

Glenn Groundwater Authority

Groundwater Sustainability Agency

PO Box 351, Willows, CA 95988 | 530.934.6501

Board of Directors Meeting Materials

Meeting Date: March 10, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson will call the meeting to order. Introductions may also be made.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll call will be conducted.

3. *APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of meeting minutes from February 10, 2020.

Draft meeting minutes are attached.

Glenn Groundwater Authority

Groundwater Sustainability Agency

PO Box 351, Willows, CA 95988 | 530.934.6501

MEETING MINUTES

GLENN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FEBRUARY 10, 2020

2:30 PM

720 NORTH COLUSA STREET, WILLOWS, CA 95988

Director Members Present:	Alternate/2 nd Alternate Directors	Agency Representing:
X John Viegas	Vince Minto	County of Glenn
X Bruce Roundy	Pete Carr	City of Orland
	Ed Vonasek (2 nd)	City of Orland
Gary Hansen	X Evan Markey	City of Willows
George Nerli	X Leslie Nerli	Glide Water District
X John Amaro	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	Lance Boyd	Princeton-Codora-Glenn Irrigation District/ Provident Irrigation District

Others in attendance:

Lisa Hunter, GGA/Glenn County; Holly Reimers; Del Reimers; Gwynn Turnbull Weaver; Valerie Kincaid, GGA Counsel; George Pendell; Gina Nicholls; Darla Nonella; Tom Nonella; David Kehn, CalWater/GGA TAC

1. CALL TO ORDER

John Amaro called the meeting to order at 2:32 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll was taken and is indicated above.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Approval of meeting minutes from January 13, 2020.

The January 13, 2020 CGA/GGA Joint Board meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

Motion: John Viegas, Second: Leslie Nerli, Vote: Unanimous

4. PERIOD OF PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. STAFF UPDATES

Lisa Hunter provided the Glenn Groundwater Authority (GGA) Board with a Program Manager Report. Ms. Hunter highlighted several items from the report including monitoring well discussions, potential services for translation of SGMA materials, ethics training compliance, and CGA/GGA draft MOU progress. She mentioned the California Fair

Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700s) Forms are due April 1, 2020 and the instructions to complete the form are included in the report. The 2018/2019 Annual Audit is complete and each Board member has been given a hard copy to return to their respective agencies. Ms. Hunter provided an update on the long-term funding including the correction of fee errors on five parcels. Thirteen invoices are being prepared for the parcels that are not included in the County's tax system. Upcoming work includes the completion of the Government Compensation in California Report.

6. FINANCIAL REPORT

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

Lisa Hunter stated the Monthly Activities Report is not available at this time. Ms. Hunter indicated clarification regarding the backup documentation for the Davids Engineering invoice has been requested. The total amount should remain the same as it appears on the invoice. The claims were approved as submitted. It was clarified the invoice would be paid after satisfactory clarifications were provided.

Motion: Chuck Schonauer, Second: Gary Enos, Vote: Unanimous

7. COLUSA SUBBASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

Lisa Hunter indicated staff is working through the contract finalization process with Davids Engineering for the remaining Groundwater Sustainability Plan components. A meeting with the outreach team and GSA staff will be held soon to schedule target meeting dates and topics which should give definition to stakeholder engagement activities as well as technical work milestones. Colusa Groundwater Authority (CGA) recently submitted the Proposition 1 grant quarterly report and invoice to DWR which includes HCM/Water Budget tasks that are reimbursed from the CGA to the GGA.

8. PROPOSITION 68 GRANT FUNDING APPLICATION

The application for Proposition 68 application was submitted on time requesting nearly 1 million dollars. DWR released the draft recommended funding awards on January 24, 2020. Additional information was requested on the Colusa Subbasin application regarding the local cost match waiver section. Davids Engineering and GSA staff have been working to address the comments and provide clarification to DWR. The amended application is due February 14. Leslie Nerli requested the application be available for review. Ms. Hunter will email the application attachments to the Board members.

9. COMMITTEE UPDATES

- a. Executive Committee
 - i. CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee

The GGA Executive Committee did not meet and has nothing new to report. A CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2020.
- b. Stakeholder Engagement Committee

The Stakeholder Engagement Committee has not met.
- c. Technical Advisory Committee

The TAC has not met and has nothing new to report.

d. West Side Ad Hoc Committee

The West Side Ad Hoc Committee is developing a report to submit to the Board summarizing discussions that have taken place at the committee level and recommendations to the Board. Committee member Gwynn Turnbull Weaver summarized a document she sent to staff outlining her ideas that had not been shared with the Board in preparation of the Board meeting. Staff stated the West Side Ad Hoc Committee meeting scheduled for February 4 had been cancelled in order to allow committee members an opportunity to provide substantive comments on the draft report. Additionally, it was unclear to staff if West Side Ad Hoc Committee members were represented by counsel. There was discussion on what the term “represented” means. Valerie Kincaid (GGA counsel) offered that if a member of the committee is represented by counsel, it would be appropriate for that member’s counsel to discuss the matter with GGA counsel as a matter of ethics. The ad hoc committee was encouraged to meet and finalize the report to submit to the Board and if a member of the committee is represented by counsel, to have that member’s counsel contact Ms. Kincaid prior to the committee meeting.

10. CLOSED SESSION

Gov’t Code §54956.9 - Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated or significant exposure to litigation (1)

John Amaro recessed the Board to Closed Session. The Board conferred with Legal Counsel. John Amaro reconvened the Board to Open Session. Direction was provided to staff during closed session. No reportable action was taken.

11. MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Lisa Hunter mentioned there is a funding mechanism task (optional task 4) in the GSP development scope of work that will be discussed at the CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee meeting and may be brought back to the board for consideration at a future meeting.

12. NEXT MEETING

The next GGA Board meeting is scheduled for TUESDAY March 10, 2020 at 1:30 PM.

13. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned 3:56 PM.

4. PERIOD OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public are encouraged to address the GGA Board of Directors on items relevant to the GGA. Public comments are limited to no more than 5 minutes. No action may be taken on public comments.

5. STAFF UPDATES

The program manager will provide a brief status updates. Reminders and/or clarifications may also be made at this time.

6. FINANCIAL REPORT

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

The Monthly Activities Report and Claims Summary are attached.

Attachments:

- Monthly Activities Report
- Claims Summary
- Budget to Actuals Through January 2020

Glenn Groundwater Authority
Monthly Activities Report
November 2019

Description	Amount
Beginning Balance	\$ 412,028.17
Revenue	
Total Revenue	\$ -
Expenses	
Provost & Pritchard Inv 75009 Revised	\$ 1,626.53
O'Laughlin & Paris LLP Inv # 9228	\$ 5,810.00
Provost & Pritchard Inv 75437	\$ 2,348.78
O'Laughlin & Paris LLP Inv # 9559	\$ 8,330.00
WATER RESOURCE HRS REIMBURS INV 19-WR-06	\$ 30,647.33
A-87 COST	\$ 199.92
Total Expenses	\$ 48,962.56
Ending Balance	\$ 363,065.61

Glenn Groundwater Authority
Monthly Activities Report
December 2019

	Description	Amount
Beginning Balance		\$ 363,065.61
Revenue		
	INTEREST (12/2019 APPORTIONMENT)	\$ 1,693.09
	SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS (PROPERTY RELATED FEE)	\$ 321,772.97
Total Revenue		\$ 323,466.06
Expenses		
	ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE (CY SECURED APPN)	\$ 3,183.43
	A-87 COST	\$ 199.92
Total Expenses		\$ 3,383.35
Ending Balance		\$ 683,148.32

Glenn Groundwater Authority
Monthly Activities Report
January 2020

	Description	Amount
Beginning Balance		\$ 683,148.32
Revenue		
	DIRECT ASSESSMENT CORRECTIONS PAYMENT	\$ (90.15)
Total Revenue		\$ (90.15)
Expenses		
	Dauids Engineering, Inc Inv 1178.01-3710 (HCM/Water Budget)	\$ 26,314.41
	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP Inv 2332641 (FY18-19 Audit)	\$ 4,875.00
	Dauids Engineering, Inc Inv 1178.02-3767 (Prop 68 application)	\$ 18,067.73
	O'Laughlin & Paris LLP Inv # 9293	\$ 1,505.00
	WATER RESOURCE HRS REIMBURS INV 20-WR-01 (Oct-Dec 2019)	\$ 17,115.80
	A-87 COST	\$ 199.92
Total Expenses		\$ 68,077.86
Ending Balance		\$ 614,980.31

Glenn Groundwater Authority

Invoices to be paid

Meeting Date: March 10, 2020

Invoice Date	Invoice Number	Description	Amount
1/30/2020	2359283	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP (FY 18/19 Audit)	\$ 4,875.00
1/31/2020	9349	O'Laughlin & Paris LLP	\$ 2,345.00
1/31/2020	1178.01-3804	Davids Engineering, Inc (HCM/Water Budget)	\$ 2,240.25
Total			\$ 9,460.25

Glenn Groundwater Authority Budget FY 2019/2020 FINAL APPROVED 7/8/19

	Current Approved	Actual through January 2020	Remaining Budget	% Budget Remaining	Projected Year End Totals	
REVENUES						
Grant Revenue						
Other	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Total Grants	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Other Government Agencies						
Colusa Groundwater Authority	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Other	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Total Other Government Agencies	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Assessments						
Property Related Fee Per Acre (\$1.61/ac)	458,552	\$ 321,682.82	\$ 136,869.18	30%	\$ -	includes corrections payment
Well Head Fee	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Extraction Fee	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Other	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	
Total Assessments	458,552	\$ 321,682.82	\$ 136,869.18	30%	\$ -	
Other						
Interest	-	\$ 3,340.39	\$ (3,340.39)		\$ 5,726.38	
Total Other		\$ 3,340.39	\$ (3,340.39)		\$ 5,726.38	
TOTAL REVENUES	458,552	\$ 321,682.82		0%	\$ -	
EXPENSES						
Administration- Contracted County Services	120,000	\$ 47,763.13	\$ 72,236.87	60%		
Program Administration Support	-		\$ -			
Legal Services	80,000	\$ 25,370.00	\$ 54,630.00	68%		
Certified Public Accountant (Yearly Audits)	9,750	\$ 4,875.00	\$ 4,875.00	50%		
JPA Insurance	1,800	\$ 1,800.00	\$ -	0%		
County Bookkeeper	5,000	\$ 1,399.44	\$ 3,600.56	72%		
GSP Development/Implementation	72,002	\$ 83,441.40	\$ (11,439.40)	-16%		
Long Term Funding Options	15,000	\$ 7,319.75	\$ 7,680.25	51%		
Professional Services	35,000	\$ 18,067.73	\$ 16,932.27	48%		
Board Expenses	2,000	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	100%		
Special Department Expenses	25,000	\$ 88.82	\$ 24,911.18	100%		
Legal Notices	1,000	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	100%		
County Tax Roll Fee	50,000	\$ 3,183.43	\$ 46,816.57	94%		
Contingency/Reserve	42,000	\$ 42,000.00	\$ -	100%		
TOTAL EXPENSES	458,552	\$ 193,308.70	\$ 265,243.30	58%		
3/4/20 Note: A-87 Cost allocated to County Bookkeeper line item						
Deferred Inflow accounted for in June 2019 collected in FY 19/20						
		\$ 26,595.25				

7. COLUSA SUBBASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

- a. Receive update on Plan development and upcoming Board and Public Workshops
- b. Receive update on Proposition 1 GSP Development Grant
- c. Receive update on Proposition 68 funding application

Staff will provide an update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan development progress. Direction and clarifications may be made.

8. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COLUSA GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY AND GLENN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

- a. Review and discuss MOU
- b. *Consider recommendation from the CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee to approve the MOU.

In June 2018, GGA Counsel prepared a draft MOU outlining the coordination between the CGA and GGA during the GSP development process. The GGA Executive Committee provided input to the draft and subsequently presented the MOU to the CGA Executive Committee for their input. The CGA and GGA Executive Committees have met jointly on several occasions to discuss and review the draft MOU. At the February 27, 2020 CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee meeting, the committees provided edits to staff for incorporation into the MOU and additional clarification to request of CGA Counsel and GGA Counsel. The CGA/GGA Executive Committee recommends approving the MOU with the requested edits and clarifications.

The Board will receive an update on the draft MOU. If the MOU clarifications have been made prior to the Board meeting, the MOU may be sent separately.

9. *2020/2021 BUDGET

Consider formation of ad hoc committee to review current budget and develop a 2020/2021 draft budget.

Article 5.5 of the JPA indicates the following:

5.5 Budget. The Authority's fiscal year shall run from July 1 of a given year through June 30 of the following year. Each fiscal year, the Board shall adopt a budget for the Authority for the ensuing fiscal year. Within ninety (90) days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Board shall adopt a budget. Thereafter, a budget shall be adopted no later than March 1 of the preceding fiscal year.

Article 4.7 indicates the annual budget will require a 2/3 vote of the Directors present.

Staff recommends the formation of an ad hoc committee to review the current budget and develop a 2020/2021 draft budget for the board's consideration.

10. WEST SIDE AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT

- a. Review and discuss report presented by the West Side Ad Hoc Committee
- b. *Provide direction or take action as necessary

The GGA West Side Ad Hoc Committee was formed on August 1, 2019 to review and discuss concerns specific to western portion of the GGA service area. The committee has submitted a report to the board.

Attachment:

- West Side Ad Hoc Committee Report

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

March 4, 2020

Committee Members

John Viegas (GGA)
Randy Hansen (GGA)
Chuck Schonauer (GGA)
Del Reimers (landowner/stakeholder)
Gwynn Turnbull Weaver (landowner/stakeholder)
Charlie Sullivan (landowner/stakeholder)
Brandon Davison (DWR Staff)- advisory role

Introduction

The Westside Ad Hoc Committee was formed by the Glenn Groundwater Authority (GGA) on August 1, 2019 to include both GGA board members and landowners providing a forum to discuss ideas, concerns, and issues related to current and future SGMA activities in the western portion of the GGA service area. The committee met three times and has coordinated via email to produce this report detailing discussions of the committee.

The goal of this report is to clearly state the committee's discussions and provide recommendations to the GGA Board.

Summary of General Discussion Topics

The Westside Ad Hoc Committee received informational background and participated in discussion to create a shared understanding of several topics including Hydrogeologic Subbasins, Bulletin 118, Basin Prioritization, Basin Boundary Modification, and the Bulletin 118 2020 update. The committee also received information on known well data in the western portion of the GGA and known data gaps.

Summary of Ideas and Potential Options

The following section summarizes ideas or potential options to address concerns previously shared at Westside Ad Hoc Committee meetings.

[Option 1: Change GGA Fee Structure to Include a Minimal Fee \(defined line\)](#)

Identify a “defined line” that should distinguish lands that have reasonable groundwater supplies and opportunities for development from those lands that are generally dry in nature and are not suitable for developing permanent irrigated crops.

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

Examples of the “defined line” are below and would need to be evaluated further:

1. All portions of the Glenn Groundwater Authority service area west of County Road D or County Road DD (intention is a continuous line from the Tehama County line to the Colusa County line).
2. All portions of the Glenn Groundwater Authority service area west of County Road D beginning at the Tehama County line south to the point where County Road D intersects the Tehama-Colusa Canal and following the Tehama-Colusa Canal south to the Colusa County line.
3. A line delineating lands that are irrigated (green) versus not irrigated (brown) based on satellite imagery (source and year to be determined).

Parcels west of the defined line receive a refund of the \$1.61 that they have paid and instead are charged a minimal fee of \$0.10 per acre per year (Minimal Fee). This fee cannot be raised at any time for any reason unless the parcel conditions are changed and meet one of the criteria listed below.

The Minimal Fee applies to parcels that are west of the defined line AND meet one or more of the following conditions:

1. Have access to surface water and/or irrigate only with surface water
2. Contiguous parcels under the same ownership
3. De minimis extractors

The Minimal Fee does NOT apply to parcels of any size that are west of the defined line AND meet one or more of the following conditions:

1. Parcel is planted with crops that are irrigated with groundwater (with or without surface water supplements).
2. All other conditions not noted above.

Identified pros:

- Simple concept
- **This is the preferred option of the landowners/stakeholders on the Westside Ad Hoc Committee**

Identified cons:

- Difficult to provide a defensible metric
- Defining the line is difficult- always have someone on each side of the line that may not agree

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

- Additional workload and cost to develop and implement
- May split parcels

Remaining questions:

- How does this approach affect the completed property-related fee (Proposition 218) process?
- How would this approach be implemented?
- Would it be feasible to establish a defined line based on a technical evaluation of well logs and other relevant data to justify the position of the line? What would be the effect on the timeline and what are the budget implications?

Option 2: Incentive Program for Non-Pumpers

Parcel owners in the western portion of the the GGA service area have an option sign a contract agreeing not to pump groundwater or plant permanent irrigated crops (i.e. orchards) until the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) is developed. Accompanying the contract would be a “rebate” (or “deferred payment” or “deferred cost” or similar). This incentive coupled with the contract would discourage additional groundwater use prior to the GSP implementation.

Identified pros:

- Provides time for the GSA to determine sustainable yield and opportunities for responsible additional growth and protects the basin from overdraft while the technical work is being conducted
- May be easier to rationalize that people who are not utilizing the groundwater should not pay the same fee as those that do pump groundwater
- This option offers flexibility- folks that choose to pump in the future can do so, but give up the incentive

Identified cons:

- Additional workload and cost to develop and implement
- Measures must be in place to accommodate landowners that may choose to use groundwater after signing the contract (back fees, penalties, etc)
- May be difficult to verify compliance/gain access to verify compliance

Remaining questions:

- How does this approach affect the completed property-related fee (Proposition 218) process?
- Would this have to be opened to all parcel owners in the basin or can it be offered only to westside landowners?
- How would this approach be implemented?
- This might work as a short term “fix”, but would it be a satisfactory long-term solution?

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

Option 3: Technical Evaluation and Fact Gathering

Immediately assemble a fact-gathering crew, with the mission of using all the available data to determine what constitutes sustainable water levels in the various areas of the water basin. The goal is to find a pumping level which avoids subsidence and other geological issues while still sustaining the farm economy that supports us all.

Examples of available information includes:

- Monitoring wells (DWR)
- Well logs obtained from the DWR
- Pumping data collected from pump contractors & water users

This information can be used to:

- Determine when subsidence occurs and set water level boundaries above the subsidence point
- Determine the balance between recharge versus pumping

The end result of the fact gathering should:

- Identify possible problem areas
- Set minimum water levels in all areas of the basin
- Identify the different areas and different water characteristics within the basin

This would then allow the determination of a plan that avoids counterproductive water usage.

IE:

Area A has a minimum water level (drawdown to) of 200'

The water users in this area are approaching the 200' level

Each user in that area would cut their usage by a percentage, as determined by previous usage, acres farmed, credits, etc.

Note: This option was written as a starting point only, with the goal of beginning and moving forward the process.

Things to remember:

- The state does not want to manage your water
- The two year deadline will be here before you know it
- No plan will be perfect. Water levels, percentages and credits will need to be continually adjusted

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

Identified pros:

- Supports GSP development
- Legally defensible scientific metrics

Identified cons:

- Takes time to develop
- This option may be part of a long-term solution, but may not adequately address immediate concerns

Remaining questions:

- Is there an option that incorporates these technical components that may also address the immediate westside landowners/stakeholder concerns?
- If these technical tasks will be done during the GSP planning process, can they be prioritized and done earlier in the process to help inform the conversations during the planning process?

Option 4: Complete the GSP and Continue Technical Evaluation

Continue moving forward with GSP development and completion keeping the GSA boundary intact with all parcels included. Make the technical evaluation a high priority and develop a timeline to obtain additional information such as well logs and hydrology to potentially support a future basin boundary modification request. Additionally, the technical work may support a re-evaluation of the fee structure with a different metric.

Identified pros:

- Supports GSP development and implementation efforts and keeps the GSP process on-track
- The technical evaluation could facilitate refining the boundary on the west side of the Colusa Subbasin
- The technical evaluation provides more data that may support a future revised fee proposal
- A technical evaluation is an unbiased scientific process

Identified cons:

- Does not satisfy the concerns of landowner/stakeholders on the Westside Ad Hoc Committee and may result in a lawsuit
- No guarantees the technical evaluation will support a basin boundary modification
- No guarantees the technical evaluation will support a future revised fee proposal
- Takes time to develop

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

Remaining questions:

- Does the GGA Board have any suggestions that may alleviate the concerns of the landowner/stakeholders?

Note: Westside landowners/stakeholders on the committee are not in favor of Option 4.

Option 5: Unmanaged Area

Adjust the GGA boundary by removing the westside parcels from the GGA leaving the “unmanaged” areas to coordinate directly with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Identified pros:

- Landowners that are unhappy with GGA management would no longer be managed by the GGA.
- GGA cannot impose a fee outside of its jurisdiction; therefore, GGA would not charge a fee to parcels in the “unmanaged” areas

Identified cons:

- Does not satisfy the concerns of landowners/stakeholders on the Westside Ad Hoc Committee and may result in a lawsuit
- **May significantly affect the GGA budget and compromise the ability to complete a satisfactory GSP on time**
- The basin may be placed on probationary status
- Requires significant coordination with the SWRCB

Remaining questions:

- Define “westside parcels”- which parcels does this option include?
- What does management under the SWRCB really entail?
- How would the basin (GSAs and unmanaged area) coordinate with the SWRCB?
- How does this affect the CGA and the basin as a whole?
- Does this de-rail the GSP development process and put the basin at risk of not completing the GSP on time?
- Can a GSA amend its boundaries, or must landowners request to be removed from the GSA?
- Would the GSP be able to include the “unmanaged” areas or would the “unmanaged” area need its own coordinated GSP?
- Is it possible for Glenn County to assume responsibility for the “unmanaged” area as a separate GSA? If so, would the County opt-in or opt-out of managing the area?
- Is this scenario possible under Proposition 218?
- Is this a viable option?

3/4/20

Westside Ad Hoc Committee Report

Note: Westside landowners/stakeholders on the committee are not in favor of Option 5.

Recommendation

The Westside Ad Hoc Committee recommends the GGA Board review the options above and determine the feasibility of moving forward with one or more of the outlined options. The technical fact gathering components weave through all the options and should be given a high priority. If the options outlined above are not feasible, it would be helpful to determine if there are alternatives that might be evaluated further.

The committee recognizes the importance of developing a compliant GSP on time and wishes to support those efforts while accounting for the concerns of landowners/stakeholders in the western portion of the GGA service area. The committee also recognizes that options may evolve over time and encourages the GGA Board to consider implementing immediate actions and also provide a long-term plan.

Some committee members are concerned with the current property-related fee and process that was taken to implement the fee. Major concerns include (1) the legality of voting by parcel and being charged by the acre and (2) understanding the benefit to those owning property in the basin that have little groundwater availability.

Next Steps

The Westside Ad Hoc Committee respectfully requests the GGA Board consider the recommendations and options above. The committee is willing to further evaluate options if the Board desires. The committee looks forward to continued dialogue and receiving a response from the GGA Board.

11. COMMITTEE UPDATES

a. Executive Committee

i. CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee

The Joint Executive Committee meeting scheduled for February 26, 2020 was cancelled and instead, the CGA/GGA Joint Executive Committee met February 27, 2020. The draft CGA/GGA MOU was discussed in a previous item. Other topics of discussion included CGA and GGA operations updates, Groundwater Sustainability Plan development updates, and Department of Water Resources Technical Assistance Programs.

b. Stakeholder Engagement Committee

The Stakeholder Engagement Committee has not met and has nothing new to report.

c. Technical Advisory Committee

The Technical Advisory Committee has not met and has nothing new to report.

d. West Side Ad Hoc Committee

The West Side Ad Hoc Committee presented a report in a previous item.

12. CLOSED SESSION

Gov't Code §54956.9 - Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated or significant exposure to litigation (1)

13. MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Members of the GGA Board are encouraged to share information, reports, comments, and suggest future agenda items. Action cannot be taken on items brought up under this item

14. NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2020 at 1:30 PM.

15. ADJOURN

The meeting will be adjourned.

*Indicates Action Item