



Michael Saunders, Chair

Sean Twilla, Vice Chair	Chris Nelson, Director
Bruce Kamilos, Director	Robert Wichert, Director
Ron Greenwood, Director	Nichole Baxter, Director
Brett Ewart, Director	Michael Grinstead, Director

## **REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Tuesday, January 27, 2026  
at 1:30 p.m.**

**2295 Gateway Oaks, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
(916) 967-7692**

### **IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING VIRTUAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

The Regional Water Authority currently provides in person as well as virtual public participation via the Zoom link below until further notice. The public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Committee on any item of interest before or during the Committee's consideration of that item. Public comment on items within the jurisdiction of the Committee is welcomed, subject to reasonable time limitations for each speaker.

### **Join Zoom Meeting**

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87910700156>

Meeting ID: 879 1070 0156

Dial by your location

+1 669 444 9171 US or +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

**If we experience technical difficulties and the Zoom link drops and you are no longer able to connect to the Board meeting, please dial 1-877-654-0338 – Guest Code 198**

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) 967-7692. Requests must be made as early as possible, and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting. The Board of Directors may consider any agenda item at any time during the meeting.

## AGENDA

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

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Members of the public who wish to address the committee 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. Committee members may request an item be removed for separate consideration.

**3.1** Approve draft meeting minutes of December 16, 2025 Executive Committee meeting

**3.2** Ratify the 2026 Executive Committee meeting schedule as amended

**Action: Approve Consent Calendar**

### **4. AD HOC COMMITTEES**

Presenter: Michael Saunders, Chair

**Action: Chair to Appoint Ad Hoc Committee Members**

### **5. PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF AN AMICUS BRIEF FOR THE “BRING BACK THE KERN” CASE**

Presenter: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

**Action: Authorize Counsel to prepare and file an amicus brief for the Bring Back the Kern case**

### **6. DISCUSSION: OVERHEAD EXPENSE ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES**

Presenter: Tom Hoffart, Finance Director

**Action: Provide staff direction**

### **7. APPROVE TASK ORDER #4 FOR WOODARD & CURRAN AGREEMENT**

Presenter: Trevor Joseph, Manager of Technical Services

**Action: Approve Task Order #4 for Woodard & Curran Agreement**

### **8. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Presenter: Ryan Ojakian, Manager of Government Relations

**Action: Take position on State Legislation AB 35**

### **9. INFORMATION: STRATEGIC PLAN**

Presenter: Trevor Joseph, Manager of Technical Services

### **10. INFORMATION: PPIC UPDATE**

Presenter: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

**11. INFORMATION: WATERSHED RESILIENCE PILOT PROGRAM UPDATE**

Presenter: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

**12. INFORMATION: RWA PROGRAM UPDATES**

Presenter: Jim Peifer, Executive Director

**13. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**14. DIRECTORS' COMMENT**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Upcoming meetings:**

**Next RWA Board of Director's Meeting:** Regular RWA Board Meeting, March 12, 2026, 9:00 a.m. at the Fair Oaks Water District, 10326 Fair Oaks Blvd., Fair Oaks, CA 95628. The location is subject to change.

**Next RWA Executive Committee Meeting:** The next RWA Executive Committee Meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2026, 1:30 p.m. at the RWA Office located at 2295 Gateway Oaks, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95833.

Notification will be emailed when the RWA electronic packet is complete and posted on the RWA website at: <https://www.rwah2o.org/meetings/board-meetings/>.

Posted on: January 23, 2025

*Ashley Flores*  
Ashley Flores, CMC, Clerk of the Board



Topic: Public Comment  
Type: New Business  
Item For: Information/Discussion  
Purpose: [Policy 200.1, Rule 11](#)

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Ashley Flores, CMC Associate PM & Board Clerk	PRESENTER:	Michael Saunders RWA Chair
---------------	--	------------	-------------------------------

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information item to provide an opportunity for the Regional Water Authority Executive Committee to recognize or hear from visitors that may be attending the meeting or to allow members of the public to address the Executive Committee on matters that are not on the agenda.

As noted on the agenda, members of the public who wish to address the committee may do so at this time. Please keep your comments to less than three minutes.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information only.

**BACKGROUND**

Public agencies are required by law to provide an opportunity for the public to address the RWA Executive Committee matters that are not on the agenda.

### **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**



Topic: Meeting Minutes  
Type: Consent Calendar  
Item For: Action; Motion to Approve  
Purpose: [Policy 200.1, Rule 14](#)

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Ashley Flores, CMC Assistant PM & Board Clerk	PRESENTER:	Ashley Flores, CMC Assistant PM & Board Clerk
---------------	--	------------	--

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an action item for the Regional Water Authority Executive Committee to review and consider approving the draft minutes of the Regional Water Authority Executive Committee Meeting of December 16, 2025.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

A motion to approve the Minutes, as presented or amended.

**BACKGROUND**

The draft minutes of the above referenced meetings are included with this Agenda. The minutes reflect the RWA Policy 200.1 to document specific details on items discussed at the meetings.

The Executive Director may list on the agenda a "consent calendar", which will consist of routine matters on which there is generally no opposition or need for discussion. Examples of consent calendar items might include approval of minutes, financial reports and routine resolutions. Any matter may be removed from the consent calendar and placed on the regular calendar at the request of any member of the Board. The entire consent calendar may be approved by a single motion made, seconded and approved by the Board.

**FINDING/CONCLUSION**

Staff believes the draft of the presented minutes correctly reflect the information shared and actions taken by the Executive Committee.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1- Draft meeting minutes of the Regional Water Authority Executive Committee Meeting of December 16, 2025

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ewart called the meeting of the Executive Committee to order on December 16, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. at the RWA Board Room located at 2295 Gateway Oaks, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95833. Seven of the Executive Committee Members were present at roll call; a quorum was established. Individuals in attendance are listed below:

### Executive Committee Members

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento, Chair  
Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, Vice Chair  
Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln  
Sean Bigley, City of Roseville – Entered at 1:35 p.m.  
Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District  
Michael Grinstead, Sacramento County Water Agency  
Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District

### Staff Members

Jim Peifer, Tom Hoffart, Ryan Ojakian, Trevor Joseph, Amy Talbot, Monica Garcia, Ashley Flores and Josh Horowitz.

### Others in Attendance:

Greg Zlotnick, San Juan Water District; Sean Twilla, Golden State Water Company

## 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

Director Kamilos requested that Consent Calendar Item 3.1 be amended in his Director's comments to state Board of Directors not City Council.

## 3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- 3.1 Approve draft meeting minutes of October 28, 2025 Executive Committee meeting
- 3.2 Approve the RWA draft Board Agenda for January 8, 2026
- 3.3 Approval of Change Order #1 with Khadam Consulting Inc. to extend the term of services provided under Task Order #4 for Sacramento Regional Water Bank (SRWB) project development from December 31, 2025 to May 31, 2026
- 3.4 Approve Change Order #5 to Task Order #22-02 to the Agreement with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

**A motion was made to the Consent Calendar as amended.**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Kamilos moved, with a second by Director Grinstead

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, Sacramento County Water Agency; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 6  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 3

**4. POTENTIAL RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE OF THE RWA FINANCIAL AUDIT REPORT**

This was an action item presented by Tom Hoffart, Finance Director and Ingrid Shepline, Richardson and Company, LLP for the Executive Committee to consider and recommend approval the fiscal year 2024/25 Independent Auditor's Report, Financial Statements, Internal Control and Compliance Report, and Governance Letter with the RWA's independent auditor.

**A motion was made to recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2024/2025 RWA Financial Audit Report to the Board of Directors.**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Kamilos moved, with a second by Director Bigley

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Sean Bigley, City of Roseville; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, County of Sacramento; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 7  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 2

**5. RWA BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR THE SPONSORSHIP OF THE PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA'S "ACCOUNTING FOR WATER" INITIATIVE**

This was an action item presented by Jim Peifer, Executive Director and Ryan Ojakian, Government Relations Manager; they provided a brief update on our partnership with Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) and their "Accounting for Water" Initiative. The PPIC is requesting financial support from RWA members in the form of a sponsorship for their "Accounting for Water." Many members are interested in sponsoring the initiative, as well as the Water Forum and the Environmental Council of Sacramento. Members have requested that the RWA invoice them and RWA send the payment to PPIC.

**A motion was made to recommend approval to the Board of Directors for a budget amendment of up to \$50,000 in member payments towards sponsorship to PPIC's initiative to be dispersed in one payment by RWA.**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Wichert moved, with a second by Director Kamilos

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Sean Bigley, City of Roseville; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, County of Sacramento; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 7  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 2

**6. STRATEGIC POTENTIAL REVISIONS TO RWA POLICIES 200.1 (RULES FOR PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS) AND 500.13 (BUSINESS EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT)**

Executive Director Peifer presented this information item for the Executive Committee to receive a progress report on the Strategic Plan Update. A shortlist has been established; a scope of work was drafted by Director Wichert that was approved by the ad hoc committee. Next steps will be to release the RFP.

*The Executive Committee agreed that the written approval would be captured in the financial program/system that the Finance Director and Executive Director review and approve charges through.*

**A motion was made to recommend approval of revisions to policies 200.1 and 500.13 to the RWA Board of Directors with amended language in Policy 500.13 section A1 and B1 to include "in writing."**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Kamilos moved, with a second by Director Saunders

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Sean Bigley, City of Roseville; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, County of Sacramento; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 7  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 2

## 7. LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

This was an action item presented by Ryan Ojakian, Government Relations Manager for the Executive Committee to take positions on state legislation and receive and update on legislative and regulatory actions. Mr. Ojakian provided an updated on Assembly Bill 497 with respect to how it supports the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes program.

### **A motion was made to support position on AB 497**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Bigley moved, with a second by Director Grinstead

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Sean Bigley, City of Roseville; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, County of Sacramento; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 7  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 2

## 8. BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING POLICY PREFERENCES

This was an information/discussion item presented by Jim Peifer, Executive Director and Tom Hoffart, Finance Director to brief the Executive Committee on certain accounting practices with respect to subscription programs and to receive direction on the separate but related items of budgeting and accounting practices. It was explained that depending on the direction to staff, policies may need to be revised and presented to the Board of Directors for consideration and approval.

No action taken, direction was provided to staff to bring the item back next year.

## 9. APPROVAL OF THE WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM BUDGET

This was an action item presented by Amy Talbot, Principal Project Manager for the RWA Executive Committee to approve the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Water Efficiency Program Budget as directed in the Subscription Program Agreement and as previously approved by the Regional Water Efficiency Program Advisory Committee (RWEPC) in May 2025.

### **A motion was made to ratify the FY 25/26 Water Efficiency Program Budget as directed in the Subscription Program Agreement**

Motion/Second/Carried Director Wichert moved, with a second by Director Nelson

Brett Ewart, City of Sacramento; Michael Saunders, Georgetown Divide Public Utility District; Chris Nelson, City of Lincoln; Sean Bigley, City of Roseville; Bruce Kamilos, Elk Grove Water District; Michael Grinstead, County of Sacramento; and Robert Wichert, Sacramento Suburban Water District; voted yes. Motion passed.

Ayes- 7  
Noes- 0  
Abstained- 0  
Absent- 2

**10. WATER FORUM AGREEMENT**

This is a discussion item presented by Jim Peifer, Executive Director for the Executive Committee to receive a brief update and discuss the “Water Forum 2050 Agreement” and receive direction on bringing the agreement to the Board of Directors for approval. City of Sacramento staff requested the RWA support in writing the potential agreement requirement of preparing a salary survey to aid in the appropriate compensation for the Water Forum Executive Director, in order to retain (and if needed in the future, attract) a highly qualified Executive Director.

No action taken, staff was provided direction to not submit a letter of support.

**11. RWA PROGRAM UPDATES**

Executive Director Peifer presented this information item for the Executive Committee to receive a report on the various programs and initiatives the RWA and SGA currently have underway. These programs and initiatives included: The Sacramento Regional Water Bank, the North American Subbasin (NASb) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) update, implementation of the current NASb GSP, the Watershed Resilience Pilot Project, the Water Forum Agreement update, the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program, and the Reinitiation of Consultation for the Biological Opinions. The report included key milestones reached to date, the overall status of the programs, upcoming key milestones, and current and future anticipated resources.

No action taken.

**12. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Executive Director Peifer directed the committee in the interest of time to review his written report.

**13. DIRECTORS’ COMMENT**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Ewart adjourned the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

By:

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Saunders, RWA Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashley Flores, CMC, Clerk of the Board



Topic: 2026 RWA Board of Directors and Executive Committee Meeting Dates  
 Type: New Business  
 Item For: Consent Calendar; Ratify 2026 Meeting Schedule  
 Purpose: Routine

---

SUBMITTED BY: Ashley Flores, CMC Board Clerk	PRESENTER: Jim Peifer Executive Director
---	---

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information item for the Regional Water Authority Executive Committee to ratify the 2026 RWA Meeting dates for the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Ratify the 2026 Executive Committee meeting schedule as amended.

**BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the RWA Policy, staff presents the following proposed 2026 board meeting schedule for Board approval:

**RWA Board Meetings (Second Thursdays starting at 9:00 a.m.)**

- January 8, 2026 – Carmichael Water District (7837 Fair Oaks Blvd., Carmichael, CA 95608)
- March 12 – Fair Oaks Water District (10326 Fair Oaks Blvd., Fair Oaks, CA 95628)
- May 14 – Carmichael Water District (7837 Fair Oaks Blvd., Carmichael, CA 95608)
- July 9 – Fair Oaks Water District (10326 Fair Oaks Blvd., Fair Oaks, CA 95628)
- September 10 - Carmichael Water District (7837 Fair Oaks Blvd., Carmichael, CA 95608)
- November 12 – Fair Oaks Water District (10326 Fair Oaks Blvd., Fair Oaks, CA 95628)

**RWA Executive Committee Meetings (Tuesdays starting at 1:30 p.m.) at the RWA Office**

- |                    |              |
|--------------------|--------------|
| January 27, 2026   | July 21      |
| <b>February 17</b> | August 25    |
| <b>March 17</b>    | September 22 |
| April 28           | October 27   |
| May 26             | November 24  |
| June 23            | December 15  |

**FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**

In accordance with the RWA Policy, the 2026 board meeting schedule is being returned to the



## Agenda Item 3.2

---

Executive Committee to modify February and March to accommodate the committee's commitments. Staff is seeking the approval of the committee.

### FISCAL IMPACT

Costs for Board of Directors and Executive Committee Meetings are included in the annual operating budget.



Topic: Ad Hoc Committees  
Type: New Business  
Item For: Information/Discussion  
Purpose: [Policy 200.1](#)

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Ashley Flores, CMC Associate PM & Board Clerk	PRESENTER:	Michael Saunders Chair
---------------	--	------------	---------------------------

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information / discussion item for the Chair to brief the Executive Committee on matters regarding the formation and charge of RWA Ad Hoc Committees.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Chair to appoint Ad Hoc committee members. This item is for information /discussion only.

**BACKGROUND**

RWA Policy 200.1, Rule 21 states that the RWA Board Chair may from time to time establish and appoint the members of ad hoc advisory committees to serve a limited or single purpose, which committees are to be dissolved once their specific task is completed.

**Watershed Resilience Ad Hoc Committee**

Chair: Michael Saunders

Members: Reappoint Existing Members

**Strategic Plan 2030**

Chair: Michael Saunders

Members: Reappoint Existing Members (Brett Ewart, Sean Bigley, Bob Wichert, Chris Nelson)

**Procedures for the Selection of the Executive Committee Ad Hoc Committee (Policy 200.3)**

Chair: Michael Saunders

Members: Sean Twilla, Tom Gray, Chris Wilson, Sean Bigley, and Audie Foster

**Executive Director Performance Review (RWA Policy 400.4)**

Chair: Michael Saunders

Members: Sean Twilla and Jay Boatwright

**Purchasing Ad Hoc Committee**

Chair: Todd Jordan, Citrus Heights Water District

## Agenda Item 4

---



Members: TBD

### **Annual Awards Committee**

Chair: TBD

Members: TBD



Topic: Preparation of an Amicus Brief for the “Bring Back the Kern” Case  
 Type: New Business  
 Item For: Action  
 Purpose: RWA Policy 100.5 (Policy on External Issues)

---

SUBMITTED BY: Jim Peifer Executive Director	PRESENTER: Jim Peifer Executive Director
--	---

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an action item for the Executive Committee to authorize Counsel to prepare and submit an amicus brief to the California Supreme Court in the *Bring Back the Kern v. City of Bakersfield* case. RWA likely would submit a joint brief with the Northern California Water Association (NCWA). The brief is likely to be due in early April.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Authorize Counsel to prepare and file an amicus brief for the *Bring Back the Kern* case.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff and Counsel believe it would be in the region’s interest to file an amicus brief with the California Supreme Court in the *Bring Back the Kern* case. An amicus brief is a brief that someone who is not a party to a case can file with a court to advise the court of the importance of a case beyond the actual parties’ particular interests. ACWA and other associations commonly file amicus briefs in significant water cases because the rules that any one court case declares can be binding over all over California.

RWA previously filed an amicus brief with the California Supreme Court in the mid-2000s in a case called *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova*. That case concerned the adequacy of the water-supply analysis in the EIR for the Vineyard area development in southern Sacramento County. RWA filed its brief to emphasize the intensive analysis that the region had conducted to support the original Water Forum Agreement, on which the EIR relied. While the California Supreme Court held that the EIR’s water-supply analysis was not adequate, its decision discussed at some length how detailed the Water Forum’s analysis had been.

Summary of *Bring Back the Kern* Case

The *Bring Back the Kern* case is an attempt by several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to compel the long-time water diverters on the Kern River to change their operations to provide more flow in the Kern River to support what the NGOs assert are fish in the river. Since the late 1800s, the Kern River diverters have operated under detailed agreements that allocated water

among those diverters' water rights. There are a series of weirs on the Kern River at which water is diverted, largely for agriculture and groundwater recharge, but also to the City of Bakersfield to some degree. (That city employs the Kern River's watermaster, which is why that city is the lead defendant.) In addition, to conserve irrigation water by reducing channel loss, some water is conveyed to diverters lower in the system through lined canals. As a result of all of this, the river's channel is dry in many summers. The Kern River does not flow to the Delta, so there certainly are no salmon or steelhead in the river and it is unclear what fish the river might actually support if its channel were to be wetter more often.

The NGOs assert that the Kern River diverters' operations violate Fish & Game Code section 5937, which, in general, requires that the owner of a dam bypass enough water over or through the dam to keep downstream fish in "good condition," which is undefined. A Kern County Superior Court judge agreed with the NGOs sufficiently to issue a preliminary injunction to require the diverters to change their operations to release sufficient water to keep fish in "good condition," with little definition of how much water that would be. The judge stated that he did not need to consider whether the required flows were reasonable relative to the diverters' water uses because, in enacting Fish & Game Code section 5937, the Legislature already had determined that it was a reasonable use for enough water to be dedicated to fish to keep them in "good condition." Later Superior Court orders refined the flow requirements.

The Kern River diverters appealed the preliminary injunction to the Court of Appeal in Fresno. The State of California filed an amicus brief in support of the NGOs' position. The Court of Appeal, however, reversed the Kern County judge's decision and held that the reasonable use requirements of Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution require a relative reasonable use assessment in this sort of case.

The NGOs appealed the Court of Appeal's decision to the California Supreme Court, which decided to review the case. The actual parties are in the middle of filing briefs. The NGOs' reply brief will be due in early March, making any amicus briefs due in early April.

#### *Bring Back the Kern's Statewide Significance*

The California Supreme Court does not hear many water law cases. It issued its last significant water law decision in 2000. That decision concerned the groundwater adjudication of the Mojave Basin and, in general, held that Article X, section 2's reasonable use requirements do not authorize the courts to ignore water-right priorities in developing a "physical solution" for an overdrafted basin. Any decision from that court obviously has significant statewide implications and, because its water decisions are so rare, they are especially important.

In the opinion of RWA's former general counsel Ryan Bezerra, the *Bring Back the Kern* case is the most important water law case the California Supreme Court has heard in at least 40 years. In 1983, that Court decided the *National Audubon Society* case, which declared that the public trust doctrine authorizes the state, in at least some cases, to revisit the effect of diversions under established water rights on environmental resources and potentially reallocate water from human use to benefit those resources. While *National Audubon* stated no well-defined

rules to govern such reconsideration, that decision nonetheless has become a key legal lever for NGOs and state regulatory agencies to seek to reallocate water from human uses to the environment. For example, the State Water Resources Control Board’s draft Bay-Delta Plan documents rely on *National Audubon* as asserted legal support for potential implementation of new regulations based on “unimpaired flows” for the American River and throughout the Bay-Delta watershed.

*Bring Back the Kern* presents a question that *National Audubon* left largely unanswered, namely whether the demands of environmental uses must be reasonable relative not only to whatever the relevant fish might need, but also relative to human water uses. The NGOs, and apparently the State of California, assert that no such reasonable use consideration is necessary because the Legislature already effectively considered competing water uses in enacting Fish & Game Code section 5937’s “good condition” requirement. The Kern River diverters argue the opposite, namely that, because Article X, section 2 states a *constitutional* reasonable use standard, it necessarily governs and requires a case-specific analysis.

If the NGOs were to prevail in *Bring Back the Kern*, the likely result statewide would be less consideration for impacts on human uses—even under established rights—in environmental decisions. If the Kern River diverters were to prevail, then state agencies and courts likely would be required to consider the impacts on human uses more.

#### Particular American River Interest In The Case

The question *National Audubon* left open about how to actually fit human and environmental uses of water together of course has vexed regions throughout the state. The best regional solution, however, may be the American River arrangements that RWA members and others have constructed from the foundation of the 1990 decision concerning EBMUD’s then proposed American River diversions issued by Judge Richard Hodge. The “Hodge decision” identified the competing uses of the lower American River—including not only EBMUD’s proposed human uses and the river’s fish, but also the recreational and aesthetic needs associated with the river’s designation as a wild and scenic river. That decision includes a finely grained analysis of what flows are necessary for what uses and why, with the goal of maximizing each of those uses as much as possible. RWA’s counsel intends to highlight the Hodge decision as an important model in the proposed *Bring Back the Kern* amicus brief.

More broadly, RWA’s counsel plans to highlight how the idea of dispensing with a reasonable use analysis for environmental uses under Fish & Game Code section 5937 would be inconsistent with the whole thread of American and California water law. The concept of “reasonable use” has been a legal tool that courts have used to fit beneficial uses together in the context of specific rivers for as long as there has been American water law. For example, the very first American water law decision—the 1827 *Tyler v. Wilkinson* decision issued by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story—relied on that concept to address claims by the competing mills that started the American Industrial Revolution in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. The proposed RWA amicus brief would highlight how the NGOs’ proposed result would be a radical departure from the law on which communities have generated their water supplies.



**FISCAL IMPACT**

In the *Vineyard* case discussed above, BKS prepared and filed an amicus brief for RWA with a not-to-exceed budget of \$15,000. The cost to RWA of an amicus brief hopefully will not exceed that because the brief is planned to be a joint brief with NCWA.

**FINDING/CONCLUSION**

The collaboration of the Amicus Brief is to assert the combined interests of Sacramento Valley agriculture and M&I.



Topic: Subscription Program Accounting Allocations  
 Type: Old Business  
 Item For: Information/Discussion; Provide Staff Direction  
 Purpose: To address appropriateness of Subscription Program Accounting Allocations

---

SUBMITTED BY: Tom Hoffart Finance Director	PRESENTER: Tom Hoffart Finance Director
---	--

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is a discussion item for the Executive Committee to consider staff’s recommendation for a strategic shift in financial management for RWA Subscription Programs. Specifically, it proposes transitioning from complex overhead allocations to a simplified direct-cost model. Furthermore, it suggests modifying the timing of Subscription Programs compensated absence payments.

The goal is to reduce administrative burden, simplify budget development, monitoring and comprehension and incentivize member participation in subscription programs. While Core dues will increase to cover indirect costs, Subscription Program dues will decrease, keeping the total revenue requirement neutral.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

No action, discussion only. Provide staff direction.

**BACKGROUND**

At the December 16, 2025, Executive Committee meeting, Subscription Program Accounting Allocations were discussed. Through meeting discussion and feedback from directors, staff is proposing Subscription Program accounting allocation practices for the Fiscal Year 2025/26 and is working towards including these practices in the related Budget document.

Currently and historically, RWA utilizes a complex accounting structure to distribute indirect costs (overhead) across various programs. While intended to capture the "true cost" of each program, this method has resulted in significant administrative burden and complicated budget development, monitoring and comprehension for both administrative staff and program managers. Additionally, the appropriateness of the amount of allocations is in question.

**PROPOSED SUBSCRIPTION PROGRAM ACCOUNTING ALLOCATIONS**

The following table compares the current methodology against the proposed changes:



Category	Current Practices	Proposed Practices
Overhead Allocations	Indirect expenses (Admin, Office, Insurance, Audit, etc.) are allocated via calculated hourly rates or direct allocation.	No Overhead Allocation. Indirect expenses will be paid entirely by RWA Core. Programs pay only direct costs (Salaries/Benefits, Consultants, etc.).
Interest Income	No interest is allocated to subscription programs; all interest remains in the RWA Core program.	No Change. Maintain current policy; all interest remains within the RWA Core program.
Compensated Absences	Accrual Basis: Programs with dedicated managers (WUE/CIMS) "prepay" vacation payouts via calculated rates.	Cash Basis: Programs are only charged for compensated absences (vacation payouts) when the employee leaves RWA.

**ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS**

**1. Operational Efficiency**

Reduced Administrative Burden

Eliminating overhead allocations removes the need for calculations, allocations, and reconciliations in both the accounting and budget functions.

Simplify Budget Development, Monitoring and Comprehension

Subscription Programs will only need to budget for direct costs (staff, consultants, etc.), making budgets easier to develop and monitor.

**2. Strategic Incentives**

Program Participation and Development

By lowering the costs for Subscription Programs, RWA creates a financial environment that encourages members to join Subscription Programs and/or launch new collaborative initiatives.

Staff Collaboration

Removing overhead from hourly rates lowers the "cost" of internal staff support, incentivizing programs to utilize RWA expertise rather than looking externally.

**3. Fiscal Impact to Members**

Expense Realignment

Total expenses across the programs will remain unchanged. However, a one-time adjustment to credit RWA Subscription programs for previously paid compensated absences, alongside an on-going increase in RWA Core expenses and a corresponding decrease in Subscription Program expenses related to the change in the overhead allocation.

Dues Realignment

Total dues should remain unchanged. However, members will see an increase in Core Dues and a corresponding decrease in Subscription Program Dues. Individual member total dues will change based on their program membership. Group/Individual member dues discounts may need to be considered to minimize the impact of the proposed changes

Future Liabilities

Under the proposed "Cash Basis" for compensated absences, Subscription Programs must be aware that a significant one-time expense will occur when a dedicated program manager departs.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Staff recommends the Executive Committee discuss and provide guidance on the proposed Subscription Program accounting allocations and consider approving modifications through the Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget process.



Topic: Approve Task Order #4 to Woodard & Curran for Progressional Services on the Sacramento Regional Water Bank project

Type: New Business

Item For: Action Item

Purpose: Policy 300.2 - Professional Services

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Trevor Joseph, Manager of Technical Services	PRESENTER:	Trevor Joseph, Manager of Technical Services
---------------	--	------------	--

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an action item for the Executive Committee to approve Task Order #4 to Woodard & Curran, Inc. for Phase 3 CoSANA Modeling Analysis and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) support for the Sacramento Regional Water Bank (Water Bank) project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Approve Task Order #4 to Woodard & Curran, Inc.

**BACKGROUND**

On January 31, 2023, the RWA Executive Committee approved a Professional Services Agreement and Task Order #1 with W&C to begin to provide groundwater modeling support for the Water Bank project. This task order was for CoSANA and CalSIM data and information integration in the amount of \$49,998.

On May 2, 2023, the RWA Executive Committee approved Task Order #2 with W&C to advance groundwater modeling support for the Water Bank project. This task order was to provide a series of tasks including CalSIM-CoSANA mapping, develop and analyze preliminary Water Bank scenarios, develop consistent CalSIM and COSANA baselines and provide project management and coordination.

On December 17, 2024, the RWA Executive Committee approved Task Order #3 with W&C to evaluate water that has been previously banked as part of the Sacramento Groundwater Authority (SGA) Water Accounting Framework (WAF) and documented in lieu recharge water banking activities in both the North American Subbasin (NASb) and South American Subbasins (SASb). During the Executive Committee meeting, W&C’s Task Order #3 included authorization for consulting services in the amount of \$81,885. During the Executive Committee meeting, additional authorization of \$18,115 was approved for contingency purposes for RWA staff to aid in managing the W&C effort. In total \$100,000 was authorized for this effort.

At the December 18, 2024, monthly Program Committee meeting, RWA staff established a funding agreement and support for the collection of funds (totaling \$100,000) from participating Program

## Agenda Item 7



Committee agencies including the City of Sacramento, Sacramento County Water Agency, Golden State Water Company, Sacramento Suburban Water District, and Carmichael Water District.

RWA has received supporting authorization from these 5 Program Committee agencies for Change Order #1 during the August 20, 2025, monthly Program Committee meeting.

The RWA Executive Committee later approved Change Order #1 in the amount of \$13,960 to Task Order #3 with W&C thereby increasing W&C's not to exceed amount for this project to \$95,845. Change Order #1 enables W&C to implement the optional task (task 1.7 additional technical & planning support) within Task Order #3 to complete this analysis including development of a technical memorandum necessary to advance the Water Bank project.

The proposed W&C scope of services described in Task Order #4 includes the following:

- Task 1: Project Management and Technical Meetings
- Task 2: Preparation of Stream Contribution Factor Analysis Plan
- Task 3: Model Setup and Coordination
- Task 4: Develop and Analyze Existing Conditions Scenario (Without and With Project)
- Task 5: Develop and Analyze Cumulative Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)
- Task 6: Climate-Change Conditions, 2043 50% LOC (Without and With Project)

The amount to complete the scope of services within Task Order #4 is \$360,660.

### FISCAL IMPACT

If approved by the Executive Committee, RWA staff will likely utilize three sources of Water Bank project funding, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) 2022 Urban Drought Grant (Grant), a United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) Federal Funding Grant, and Water Bank Participating Agency Phase 3 funding. However, use of DWR Grant funds is dependent on DWR's approval of a grant contract amendment that would authorize RWA to complete the work described in W&C's Task 2: Preparation of the Stream Contribution Factor Analysis Plan and all of the W&C contact tasks are dependent on RWA entering into a grant agreement with the USBR. RWA has been provided with a notice of award from USBR, but a grant agreement has yet to be signed.

### FINDING/CONCLUSION

Approve Task Order #4 to Woodard & Curran, Inc. (W&C) for Phase 3 Modeling and EIR Support Activities in the amount of \$360,660 for the Sacramento Regional Water Bank project.

### ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1 – Task Order #4 with Woodard & Curran, Inc. for Phase 3 Sacramento Regional Water Bank CoSANA Modeling Analysis and EIR Support

**Regional Water Authority (RWA)**  
**Phase 3 Sacramento Regional Water Bank**  
**CoSANA Modeling Analysis and EIR Support**  
**Task Order 4**  
**January 23, 2026**

## **Introduction**

This Task Order (TO) outlines continuing work to be completed by Woodard & Curran (W&C) in support of the Regional Water Bank Project. Under previous Task Orders #1-3, W&C completed tasks to build procedures and templates to integrate CoSANA and CalSim3 models, provide consistency between the two models, and to increase efficiency of future model applications. Under this TO, the models developed under the previous Task Orders will be used to develop and analyze water bank operational scenarios as part of establishing a regional groundwater banking opportunity in the Sacramento region. The project is being conducted in close coordination and collaboration with the Stantec CalSim team and Khadam Consulting.

## **Scope of Work**

TO 4 includes six tasks as described below.

### **Task 1: Project Management and Technical Meetings**

#### *Activities:*

- Attend bi-weekly technical coordination calls with Stantec and RWA ( $\approx$  20 sessions).
- Present results to RWA and stakeholders (two meetings each).

#### *Deliverables:*

- None

### **Task 2: Preparation of Stream Contribution Factor Analysis Plan**

#### *Activities:*

- Prepare an analysis plan that addresses the stream contribution factor that can result from operation of the Sacramento Regional Water Bank
- Collaborate and meet with RWA staff and consultants on preparation of the plan
- Prepare a Draft memorandum for review by RWA

#### *Deliverables:*

- Draft and Final Memorandum.

## Task 3: Model Setup and Coordination

### *Activities:*

- Review and confirm, as needed, the mapping of CoSANA and CalSim demand units; coordinate the 2020 and 2040 demand and water-supply source attribution between CoSANA and CalSim demand units. Assume that Calsim3 will conform to the demand values that are developed for the Baseline for CoSANA.
- Refine and automate data-exchange templates for recharge, pumping, and stream-accretion linkages. Total of one iteration for this work.
- Coordinate on assumptions and approach for representing SRWB operations in CoSANA.
- Conduct joint QA/QC with Stantec to confirm consistent boundary conditions and data exchange protocols.

### *Deliverables:*

- Automated data-exchange templates.

## Task 4: Develop and Analyze Existing Conditions Scenario (Without and With Project)

### *Model Basis:*

Use the Existing Conditions Baseline CoSANA model from the ongoing GSP update and CoSANA model upgrade project for the North American Subbasin (NASb), which reflects the 2020 Level of Development, historical hydrology, and calibrated groundwater conditions. The South American Subbasin (SASb) representation will use consistent boundary conditions and datasets from the same update effort.

### *Activities:*

- Update the NASb GSP Existing Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb and implement 2020 Level of Development demands and water supplies for SASb Water Bank entities (SCWA and GSWC). No other changes to the SASb area will be made.
- Update Water Transfer practices in the GSP Existing Conditions Baseline to have a consistent model assumptions and data between the GSP and Water Bank scenario
- Update output processing templates for the Baseline to have consistent tables, charts, maps for GSP and WB EIR analysis
- Perform the integrated "Without Project" (no SRWB) scenario in coordination with CalSim
- Perform the integrated "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) scenario in coordination with CalSim. Perform up to two (2) iterations to fine tune the project operation, timing, and size to minimize potential impacts and undesirable results.
- Coordinate boundary inflows/outflows and accretions with CalSim 3 scenarios.
- Perform an assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" scenario

### *Deliverables:*

- Change in groundwater levels, storage volume, and stream accretions between with and without Project conditions.
- SMC performance for NASb and SASb and comparison between with- and without Project conditions.

## Task 5: Develop and Analyze Cumulative Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)

### *Model Basis:*

Use the Projected Conditions CoSANA model from the NASb GSP update, configured for the 2040 Level of Development with historical hydrology. The SASb area will be represented with corresponding boundary conditions for regional consistency and updated water demand and supplies for Water Bank entities. The GSP projected conditions model already includes representation of the following:

- Harvest Water and Omochumne-Hartnell banking programs
- Planned development in the Study area includes Grand Park, Sutter Point, and other West Placer developments.
- City of Sacramento groundwater master plan.

### *Activities:*

- Update the NASb GSP Projected Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb and implement 2040 Level of Development demands and water supplies for SASb Water Bank entities.
- Update Water Transfer practices in the GSP Existing Conditions Baseline to have a consistent model assumptions and data between the GSP and Water Bank scenario
- Perform the integrated Cumulative Conditions "Without Project" (no SRWB) scenario in coordination with CalSim
- Perform the integrated Cumulative Conditions "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) scenario in coordination with CalSim. Perform up to two (2) iterations to fine tune the project operation, timing, and size to mitigate impacts and undesirable results.
- Coordinate boundary inflows/outflows and accretions with CalSim 3 cumulative scenarios.
- Perform an assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" scenario

### *Deliverables:*

- Tables, charts and maps reflecting the change in groundwater levels, storage volume, and stream accretions between with and without Project conditions.
- Appropriate tables and graphics to report on the SMC performance for NASb and SASb and comparison between with- and without Project conditions.

## Task 6: Climate-Change Conditions, 2043 50% LOC (Without and With Project)

### *Model Basis:*

Use the climate Change scenario model from Task 4 using 2043 50% Level of Concern (LOC) climate scenario developed by DWR for SWP Climate Adaptation Plan.

### *Activities:*

- Because this hydrology is not currently available within the GSP update, W&C will: develop new CoSANA input hydrology based on CalSim 2043 50% LOC datasets provided by Stantec, which includes precipitation patterns, unimpaired flows and reservoir releases.
- Perform Climate Change Conditions model scenarios for "Without Project" and "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) cases with the 2043 climate change scenario. The "With Project" scenario will be based on the most feasible scenario as developed in Task 4.
- Coordinate boundary inflows/outflows and accretions with CalSim 3 cumulative scenarios.
- Perform an assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" scenario

### *Deliverables:*

- Collaborate in preparation of the hydrology-generation documentation
- Tables, charts and maps reflecting the change in groundwater levels, storage volume, and stream accretions between with and without Project conditions.
- Appropriate tables and graphics to report on the SMC performance for NASb and SASb and comparison between with- and without Project conditions.

## TO 4 Budget

The fee for TO 4 services above is not to exceed \$360,600.

## Schedule

Work outlined in this scope of work is to be completed in collaboration with the RWA project manager. The work is anticipated to be completed within twelve months following the Notice to Proceed (NTP). A detailed schedule will be coordinated with the RWA project team.

---

*Ali Taghavi*

---

*Date*

*Woodard & Curran, Inc.*

---

*Jim Peifer*

---

*Date*

*Regional Water Authority*



**Sacramento Regional Water Bank CoSANA Modeling Analysis and EIR Support  
Task Order 4**

Tasks	Total
	Total Fee
<b>Phase 3 - Modeling and EIR Support Activities (12 Months)</b>	
<b>Task 1: Project Management &amp; Coordination</b>	
1.1 Project Management (Monthly Invoicing and Progress Reports)	\$13,080
1.2 Bi-weekly Technical Coordination Calls with Stantec and RWA	\$21,060
1.3 Results Presentation to RWA and stakeholders (Up to 4 Meetings)	\$10,560
Subtotal Task 1:	\$44,700
<b>Task 2: Preparation of Stream Contribution Factor Analysis Plan</b>	
2.1 Develop Draft Plan Outline	\$2,170
2.2 Prepare the Draft Plan	\$13,020
2.3 Address Comments and Finalize Plan	\$7,220
2.4 Up to Three (3) Technical Meetings	\$4,350
2.5 Project Coordination	\$2,780
Subtotal Task 2:	\$29,540
<b>Task 3: Model Setup and Coordination</b>	
3.1 Evaluation and Confirmation of CalSim-CoSANA Demand Units Mapping	\$4,270
3.2 Refinement and Automation of CalSim-CoSANA Data-Exchange Templates	\$8,300
3.3 Coordination on Assumptions and Approach for Representing SRWB Operations in CoSANA	\$5,000
3.4 Joint QA/QC with Stantec to Confirm Consistent Boundary Conditions and Data-Exchange Protocols	\$9,760
3.5 QC and Verification of Model Setup	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 3:	\$34,850
<b>Task 4: Develop and Analyze Existing Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)</b>	
4.1 Update NASb GSP Existing Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb	\$11,060
4.2 Perform "Without Project" (no SRWB) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	\$10,660
4.3 Perform "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	\$18,960
4.4 Perform up to two (2) Iterations to Fine Tune the Project Operation, Timing, and Size to Mitigate Impacts and Undesirable Results	\$18,960
4.5 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	\$10,660
4.6 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	\$13,420
4.7 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	\$7,520
4.8 QC and Verification of Results	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 4:	\$98,760
<b>Task 5: Develop and Analyze Cumulative Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)</b>	
5.1 Update NASb GSP Projected Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb	\$6,510
5.2 Perform "Without Project" (no SRWB) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	\$7,240
5.3 Perform "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	\$16,840
5.4 Perform up to two (2) Iterations to Fine Tune the Project Operation, Timing, and Size to Mitigate Impacts and Undesirable Results	\$18,960
5.5 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	\$7,240
5.6 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	\$8,170
5.7 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	\$8,980
5.8 QC and Verification of Results	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 5:	\$81,460
<b>Task 6: Develop and Analyze Climate-Change Conditions, 2043 50% LOC (Without and With Project)</b>	
6.1 Develop New CoSANA Hydrology Based on CalSim 2043 50% LOC Datasets Provided by Stantec	\$15,140
6.2 Perform Cumulative Conditions Baseline Model Scenario for "Without Project" (no SRWB) Case	\$13,020
6.3 Perform Cumulative Conditions Baseline Model Scenario for "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Case	\$10,660
6.4 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	\$7,240
6.5 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	\$9,350
6.6 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	\$8,700
6.7 QC and Verification of Results	\$7,240
Subtotal Task 6:	\$71,350
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$360,660</b>



**Woodard & Curran**  
**Sacramento Regional Water Bank CoSANA Modeling Analysis and EIR Support**  
**Task Order 4**

**Fee Estimate**

11/26/2025

Tasks	Labor							Total Hours	Total Fee
	Ali Taghavi	Jim Blanke	Brian Van Lienden	Reza Namvar	Jingnan Zhou	Mid-Level Engineer/Planner	Admin.		
	PIC	STL	PM	TM	PE-2	E-3	Project Coordinator		
	\$365	\$360	\$355	\$355	\$295	\$265	\$145		
<b>Phase 3 - Modeling and EIR Support Activities (12 Months)</b>									
<b>Task 1: Project Management &amp; Coordination</b>									
1.1 Project Management (Monthly Invoicing and Progress Reports)			12		24		12	48	\$13,080
1.2 Bi-weekly Technical Coordination Calls with Stantec and RWA	48				12			60	\$21,060
1.3 Results Presentation to RWA and stakeholders (2 Meetings with RWA, 2 Meetings with Stakeholders)	16				16			32	\$10,560
Subtotal Task 1:	64	0	12	0	52	0	12	140	\$44,700
<b>Task 2: Preparation of Stream Contribution Factor Analysis Plan</b>									
2.1 Develop Draft Plan Outline	2	4						6	\$2,170
2.2 Prepare the Draft Plan	12	24						36	\$13,020
2.3 Address Comments and Finalize Plan	4	16						20	\$7,220
2.4 Up to Three (3) Technical Meetings	6	6						12	\$4,350
2.5 Project Coordination	4				3		3	10	\$2,780
Subtotal Task 2:	28	50	0	0	3	0	3	84	\$29,540
<b>Task 3: Model Setup and Coordination</b>									
3.1 Evaluation and Confirmation of CalSim-CoSANA Demand Units Mapping	2				12			14	\$4,270
3.2 Refinement and Automation of CalSim-CoSANA Data-Exchange Templates	4				16	8		28	\$8,300
3.3 Coordination on Assumptions and Approach for Representing SRWB Operations in CoSANA	4				12			16	\$5,000
3.4 Joint QA/QC with Stantec to Confirm Consistent Boundary Conditions and Data-Exchange Protocols	8				16	8		32	\$9,760
3.5 QC and Verification of Model Setup	8				12	4		24	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 3:	26	0	0	0	68	20	0	114	\$34,850
<b>Task 4: Develop and Analyze Existing Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)</b>									
4.1 Update NASb GSP Existing Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb	8				24	4		36	\$11,060
4.2 Perform "Without Project" (no SRWB) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	4				24	8		36	\$10,660
4.3 Perform "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	8				40	16		64	\$18,960
4.4 Perform up to two (2) Iterations to Fine Tune the Project Operation, Timing, and Size to Mitigate Impacts and Undesirable Results	8				40	16		64	\$18,960
4.5 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	4				24	8		36	\$10,660
4.6 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	8				32	4		44	\$13,420
4.7 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	8				12	4		24	\$7,520
4.8 QC and Verification of Results	8				12	4		24	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 4:	56	0	0	0	208	64	0	328	\$98,760
<b>Task 5: Develop and Analyze Cumulative Conditions Baseline and Scenarios (Without and With Project)</b>									
5.1 Update NASb GSP Projected Condition Baseline CoSANA model for SASb	2				16	4		22	\$6,510
5.2 Perform "Without Project" (no SRWB) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	4				16	4		24	\$7,240
5.3 Perform "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Scenario in Coordination with CalSim	8				40	8		56	\$16,840
5.4 Perform up to two (2) Iterations to Fine Tune the Project Operation, Timing, and Size to Mitigate Impacts and Undesirable Results	8				40	16		64	\$18,960
5.5 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	4				16	4		24	\$7,240
5.6 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	8				16	2		26	\$8,170
5.7 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	12				12	4		28	\$8,980
5.8 QC and Verification of Results	8				12	4		24	\$7,520
Subtotal Task 5:	54	0	0	0	168	46	0	268	\$81,460
<b>Task 6: Develop and Analyze Climate-Change Conditions, 2043 50% LOC (Without and With Project)</b>									
6.1 Develop New CoSANA Hydrology Based on CalSim 2043 50% LOC Datasets Provided by Stantec	4				32	16		52	\$15,140
6.2 Perform Cumulative Conditions Baseline Model Scenario for "Without Project" (no SRWB) Case	4				32	8		44	\$13,020
6.3 Perform Cumulative Conditions Baseline Model Scenario for "With Project" (SRWB 65/55 TAF) Case	4				24	8		36	\$10,660
6.4 Coordinate Boundary Inflows/Outflows and Accretions with CalSim 3 Scenarios	4				16	4		24	\$7,240
6.5 Perform Assessment of "Leave Behind" and "Loss Factor" for the "With Project" Scenario	8				20	2		30	\$9,350
6.6 Interpret and Coordinate Scenario Model Results	8				16	4		28	\$8,700
6.7 QC and Verification of Results	4				16	4		24	\$7,240
Subtotal Task 6:	36	0	0	0	156	46	0	238	\$71,350
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1172</b>	<b>\$360,660</b>

- The individual hourly rates include salary, overhead and profit.
- Subconsultants will be billed at actual cost plus 10%.
- Other direct costs (ODCs) such as reproduction, delivery, mileage (rates will be those allowed by current IRS guidelines), and travel expenses, will be billed at actual cost plus 10%.
- W&C reserves the right to adjust its hourly rate structure and ODC markup at the beginning of the calendar year for all ongoing contracts.
- Additional Woodard & Curran staff may perform work on the project, based on our standard billing rate schedule currently in effect.



Topic: Legislative Update  
 Type: Legislative  
 Item For: Action; Take positions  
 Purpose: Policy 100.5 and Strategic Plan Priority- Advocacy Objective A

SUBMITTED BY: Ryan Ojakian Manager of Government Relations	PRESENTER: Ryan Ojakian Manager of Government Relations
---	--

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an action item for the Executive Committee to take positions on state legislation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Take position on state legislation AB 35.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff will provide an update to the Executive Committee on legislative activities including anticipated bills addressing wildfire liability, groundwater recharge, and low-income rate assistance.

The Legislature reconvened January 5<sup>th</sup>. Two-year bills still in house of origin (AB’s in the Assembly and SB’s in the Senate) have to pass their respective house by January 30<sup>th</sup>. Additionally, the bill introduction deadline is February 20, 2026. Staff recommends taking a position on the following two-year bill.

Bill Number and Author	Bill Summary and recommend position
<a href="#">AB 35 (Alvarez D- San Diego)</a>	Would remove the requirement that Prop 4 fund distribution is subject to emergency regulations. By removing this requirement, the bill would allow for a more standard regulatory process when allocating Prop 4 funds, providing greater clarity and predictability in implementation.  <b>Current Position: None</b> <b>Recommended Change: Support</b>

**FINDING/CONCLUSION**

This information is consistent with Policy Principles adopted as part of RWA policy 100.5 and Strategic Plan Priority - Advocacy Objective A.



Topic: Strategic Plan 2030 Update  
Type: Old Business  
Item For: Information/Discussion  
Purpose: Policy 200.2

---

SUBMITTED BY: Jim Peifer  
Executive Director

PRESENTER: Jim Peifer  
Executive Director

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information/discussion item for the Executive Committee to receive a report from the Executive Director and the Manager of Technical Services on the process of soliciting a consultant to assist in developing the Strategic Plan.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information/discussion only.

**BACKGROUND**

The Ad Hoc committee will be meeting to discuss and chose one of the consulting firms to assist in the development of the Strategic Plan.

Proposals were received from the following two firms:

- Integrated Communications Strategies (Jerry Azavedo)
- Bienati Consulting Group, Inc. (Larry Bienati)

Topic: PPIC Update  
Type: Old Business  
Item For: Information/Discussion  
Purpose: [Policy 200.1](#)

---

SUBMITTED BY: Jim Peifer  
Executive Director

PRESENTER: Jim Peifer  
Executive Director

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information / discussion item for the Executive Director to brief the Executive Committee on the Public Policy Institute of California’s Accounting for Water initiative.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

This item is for information /discussion only.

**BACKGROUND**

On January 9, 2026, Mr. Peifer attended a workshop that the PPIC held with Sacramento Valley representatives to discuss their Accounting for Water Initiative. Mr. Peifer will brief the Executive Committee on the workshop and the next steps for sponsoring the initiative.

Topic: Watershed Resilience Pilot Project Update  
Type: Old Business  
Item For: Information  
Purpose: Strategic Plan Objective A – Supports securing of funding and assist in resourcing projects and programs that are regional priorities

---

SUBMITTED BY: Jim Peifer,  
Executive Director

PRESENTER: Jim Peifer,  
Executive Director

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information item presented by Jim Peifer, Executive Director and Ryan Ojakian, Manager of Government Affairs, will brief the Committee on the Watershed Resilience Pilot Project activities.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information only.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff and consultants continue to work on the Watershed Resilience Pilot Project, which is being funded by a grant from the Department of Water Resources. The Pilot examines nine interconnected systems that are affected by climate and weather: ecosystem, flood management, groundwater supply, hydropower, surface water supply, agriculture, recreation, water quality, and community and equity. The focus is on strategies that benefit multiple systems at once and that address the most vulnerable assets and communities.



Topic: RWA Program Update  
Type: Old Business  
Item For: Information/Discussion  
Purpose: [Policy 200.2](#)

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Jim Peifer Executive Director	PRESENTER:	Jim Peifer Executive Director
---------------	----------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information/discussion item for the Executive Committee to have a two-way dialogue with staff regarding various programs and initiatives the RWA currently has underway.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information/discussion only.

**BACKGROUND**

The RWA and SGA have a number of programs underway, the Executive Director will brief the Executive Committee on the status of many of those programs and initiatives. The report will include key milestones reached to date, the overall status of the programs, upcoming key milestones, and current and future anticipated resources.



Topic: Executive Directors’ Report  
Type: New Business  
Item For: Information  
Purpose: General

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Jim Peifer Executive Director	PRESENTER:	Jim Peifer Executive Director
---------------	----------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information item for the Executive Director to provide a briefing on important activities, reports, communications, advocacy, and other updates.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information/discussion only.

**BACKGROUND**

This report is intended to provide an opportunity for the Executive Director to report to the Executive Committee on important activities, reports, communications, advocacy, and other updates.

**Watershed Resilience Pilot Project** – The Sacramento Bee ran an article on the Watershed Resilience Pilot Project. Please find the article at this link:

<https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article314322082.html>

**RWA Op Ed** in the Sacramento Bee - The RWA submitted an Op Ed to the Sacramento Bee addressing climate change impacts. The article can be found here:

<https://www.sacbee.com/opinion/op-ed/article314404264.html>

**Mavens Notebook** – The RWA submitted an Op Ed to Maven’s Notebook on the recharge efforts of our region. It is titled “We Banked on Collaboration and it’s paying off” and it can be found here: <https://mavensnotebook.com/2026/01/22/commentary-we-banked-on-collaboration-and-its-paying-off/>

**Contract Lobbyist** – The RWA’s contract lobbyist, Fernandez Jensen Kimmelshue Government Affairs is considering representing another client south of the Delta. RWA staff intend to work with contract lobbyist to ensure safeguards to prevent conflicts of interest.



Topic: Directors' Comments  
Type: New Business  
Item For: Information  
Purpose: Routine

---

SUBMITTED BY:	Jim Peifer Executive Director	PRESENTER:	Michael Saunders RWA Chair
---------------	----------------------------------	------------	-------------------------------

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is an information item to provide an opportunity for the RWA Executive Committee to report on any updates from their agency, comments, request future agenda items, recommendations, and questions.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

None. This item is for information only.

**BACKGROUND**

This report is intended to provide an opportunity for the Board of Directors to report on any updates from their agency, comments, request future agenda items, recommendations, and questions.