions. If different MTs are needed for certain areas, that usually drives the need to establish an MA. The GGA could learn about MAs, discuss pros and cons and then weave in discussions during MT development. If it becomes apparent that different MT should be set, then an MA might be needed. If not, you can usually achieve your goals through governance and separate projects without MAs. Some desire MAs for jurisdictions with a sense they can implement SGMA in their own area more than another. MAs can help you distinguish areas within a plan or subbasin, but there are other ways to do that as well. With MAs there are additional requirements such as mapping, reporting, and separate monitoring networks, as well as providing as reason to DWR why MAs were made. It is possible to identify them in a five-year update, now, or during MT development.

Mr. Roundy indicated he liked the latter option. What we don't know is what we don't know yet. As we go, we can determine if we need them. There is a lot of extra work and money to develop MAs.

Byron Clark shared some views with Ms. Kincaid, but offered that the GSP regulations don't say a whole lot about MAs. They can be based on physical characteristics, or other considerations, or facilitate implementation of Projects and Management Actions (PMAs). The establishment of Sustainable Management Criteria must be based on consistent definition of what would be an Undesirable Result throughout the basin. Some basins formed MAs as soon as they started the process in anticipation of needing them, and for others, it has been more of a process. With regard to uncertainty, that will be challenging in initial GSP with or without MAs. The Colusa Subbasin is approximately three-quarters of a million acres. Initial water budgets are projecting a long-term overdraft of about 7,000 acre-feet. Another topic for future discussion is the way the system responds physically due to the inter-connectedness of the Sacramento River and Colusa Drain. Thresholds will be set uniquely at each monitoring site based on same principals for determining Undesirable Results. He provided some examples of how thresholds could be developed with or without MAs. For PMAs, it has been noted that existing institutions could champion a project which might be more efficient with an MA, but it is not necessary to carry it out. Additionally, the benefits of the project may not coincide identically with the MA. He also noted the GSA has authority to delegate with regard to projects and a MA is not necessarily needed to do that. Regarding raising funds for projects, a benefit assessment would likely be needed with or without an MA.

Mr. G. Hansen noted at this time it seems that there are more negatives than positives, but time will tell if MAs are needed. Mr. Clark added that this is an adaptive management process as conditions are monitored

throughout the basin over time. Additionally, you cannot have an Undesirable Result until 2042, so there is time to track conditions and make adjustments.

Ms. Hunter read a question from Jamie Lely asking if a management area is needed to help with the different imposed fees in different areas if that should be an issue later on. Ms. Kincaid stated it could help, but it is not required. For instance, if a fee structure is developed based on groundwater extraction, an MA is not needed to treat different parcels differently. Different fee structures can be developed with or without MAs.

Ms. Kincaid stated that in determining if you want MAs or not, some may consider if there are certain natural jurisdictions. If you choose to make management areas by these jurisdictions, inherently, it creates an MA outside of those areas. The County is usually the agency left for the remainder of those areas, and the County will need to pay special attention to what it means for its membership and weigh in appropriately given that interest.

Ms. Hunter recapped that the GGA would like to continue to discuss MAs, but is not currently interested in holding a special meeting to have a focused discussion. Mr. G. Hansen recommended that MAs remain a discussion topic for future agendas, but there is currently no need for a special meeting. Mr. Lohse said that from the TAC discussions, it seems that some of the districts would really like to have MAs which needs to be considered and we need to know what their thoughts are. Mr. Clark referenced a draft memo from Davids Engineering outlining the possibility of two types of MAs. Ms. Hunter will distribute the memo. The Board agreed with the approach stated.

10. COMMITTEE UPDATES

- a. Executive Committee
 - i. CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee
- b. Stakeholder Engagement Committee
- c. Technical Advisory Committee

Ms. Hunter stated the **Executive Committee** summary is provided in the meeting packet. They last met January 27. Several topics were discussed in previous items. Topics included MA, annual audit, inter-basin coordination, how to bring TAC meeting information to the board, the Well Monitoring Pilot Program, Projects and Management Actions solicitation form, and the discussion with TNC/DWR multi-benefit recharge project. Ms. Nerli asked if the coordination with water district would be delayed until the meeting between counsel and TNC and DWR. Ms. Hunter stated the project could move forward with or without the GGA and the introductions to the water districts could be delayed until the logistics questions are answered if that was desired. However, it seems that it might be more efficient to have a parallel process. The CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee meeting has not met.

The **Stakeholder Engagement Committee** has not met and has nothing to report. Ms. Hunter suggested reviewing the purpose and goals of this committee at a future meeting.

Ms. Hunter said David Kehn, the TAC representative to the GGA Board, normally provides the **Technical Advisory Committee** reports. The TAC met jointly with the CGA January 8. Many of those topics have been discussed already. There have been many discussions on MAs, and some questions on the TACs' roles versus the Boards' roles. Finding the balance between the technical and policy portions is ongoing. The TAC presentation and Davids Engineering memo are included in the meeting packet and she encouraged members to review the materials which provides a good synopsis of activities. She also noted that she will meet with Mr. Kehn after

TAC meetings to prepare and frame up items for Board discussion. Ms. Hunter also noted the February 12, 2021 TAC meeting has been cancelled and the meeting will be rescheduled soon.

11. MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

None.

12. NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday**, March 9, 2021 at 1:30 pm.

13. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm.