REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Thursday, September 9, 2021, 9:00 a.m.

AMENDED AGENDA

The public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board on any item of interest before or during the Board' consideration of that item. Public comment on items within the jurisdiction of the Board is welcomed, subject to reasonable time limitations for each speaker. Public documents relating to any open session item listed on this agenda that are distributed to all or a majority of the members of the Board of Directors less than 72 hours before the meeting are available for public inspection in the customer service area of the Authority's Administrative Office at the address listed above. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you have a disability and need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the Executive Director of the Authority at (916) 847-7589. Requests must be made as early as possible, and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting. The Executive Committee may consider any agenda item at any time during the meeting.

Note: Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 and given the state of emergency regarding the threat of COVID-19, the meeting will be held via teleconference.

We encourage Committee members and participants to join the meeting 10 minutes early. Note that we will use GoToMeeting to share slides and other information during the meeting. Use the link below to join GoToMeeting. If you have a microphone that you can use with your computer, it should be possible to both listen to, and participate in, the meeting through GoToMeeting. If you do not have a microphone, or a headset with a microphone, that plugs into your computer via USB port, you will need to call into the conference line to listen and comment, although you still should be able to view the meeting materials on GoToMeeting. Please do not simultaneously use a microphone through GoToMeeting and the telephone conference line. That combination results in audio problems for all participants.

Meeting Information:

RWA Board meeting
Thu, Sep 9, 2021 9:00 AM - 11:30 AM (PDT)

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/139317565

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (872) 240-3412

Access Code: 139-317-565

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Members of the public who wish to address the board may do so at this time. Please keep your comments to less than three minutes.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR:** All items listed under the Consent Calendar are considered and acted upon by one motion. Anyone may request an item be removed for separate consideration.
   a. Minutes of the July 8, 2021 Board of Directors Meeting
   Action: Approve Consent Calendar Item

4. **DROUGHT CONDITIONS UPDATE**
   Presentation: Michelle Banonis, Manager of Strategic Affairs and Amy Talbot, Water Use Efficiency Program Manager

5. **SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY STAFFING**
   Discussion: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

6. **LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY UPDATE**
   Information and Presentation: Ryan Ojakian, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager

7. **ADOPT RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR ACWA VICE PRESIDENT**
   Discussion: Sean Bigley, Chair
   Action: Accept the recommendation from the Chair and Vice Chair for Candidate for ACWA Vice President and Approve a Resolution of Support for the Candidate.

8. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

9. **DIRECTORS' COMMENTS**

ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming Meetings:

Executive Committee Meetings: Wednesday, September 22, 2021, 8:30 a.m. and October 27, 2021, 8:30 a.m. at the RWA Office, the location is subject to change depending on the COVID-19 emergency.

Regular Board Meeting: Thursday, November 4, 2021, 9:00 a.m., at the RWA Office, the location is subject to change depending on the COVID-19 emergency.

The RWA Board Meeting electronic packet is available on the RWA website at https://rwah2o.org/meetings/board-meetings/ to access and print the packet.

This revised packet includes the following items that were not in the initial packet:

- A letter from the San Juan Water District regarding agenda item 5!
- A staff report and draft resolution for agenda item 7

RWA Board of Directors

2021 Chair: Sean Bigley

2021 Vice Chair: Dan York

S. Audie Foster, General Manager, California American Water
Evan Jacobs, Operations Manager, California American Water

Ron Greenwood, **Board Member, Carmichael Water District**
Cathy Lee, General Manager, Carmichael Water District

David Wheaton, Director, Citrus Heights Water District
Hilary Straus, General Manager, Citrus Heights Water District
Raymond Riehle, Director, Citrus Heights Water District (alternate)
Rebecca Scott, Principal Operations Specialist (alternate)

Kerri Howell, Councilmember, City of Folsom
Marcus Yasutake, Environmental/Water Resources Director, City of Folsom

William Lauritsen, Councilmember, City of Lincoln

Bruce Houdesheldt, Councilmember, City of Roseville
Sean Bigley, **Assistant Environment Utilities Director, City of Roseville, Chair**
Rich Plecker, Director of Utilities, City of Roseville (alternate)
Dale Olson, City of Roseville (alternate)
Pauline Roccucci, Councilmember, City of Roseville (alternate)

Jeff S. Harris, Councilmember, City of Sacramento
Michelle Carrey, **Supervising Engineer, City of Sacramento**
Bill Busath, Director of Utilities, City of Sacramento (alternate)
Anne Sanger, Policy and Legislative Specialist, City of Sacramento (alternate)

Martha Guerrero, Council Member, City of West Sacramento
Bill Roberts, Director of Public Works and Operations, City of West Sacramento

Grace Espindola, Councilmember, City of Yuba City
Diana Langley, Public Works Director/City Manager, City of Yuba City

Robert Matteoli, Board Member, Del Paso Manor Water District
John Lenahan, Board President, Del Paso Manor Water District

Pat Dwyer, Director/Board President, El Dorado Irrigation District
Jim Abercrombie, General Manager, El Dorado Irrigation District
Brian Mueller, Engineering Director, El Dorado Irrigation District (alternate)

Sophia Scherman, Board Chair, Elk Grove Water District
Bruce Kamilos, General Manager, Elk Grove Water District
Elliot Mulberg, Director, Elk Grove Water District (alternate)

Randy Marx, Board Member, Fair Oaks Water District ***Tom Gray,*** General Manager, Fair Oaks Water District
Paul Schubert, **General Manager, Golden State Water Company** ***Ernie Gisler,*** Capital Program Manager, Golden State Water Company
Robert Hunter, Board Member, Orange Vale Water Company ***Joe Duran,*** General Manager, Orange Vale Water Company
Robert Dugan, **Board Member, Placer County Water Agency** ***Tony Firenzi,*** **Director of Strategic Affairs, Placer County Water Agency** ***Andy Fecko,*** General Manager, Placer County Water Agency (alternate) ***Mike Lee,*** Board Member, Placer County Water Agency (alternate)
Les Clark, Director, Rancho Murieta Community Services District ***Tom Hennig,*** Interim General Manager, Rancho Murieta Community Services District
Patrick Kennedy, Supervisor, Sacramento County Water Agency ***Kerry Schmitz,*** **Division Chief, Water Supply, Sacramento County Water Agency**
Dave Jones, Board Member, Sacramento Suburban Water District ***Dan York,*** **General Manager, Sacramento Suburban Water District, Vice Chair** ***Kevin Thomas,*** Board Member, Sacramento Suburban Water District (alternate)
Dan Rich, **Director, San Juan Water District** ***Greg Zlotnick,*** Water Resources and Strategic Affairs, San Juan Water District ***Ted Costa,*** Board President, San Juan Water District (alternate)

RWA ASSOCIATES	
Organization	**Representatives**
El Dorado County Water Agency	***Lori Parlin,*** Chair ***Ken Payne,*** General Manager (alternate)
Placer County	***Ken Grehm,*** Director Public Works and Facilities ***Jared Deck,*** Manager Environmental Engineering
Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)	***Arlen Orchard,*** General Manage/CEO ***Damien Waples,*** Strategic Account Advisor ***Ansel Lundberg,*** Energy Commodity Contracts Specialist
Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD)	***Christoph Dobson,*** Director Policy and Planning ***Terrie Mitchell,*** Manager Legislative and Regulatory Affairs ***Jose Ramirez,*** Policy and Planning ***David Ocenosak,*** Principal Engineer
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)	***Richard Johnson,*** *Executive Director*

RWA AFFILIATE MEMBERS	
Organization	**Representatives**
Brown & Caldwell	***Paul Selsky,*** Water Supply Planning, Vice president ***LaSandra Edwards,*** Civil Engineer ***May Huang,*** Engineer ***David Zuber,*** *Vice President*
Cosumnes CSD	***Steve Sims,*** *Park Superintendent*
Forsgren Associates, Inc.	***Alan Driscoll,*** *Division Manager* ***Sergio Guillen,*** *Division Manager, Sacramento*
GEI Consultants	***John Woodling,*** *Vice President, Branch Manager* ***Chris Petersen,*** *Principal Hydrogeologist* ***Richard Shatz,*** *Principal Hydrogeologist*
HDR, Inc.	***Jafar Faghih,*** *Water Resources Engineer* ***Ed Winkler,*** *Client Development Lead*
Sacramento Association of Realtors	***David Tanner****, Chief Executive Officer* ***Christopher Ly,*** *Chief Operations Officer*
Stantec	***Kari Shively,*** *Vice President* ***Vanessa Nishikawa,*** *Principal Water Resources Engineer* ***Yung-Hsin Sun,*** *Principal Engineer* ***Rebecca Guo,*** *Senior Associate Water Resources Engineer* ***Kirsten Pringle,*** *Associate Public Affairs Specialist* ***Ibrahim Khadam,*** *Principal Engineer*
West Yost Associates	***Charles Duncan****, President* ***Abigail Madrone****, Business Development Director* ***Kelye McKinney****, Engineering Manager I* ***Jim Mulligan,*** *Principal Engineer*
Woodard & Curran (formerly RMC Water and Environment)	***Ali Taghavi,*** *Principal* ***Jim Graydon,*** *Senior Client Service Manager*

AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSENT CALENDAR

All items listed under the Consent Calendar are considered and acted upon by one motion. Anyone may request an item be removed for separate consideration.

3a. Approve minutes of the July 8, 2021 Board of Directors Meeting

Action: Approve Consent Calendar Item

Attachments:
3a. Draft minutes of the July 8, 2021 Board of Directors Meeting

Regional Water Authority
BUILDING ALLIANCES IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

RWA Board Meeting
Draft Minutes
July 8, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bigley called the meeting of the Board of Directors to order at 9:00 a.m. as a teleconference meeting. Individuals who participated are listed below:

RWA Board Members

Evan Jacobs, California American Water
S. Audie Foster, California American Water
Ron Greenwood, Carmichael Water District
Cathy Lee, Carmichael Water District
David Wheaton, Citrus Heights Water District
Hilary Straus, Citrus Heights Water District
Marcus Yasutake, City of Folsom
Bruce Houdesheldt, City of Roseville
Sean Bigley, City of Roseville
Michelle Carrey, City of Sacramento
Bill Roberts, City of West Sacramento
Grace Espindola, City of Yuba City
Diana Langley, City of Yuba City
Jim Abercrombie, El Dorado Irrigation District
Sophia Scherman, Elk Grove Water District
Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District
Tom Gray, Fair Oaks Water District
Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company
Robert Hunter, Orange Vale Water Company
Robert Dugan, Placer County Water Agency
Tony Firenzi, Placer County Water Agency
Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County Water Agency
Dan York, Sacramento Suburban Water District
Greg Zlotnick, San Juan Water District

RWA Associate Members
Ken Payne, El Dorado Water Agency

RWA Affiliate Members
Vanessa Nishikawa, Stantec

Staff Members
Jim Peifer, Rob Swartz, Ryan Ojakian, Michelle Banonis, Josette Reina-Luken, Amy Talbot, Cecilia Partridge, Monica Garcia and Andrew Ramos, Legal Counsel

Others in Attendance:
Brian Sanders, Mike Huot, Craig Locke, Paul Helliker, Bob Reisig, Pauline Roccucci, Dave Jones, Jessica Law, Dan Kelly, Tom West, Brent Smith, Ed Winkler and Paul Selsksy

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Minutes from the May 6, 2021 RWA Board of Directors meeting
b. Minutes of the May 10, 2021 RWA Special Board meeting

Motion/Second/Carried (M/S/C) Mr. Wheaton moved, with a second by Mr. Greenwood, to approve the Consent Calendar Items. Evan Jacobs, California American Water, Ron Greenwood, Carmichael Water District, David Wheaton, Citrus Heights Water District, Marcus Yasutake, City of Folsom, Bruce Houdesheldt, City of Roseville, Michelle Carrey, City of Sacramento, Bill Roberts, City of West Sacramento, Diana Langley, City of Yuba City, Jim Abercrombie, El Dorado Irrigation Sophia Scherman, Elk Grove Water District, Tom Gray, Fair Oaks Water District, Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company, Joe Duran, Orange Vale Water Company, Robert Dugan, Placer County Water Agency, Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County Water Agency, Dan York, Sacramento Suburban Water District and Greg Zlotnick, San Juan Water District voted yes. The motion carried.

4. RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PAM TOBIN FOR PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES

Mr. Peifer said that the resolution is to support Pam Tobin for President of the Association of California Water Agencies. RWA supported her candidacy for ACWA Vice President two years ago.

M/S/C Mr. Greenwood moved, with a second by Mr. Dugan, to adopt Resolution No. 2021-02 supporting the nomination of Pam Tobin for President of the Association of California Water Agencies. Evan Jacobs, California American Water, Ron Greenwood, Carmichael Water District, David Wheaton, Citrus Heights Water District, Marcus Yasutake, City of Folsom, Bruce Houdesheldt, City of Roseville, Michelle Carrey, City of Sacramento, Bill Roberts, City of West Sacramento, Diana Langley, City of Yuba City, Jim Abercrombie, El Dorado Irrigation Sophia Scherman, Elk Grove Water District, Tom Gray, Fair Oaks Water District, Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company, Joe Duran, Orange Vale Water Company, Robert Dugan, Placer County Water Agency, Kerry Schmitz, Sacramento County Water Agency, Dan York, Sacramento Suburban Water District and Greg Zlotnick, San Juan Water District voted yes. The motion carried.

5. WATER FORUM UPDATE

Jessica Law, Water Forum Executive Director, gave updates on Water Forum activities. The Water Forum has been working with members and state and federal

agencies to address recent drought issues. They have been looking at hydrology and working with the Bureau of Reclamation to understand their priorities and what flow releases they are likely to follow in the coming months. Concentration is on protecting storage in Folsom Reservoir and resources for the lower American River to preserve the health of the fisheries. The desired outcomes that the Water Forum is looking for include working closely with the Bureau of Reclamation to maintain storage in Folsom Reservoir and maintain viable conditions for the fisheries in the river.

The original Water Forum agreement is being renegotiated. There are challenges including climate change and adapting the region and system to a more resilient future and how this region needs to take action under drought or drier conditions. A challenge with climate change is water supplies and how the environment might fair in the future given the current circumstances and balancing the goals of water supply for our economy while maintaining protection of the lower American River.

6. AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT BRIEFING

Ms. Banonis, Manager of Strategic Affairs, gave a brief update on the American Resource Plan. Water infrastructure is included as part of the act. The American Resource Plan Act provides fiscal recovery funds to provide economic stimulus primarily in response to losses suffered from the pandemic. There are four main categories for funding eligibility: responding to pandemic public health, emergency and the economic impacts, providing a premium pay to essential workers or grants to employers with essential workers, replacing lost, delayed or decreased revenue, and making necessary investments in water, sewer or broadband infrastructure. She gave information on the general eligibility guidelines and reporting requirements to receive funding.

Water projects in our region serve a critical role in advancing public health and safety. Three important topics to focus on are providing clean drinking water, drought response and climate resiliency. RWA has requested from its member agencies a list of projects that are ready to put before funding entities for consideration.

7. SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY STAFFING

Mr. Peifer said that there was a meeting between the Sacramento Groundwater Authority, Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA) and the Regional Water Authority where Gina Bartlett, Consensus Builders Institute, presented her stakeholder assessment findings and a process roadmap. A frequently asked questions list with answers is being generated. The first decision point is whether the authorities should move forward engaging in further conversations. Mr. Peifer encouraged any questions be sent directly to him.

8. LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY UPDATE

Mr. Ojakian provided an update on the budget that the legislature passed and how the funds are expected to be distributed for drought response, water and climate resilience. Specifically, that $200 million has been included for funding expanded conjunctive use, $1 billion has been included for water arrearages, and that further budget actions are continuing into the summer.

Bills of interest include resilience bonds SB 45 and AB 1500 that include wildfire prevention, safe drinking water and drought preparedness, SB 222 for low-income water rate assistance, SB 223 dealing with water shutoffs, AB 377 for water quality and AB 1434 indoor water use efficiency. We will continue to be engaged on funding for outreach to non-English speaking communities until the issue is resolved.

9. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Peifer commented that there has been discussion about returning to in-person board meetings in the future. It is anticipated that the we will begin to transition RWA Executive Committee meetings being held in person with an option for participants to access the meeting remotely. The remote option is still being researched for feasibility.

RWA continues a collaborative relationship with Reclamation and the Department of Water Resources on the drought. As we rely on them for funding our future resilience projects and policy support, we want to build strong relationships with them. As the drought continues to cause hardship throughout the state, there is less available water putting our water supply in the region in a vulnerable situation. Water demands are going up and water conservation is a challenge.

The RWA 20th anniversary celebration is scheduled for October 7th.

10. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

Mr. Greenwood reported that Carmichael Water District held an emergency special board meeting to reapprove a stage two water shortage emergency declaration. The district may reactivate wells that were previously retired.

Ms. Carrey said that the City of Sacramento has a team that is meeting weekly to work on water conservation and responses to the drought. They are taking a proactive approach trying to address and anticipate challenges, especially operationally. They are increasing communications and outreach.

Ms. Espindola, City of Yuba City, said that they have met with several federal representatives to advocate on behalf of the region for available funding.

Mr. Schubert reported that the California Public Utilities Commission authorized the purchase of the Robbins water system in Sutter County, a disadvantaged community with no potable water. Golden State Water Company is working with the county and state agencies to bring the community into compliance.

Mr. York, Sacramento Suburban Water District, reported that Greg Bundesen, Water Conservation Supervisor, conducted an interview on Fox 40. Sacramento Suburban Water District and Carmichael Water District initiated a 2 x 2 Ad Hoc Committee to look at ways to collaborate sharing resources, programs and operations staff.

Mr. Zlotnick, San Juan Water District, reported that they are assisting Carmichael Water District by sending them water.

Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, Chair Bigley adjourned the meeting at 10:47 a.m.

By:

_____

Chairperson

Attest:

_____

Josette Reina-Luken, Board Secretary / Treasurer

AGENDA ITEM 4: DROUGHT CONDITIONS UPDATE

BACKGROUND:

Michelle Banonis and Amy Talbot will be briefing the RWA Board on current drought conditions.

Discussion: Michelle Banonis, Manager of Strategic Affairs and Amy Talbot, Water Use Efficiency Program Manager

AGENDA ITEM 5: SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY STAFFING

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this item is to provide an update to the Board in accordance with the memorandum of understanding MOU adopted by the Board last year (MOU attached).

On June 7th, the SGA, SCGA and RWA boards met for a joint workshop to hear the findings of Ms. Gina Bartlett, the facilitator who has been assigned by the Department of Water Resources to assist in the resolution of the potential integration of the SCGA and SGA. In addition, Ms. Bartlett presented a process roadmap for further exploration of the integration. A summary of the meeting and a copy of the process roadmap are attached.

A number of board members have raised questions in the workshop or in SGA or RWA regular board meetings. A Frequently Asked Questions and Answers (FAQs) document has been attached to address some of these questions. The San Juan Water District (SJWD) has submitted two documents with questions that they requested be included in the Board packet. Copies of those documents are attached. Some of the questions from the SJWD may be addressed by the FAQs but other questions may need additional work, some in future phases, to address the questions. The Carmichael Water District board members for the Sacramento Groundwater Authority have submitted comments (Copy attached). The Fair Oaks Water District (FOWD) submitted an email reflecting the FOWD's thoughts on the merger, which are as follows: 1) Though not strongly opposed to the merger, the FOWD would likely vote no on the proposed merger at this time; 2) As a member of the SGA, FOWD would like to see SGA remain focused on the completing the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) and Groundwater Bank prior to working on the proposed merger; 3) Upon completion and beta testing of the GSP and Groundwater Bank, the FOWD would reconsider the proposed merger – knowing that we have achieved completion of our most important tasks – and bringing forward a stronger package to the proposed merger.

During the SGA Board meeting on August 12th, Ms. Bartlett asked each of the board members to provide their perspectives on the proposed process and integration. Some board members requested additional information on the potential pros and cons of the merger as well as information on potential pension liabilities.

A question was raised about the potential of the RWA staff to provide staffing services to the SCGA, similar to the SGA without integrating the SGA and SCGA. The FAQs address that question in part. An email from Ms. Isabel Safie to Mr. John Woodling is attached, which provides additional information regarding this question.

Discussion: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

Attachments:

1. SCGA SGA RWA MOU
2. CBI Meeting Summary of the June 7 Joint SGA SCGA RWA Workshop
3. Process Roadmap

4. Frequently Asked Questions
5. San Juan Water District: Issues/Questions Related to Discussion of Potential SGA/SCGA Consolidation DRAFT
6. San Juan Water District Supplemental Questions
7. Carmichael Water District Letter
8. Workplan
9. Email from Ms. Isabel Safie to Mr. John Woodling regarding SCGA becoming a CalPERS agency

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGY FOR SHARED OPERATIONS of the REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY, the SACRAMENTO GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY, and the SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, water resources planning and implementation in the greater Sacramento area has benefitted considerably from collaborative and regional approaches to problem solving; and

WHEREAS, the REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY (RWA), the SACRAMENTO GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SGA) and the SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (SCGA), collectively referred to hereinafter as "the AUTHORITIES" have a common purpose in their respective formations to implement elements of the Sacramento Water Forum Agreement (Water Forum); and

WHEREAS, the RWA was formed in 2001 to assist its water purveyor members in implementing a regional conjunctive use program to meet commitments under the Water Forum; and

WHEREAS, the SGA was formed in 1998 to manage the groundwater basin underlying Sacramento County north of the American River (the North Area), in satisfaction of the Groundwater Management Element of the Water Forum; and

WHEREAS, the SCGA was formed in 2006 to manage the groundwater basin underlying a portion of Sacramento County south of the American River (the Central Area), in satisfaction of the Groundwater Management Element of the Water Forum; and

WHEREAS, the Water Forum is beginning a process to evaluate and revise the Agreement to reflect changes that have occurred in the two decades since its signing and provide a framework for the future; and

WHEREAS, the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), passed as state law in 2014 provides for additional responsibilities and authorities for groundwater management and will require coordination between the SGA and SCGA, which have elected to become Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, the responsible entities under SGMA; and

WHEREAS, the AUTHORITIES share a number of common water purveyor members that have seats on the Boards of Directors of two or three of the independent agencies; and

WHEREAS, the RWA and the SGA have entered into an agreement to share costs and certain operational staff, and with RWA acting as the employer of all staff; and

WHEREAS, the SCGA is seeking to enter into a similar agreement for administration by RWA; and

WHEREAS, the AUTHORITIES recognize a potential to gain mutual benefit by exploring opportunities for shared approaches to operations;

THEREFORE, the AUTHORITIES agree through this Memorandum of Understanding to work cooperatively towards an integration of SCGA into the existing joint operation of RWA and SGA, subject to the following framework and guiding principles.

1. Discussions and negotiations will be conducted by a "3x3" ad hoc committee consisting of the Chair and Vice Chair of RWA, SGA, and SCGA, as well as an additional member of the Board of Directors of each. The makeup of each AUTHORITY delegation should include one individual who represents an entity that is exclusive to that AUTHORITY, i.e. not a member of more than one AUTHORITY.
2. The 3x3 ad hoc committee will include the Executive Director of RWA-SGA and the Interim Executive Director of SCGA, with additional staff support as needed.
3. Updates on progress will be provided to the Board of Directors of each AUTHORITY regularly.
4. At the appropriate time and as needed, each AUTHORITY will be represented by and be responsible for its own attorney(s) and legal costs to review any agreement among the AUTHORITIES.
5. Operational and administrative as well as governance changes may be needed to implement an effective collaborative solution.
6. Any potential operational or governance agreement among the AUTHORITIES shall be beneficial to each in its own right, both financially and in terms of the level and quality of services provided. The Boards of the independent AUTHORITIES will make this determination.
7. Any potential operational or governance agreement among the AUTHORITIES shall strive to be beneficial, or be at least neutral, to each AUTHORITY, both financially and in terms of the level and quality of services provided.
8. Implementation of any operational or governance agreement shall be structured and phased in a manner that minimizes disruption of ongoing operations of each AUTHORITY.

Tri-Board Workshop RWA – SCGA - SGA

Meeting Summary

Held: June 7, 2021
Prepared by: Consensus Building Institute

Workshop in Brief

The primary purpose of this joint board workshop of the Regional Water Authority, Sacramento County Groundwater Authority, and the Sacrament Groundwater Authority's (Authorities) was to continue discussions on a potential consolidation of SCGA and SGA. Senior Facilitator and Mediator Gina Bartlett from the Consensus Building Institute has been conducting an issue assessment, and this workshop served as an opportunity for all board members to share issues and concerns to inform the assessment process.

The immediate next steps are for each board to hold its own workshop this summer to prepare SCGA and SGA to decide whether to direct staff to proceed to develop a governance proposal for consolidation that the boards would consider in January 2022 and form an ad hoc committee to participate in discussions.

Next Steps and Considerations

- Consider having RWA participate actively in the ad hoc beginning in Phase 2, governance.
- Provide a memo on the CALPERS issue for staffing.
- Develop a public engagement plan to support this effort.
- Determine if an extension from DWR would be possible.
- CBI will revisit the assessment report to determine what additions should be incorporated.

Background and Introduction

Jim Peifer, SGA and RWA Executive Director
John Woodling, Interim SCGA Executive Director

The executive directors kicked off the workshop, reminding everyone that the foundation of the authorities is the Water Forum Agreement's groundwater element. The common purpose across authorities is to manage water supply for all users in the basin and to solve water issues in a cost effective manner.

During its strategic planning process, SCGA identified the need for different staffing. Examining these options, the possibilities of consolidating SCGA and SGA and relying on RWA as staff emerged. In 2020, the Authorities entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to explore the possible consolidation of SCGA and SGA. A "3x3" ad hoc committee, made up of three representatives from each authority participated. The

intent was to explore jointly and evaluate independently the potential consolidation. The 3x3 presented several different scenarios for consideration. Efficiencies for shared staff, equipment, accountants, etc. as a result of a potential consolidation were identified as part of the 3x3. The board workshop was planned to continue the investigation.

An impartial facilitator, Gina Bartlett from the Consensus Building Institute, is now available to work with the authorities' boards and staff to explore governance, staffing, and funding associated with the potential consolidation. The California Department of Water Resources is funding CBI's work for up to one year to work as part of its facilitation services support program. Funding will last through June 2022.

The directors clarified that if the consolidation does not work, SCGA would pursue other options for staffing.

Assessment Findings

Presentation

The assessment was meant to summarize the range of issues, concerns, and ideas of the interested parties as well as process recommendations for moving forward. At the time of the workshop, Ms. Bartlett had interviewed 20 people during 17 interviews. The intent of the workshop was to benefit from discussion among all the board members, which would supplement the initial interviews.

CBI's assessment brief (dated 6/2/21) is available. Ms. Bartlett discussed the key findings articulated by interviewees and invited others to weigh in with other issues and concerns.

Interview Findings Synopsis

Benefits of Consolidation

- Superior groundwater coordination and management.
- Operational efficiencies and cost savings.
- Unified mission and voice on water at state level.

Downsides of Consolidation

- Anticipated curbs on water banking and transfers.

Issues and Concerns with Consolidating

- Board / organizational culture.
- Establishing effective governance structure, including board composition.
- Staffing and funding.

Governance Options

Discuss Additional Benefits, Downsides, Issues to be Addressed

A substantial portion of the meeting was spent discussing board members issues and concerns, captured here to inform future discussions.

- Water banking is a concern for some; however, the director's organization supports a strong water bank and basin sustainability.

- The regional water bank must get rolling. RWA should manage both basins.

Staff clarified in response to a comment that keeping SCGA and SGA separate and having RWA serve both did not create efficiencies. The SCGA Chair clarified that RWA would not be able to serve both entities due to complications with CALPERS. SCGA would pursue outside staffing if the consolidation does not occur.

Additional directors' comments:

- SCGA and SGA were created for different reasons hence different cultures. These entities are important independently.

- Merging the authorities or bringing them together more closely will create a smoother water future for the region.

- While separate organizations have value, keeping the authorities together is a significant administrative burden that is cumbersome. Bringing SCGA and SGA together creates huge value. The challenge is figuring out how to bring in diverse voices.

- Additional support expressed for consolidation. Balancing the diversity of voices with a smaller board that is less cumbersome than a large board is key.

- Support for consolidation expressed as long as water levels are maintained, and the entity creates a well protection plan. Ag Res represents a diverse group of people with differing viewpoints, but all emphatically commit to sustainability.

- SCGA has a rate study underway that will generate $1.1 mil / year for SCGA operations. The Water Forum white paper estimated costs would be under $1 mil/year for staffing SCGA.

- Not being interviewed for this process accentuates the fear of being excluded even as a large pumper.

- Many who contribute significant funding for management and administration want to be sure to protect those interests.

- Governance and finance are the key concerns as well as identifying the benefits to communities.

The facilitator clarified that most interviewees were open to consolidation. She further clarified that feedback on board size (large, small, or small with advisory committee) were mixed and detailed discussion is needed. Interviewees recognize the value of diverse constituent engaged in these issues.

Public Comment

Suzanne Pecci, Former Ag Res Member of the Board: Ms. Pecci appreciates comments of Directors Oneto, Trask, and Thompson. Ag Res is not as well organized so concern expressed that those stakeholders could be "lost in the shuffle." Ag Res is a large water user and benefits from having a voice on the board. Ms. Pecci is concerned that they may not be listened to on an advisory committee.

CBI Process Recommendations and Immediate Next Steps

The Consensus Building Institute presented process recommendations for moving forward. This outlined a series of discussion topics that would occur in phases, with the boards making decisions at key milestones to proceed to the next phase.

Anticipated Discussion Topics and Phases for Decision-Making

The recommended approach anticipates board decisions to proceed to subsequent phases.

Phase 1

Assessment: issues and questions

Vision for ideal organization

Decision-making timeline

Phase 2 (SCGA, SGA)

Governance structures and options

- Representation
- Voting
- Public Involvement

Criteria for evaluating options

Phase 3 (RWA, SCGA, SGA)

Staffing, funding, cost structure

Package governance, staffing, funding

Phase 4

Legal structure and documentation

Approval process

Board Discussion on Process Recommendations

Board directors offered the following comments:

- The timeframe and structure makes sense although the drought is going to take a lot of attention of stakeholders and may hinder stakeholder involvement.
- The effort should proceed expeditiously even with the drought underway.
- It might be helpful to address funding and staffing sooner – those topics seem late in the timeline.
- The process should clarify what happens if the chairs and vice-chairs change since they will be serving the ad hoc committee. The RWA Chair responded that representation on the ad hoc would be up to the board. (*Note: Staff clarified after the meeting that the RWA Chair designates ad hoc committee members.)*
- Support expressed for board workshops. The Director requested a memo about staffing and PERS and is unsure if employee benefits should be a driver.
- The region rises and falls together; the region and the agencies must move forward cooperatively. Everyone should commit to generating answers.
- RWA should not be ex officio / non-voting member of the ad hoc during Phase 2, governance. RWA should be an active voting member during this phase as well.
- Three members expressed support for RWA being an ex officio member during Phase 2, governance. One highlighted that SCGA and SGA, as independent agencies, should negotiate their own governance. An SGA director joined the former RWA director to express support for RWA being a decision-making member of the Ad Hoc Committee.
- The SCGA is doing a good job right now and conducting positive meetings on the Groundwater Sustainability Plans. Thinking about a potential consolidation makes sense at this time. Having RWA be in the "driver seat" for both agencies makes sense. RWA's efforts analyzing the data and working on the model are critical; having one entity doing that is critical.

Recommendations to Incorporate into the Process Documents

- Clarify how ad hoc committee member designations will change if/when chairs and vice chairs shift.

Staff Clarifications

Both SCGA and SGA would ultimately need to make recommendations to members of the JPA to make the final decision on governance.

Public Comment

Suzanne Pecci: Staff should consider the need for public involvement. Members of the public are busy reviewing the Groundwater Sustainability Plan, and the public needs to be engaged and contributing to this as well.

Dominic Gutierrez, DWR, would be able to consider the possibility of an extension to CBI's task order to provide facilitation services. He was uncertain if the timeline could extend beyond June 2022.

Return to Board Comments and Discussion

Additional board member comments:

- SCGA would like to focus on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The SCGA board needs to discuss this internally.

- On timing, the boards have been talking about this for a few years. Giving the boards a schedule with milestones is a good thing to do. Support expressed for the path forward.

Staff Clarifications

In September, the SCGA and SGA boards will decide if they want to pursue this and then direct staff and the ad hoc committee to figure out how to structure governance. If either board decides that it is not the time or there is a fatal flaw, then the SCGA will move to other options.

See the Next Steps at the beginning of the document.

Decision-Making Roadmap: SCWA, SGA, and RWA Shared Operations

V 6/16/21

Anticipated Discussion Topics and Phases for Decision-Making

The recommended approach anticipates board decisions to proceed to subsequent phases.

Phase 1

Assessment: issues and questions

Vision for ideal organization

Decision-making timeline

Phase 2 (SCGA, SGA)

Governance structures and options

- Representation
- Voting
- Public Involvement

Criteria for evaluating options

Phase 3 (RWA, SCGA, SGA)

Staffing, funding, cost structure

Package governance, staffing, funding

Phase 4

Legal structure and documentation

Approval process

Process Overview

SCGA SGA Consolidation Frequently Asked Questions

What are the benefits of the consolidation?

A consolidation has the potential to reduce costs, increase organizational efficiencies and/or provide more services to the RWA, SCGA and SGA members. It will result in better coordination. It has the promise of creating and retaining institutional knowledge, which is extremely valuable to our region. It could be helpful in succession planning, as some staff that have been with the organization since near its beginning near retirement over the next several years.

Will my agency's dues or fees go up?

It appears that the member agencies fees will not increase as part of the consolidation, but we cannot be sure of that until we understand the governance and staffing arrangements. The analysis performed so far indicates that fees will not increase for RWA or SGA members. SCGA has recognized that it is responsible for fully funding the staffing and administrative expenses that would result from being brought into RWA.

Will I have less access to RWA staff? We are concerned that staff attention will be diverted from work that is important to us.

A consolidation has the potential to increase access to RWA staff. With a merged SCA-SCGA, new technical staff would be brought in to manage normal groundwater management activities. This would potentially free up time for the Manager of Technical Services to work on higher value activities at RWA without sacrificing the workload that the groundwater authorities need to perform under SGMA. Additionally, the new technical staff could be available to RWA on a subscription-basis to assist in activities such as future water transfers under the Sacramento Regional Water Bank or other priority activities that tend to ebb and flow within RWA. This has proven a successful model for RWA in the past.

Does the RWA have capacity to perform the work needed?

No. Staff would not be able to take on an additional organization's work without additional staff and resources. Additional resources include services such as legal services, auditing services, etc. The addition of the SCGA will require more staff administrative capacity as well as technical capacity.

Can't RWA just staff SCGA and SGA as separate organizations?

This would be problematic, and may result in reducing benefits to some staff, and cause problems with retention and recruitment. In order for the RWA to staff an independent SCGA, the SCGA would have to apply to become a CalPERS member. According to Counsel, the SCGA would likely be accepted into CalPERS, but would become a "PEPRA" agency. Current "Classic" employees may receive a diminished pension benefits under this arrangement. It is not clear if this would be allowed.

How will pension obligations and OPEB be affected?

In general, more staff will increase pension obligations. However, the RWA revised its benefits policy in 2019 to reduce the post-employment benefits costs of labor, including significantly increasing the vesting time to receive post-employment health benefits. Additionally, any new employees hired to support the current area covered by SCGA would be fully funded by the groundwater users in the SCGA area. Finally, since SCGA is not currently a CalPERS agency, RWA would not inherit any current pension or OPEB obligations of the organization.

Will Delta issues cause problems for existing SGA members?

We do not believe this will be a problem. SCGA has been in existence since 2006. During that time, there have been no documented significant issues with the Delta for the organization. Under SGMA, the South American Subbasin (SASb) is largely represented by the Northern Delta GSAs, with which SCGA has a cooperative relationship. Therefore, it does not appear that Delta issues will affect the liability of a consolidated SGA SCGA.

Will my vote be diluted?

The details of a consolidated SGA governance are not clear and will not be until the authorities agree to proceed to phase 2. It is possible that a consolidated SGA will have more members, but that does not necessarily result in diluted representation.

How will my interest be represented on the Board?

The SGA currently has water purveyor members (public agencies, investor owned and mutual water companies), an agricultural representative, and a self-supplied representative. The SGA does not have seats for conservation landowners, Regional San, or Ag Res representatives. Representation of these interests will need to be considered when developing a revision to the SGA JPA. Ultimately, representation would need to be decided upon by the signatories to the JPA.

How will the consolidated SGA and SCGA interact with other subbasins?

Both SGA and SCGA have established relationships with the other GSAs in their respective subbasins. Additionally, DWR expects management under SGMA at the subbasin level, so it would be important to maintain a degree of separation between the North and South American subbasins. During the consolidation evaluation process, we will seek legal guidance on how to preserve the existing relationships and contracting in place in the respective subbasins.

How will this affect groundwater transfers and the banking program?

RWA has long had a desire to operate the Sacramento Regional Water Bank in a seamless fashion in both the North American and South American subbasins. A consolidated SGA SCGA will result in better coordination between the three organizations, and a greater likelihood that the bank could be operated at the combined subbasin level.

What is the process for making decisions?

- Each board will make decisions to proceed at milestones and ultimately have to approve the final set of agreements on governance, staffing, funding, and the legal entity.
- For example, the first decision will be to proceed to phase 2 to develop a governance structure. The second decision will be to proceed to phase 3 to develop funding and staffing plan.

How will the public be involved in the consolidation evaluation process?

- The public can attend board meetings to learn about board member perspectives.
- If the boards decide to proceed to phase 2, staff and the facilitator will develop a public engagement plan.

San Juan Water District: Issues/Questions Related to Discussion of Potential SGA/SCGA Consolidation
DRAFT

Some issues that should be more clearly understood/resolved prior to SGA pursuing consolidation discussions with SCGA:

- How is SGMA governance of NASb going to be resolved with 4 other entities and integrated with SGA governance? Need to understand this before attaching to SCGA. Our understanding is that SGA will serve as the administrator and facilitator of the NASb 5-GSA collective, and will have the responsibility for organizing and managing monitoring and reporting activities. This workload has yet to be defined (or at least articulated to the SGA Board), and it will affect the staffing bandwidth that would be available to address SCGA issues.

- How would NASb SGMA governance be impacted by an SGA/SCGA merger which would then presumably incorporate SASb SGMA governance obligations? It does not seem prudent to mesh the NASb governance and management with the SASb without taking the time to get the NASb situation settled and functioning effectively.

- How would SGA be insulated from stakeholder issues, controversies, undesirable results in the SASb, existing or arising in SCGA area, or would a "merger" mean assuming those risks and obligation to address them? If SGA maintains its separate Board of Directors and independent decision making authority, this would presumably only be an issue for workload and priorities for the joint staff, but if there is one Board for a merged SGA and SCGA, this could impact the ability of the Board to effectively address SGA-specific issues.

- What is current situation, level of Board consensus, with regard to governance of SCGA, its mission and priorities related to Board relationships and its operations, including among SASb stakeholders; independent of issue of potential "merger" with SGA?

- What would a governance structure be of a new organization that would at least maintain SGA authorities and autonomy, and vice-versa with respect to SCGA maintaining control over its basin(s), i.e. one that didn't merge Boards?

- What are implications of consolidation on existing SGA and SCGA contracts with other entities (grants, GSAs, etc.)? Also, how would future agreements under SGMA that would be only applicable to a specific sub-basin be dealt with in a merged organization?

- What are implications for Sac Water Bank, particularly north of the river, as it also must be integrated into NASb/GSA management?

- Existing Water Accounting Framework is limited to SGA area, but does it need to be updated in light of NASb GSP/SGMA, and how would that be potentially impacted by consolidation?

- What is actual "connectivity" of North and South Sub-basins considering separated by the river? Is there any hydraulic connection between the two basins, or interaction between them, given that both have cones of depression and declines in elevation as one moves away from the American River and into the sub-basins?

- What is the "health" (current status of "sustainability") of the South Basin and does that have implications for "merging" organizations?

- What are short and long-term implications of connectivity of South Basin to Cosumnes River and the Delta more broadly?

- SGA/RWA has invested heavily in Water Bank and advocacy of same, what level of investment has been made by SCGA in facilities/advocacy to improve its management over the same period? What is the implication going forward in terms of level of effort and potential conflict of interest or competition for state/federal financial resources?

- How will SGA (and RWA) be insulated from the merger being a drain on current capabilities of staffing, technical support, and financial resources at the outset and into the future?

- What is the staffing burden associated with managing and accounting for the recently adopted SCGA parcel fee? Will SGA be required to adopt a similar funding structure for the NASb if the organizations were merged?

- What assurances can be made that SGA (and RWA) dues will not need to be raised to address unknown or unintended downstream impacts of merger?

- What are options for staffing relationships if SGA were to "house" SCGA staff and potentially share some admin staff with SCGA rather than "merge" at the governance level? [SGA Board requested formal legal memo regarding this issue, specifically potential PERS constraints that had been raised.]

- Other than supposed financial savings (which need to be more explicitly defined rather than assumed a priori), what is the benefit to SGA in taking on oversight (particularly as a merged Board) of the SCGA territory that could not be achieved without such a consolidation, e.g. through cooperative agreements, MOUs, etc.?

San Juan Water District Initial Perspective and Questions related to Understanding SCGA/SGA/RWA PERS "Issues"

Staff has presented limited information regarding PERS issues and constraints on other staffing options of a potential merger/consolidation/housing of SCGA with SGA. However, more detail justifying their conclusions and presentation of alternative path options to their determination of what has essentially been presented as the only available option have not been provided to the SGA Board. During a prior Board discussion there was a request for a legal memo to fill this informational void, but that request was not formalized by an SGA Board action and as such the Executive Director felt he didn't have actual direction and had no authority to expend funds to seek such a memo from counsel. While that was a reasonable rationale for not pursuing such additional information through the requested legal memo, the void remains.

> *Response: We understand that legal advice has been provided covering the scope of the questions asked at the Board meeting. SCGA cannot independently become a CalPERS contracting agency in a way that would provide equal benefits to what RWA/SGA staff are currently receiving. At the time of the CalPERS issue for SGA, both Boards were adamant that diminishing employee benefits was not a workable solution.*

The staff provided FAQ includes only the one Q&A (below), just scratching the surface of one part of the universe before the SGA Board on these PERS related issues, along with an assurance that because SCGA is not a PERS agency a merger/consolidation/ housing would not result in an assumption of any OPEB obligation from SCGA.

Can't RWA just staff SCGA and SGA as separate organizations?

"This would be problematic, and may result in reducing benefits to some staff, and cause problems with retention and recruitment. In order for the RWA to staff an independent SCGA, the SCGA would have to apply to become a CalPERS member. According to Counsel, the SCGA would likely be accepted into CalPERS, but would become a "PEPRA" agency. Current "Classic" employees may receive a diminished pension benefits under this arrangement. It is not clear if this would be allowed."

This is not a clear explanation of the topic of what implications there would be for retirement benefits for RWA/SGA employees who would be assigned to work on SCGA tasks, if SCGA either remains an independent organization or is merged into SGA. It also assumes the outcome without providing any discussion or identifications of options so the costs and benefits and impacts can actually be weighed by the SGA and RWA Boards.

San Juan offers the following questions for consideration related to the PERS issue which we believe merit discussion and detailed responses as well. These were not included in the other set of questions San Juan developed because the assumption was

that a legal memo setting forth PERS issues and options would be provided based upon the prior conversation during the joint Board meeting.

How many employees does SCGA have? What retirement benefits does SCGA offer to its employees?

Response: SCGA currently has no employees. SCGA contracts for services from Sacramento County and from private consulting firms.

Does SCGA contract with other agencies for staff time to perform SCGA duties? What retirement benefits do those personnel have? If those personnel were to become SCGA employees, what retirement benefits would be offered to them?

Response: SCGA contracts for services from the County of Sacramento who receive benefits from the County retirement system. There is no plan for those personnel to become SCGA employees.

Can SCGA contract with RWA or SGA to provide staff time to perform SCGA duties? If personnel currently employed by another employer but serving under contract to SCGA were to be offered employment by RWA or SGA (should SCGA decide to contract instead with RWA or SGA for its staffing needs), what retirement benefits could/would be offered to them?

Response: SCGA could enter into an agreement with RWA for services. However, to the extent that employees worked under the direction of another independent agency, their time would not count as CalPERS service. This is similar to the problem SGA had with respect to past service of employees and led to SGA becoming a CalPERS employer.

Do RWA and SGA each directly employ the staff who work for either or both organizations? For any staff who are employed part-time by RWA and part-time by SGA, what retirement benefits are offered to them by each organization?

Response: RWA and SGA share some staff and employ some separately. In any case, each employee's time under RWA and/or SGA is CalPERS covered service.

Could RWA/SGA staff provide support to an "independent" SCGA via an interagency agreement whereby SCGA keeps its current Board and JPA agreement?

Response: In theory, RWA could provide this service, however, the employees time would not count as CalPERS service.

Could RWA contract with current SCGA staff (are any Sac County employees?) to continue to do work for SCGA, via an interagency agreement whereby SCGA

maintains an independent Board, but uses RWA staff, including the contracted former SCGA staff?

Response: Any mechanism whereby an independent SCGA "uses RWA staff" would result in the employees not earning CalPERS service for their time. RWA contracting with current County employees to do SCGA work would provide no real benefit beyond the current SCGA structure.

Other?

CARMICHAEL WATER DISTRICT

7837 FAIR OAKS BOULEVARD
CARMICHAEL, CALIFORNIA 95608
TELEPHONE: (916) 483-2452
FAX: (916) 483-5509

Ronald Davis
Director Division 1

Mark R. Emmerson
Director Division 2

Jeff Nelson
Director Division 3

Ron Greenwood
Director Division 4

Paul Selsky
Director Division 5

Cathy Lee
General Manager

VIA EMAIL DELIVERY

August 20, 2021

Mr. Jim Peifer
Executive Director
Sacramento Groundwater Authority
5620 Birdcage Street, #180
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Subject: Concerns Regarding the Process for Evaluating a Potential SCGA Consolidation with SGA

Dear Mr. Peifer,

Carmichael Water District (CWD) has several concerns regarding the evaluation of the potential consolidation of the Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) with the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA). We would like to see a more thorough description of the pros and cons of the consolidation and a change in the makeup of the Phase 2 *ad hoc* committee, as described in this letter. We feel a positive step towards gaining our support would be for SGA staff to address these concerns and provide for an open discussion with all SGA Board Members regarding these concerns and suggestions.

1. **Thorough Pros and Cons Evaluation** - The information provided in Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) prepared by SGA staff does not provide enough information to adequately inform the CWD that the proposed undertaking is beneficial to the SGA and all of its members. For example, the FAQs describe the potential benefits as reduced costs, increased organizational efficiencies, and providing more services to the SGA, SCGA, and Regional Water Authority (RWA). These statements are very general and do not provide any specifics. The CWD respectfully requests SGA staff prepare a detailed "pros and cons" analysis related to the merging of the SGA and the SCGA. While we recognize it is probably not practical for SGA staff to complete this analysis before the next scheduled SGA Special

Board meeting on September 8th, in the interest of moving this process forward, we would like to have a first draft of this analysis be provided to SGA members by the end of September and agendized for SGA's Regular October 2021 Board meeting.

2. **Make up of Phase 2 Governance *ad hoc* Committee** – We understand the currently configured Phase 2 *ad hoc* committee is to be comprised of SGA board members that are also SCGA board members, and does not include any SGA exclusive board members. Since SCGA staff have publicly announced it is in favor of consolidating with SGA, that means the *ad hoc* committee members have already made the decision to be in favor of consolidation in their dual role as SCGA members. The governance structure will be a critical deciding factor in SGA members' consideration of the benefits of a consolidation with SCGA. Therefore, to ensure an objective approach, CWD respectfully requests that the Phase 2 *ad hoc* committee include no more than one SGA board member that represents an agency that is also a member of the SCGA. Furthermore, CWD requests that the Phase 2 *ad hoc* committee include elected officials or obtains significant input and engagement by elected officials.

We look forward to our concerns listed above being appropriately recognized and addressed. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and suggestions. Please do not hesitate to contact us or our General Manager, Ms. Cathy Lee if you have any questions or would like additional information regarding the suggestions presented in this letter.

Sincerely,

Paul Selsky, Board Member
Representative to SGA

Jeff Nelson, Board Member
Alternate Representative to SGA

cc: Mr. John Woodling, SCGA Executive Director
Mr. Audie Foster, California American Water
Board of Directors, Citrus Heights Water District
Board of Directors, Fair Oaks Water District
Board of Directors, Del Paso Manor Water District
Mr. Marcus Yasutake, City of Folsom
Ms. Kerri Howell, City of Folsom
Mr. Paul Schubert, Golden State Water Company
Mr. Matt Lauppe, Natomas Central Mutual Water Company

Mr. Brett Gray, Natomas Central Mutual Water Company
Mr. John Wingerter, Orange Vale Water Company
Mr. Joe Duran, Orange Vale Water Company
Board of Directors, Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District
Mr. Tim Shaw, Rio Linda Elverta Community Water District
Mr. Bill Busath, City of Sacramento
Mr. Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento
Board of Directors, Sacramento Suburban Water District
Board of Directors, San Juan Water District
Mr. Michael Peterson, County of Sacramento
Ms. Kerry Schmitz, County of Sacramento
Mr. Mike DeWit
Mr. Larry Johnson

Work Plan: SCGA, SGA, and RWA Shared Operations

V 8/3/21

Timeline	Goals & Major Activities	
Summer 2021	Phase 1 GOAL: Assess Issues and Questions	
	▪ Consensus Building Institute (CBI) conducts interviews with board members and facilitates Tri-Board discussion session on key issues and future needs ▪ Boards hold workshops to identify additional issues and questions; Board members brief constituents as needed; Board members prepare for decision	
	6/7	Tri-Board discussion on key issues and process recommendations
	7/8	RWA Board Update
	8/11 9am	SCGA Board Workshop
	8/12 9am	SGA Board Workshop
	8/31 9am	RWA Board Workshop
Sept - Oct	SCGA and SGA Decide to Proceed to Phase 2, Develop Governance Options	
	▪ The SCGA and SGA Boards would consider directing staff to proceed to Phase 2, to develop a governance proposal for consolidation that the Board would consider in January 2022 ▪ SCGA, SGA, and RWA chair's would designate **ad hoc committee** members (chair, vice-chair, and executive director for each agency) to participate in discussions	
	8/11 9am	SCGA Board Meeting (Future Meeting Dates: 9/8 at 9am; 10/13)
	9/8 10 am	SGA Board Meeting (9/8 at 10am) (Future meeting: 10/14)
	9/9	RWA Board Intent (action: TBD)
Sept - January	Phase 2 GOAL: Develop Proposed Governance Structure	
	▪ Joint Meeting: Vision and Mission of the New Entity ▪ Staff and Ad Hoc explore governance options ▪ Nov-Dec: Vet options with Boards ▪ Dec: Staff and Ad Hoc develop and refine preferred option ▪ Staff and Ad Hoc create recommended governance structure proposal and process roadmap for developing staffing and funding plan	
February	Decide on Preliminary Governance Structure Proposal. SCGA and SGA Decide to Proceed to Phase 3, Develop Funding and Staffing Plan	
	▪ The SCGA and SGA Boards would consider approving the governance structure and directing staff to develop the funding and staffing plan. ▪ The RWA Board would direct staff to develop the funding and staffing plan.	

Feb-April	Phase 3 GOAL: Develop Funding and Staffing Plan
	▪ Staff and Ad Hoc explore and develop funding and staffing plan ▪ April: Vet staffing, funding with Boards
May-June	Approve Governance, Staffing, Funding, Decide to Proceed to Phase 4, Legal Entity / Documentation
	▪ The SCGA, SGA, and RWA Boards would consider approving the staffing, funding, and governance plan and direct staff to proceed to Phase 4 to prepare legal documents and schedule approval process for the necessary entities.
Summer	Phase 4 Goal: Develop and Approve Legal Documents

2019 Preparatory Work

Timeline	Major Activities
2019	SCGA prepares a strategic plan that includes provisions to: ▪ "Consider status quo, merger with SGA, or other measures to most effectively and efficiently govern" ▪ "Create new governance to foster independence, transparency, accountability, and cost efficiency as it relates to the long term management of the basin."
August 2019	Established "2x2" meetings (Chair and Vice Chair of the authorities) to begin discussing the potential to have the RWA provide staffing to the SCGA
December 2019	RWA presents to the SCGA Board on RWA staffing for SGA
March 2020	Water Forum White Paper presented to the SCGA
July 2020	MOU approved and convene "3x3" Committee
Aug 2020 to Dec 2020	3x3 members discuss proposed staffing for SCGA
Dec 2020 to Jan 2021	Presentations on Staffing to RWA, SGA and SCGA

From: Isabel Safie <isabel.safie@bbklaw.com>
Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 5:59 PM
To: Woodling, John <jwoodling@geiconsultants.com>
Cc: Jennifer Oberg <Jennifer.Oberg@bbklaw.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: follow up on Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority

---

John,

My apologies for my extreme oversight of the email below. The end of the year rush began shortly before the Thanksgiving holiday and resulted in the inundation of my email inbox. Workload is under control this week due to most of my client's going dark this week and I finally have a chance to review outstanding emails. To my dismay, I saw that I inadvertently overlooked your email.

I noted that your board meeting has already taken place and, therefore, my reply is almost certainly late. To the extent that it is still timely or useful to you, enclosed please find the following:

1. Draft legal services agreement
2. CalPERS application (Public Agency Applicant Questionnaire)
3. CalPERS Financial Questionnaire (This is a custom questionnaire based on the profile of the applicant. The attached is a sample from a pending application to give you an idea of the questions that CalPERS focuses on but the financial questionnaire for SCGA may look very different).

In terms of the process to apply for CalPERS membership, the following is a general outline:

1. Prepare CalPERS application and supplements (2-4 weeks) and submit after approval from SCGA
2. CalPERS Review of Eligibility (2-3 months)
3. While 2 is pending, receive and complete financial questionnaire (varies, but generally 1-2 months and runs concurrently with 2)
4. *If* SCGA is deemed eligible, CalPERS will prepare an actuarial valuation to provide SCGA with its expected contribution rate (90 days after 2 is completed).
    - *If SCGA is entering into a new contract (as opposed to taking on portions of an existing contract as was the case with SGA), SCGA will be limited to the PEPRA 2% at 62 retirement formula even for employees that have classic status. Some agencies have worked around this through specific legislation (see Gov. Code §7522.02(f), (g) and 7522.05) but in all those cases the exemption only applied to those employees hired by the JPA from one of its member agencies that is a CalPERS agency within 180 days after the JPA was established.*
5. Assuming SCGA wants to move forward, CalPERS will prepare the contracting documents and request census data from SCGA (about 30 days after SCGA indicates it wants to move forward).
6. SCGA must adopt a "Resolution of Intent" and disclose costs of contracting with CalPERS in a public meeting.
7. SCGA must wait at least 2 weeks after #6, the CalPERS contract is approved by the SCGA Board.
8. Contract becomes effective the 1st day of the pay period following SCGA Board approval. SCGA will have the option to include "prior service credit" to capture the period between the contract application date and the effective date.

Please note that if SCGA wishes to move forward with retaining BB&K, we will likely need a waiver from RWA or SGA *if* your path forward will require: (a) changes/revisions to existing agreements of RWA or SGA or, (b) a new agreement with RWA or SGA.

With respect to the following question:

"In addition, I'd like your thoughts relative to the possibility of SGA revising its joint powers agreement to include the signatories and jurisdictional are of SCGA. Would there be CalPERS hoops to jump through for SGA if we that route."

Are you suggesting a merger or consolidation such that SGA absorbs SCGA? So long as the new member agencies of SGA are all public agencies, CalPERS will not have an issue with this. This approach would allow employees of SCGA transferring to SGA and retaining classic status to obtain a classic formula (what SGA has in place).

Again, my apologies for the delay.

Wishing you a safe and prosperous New Year.

Isabel Safie
Partner
isabel.safie@bbklaw.com
T: (951) 826-8309 C: (909) 641-1330
www.BBKlaw.com

Shelter-in-place and public health orders issued in multiple counties in California require our offices to be physically closed, effective March 17, 2020. Because all staff are working remotely, all documents (including correspondence, pleadings, and discovery) will be served via e-mail until at least March 31, 2020. Because we may not receive regular mail or other deliveries during this period of time, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery. Send all e-served documents in your case to the e-mail addresses for any Best Best & Krieger LLP attorney who has appeared in your case, or who has communicated with you by e-mail on your matter.

From: Woodling, John [mailto:jwoodling@geiconsultants.com]
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2020 8:50 AM
To: Isabel Safie
Subject: follow up on Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority

---

Isabel,

I wanted to follow up on our discussion a few weeks back. I am still planning to go to the SCGA Board on December 9 to get approval to contract BBK to support our CalPERS application efforts. You indicated that you had a brief process outline that would help inform the discussion. Please send that when you get a chance.

In addition, I'd like your thoughts relative to the possibility of SGA revising its joint powers agreement to include the signatories and jurisdictional are of SCGA. Would there be CalPERS hoops to jump through for SGA if we that route.

Thanks.

GEI50

JOHN K. WOODLING, PG, CEG, CHG
VP - Branch Manager - Principal Geologist
916.631.4563 cell: 916.812.9118
2868 Prospect Park Drive, Suite 400, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

AGENDA ITEM 5B: SACRAMENTO CENTRAL GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY STAFFING

BACKGROUND:

Attached is additional correspondence from the San Juan Water District regarding agenda item 5.

P.O. Box 2157 | 9935 Auburn Folsom Road | Granite Bay, CA 95746 | 916-791-0115 | sjwd.org

SAN JUAN WATER
SINCE 1854

Directors
Edward J. "Ted" Costa
Marty Hanneman
Kenneth H. Miller
Dan Rich
Pamela Tobin

General Manager
Paul Helliker

August 23, 2021

Mr. Bret Ewart
Chairman
Sacramento Groundwater Authority

Mr. Sean Bigley
Chairman
Regional Water Authority

Mr. Jim Peifer
Executive Director
Sacramento Groundwater Authority/
Regional Water Authority
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Via E-mail

Subject: Potential Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA) integration with Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA)

Dear Chairmen Ewart and Bigley, and Mr. Peifer:

We appreciate that the Board packet for the August 12 SGA Board meeting included the questions and preliminary concerns the San Juan Water District (SJWD) provided with respect to the discussion of a potential merger between SGA and SCGA. We also appreciate the rapid response to additional questions we posed about the issue of retirement benefits that were posted to the web page just prior to the meeting.

As we noted at the August 12 meeting, we do not believe the process to date has provided sufficient information beyond generalities, without substantiation, to support repeated assertions of broad benefits that would supposedly accrue to SGA/RWA. Consequently, we are not ready to agree to move on to Phase 2.

At the August 12 SGA meeting a number of other agencies stated they have similar information needs, questions and concerns that they would like to have addressed prior to being pushed into a vote to move forward, or not. We are aware of the "Work Plan" that is intended to eventually address many of the issues raised in detail, but we (and others apparently) are seeking a ***threshold*** level of detail and information ***before*** we can feel comfortable that it would be worthwhile to move forward with additional analyses. At this point, possible benefits are speculative, while potential negative impacts related to program, governance, complexity, and staffing are clear.

SGA is still in the process of completing its Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP), in conjunction with four neighboring Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs). This project is currently the highest priority of SGA, and beyond the plan itself, many issues of staffing, ongoing monitoring and reporting activities, as well as overall governance of the North American Subbasin (NASb) have yet to be addressed – none of which relate to SCGA and its own GSP (under development with its own set of five GSAs).

We believe it is critical to complete SGA's GSP and associated governance and work activity agreements before conducting further detailed analysis of a potential merger with SCGA. Simply put, as Director Costa stated on August 12, we need to get our own house in order with regard to SGMA implementation before we look at the question of whether it might make sense to expand SGA's scope to assume the responsibility for another basin's SGMA processes, obligations, and challenges. We realize SCGA wants to reap the benefits it has determined favor a merger as soon as possible, but that should not and cannot be allowed to drive and short circuit SGA's deliberations.

Unless and until the SGA Board decides it wishes to move forward with Phase 2, we do not believe an ad hoc committee is appropriate to deliberate on governance or other issues. However, should one become active in the future, there needs to be much more transparency, communication and coordination between the SGA and RWA representatives and their full Boards with regard to the specific identification of issues being discussed, the content of such discussions, and receiving direction from the Boards who are being represented.

Moreover, if an ad hoc committee moves forward at some point, we do not support its currently proposed composition. Though we very much appreciate the efforts of those who are representing dual SCGA and SGA member agencies to remain open minded and receptive to SGA-only members' concerns, the fact remains that both the Chair and the Vice-Chair of SGA are representatives of dual SCGA/SGA agencies. Consequently, four of the six Board representatives of the ad hoc committee as proposed would be SCGA Board members. That should not be the case. We encourage that you instead appoint two non-dual agency SGA representatives to such a committee should it be established.

The SGA Board has repeatedly asked for a workshop on the pros and cons of a potential merger, including the ability to raise and discuss other issues of concern. To date, none has occurred. We do not consider the August 12 meeting to have satisfied this request. There was no real opportunity to discuss issues among the SGA Board members and staff after the survey of each Board member was completed. Also, the questions we had posed in response to your request for submission to you of questions and issues of concern (included in the Board packet) were not discussed, or addressed. Those questions and concerns remain.

At this point, we recommend that the September 8 SGA Board meeting be conducted as a workshop where the questions we and others posed can be discussed, and that a vote to move to Phase 2 be postponed until SGA's GSP governance situation is relatively settled, which could

be as soon as SGA's October meeting when the draft NASb GSP MOU is expected to be available for review. We also recommend that the special August 31 RWA Board meeting be canceled. Unless and until the SGA Board decides to proceed with more detailed analyses of a potential merger, the RWA Board only really needs to receive updates regarding SGA's engagement on the issue.

Finally, to be clear, the San Juan Water District remains open to a potential merger between SGA and SCGA, and undertaking the detailed due diligence analyses necessary to make an informed decision, at some point in the future.

However: (1) until we get our house in order with regard to SGMA governance and implementation in the NASb, we simply do not know what the foundation is that we would be building on – which before moving forward re: SCGA we must know is solid and capable of taking on the additional weight and stress of assuming SCGA's SGMA obligations; and, (2) there are issues and questions we believe need to be addressed with some threshold level of discussion, information and specificity NOW before moving to the proposed next phase as we just do not accept "we'll figure it out later" as a satisfactory basis for deciding to expend additional significant time, money and staff resources on "process" in pursuit of what are only asserted, but speculative, benefits to SGA and RWA.

Thank you,

Ted Costa
SJWD SGA Board member

Dan Rich
SJWD RWA Board member

Greg Zlotnick
SJWD RWA Board member

cc via email: Dan York, Vice-Chair, RWA
Marcus Yasutake, Vice-Chair, SGA

AGENDA ITEM 6: LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY UPDATE

BACKGROUND:

The Legislative session concludes on September 10th. All bills that RWA opposed are no longer moving this year. RWA has the following positions on twelve active bills:

AB 315 (Stone D- Scotts Valley)- Limits liability for stream restoration work – Support
AB 322 (Salas D- Bakersfield)- Invest EPIC funds in biomass- Support
AB 361 (R. Rivas D- Hollister)- Revises access to public meetings- Support
AB 418 (Valladares R- Santa Clarita)- Resilience to PSPS events – Support
AB 652 (Friedman D- Glendale)- PFAS prohibition in children's products- Support
AB 697 (Chau D- Arcadia)- Flexibility in funds for forest health- Support
AB 897 (Mullin D-So. San Francisco)-Regional adaptation planning- Support if amended
AB 1200 (Ting D- San Francisco) Prohibits PFAS in food packaging and cookware- Support
AB 1250 (Calderon D- Whittier) - Timelines for CPUC regulated consolidations- Support
SB 222 (Dodd D- Napa)- Low-income rate assistance - Support
SB 323 (Caballero D- Salinas)- Challenge timelines on water/sewer fees- Support
SB 369 (Pan D- Sacramento)- Yolo Bypass multi-benefit partnership program- Support

By the end of session on September 10th the Legislature is expected to approve specifics on the already appropriated $730 million for drought resilience and $440 million climate resilience. At the time of this writing, those specifics are not yet known.

A couple of highlights from the Legislative session that will have further actions in the coming weeks are on the $985 million to address water arrearages accumulated during the COVID pandemic and $200 million for grants for watershed management projects that provide multiple benefits.

Information and Presentation: Ryan Ojakian, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager

AGENDA ITEM 7: ADOPT RESOLUTON OF SUPPORT FOR ACWA VICE PRESIDENT

BACKGROUND:

Every two years, the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) forms a nominating committee to select and propose a “slate of candidates” for president and vice president. The ACWA members vote for the slate at the ACWA fall conference. The terms for president and vice president are for two years.

Chair Bigley and Vice Chair York will be interviewing candidates that wish to receive a resolution in support of their candidacy. Chair Bigley and Chair York will be making a recommendation to the Board regarding which candidates should receive the RWA’s endorsement.

Discussion: Sean Bigley, Chair

Action: Accept the recommendation from the Chair and Vice Chair for Candidate for ACWA Vice President and Approve the Resolution of Support for the Candidate.

Attachment:
Draft Resolution No. 2021-04

Resolution 2021-04

A Resolution of the Regional Water Authority in Support of _____ for ACWA Vice President

Whereas, the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) has announced that a Nominating Committee has been formed to develop a slate for the Association's statewide positions of President and Vice President; and

Whereas, The RWA Chair and Vice Chair have interviewed candidates for ACWA Vice President who wish to receive a resolution of support from the RWA; and

Whereas, The Chair and Vice Chair have considered the candidate's qualifications and abilities; and

Whereas, the Chair and Vice Chair have recommended in their judgement, the best candidate to serve the interests of ACWA,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Regional Water Authority Board of Directors does hereby support _____ for the office of ACWA Vice President.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a meeting of the Authority held on _____.

By:_____ Chair, Regional Water Authority

Attest: _____
Board Secretary, Regional Water Authority

AGENDA ITEM 8: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

SEPTEMBER 9, 2021

TO: RWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: JIM PEIFER

RE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

a. Grants Update – RWA recently received the first reimbursement check for $678K from the Proposition 1 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Grant on behalf of a SAFCA project near the Cosumnes River.

A check for $906,750 was recently sent to El Dorado Irrigation District for a drought grant for the Easy Street Waterline Replacement Project.

b. RWA Outreach

- **Sacramento Regional Water Bank** – **The Sacramento Bee on August 1 published an RWA-sponsored op-ed by Tom Gray of Fair Oaks Water District and Ralph Propper of ECOS,** urging the public to increase conservation.

- **RWA Manager of Technical Services Rob Swartz organized a panel discussion for DWR's monthly Lunch-MAR series on August 4**, which featured integrated recharge solutions on the Cosumnes River. The panel also featured RWA Associate Member SAFCA on its integrated flood and recharge planning efforts.

- **RWA Water Efficiency Program Manager Amy Talbot shared her expertise August 19 as a panelist discussing "How Low Can We Go: Measuring Droughts Now and in the Future"** at the California Water Data Summit virtual conference

- **RWA on August 27 hosted a virtual Coffee and Conversation event with Congressman Dr. Ami Bera,** which explored current water and infrastructure issues and addressed RWA member questions.

- **The RWA Water Efficiency Program is featured in a new Drought Communications Primer,** published August 31 by the California Water Efficiency Partnership (CalWEP). RWA Water Efficiency Program Manager Amy Talbot will be a featured panelist at a CalWEP webinar in September, discussing past and current drought outreach efforts discussed in the primer.

- **DWR Outreach –** Michelle Banonis, Ryan Ojakian and Jim Peifer met with Kris Tjernell, Carmel Brown and Ashley Gilreath to discuss the recent State budget adoption which included funding for water projects as set forth in Senate Bill 129. As RWA members are aware, the RWA along with the RiverArc partners worked to include $200 million of funding for multi-benefit projects into the State budget. SB 129 includes other funding that may be of interest to the RWA members including drought assistance, and Sustainable Groundwater Management Act funding. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the RWA's intent for the multi-benefit funding and how that funding could achieve the State's and the Region's objectives. Discussions included understanding how DWR may want to release the funding.

- **SACOG Outreach** – RWA staff have been meeting with SACOG staff to discuss how we can support each other's regional priorities. SACOG recently support the Water Bank by requesting funding for the Water Bank within a "Green Means Go" advocacy effort.

c. **Water Forum Negotiations** – For several years, the Public Caucus of the Water Forum was largely dormant. During that time, some of the original members of the Public Caucus would caucus with the Water Caucus. The Public Caucus has updated its membership to include representatives of the planning departments from some of the Cities and Counties, as wells other government agencies (SACOG, SAFCA) and NGOs. The Public Caucus recently released and presented their statement of interest (see attachment).

   The Water Forum is continuing the process of identifying the future water demands for the region and gathering information on available water supply.

d. **Financial Reports –** Account statements are attached through August 31, 2021. Next Quarterly Financial Reports through September 30, 2021 will be available at the November Board meeting.

Attachments

1. **Grants Table**
2. **Public Caucus Interest Statement**
3. **Financial Reports**

Regional Water Authority Status of Grant Awards

September 2021

	Prop 84 2014 Drought Grant	Prop 84 2015 Implementation Grant	USBR 2018 Drought Resiliency Grant (2)	Prop 1 IRWM Grant	Total
Awarding Agency	DWR	DWR	USBR	DWR	
Award/Effective Date	1/17/2014	1/13/2016	9/17/2019	6/26/2020	
Completion Date	9/30/2021	12/31/2021	12/31/2020	6/30/2022	
Grant Award Amount	$9,765,000	$1,757,000	$300,000	$8,749,750	$20,571,750
Reimbursement Requests Currently Being Reviewed	$0	$0	$0	$64,958	$64,958
Reimbursements Received During Previous Quarter	$1,367,040	$0	$0	$678,057	$2,045,097
Reimbursements Paid to Date	$9,466,203	$1,297,154	$0	$678,057	$11,441,414
Grant Award Outstanding	$298,797	$459,846	$300,000	$8,006,735	$9,065,378

(1) Awarded to Sacramento Suburban WD on behalf of the region. RWA developed the application and is managing the grant.
(2) Awarded to San Juan WD and includes Sacramento County WA as subrecipient. RWA developed application and is managing grant.

WATER FORUM 2.0 PUBLIC CAUCUS STATEMENT OF INTERESTS

Negotiating Steering Committee

August 19, 2021

PUBLIC CAUCUS MEMBERSHIP

First Name	Organization
Ansel Lundberg & Alex Harold	SMUD
Bob Erlenbusch	Sacramento Regional Coalition to End Homelessness
Dave Defanti	Placer County
David Harlow	SacACT
Dianna Poggetto	American River Parkway Foundation
Gary Bardini	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
Greg Sandlund	City of Sacramento
Inga Olson	League of Women Voters, Sacramento County
Joseph Smith	Loaves and Fishes
Kacey Lizon	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Kelly Hopkins	Sacramento Valley Conservancy
Kent Anderson	Effie Yeaw Nature Center
Liz Bellas	Sacramento County Parks
Tamika L'ecluse	American River Flood Control District
Todd Smith	Sacramento County

Coequal objectives

The Public Caucus supports the two coequal objectives of the 2000 Water Forum Agreement:

- to provide a reliable and safe water supply for the Sacramento region's long-term growth and economic health; and
- to preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the lower American River.

Note: As part of the WF 2.0 process the PC would like to engage with diverse communities in the region to assess if the co-equal objectives meet community needs and priorities or if they would benefit from being further clarified in the future.

1. Foster long-term, integrative water and land-use planning to promote water supply reliability and quality of life across the region.

Facilitate information-sharing among agencies, so that land-use decisions account for the region's long-term cumulative water supply availability (groundwater and surface water), acknowledge and address community needs, promote equity, and minimize environmental costs. Serve as a venue to share information about ongoing public planning processes.

Assess whether or not individual jurisdictional decisions add up towards promoting a sustainable and equitable future for the region.

Leverage and enhance public programs and other funding sources to maximize the community and economic benefits of water programs and infrastructure investments.

2. Foster water use efficiency and conservation to increase drought resilience.

Promote and advocate for strategies and approaches to maximize water conservation. Encourage water reuse and recycling.

Encourage water conservation and use-efficiency programs that effectively reach and do not negatively impact low-income communities.

Develop drought messaging at a regional level, describing collective impacts, and communicating urgency and interdependencies.

3. Promote integrated and sustainable groundwater and surface water management.

- Promote better understanding of the connection between groundwater and surface water and regional conjunctive use.
- Support and promote creative solutions and actions that lead to sustainable groundwater use.
- Advocate for greater coordination and investment in infrastructure to enhance groundwater recharge.

4. Ensure the Water Forum promotes inclusive and equitable participation and representation from diverse communities in the region that have a stake in the WF's work.

Equity

- Engage with other caucuses to meaningfully and intentionally incorporate equity at the forefront of the Water Forum's work.

Representation

- Ensure that a WF 2.0 Agreement and process represent all communities within the region.
- Vulnerable groups tend to be disproportionately impacted by decisions and yet their voices are often missing in conversations about water. Underrepresented groups include but are not limited to black, indigenous, people of color, low-income, and unsheltered communities.

4. Ensure the Water Forum promotes inclusive and equitable participation and representation from diverse communities in the region that have a stake in the WF's work.

Engagement

- Provide various pathways and opportunities for engagement to share information, raise awareness, and gather input. Acknowledge that providing a space for diverse perspectives fosters stronger community support for a renewed Water Forum Agreement and for the Water Forum's ongoing work.

Relationships

- Build strong relationships with California Native American tribes and other historically underrepresented groups, recognize traditional knowledge, and develop engagement protocols and co-management practices.

Dialogue

- Advance dialogue on issues such as water affordability, river access, water quality, and participation through an equity and environmental justice lens. Integrate available social equity data into technical studies and analyses.

5. Serve as a model and catalyst of community water stewardship in the region. Reach, connect, educate, and empower current and future water stewards.

- Foster a broader understanding of water issues in the region. Educate community members about the Water Forum's work (current and proposed water projects), and educate other Water Forum Caucuses about community concerns, values, and priorities.

- Play an active role as a steward of the lower American River Parkway, maintaining and adaptively managing projects. Be an excellent partner to other organizations with stewardship roles.

- Collaborate with partners to host and support a variety of community events to educate and engage the larger community in the Water Forum's work. Research, support, and add value to projects and programs that engage with schools and local residents to help identify and design solutions.

- Actively and strategically reach out to historically underrepresented communities and school districts that lack access or exposure to the American River Parkway.

6. Promote environmental justice, universal access to clean and affordable water, and public health in the region.

Seek greater understanding of environmental justice issues and solutions related to water in the Sacramento region. Definitions of environmental justice generally encompass both equitable protection from environmental hazards and meaningful participation of people of all races, cultures, incomes, and identities.

Facilitate cross-caucus dialogue to identify and address existing gaps (e.g., lack of clean water, unaffordable water, limited access to the recreational and aesthetics of the river).

Recognize clean water as a key part of public health for the region and educate the community about water quality concerns, past and current river and water contamination sites, and efforts underway to address them.

*Note: The California Government Code (Section 65040.12) defines environmental justice as "The fair treatment and meaningful participation of people of all races, culture and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies."

6. Promote environmental justice, universal access to clean and affordable water, and public health in the region.

Engage in cross-caucus discussion to explore if the Water Forum has a role in advancing projects and policies that contribute towards:

- Helping to ensure all residents have access to safe and affordable water
- Considering equitable ways to set water rates and promote landscaping that foster water conservation and affordability
- Helping secure access to clean water and sanitation for unsheltered populations on the American River Parkway and explore strategies with partners to benefit regional water quality and river health
- Understanding the factors that have led to an increase in populations experiencing homelessness on the Parkway and work with partners to address them, where appropriate
- Promoting public safety for all people, including sheltered and unsheltered communities on the Parkway

7. Promote equitable access, public awareness, and engagement in the restoration and protection of habitat and ecosystem health of the Lower American River Parkway.

- Collaborate with partners to promote equitable access and connection to the Parkway and help identify and address barriers of entry for recreation.
- Promote the community's knowledge, appreciation, and love of the American River and its habitat.
- Provide information and tours of the Lower American River watershed and identify community concerns, aspirations, and desired changes.
- Recognize the ecological, medicinal, religious, and cultural values tied to native habitat, and work with partners to restore native plants and species of long-time significance to local communities, particularly indigenous communities.

8. Bolster climate resilience to ensure that people in our community can continue to live in our region as the pace and scale of climate change intensifies.

Encourage broad foresight and realistic expectations about climate risk and its effects on water supply, flooding, fire, drought, and habitat management, basing this understanding on the best available data and science.

Foster alignment among Water Forum members and advocate for a portfolio of projects to build resilience and bring benefits to the region. Build capacity for the Sacramento region to be a leader in climate resilience and adaptation and demonstrate the value and multiple social, economic, and environmental benefits of these projects.

Act with urgency together as a region to implement climate resiliency projects; educate the community on the scale and magnitude of expected changes; and further solutions/policies to address climate risks.

*Note: Carry out these efforts while maintaining the values and principles outlined in Section #4

Summary of Key Interests

1. Foster long-term, integrative water and land-use planning to promote water supply reliability and quality of life across the region.
2. Foster water use efficiency and conservation to increase drought resilience.
3. Promote integrated and sustainable groundwater and surface water management.
4. Ensure the Water Forum promotes inclusive and equitable participation and representation from diverse communities in the region that have a stake in the Water Forum's work.
5. Serve as a model and catalyst of community water stewardship in the region. Reach, connect, educate, and empower current and future water stewards.
6. Promote environmental justice, universal access to clean and affordable water, and public health in the region.
7. Promote equitable access, public awareness, and engagement in the restoration and protection of habitat and ecosystem health of the Lower American River Parkway.
8. Bolster climate resilience to ensure that people in our community can continue to live in our region as the pace and scale of climate change intensifies.

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

CERBT and CEPPT Plan Portal

» [CERBT and CEPPT]: rwah2oorg00

My Accounts

As of the financial markets most recent close of business (09/02/2021), the total value of your account(s) is **$1,622,357.44**.

Get Account Data

Website Contact

Contributions to the CERBT AND CEPPT :

Contributions may be submitted using three different transmittal methods:

- Electronic Funds Transfer by Wire Transfer
- Electronic Funds Transfer by ACH Credit Method
- Check

When submitting a contribution, a Contribution Form by transmittal type must be submitted to ensure proper crediting to your OPEB or Pension Contribution Prefunding Account. To obtain a contribution form by the transmittal type, please email CERBT4U@CalPERS.ca.gov or CEPPT4U@CalPERS.ca.gov and a team member will be happy to email you the appropriate form.

Please note: Contributions by Wire Transfer or ACH Credit Method in the amount of $5 million or greater require 72 hour notice prior to sending the contribution.

Disbursements from the CERBT and CEPPT:

All requests for disbursements must be in writing using the CERBT Disbursement Request Form or CEPPT Disbursement Request Form and must include a certification that the monies will be used for the purposes of the Prefunding Plan. The requests must be signed by an individual serving in the position authorized by the employer to request disbursements from the Trust(s).

Please note: Disbursements $10,000 or greater require two signatures.

Please email:CERBT4U@CalPERS.ca.gov or CEPPT4U@CalPERS.ca.gov to obtain the Disbursement Request Form(s).

Upon completion of the Disbursement Request form, please mail the original to the following address:

CalPERS
CERBT/CEPPT
P.O. Box 1494
Sacramento, CA 95812-1494

Please email a completed copy of this form to CERBT4U@CalPERS.ca.gov or

California State Treasurer
Fiona Ma, CPA

Local Agency Investment Fund
P.O. Box 942809
Sacramento, CA 94209-0001
(916) 653-3001

September 03, 2021

LAIF Home
PMIA Average Monthly Yields

REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY

TREASURER
5620 BIRDCAGE STREET, SUITE 180
CITRUS HEIGHTS, CA 95610

Tran Type Definitions

Account Number: 90-34-019

August 2021 Statement

Effective Date	Transaction Date	Tran Type	Confirm Number	Web Confirm Number	Authorized Caller	Amount
8/27/2021	8/26/2021	RD	1683847	1644036	JOSETTE REINA-LUKEN	300,000.00

Account Summary

Total Deposit:	300,000.00	Beginning Balance:	2,967,798.25
Total Withdrawal:	0.00	Ending Balance:	3,267,798.25

AGENDA ITEM 9: DIRECTORS' COMMENTS