

MEETING SUMMARY | February 8, 2017

Glenn Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) – Governance Workgroup Meeting #8

MEETING RECAP

- The group received general updates and Glenn County updates.
- The group was updated on the Colusa County Governance work group meetings.
- The group received a summary of the Colusa legal review committee meeting and the next steps for Glenn County.
- The group reviewed the current Glenn Critical Path and the revised Colusa Critical Path.
- The group received an update on the process regarding funding for the Davids Engineering Work Plan.
- The group discussed the future Groundwater Sustainability Agency's (GSA's) governance, membership, appointments and voting structure.

MEETING SUMMARY

Introduction

Dave Ceppos (Facilitator) is with the Center for Collaborative Policy. He reviewed the meeting agenda, meeting materials and meeting expectations. In the early stages of the work group meetings Mr. Ceppos had explained there would come a time when the structure of the meetings would change. That change has occurred, and for all agenda items Mr. Ceppos will first look to eligible Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to discuss the item and then open the floor to the public for comment. The floor would then be opened back up to the eligible GSAs for any further comments or responses. He made reference to the proposed Glenn Critical Path document and mentioned that one major goal is to sequentially align Glenn and Colusa GSA formation processes.

Question: Will the new district that is being formed (Glenn Groundwater District) be able to sit at the table? Response: Yes, the Glenn Ground Water District attorney has been invited to represent the proposed district.

SGMA Process Updates

Colusa County Governance Working Group Meeting- Colusa County working group members decided the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that they are working on would not need a formal ratification. Instead, their efforts will be concentrated on developing a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). During the legal review it was decided that the MOU would be revised into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to be more consistent with the language in the SGMA statute. The MOA will be the foundation for the JPA development. The Colusa group decided to agree on a single lawyer to consolidate comments and provide a final document for review. Mr. Ceppos addressed the eligible GSAs in the room and asked if they would like a similar legal review process for the Glenn working group. He told them they would get into detail about this later in the meeting agenda.

Glenn County Updates-The Glenn County Private Pumper Advisory Committee (PPAC) members were selected November 15 to advise the County on management of the “white areas.” The PPAC is composed of seven members. The meeting topics so far have included an orientation on their roles and responsibilities, SGMA overview, a flow meter presentation, approving a meeting schedule, and a review of the December 8 version of the Colusa MOU. The PPAC provided comments to the Board of Supervisor members assigned to SGMA, who are John Viegas and Vince Minto. The next PPAC meeting is February 27 from 1-4 pm at the Farm Bureau in Orland. The PPAC members are also reviewing the Glenn County Principles, and comments will be discussed at the upcoming PPAC meeting. In an effort to help the County assess the extent of the unmanaged areas in the County, the County Board of Supervisors is sending out a letter to eligible GSAs that have not been participating in the Governance Workgroup meetings to determine their interest level of involvement.

Dauids Engineering Update- The contract for the Davids Engineering Risk Assessment and Work Plan projects will be going to the Board of Supervisors for approval on February 21.

Question: Who are the PPAC members? Response: Rick Beale, Sharron Ellis, Ben Kerman, Larry Maben, Richard Olney and Ron Stilwell. Geoff Fulks recently resigned, so there is an open position on the committee that will be filled in the future.

Glenn/Colusa 2x2 Supervisors Meeting- In the future there should be coordination meetings between GSA eligible agencies from both Glenn and Colusa Counties. The group discussed the West Butte Subbasin and some possible coordinated approaches between the counties that share that subbasin. The land use and ownership patterns within the respective counties that share this subbasin are variable and require coordination. The Supervisors will be reaching out and talking about issues with people in their respective County. There will eventually be a West Butte Subbasin specific meeting to discuss governance and potential basin boundary modification(s). It is likely that agencies within the West Butte Subbasin will strive to meet the minimum SGMA requirements to be compliant by June 30 in order to be in a position to more fully understand the potential for basin boundary modifications and like issues. There was discussion between the two counties regarding the overlap status of the basins. The Supervisors have indicated they are prepared and willing to rescind notifications once MOA/JPA language is clear and agreed upon and they feel the interests of the County and the residents are being met.

Draft MOA- Mr. Ceppos stated that he will be directing much of this conversation toward eligible GSAs moving forward with the governance discussion. He gave an update on the Colusa County MOA process and plans to move forward with Glenn in a similar way to the Colusa process, while keeping in mind that Glenn still holds its independence and does not have to follow the same governance decisions as Colusa. He mentioned there is still some apprehension from some agencies to rescind their notices until more specifics on governance are developed beyond the MOA. Mr. Ceppos reiterated that the SGMA compliance requirements for June 30 do not have to include specific governance proposals; however, if only the minimum requirements (to have no unmanaged areas and no overlap) are met, the group is no closer to being able to make governing decisions on July 1.

Mr. Ceppos stated, regarding the Colusa process, that the Colusa group is happy with the progress of the MOA and would like to move forward with governance as quickly as possible. The group decided not to formally ratify the MOA, but rather to begin concentrated work on the development of the JPA. Legal language is being developed (much of which comes from the Colusa County MOA) and will be inserted into a JPA. From a content perspective there are relatively minor differences between the Glenn and Colusa MOU/MOA documents. Mr. Ceppos stated that when the next iteration of the Colusa MOA is ready for review he would like Glenn County eligible GSAs to review it with their respective attorneys and reconvene at the next SGMA work group meeting ready to discuss the document.

The facilitator posed the question to the group members if they feel comfortable moving forward simultaneously with the review of the updated MOA by their attorneys and with JPA development. Will the group want to have a legal review meeting similar to Colusa?

Question: What is the product that will be reviewed? Response: The Colusa County attorney is compiling the results of the comments made by the Colusa agencies to develop the next single iteration of the MOA. The MOA language will be inserted into the JPA once the MOA is finalized. The group will develop the JPA as much as they can over the next few months. At a certain time, work must stop on the JPA and the notification requirements must be met. If necessary, the MOA can be used to meet the requirements for June 30. Better, and ideally, the JPA will be complete for the purposes of submitting to DWR for GSA notification. Comment: It would be good for the Colusa group to review the updated MOA first before it is reviewed by the Glenn GSA-eligible agencies.

Comment: It may be beneficial to have a joint meeting of Colusa and Glenn GSA-eligible agencies. Response: It would ultimately be the decision of the Colusa eligible-GSAs re: accepting any of the proposed Glenn changes to their document. Glenn is under no obligation to adopt the same MOA. There undoubtedly will be similarities between the two county's documents; however, eventually there will be two different governance agencies, each in their respective counties, and the MOAs may not be the same. The proposed path forward is to have Colusa Counsel finish the Colusa final draft of the MOA. That draft will be distributed to the Colusa group with a short review period. Once that is complete, the MOA will be distributed to the Glenn eligible agencies.

The facilitator noted that for the Colusa MOA, the Colusa group collectively agreed to have the County's Counsel compile the comments and clean up the language. The same question has been raised to Glenn County Workgroup members. Glenn County has indicated they would be willing to have Counsel consolidate comments. Other than having agencies' individual attorneys review documents, are there any additional suggestions for an attorney that could work on the document and consolidate changes, etc. collectively?

Comment: It would be beneficial to first see if there are differences between the Colusa and Glenn versions. If there is a difference, talk with Colusa to see if they are willing to accept that change. The same attorney that is doing that consolidation for Colusa could do the consolidation for Glenn to help to reconcile differences and move forward as one document. If there are irreconcilable differences, that would warrant additional conversation.

Comment: We would want to ensure our interests are being addressed. Response: We can follow the same path mentioned a few moments ago. After the attorney review, during the consolidation phase, if any significant differences are raised, we could go into a joint process to try to reconcile the differences.

Comment: It would be best to encourage agencies to suggest substantive changes only if those changes are necessary for them to feel comfortable with the document, but not to make comments for the sake of making comments.

Question: Will the County use County Counsel or will they hire outside counsel? Comment: By statute, the County represents private pumpers. The County will be looking to ensure there are principles in the MOA that are protective of private pumpers. Response: Once the Glenn County Principles are in order and have been reviewed, we will likely seek outside Counsel.

Mr. Ceppos proposed the following process: he will get the updated Colusa MOA document, and will email Mary Fahey and the Colusa governance group expressing a desire to have the document sent to the Glenn County work group for review. After both groups get a chance to review, the comments on the document will be analyzed to see how closely they are aligned. If there are items that need to be reconciled, a joint meeting between Glenn and Colusa will be arranged.

Comment: I would suggest setting a meeting date for the joint meeting. Response: Prior to setting an additional meeting date here, we will review meeting dates already set to see if we can capitalize on of the meetings that are already planned.

Mr. Ceppos then opened the floor for public comment. No comments were made.

Next Steps-

The working assumption for both counties is that each county is working toward a multi-party agency created by a JPA. There will be a single GSA in each county that oversees groundwater sustainability in that county and will have coordination agreements with neighboring counties working together to implement SGMA. Counties are uniquely responsible by statute for unmanaged areas which include areas that do not fall within another agency's service area or the service area of an agency that chooses not to participate in SGMA. The letter sent out to eligible GSAs assessing their interest level of involvement will help the County determine how much area is considered "unmanaged."

The facilitator asked the group which eligible GSAs are prepared to preliminarily commit to a multi-agency approach and joint agency governance. The consensus was that all the eligible agencies currently sitting at the table commit to that approach at this point.

Question: Who has currently not committed or given a response indicating their interest level of involvement regarding SGMA? Response: The eligible agency letter discussed earlier was sent to approximately 15 agencies. In general there are some levee districts and community service districts that have not formalized their anticipated involvement. Mutual water companies are not GSA-eligible and they would need to be invited to the process. The letter was also sent to Reclamation District 2106, recently revitalized. Based on conversations, it is

anticipated they are interested in being a GSA. Once their contact information is received, they will be invited to the SGMA process such as the SGMA work group meetings.

Comment: Is there a timeline on the response to the letter? Response: It is requested that the return portion of the letter be received before March 7.

The facilitator added that it is really important to have it in the administrative record that there was clear intent to notify and involve all eligible agencies in the SGMA process. The administrative record protects other agencies in the 90 day review period that will begin after notification to DWR.

Question: What kind of barriers are there for other agencies coming late into the multi-agency process? Response: The only potential barrier would be the language that is added to the MOA or JPA that outlines rule or guidelines for new forming GSAs. Other GSAs originally will put in funding and there may be some funding requirements to be fair. It is up to the eligible GSAs here at this work group meeting to decide how restrictive the requirements and accommodations will be for other GSAs in the future.

The facilitator asked if the group is comfortable with the idea of dispensing with ratifying the MOA first and instead immediately diving into a JPA approach starting with governance. There were no objections from the eligible GSAs.

Mr. Ceppos opened the floor to public comments. No comments were received.

Preliminary Discussion- Membership and Appointments

Moving into the preliminary discussion and looking at the critical path, some of the harder governance issues to agree upon are membership, voting, and funding.

There are many questions as far as membership goes and there are various approaches. This group will have to think about the approach towards mutual water companies and what kind of approach towards membership there will be, if any.

Comment: One of the reasons why mutual water companies are left out of the legislation is that they are exempt from public processes and Brown Act requirements. The entity would also need to weigh whether their involvement would put them at risk or more requirements. There will also be a cost associated with membership.

Comment: The GSA may also need to address that issue to ensure items are channeled correctly through a public and open process. Also, mutual water companies are not precluded from converting to a district.

The facilitator clarified that State Board policy is that mutual and private water companies cannot be signatory to the JPA. They may be invited in to participate. They can be given as much or as little authority as the member agencies decide. Glenn County has been reaching out and is including mutual water companies in their outreach efforts. The facilitator asked the group if there should be a concentrated communication to the mutual water companies.

Comment: It would be nice to send a letter asking if they are even interested in participating in the SGMA process. If they are, we can discuss membership at that time.

Comment: Have a doors-open approach to have good participation; however, have a policy that the same standard must be met for water companies as for water districts. They must observe the standards and the formalities of being a water district or water company. Question: Are there spatial differences that should be considered for mutual water companies, such as size or distribution? Response: The size issue will come up no matter what.

Comment: How about inviting the mutual water companies to be represented by one entity, with the idea that one representative would represent their interest collectively?

Comment: I agree it would be beneficial to invite all and develop the type of representation after we see who is interested in participating.

The facilitator stated we could generate a draft communication to the mutuals and send it out to the eligible agencies for comment prior to sending. Do you want to go as far as preliminarily offering the mutual water companies a seat in governance at this point?

Comment: There is accountability when you sit at the governing table as far as funding goes etc. Making preliminary contact first is a good idea.

Comment: At least draft a letter to gauge their level of interest which also documents that they weren't left out of the SGMA process. The attempt to contact them would be administratively documented.

In Colusa, tomorrow's meeting will be focused on financing and reviewing roles and responsibilities. A similar discussion will be scheduled for Glenn's next meeting. Inviting mutual water companies to show them what being a part of governance really means is a good idea. Lisa Hunter and Dave Ceppos will draft a letter inviting mutual water companies to the next meeting and send to this group for comments

The facilitator initiated discussion regarding the Glenn County PPAC and where they stand in SGMA governance at this point. Lisa Hunter stated the PPAC is currently an advisory committee to the Board of Supervisors (BOS), represented by the County. The BOS will be receiving comments from the PPAC on the County's Principles and will consider at that time if a change is warranted.

Mr. Ceppos then asked Ms. Hunter and BOS member Vince Minto, "do you foresee the County advocating for a dedicated governance seat for the PPAC in the future?" Mr. Minto stated that at this point they are advisory. Mr. Ceppos stated to reiterate, recognizing the relationship between how the PPAC advises the County is still a work in progress, the County is not currently advocating for a "PPAC seat" on the GSA board and that the County will act as representative voice for the private pumpers as advised by the PPAC. Mr. Minto stated that the next SGMA Workgroup meeting discussion on funding will provide more clarity for the PPAC and for the County re: the PPAC's role.

Mr. Ceppos then provided a recap: (1) The agencies represented at the table today all plan to be members of the multi-agency GSA. (2) A letter will be sent out to the mutual water companies to establish their level of interest in involvement and to strongly encourage them to come to the next SGMA work group meeting. (3) A letter will go out to the other eligible GSAs

asking whether they will join the multi-agency approach, be a standalone GSA, or waive their statutory rights in which case their service area would then be assumed by the County.

Mr. Ceppos then opened the floor for public comment.

Question: Can the mutual water companies be asked to the table without being signatories or having a vote? Response: They cannot be signatories but may be invited to the governance table. If they are invited to participate in governance the governing body can give them as much or as little authority as they see fit.

Comment: Will the private pumper district (Glenn Ground Water District) be able to represent private pumpers that are not part of the district? Response: No.

Comment: Private pumpers need to be more than advisory. Private pumpers are not covered by a special district and I advocate for private pumpers to have a seat at the table.

Comment: There is a path and a process to becoming a special district. I think the County needs to go back to the PPAC and see if it truly reflects the interests in the unmanaged areas. It would be in the County's best interest to retool the PPAC so it is fully reflective of the unmanaged areas.

Comment: As a private pumper, I'm surprised that all the water districts don't want the private pumpers to have a vote because the private pumper represents most of the groundwater use.

The facilitator directed the conversation to the eligible agencies. Mr. Ceppos posed the question asking the group how they feel about private pumpers being on a governing body.

Comment: Many of these districts do exactly that, they represent many private pumpers. I represent over 200 private pumpers. Private pumpers have options. They could form a special district.

Comment: I don't have a problem with having a seat for private pumper similar to the route Colusa County has taken. The private pumpers have two seats in Colusa. They need to be represented because they are part of the County. It is worth working towards a goal to benefit everyone. The private pumpers do deserve a spot and a vote, however we get there.

Comment: I do not oppose the private pumpers having a seat, but it is the County's choice.

Comment: It makes sense.

Comment: It is a hard question. I would first defer to the County and they will decide. We have to better understand what is the role and requirements to be a part of the governing body and to be sustainable. If private pumpers want to bring money, education, and accountability to the table, and if they are prepared to make tough choices and bare their proportionate responsibility, then yes, take the seat. If that is not the expectation, then we need to rethink this.

Comment: The payments and fees that will be a result of SGMA in the future will be spread County-wide and will go to fund the GSAs whether or not you live in or out of a district. The County needs to sit down ask how they are representing unorganized areas and how do they anticipate funding management in the unorganized areas. The County should be exploring how

to proportionately get funding and how to determine the mechanisms to get funding so that it is fair spatially. Response: Funding will be more fully discussed at the next meeting. Initially the GSA would be need to be funded by the members' resources. Depending on if Proposition 218 will be applicable in the future, unorganized private pumpers will not have a mechanism to pay, let alone a rule to pay at this point.

Comment: I appreciate the support of those in the room that support private pumper representation at the table. We need to have faith the County can do this. We need good information and good people in the process.

Voting Structure

Voting can be handled in innumerable ways for governance structure. There are places in the State that have chosen to use proportional voting structures based on different parameters. SGMA is unique in that sustainability will be assessed as an entire subbasin. Arguing for a higher percentile or proportionate vote is irrelevant; it gets the subbasin no closer to sustainability. Most places are leaning towards the one agency-one vote structure.

The facilitator asked the group for their thoughts regarding potential voting structures.

Comment: I like the idea of one seat one vote. It could move things along more quickly. There does need to be some kind of protest process or secondary process if for example there is a 6-4 vote, then proportionality or issue type could be taken into consideration. Proportionality can also change. Districts and stake holder numbers can increase or decrease. When issues arise there needs to be a mechanism for a review process if there is disagreement. Response: There is language built into the draft MOA that addresses an exit clause process that has been strongly advocated for. There is also a paper co-written by Russ McGlothlin and Dave Ceppos that has model governance language which combines the intent to solve issues collaboratively through consensus with the necessity to make hard decisions within an open process.

Comment: Wouldn't the JPA address that? Response: Yes. The model language could be used as a starting point if the group found it appropriate.

Comment: It would be good to try to find a way to quantify by issue type and incorporate a proportional vote mechanism if the vote is close. Those that are in the minority could trigger the mechanism and perhaps pay the cost. This should be an interim step prior to an agency exiting the GSA. I am not a big fan of the GSA exit clause although I see the necessity.

Comment: Maybe define exactly what the seat and what the vote represents and define that in the JPA. How many unorganized private pumpers are there? Response: People or acres? It hasn't been quantified; however, the majority of the County is reliant on groundwater at least for drinking water.

Comment: This is a really complicated issue. An agreed-upon third party could review and provide a recommendation if there is a disagreement.

Comment: We could make this very complicated. I don't necessarily disagree, but for the sake of simplicity the one seat-one vote works. The exit clause is an incentive also to put this together right.

The facilitator mentioned that SGMA creates a new paradigm because it forces agencies to not only protect the district, but forces agencies to problem-solve together and work collaboratively with a 25 year timeline.

Comment: If the vote is ten to one, it is generally ten agricultural representatives to one municipal. One to one vote is the easiest to justify it. Response: Recall that you created Principles that the group has collectively agreed upon and to protect everyone's interests.

Comment: The idea of having a secondary process during a close vote situation is important because an agency can essentially use their exit clause or withdrawal as a threat to the group. The agencies involved with this work group will accrue many expenses from this process and there should be a step before an agency can exit because the remaining agencies will continue to bear the cost of this process and we as a group benefit from staying together. Response: Are you willing to draft an idea for the process of an interim step or mediation process prior to an agency exiting the multi-agency GSA? Response: Yes.

Comment: We may need some type of mediation once the two counties agencies begin to coordinate.

Question: You're still fine with the one seat-one vote, but add dispute resolution? To me the dispute resolution language would be part of the JPA development. Response: Yes. But if we start getting close votes, there will be a lot of contention.

Comment: I like the one seat-one vote, but I see merit in the dispute resolution section. That can be developed in the JPA.

Comment: I like the one seat-one vote.

The facilitator asked the group collectively that, notwithstanding the dispute resolution section was there any opposition to the one seat-one vote structure? No opposition was raised.

Mr. Ceppos opened the floor for public comment. No comments were made.

Mr. Ceppos then described some future action items, as follows:

- Mutual Water Company Draft Letter
- Colusa MOA, distribute to the Glenn work group for comments after to Colusa group have finalized their review.
- Draft Concept Language paper
- Check into potential dates for a Glenn-Colusa joint meeting
- Next Glenn SGMA working group meeting will be focused on funding structure- reminder that the group is now on an accelerated meeting schedule.
- Revise the Critical Path document

A public meeting will be held at Cal EPA in Sacramento on March 20 to review the draft Project Solicitation Package (PSP) for the Proposition 1 funding. The final PSP, targeted to be released in July, will be for the 86.3 million dollars remaining from Proposition 1 funds for groundwater planning. There is typically a cost-share or matching fund for grant funding. The agencies were encouraged to begin thinking about how much has been spent, and how much might be

needed to fund SGMA work for the next year or two. Pre-work coordination with other counties within a basin and paying attention to the PSP is important.

Mr. Ceppos opened the floor to the public for any final comments. No comments were made.

Meeting Participants

- Sharla Stockton Glenn County
- Mary Randall Department of Water Resources
- Pete Knight Glenn County citizen
- Craig Knight Glenn County citizen
- Ron Stilwell Private Pumper
- Dennis Clark Farmer Glenn Co.
- Marcie Skelton Glenn County Agricultural Commissioner
- Sharron Ellis Private Pumper
- Richard Olney Private Pumper
- Paddy Turnbull Capay Landowners
- Bruce Roundy City of Orland Mayor/ Resource Conservation District Director
- Vince Minto Glenn County Board of Supervisors
- Lance Boyd Provident/Princeton-Codora-Glenn Irrigation Districts
- John Amaro GCID
- Emil Cavagnolo Orland-Artois Water District
- Ed Vonasek City of Orland
- Nicole Groathouse Keyawa Orchards
- Mardy Thomas Glenn County Planning & Public Works
- Jason Hammond Cal Water
- Mike Alves Kanawha/Glide Water Districts
- Mark Lohse Private Pumper
- George Pendell Stony Creek
- Thad Bettner GCID
- John Garner Glenn Ground Water District
- Kevin Backus Glenn County Environmental Health
- Linda Mendez UC Davis
- Andrea Jones Orland-Artois Water District

Staff

- Lisa Hunter Glenn County Water Resources Coordinator
- Dave Ceppos Center for Collaborative Policy

APPENDICES

- Draft Version 1, Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Critical Path-Glenn Interests

D R A F T

Version 1

Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency Critical Path – Glenn Interests

Key:

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Steps
Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) Steps
Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Notice Steps

Note: All dates assume the first day of a week in that month. This does not presume each date is the actual date that an action will occur.

6 December 2016	Prepare Draft Final MOU GSA
13 December 2016	Finalize target list of signatory parties of MOU and submit MOU to governing bodies for review
9 January 2017	Review and reconcile final MOU comments and submit MOU to governing bodies for ratification
9 January 2017	Begin work on preliminary draft JPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Preliminary Outline of JPA Articles • Begin Membership and Governance Discussion. To include but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Membership and Appointments ○ Member terms, additions and withdrawals ○ Board structure ○ Voting Structure
20 February 2017	Complete ratification process for Glenn GSA MOU
20 February 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt ratified MOU as Draft Recitals and Principles Articles of JPA • Preliminary Draft Membership and Governance Articles • Preliminary Draft Budget and Funding Article
<i>Potentially begin Governance Work Group Meetings every 2 weeks</i>	
20 March 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Membership and Governance Articles • Draft Budget and Funding Article • Begin Special Projects Article Discussion • Begin Liabilities Article Discussion
17 April 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Membership and Governance Articles • Draft Final Budget and Funding Article • Preliminary Draft Special Projects Article • Preliminary Draft Liabilities Article • Begin Miscellaneous Provisions Discussion • Begin Formation, Purpose and Powers Discussion
1 May 2017	Review preliminary draft multi-agency GSA notice
15 May 2017	Review draft multi-agency GSA notice and submit to governing bodies for review
29 May 2017	Review draft final multi-agency GSA notice, reconcile issues and submit to governing bodies for ratification
19 June 2017	Finalize multi-agency GSA notice

30 June 2017	Previously noticed GSAs rescind their notices to the State
30 June 2017	Submit final multi-agency GSA notice to State. Begin 90-day review period.
10 July 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Membership and Governance Articles • Final Budget and Funding Article • Draft Special Projects Article • Draft Liabilities Article • Preliminary Draft Miscellaneous Provisions Discussion • Preliminary Draft Formation ,Purpose and Powers Discussion
7 August 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Special Projects Article • Final Liabilities Article • Draft Miscellaneous Provisions Discussion • Draft Formation ,Purpose and Powers Discussion
4 September 2017	Continue JPA development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Miscellaneous Provisions Discussion • Draft Formation ,Purpose and Powers Discussion • Other items
2 October 2017	Complete GSA 90-day Notice Review
2 October 2017	Finalize All JPA Articles and submit to governing bodies for review
6 November 2017	Ratify JPA and conduct initial meeting of GSA