

Board Meeting

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Date: December 13, 2018

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Location: Santa Rosa Utility Field Office 35 Stony Point Rd, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Address: 35 Stony Point Rd, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

<http://www.sonomacountygroundwater.org>

Agenda

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call**
- 2. Public comment on matters not listed on the agenda but within the subject matter jurisdiction of the board**
- 3. Consent Calendar**
 - a. Approve Minutes of October 18, 2018
 - b. Approve Year-to-Date Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2018-19
- 4. Directors/Subcommittee Report**
 - a. Consider Resolution Commending Director Mark Millan
- 5. Advisory Committee Report**
- 6. Information Items**
- 7. Rate and Fee Study Session**
 - a. Study Session topics for Board discussion
 - i. Well registration program
 - ii. Boundary parcels
 - iii. Fee development
- 8. Action Items**
 - a. Consider Resolution appointing Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator, as Secretary of the Board
 - b. Consider adding Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator, as signatory of GSA account
- 9. Administrator, Plan Manager and Legal Counsel Report**
- 10. Adjournment**

Member Agency	Directors	Alternates
<i>City of Cotati</i>	Susan Harvey	Mark Landman
<i>City of Rohnert Park</i>	Pam Stafford	Jake Mackenzie
<i>City of Santa Rosa</i>	Tom Schwedhelm <i>Vice Chair</i>	Chris Rogers
<i>County of Sonoma</i>	Shirlee Zane	Susan Gorin
<i>Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District</i>	Joe Dutton	Mel Sanchietti
<i>Independent Water Systems</i>	Evan Jacobs	Michael Spielman
<i>Sonoma County Water Agency</i>	Lynda Hopkins <i>Chair</i>	Susan Gorin
<i>Sonoma Resource Conservation District</i>	John Nagle	Walt Ryan
<i>Town of Windsor</i>	Debora Fudge	-

Special Accommodations: If you have a disability which requires an accommodation, an alternative format, or requires another person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact Ann DuBay, (707) 524-8378, as soon as possible to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

Public Comment: Any member of the audience desiring to address the Board on a matter on the agenda: please complete a Speaker Card and hand it to the Clerk at the beginning of the meeting or prior to the time the Board Chair closes public comment on the item about which you wish to speak. When called by the Chair, please walk to the podium, state your name and make your comments. The public may comment on closed session items prior to the Board adjourning to closed session. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the subject under discussion. Each person is usually granted 3 minutes to speak; time limitations are at the discretion of the Chair. While the public is welcome to address the Board, under the Brown Act Board members may not deliberate or take action on items not on the agenda, and generally may only listen.

Meeting Documents: The associated documentation is available at the offices of the local agencies listed above and on the website at: www.santarosaplaingroundwater.org. Any changes to the date of the hearing, or any other updates will be noticed on the above website. For more information, please contact Andy Rodgers, arodgers@westyost.com.

Board Meeting Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Regular Meeting Minutes DRAFT

October 11, 2018

1:00 p.m.

City of Santa Rosa, Utilities Field Office

35 Stony Point Rd, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

<http://www.sonomacountygroundwater.org>

Member Agency	Directors	Alternates
City of Cotati	Susan Harvey	Mark Landman
City of Rohnert Park	Pam Stafford	Jack Mackenzie
City of Santa Rosa	Tom Schwedhelm	Chris Rogers
County of Sonoma	Shirlee Zane	Susan Gorin
Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District	Joe Dutton	Mel Sanchietti
Independent Water Systems	Evan Jacobs	Michael Spielman
Sonoma County Water Agency	Lynda Hopkins	Susan Gorin
Sonoma Resource Conservation District	John Nagle	Walt Ryan
Town of Windsor	Mark Millan	Deborah Fudge

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Lynda Hopkins, Chairwoman, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. noting that a quorum of the Board was present, consisting of the following Directors: Susan Harvey, Lynda Hopkins, Evan Jacobs (arrived 3:10), Mark Millan, John Nagle, Chris Rogers (for Tom Schwedhelm), Mel Sanchietti (for Joe Dutton), Pam Stafford, and Shirlee Zane. Others present included Ann DuBay, Interim Administrator; Simone Peters, GSA Administrative Assistant; Jay Jasperse, Plan Manager, Sonoma Water; Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water; Scott Morris, Legal Counsel.

2. Public comment on matters not listed on the agenda but within the subject matter jurisdiction of the board

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa - The Rate and Fee study claims people who rely on wells for their home use lots of water while the wine industry is trying to claim they use very little. There is no representation for the rural residential well owners on this Advisory Committee.

Duane DeWitt, Roseland – The place I rent is rural residential, we are on well and septic, we are conscience about water use as is our landlord. I believe these Board meetings should be held in the late afternoon or evening as mid-day is not helpful for taxpayers. One concern

my landlord has is that he is not well informed about activities going on. I am on an email list but don't get notifications about the meetings. For regular citizens, rural residential well owners shouldn't have to pay a fee. The wine industry doesn't seem to care about water usage, there is no stewardship program even though they claim to be sustainable. Get some metrics going that are easily understood by the public. Also, we shouldn't have to pay for a facilitator at Advisory Committee meetings. We can do it by ourselves in Sonoma County.

3. Consent Calendar

- a. Approve Minutes of June 14, 2018
- b. Approve Year-to-Date Financial Report for FY 2018-19

Public Comments: None

Director Stafford moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, **Director Harvey** seconded. Motion passed. Abstained from 3A (2), **Alternate Director Rogers** and **Alternate Director Jacobs**.

4. Directors/Subcommittee Report

Ad hoc committee on funding options

- a. **Director Millan** mentioned the Ad hoc met twice since the last Board meeting. At the Sept. 25th meeting, Raftelis reviewed its most up-to-date groundwater use estimates. On Oct. 3, they revisited the data and made additional clarifications. The Ad hoc also discussed options for spreading the costs more broadly to reflect the groundwater benefits and reviewed some options. The Ad hoc spoke with Legal Counsel to see if there was any wiggle room. They provided feedback to staff on the proposed work schedule.

Public comment:

Duane Dewitt, Roseland – I think there may be a bit of confusion about recharge. You should work with hydrologists. Where are you getting your science?

No action was taken.

5. Advisory Committee Report

Bob Anderson, Advisory Committee Chair, thanked Rue Furch for reporting to the Board while he was travelling. The Advisory Committee met on September 10. He mentioned they reviewed groundwater use numbers, no action taken, and they will have another chance to review numbers. Discussion about rural residential properties, in these numbers, a decision was made to go with a half-acre foot. In AC discussions it was pointed out that these numbers are about 60% -80% higher than urban water users. What is the basis of the half-acre foot? They discussed the numbers, boundary modifications, the State request to have six basins in the county, and commented on that, and had a quick look at the beginning of the GSP.

- Question –What are some issues and concerns regarding pasture land and use of recycled water?

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

- Response – The number of acres - number outside of Santa Rosa is 3,000 acres, in the prior document from the consultants we received in May it was 250 acres.
- Question - Do pasture lands turn over 2-3 times a year or only once?
 - Response – Suspect it varies, the pattern in Laguna is an early crop and hope for a second.
- Comment – Not aware of any agricultural persons irrigating with groundwater, only reclaimed water for pasture and crops. Can't understand where the 3,000 acre number came from.
- Question – Another part of the formula would be the use of holding ponds. Seems you would pump less if you had several holding ponds. Do you consider that when looking at acreage of pumping?
 - Response – Holding ponds – Pump an acre foot in, pump one out, still using an acre foot of water.
- Comment – Assumption is less water use if using holding ponds.
 - Response - If holding rainwater than a question of detailed analysis if an acre foot runs into a holding pond and denied downstream for replenishing the groundwater, it would be different than if you were pumping groundwater. It was noted that ponds with water rights (that are holding rainwater or surface water) were deducted from the equation.
- Comment – Overlay will be taken into consideration, offset could be utilized.
- Comment – It should be an offset and has to be considered in the equation.

Public comment: None

No action was taken.

6. Information Item

a. Agricultural Community Proposal

Mike Martini, representing Sonoma Alliance for Vineyards, Sonoma County Farm Bureau and North Bay Water District, discussed a paper that he submitted to the Board. He summarized the paper, noting that farmers, primarily in Santa Rosa Plain, are doing a study of recharge, and have installed monitoring wells using a new technology. They plan to work with GSA technical staff to ensure that the monitoring information is helpful. Want to use dollars to create solutions, not bureaucracy. Want to be part of the solution.

Public Comment:

Duane Dewitt, Roseland: Mr. Martini wants to be the 10th member on the Board, should have conservative conservationists also have a seat on the Board - that would make 11 members. Less extraction, more recharge is important.

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa: I would object to the wine industry seeking a position on the Board. Mr. Martini said the rural well owners might be charged an annual fee but not charged for extraction. That is contrary to what is being discussed in the rate and fee study. Don't look to the larger community to contribute money to what you are doing. Why do vineyards need deep wells if using little water?

Sebastian Bertsch – On the subject of recharge, there are lots of positive benefits, but the amount of groundwater is not the only factor, there is a seasonality to the groundwater and impact on groundwater. Have to play with yearly swings. Need to look at real-time analysis, depends on land use, significant different alterations for amounts of water.

No action was taken.

b. Basin Boundary Modification submission

Jay Jasperse, Plan Manager, gave a brief report. The County of Marin made a jurisdictional request to merge its portion of the Wilson Grove Formation Highlands Basin with Sand Point Basin. The City of Sebastopol requested a jurisdictional modification request as well. Requests were submitted to DWR before the September 28 deadline. DWR anticipates releasing the final 2018 Basin Prioritization document in November and responding to Basin Boundary Modification requests in spring 2019. When they have a draft, there will be a 30 day window for comment.

Public Comment:

Michel Hilber, Santa Rosa – How does this benefit those already in Santa Rosa Plain to add Sebastopol? Looks like adding the area west of the Laguna want to be added because it is a benefit to them. No relationship with the basin.

No action was taken.

c. Rate and Fee Study Update

Ann DuBay, Interim Administrator, provided the context of the Raftelis presentation and a quick update on the progress and projected schedule of the rate/fee study. In September/October Raftelis met with the Advisory Committee, and also met with the Ad hoc committees twice. They are anticipating a possible well registration program. Bringing some information about levying a fee on residential well owners to the Advisory Committee in November and to the Board in December. They have put together a work plan/schedule. In January the Advisory Committee will meet and provide input on different well options. It will go to the Board in February. There will be no adoption of the fee option until April.

Sally van Etten, Raftelis, mentioned Phase 1 is intended to pay for the administration and the portions of the GSP development not covered by the \$1 million grant being

awarded by DWR. Lots of the data questions will be answered with the GSP. Agricultural numbers have increased since the last presentation. Other new data updates: Addition of urban wells, addition of water rights for agriculture, roughly 235 AF per year offset, assumption of 50 AF per year for Windsor. There are a variety of different data sources out there.

- Comment - I think it would be helpful if in the final product there is an addendum of possible final resources.
- Question – How are we doing compared to the other two GSAs?
 - Response – The two other GSAs are going with agency contributions, very different path.
- Question - Were there any surprises in what you found or is the data as expected?
 - Response – Pasture land notably higher than others. This was a surprise.
- Question – Are we unique in how we treat pastures?
 - Response – These are State numbers. The numbers we came up with so far are a bit lower than the State's.
- Question – When do we decide if we repay 50% or 100%?
 - Response – It would be really helpful to have that decision by the December meeting. Maybe a deferred payment to phase 2 could be spread out over a longer period of time?
- Comment – It would be helpful to have something specific.
- Comment – Caution using language of Phase 1 and Phase 2.
- Comment – These numbers are very scary.
- Comment – It is important to hear from Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park regarding payback as they are the biggest municipalities.
- Comment – We are now getting even more options. Paying back, I can't speak for Rohnert Park right now. There is a huge conversation attached to this.
- Comment – The political side of this can't be over-stated. The State should pay for setting up this bureaucracy. I don't want to rush it. Public doesn't care about Phase 1 or Phase 2. Maybe we should have a meeting in the evening so public can attend.
- Comment – Ad hoc should work with Raftelis to come up with something more concrete.
- Question –Is this something that would merit additional workshops?
- Comment – Right now this doesn't resonate fairness.
- Comment – We haven't really had an opportunity to dive into this as a Board. We should devote a significant amount of time to this at our next meeting. Good role for Ad hoc to develop the agenda.

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

- Comment – There should be a workshop dedicated to this subject in the evening including the public.
 - Response – JPA doesn't specify a time. We could possibly turn the December Board meeting into a workshop.
- Comment – We need to have a discussion about the timeline of the repayment.

Public Comment:

Mary Grace Pawson, Rohnert Park – Earlier this year, most of the cities went back to the Board and unanimously agreed they wanted to continue with the rate study.

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa –This contradicts what Mr. Martini said about the usage charge. I would suggest we put the option of a de Minimis user charge-back on the table. Do you know what a half acre foot is per day for a household?

Rue Furch – Sebastopol may be at the table in three months and should have a voice here.

Sandi Potter, Windsor – We make an assumption that 310 gallons/day (119 irrigation, other household) = 0.13 acre feet, which is in line with the 'urban well' user estimates.

Brittany Jensen, Gold Ridge RCD – Will provide data regarding a study done in Bodega area on rural residential well use.

No action was taken.

d. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Update

Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, provided an informational update on the progress of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan and a proposed Board and Advisory Committee work plan. A community workshop will be held in early spring 2019 to solicit input and perspectives of stakeholders.

Public Comment: None

No action was taken.

7. Action Items

- a. **Contract with Sonoma County Water Agency: Consider authorization to enter into a contract with Sonoma Water from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2022 to provide technical, monitoring, outreach, and grant administration services to the GSA.**

Ann DuBay presented this item. Staff recommended to approve Service Agreement with Sonoma Water to continue to provide Technical Services for GSP development, financing options study, and other optional technical tasks; Outreach and

Communication activities for the GSA in general and for the Groundwater GSP; and management of the proposition 1 grant and future grants, monitoring grant opportunities, and developing grant applications for a not-to-exceed amount of \$996,000 from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2022.

Public Comments:

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa - Does not think this is the best way forward.

Director Stafford moved to approve, **Director Harvey** seconded. Recused: (1), **Director Hopkins**. Motion passed.

b. **Contract with California State University Sacramento: Consider authorization to amend contract with California State University Sacramento from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020, to provide facilitation services.**

Ann DuBay covered this item. Staff recommendation is to authorize the Interim Administrator to contract with the Collaboration and Consensus Program to facilitate Advisory Committee meetings and community meetings for an amount not-to-exceed \$56,000.

- Question – What is the hourly rate?
 - Response - \$153/hour for Rich Wilson, support staff is less.

Public Comment:

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa – It is a waste of money.

Director Harvey, moved to approve as presented, **Director Stafford** seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

c. **Contract with Kronick, Moskowitz, Tiedemann and Girard, LLC: Consider amended contract for legal services from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.**

Ann DuBay, gave an overview of this item. Staff recommended the Board approve to amend the existing contract by adding \$40,000 and extending it through June 30, 2019.

- Question – Are the other GSAs paying the same amount?
 - Response – Their bills right now are about half of ours, mainly due to the fee/rate study. We anticipate when things are finalized with the fee/rate study, the amount will go down considerably.
- Question – Do we pay for legal travel time to/from Sacramento?
 - Response – Yes, \$320/hour.
- Question – How long will this go on, this is a lot of money?
- Comment – One possible idea is to have legal counsel call into meetings to save money.
- Comment – Yes, agreed.
- Comment– Spending, while painful upfront, is good money in the long run so we don't get into trouble down the road.

Public Comment:

Michael Hilber, Santa Rosa – You are using legal counsel to seek advice on the right for charging a fee.

Director Stafford moved to approve as recommended and asked that as many cost savings as possible are taken, **Director Harvey** seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

d. **Contract for GSA Administrator: Consider authorization to enter into a contract with West Yost Associates for administrative services for the GSA from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020.**

Ann DuBay, presented this item. Staff recommendation is for Board to authorize the Interim Administrator and legal counsel to negotiate an agreement with West Yost Associates for administrative services from November 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020 for a not-to-exceed amount of \$275,500.

- Comment **Director Stafford** – Overwhelmingly chose West Yost during interview process.
- Comment **Director Milan** – Reiterated Director Stafford comment.

Director Stafford moved to approve: **Director Harvey** seconded. Recused (1), **Director Sanchietti**.

Public Comments: None

8. Legal Counsel, Administrator & Plan Manager Report

Scott Morris, provided an update on the Scott River case in Siskiyou County which involved public trust doctrine and the impact of groundwater pumping on surface waters.

Jay Jasperse, presented the Plan Manager update and noted local ramifications of the above mentioned case. Since the last meeting they have submitted written comments for the basins regarding basin re-prioritization.

Ann DuBay, mentioned the administrator report was in the package and thanked everyone for their work, she enjoyed working with everyone over the last few months.

Public Comment: None.

No action was taken.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Agenda Item: 3B

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Consent Calendar Item

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Andy Rodgers, Administrator
SUBJECT: Financial and In-kind Report through November 30, 2018

Summary: The Agency's total revenue is \$175,600.40 and had \$76,514.81 in expenses through November 30, 2018.

Background

This report covers the first five months of fiscal year 2018-19.

The Agency's budget for FY 18/19 is \$532,000 in addition to \$16,775.63 in match from the Gold Ridge RCD.

Reported in-kind from Gold Ridge RCD through October is \$16,775.63.

Income for FY 18/19 is \$175,600.40

Expenses for FY 18/19 is \$76,514.81

Accounts receivable balance is \$4,892.70

Accounts payable balance is \$0

Net Income balance for FY 18/19 is in the positive at \$99,646.87

List of Attachments

1. Agency Budget Performance as of November 30, 2018.
2. Member agency contributions received as of November 30, 2018.

Contact

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, 707-508-3672, arodgers@westyost.com

**Santa Rosa Plain GroundWater Sustainability Agency
 Financial Report - Budget to Actual as of 11/30/18**

Account	Account Description	FY 2018/19 Budget	FY 2018/19 Year-to-Date (as of	
			11/30/18)	% of Budget
42601	County of Sonoma	64,000.00	21,000.00	32.81%
42610	Other Governmental Agencies (SCWA)	64,000.00	64,000.40	100.0%
42611	City of Santa Rosa	64,000.00	21,000.00	32.81%
42613	City of Rohnert Park	64,000.00	21,000.00	32.81%
42615	City of Cotati	64,000.00	21,000.00	32.81%
42619	Town of Windsor	64,000.00	21,000.00	32.81%
42627	Special Districts (Sonoma and Gold Ridge RCDs)	84,000.00	6,600.00	7.86%
46040	Miscellaneous Revenue (Independent Water Suppliers)	64,000.00	0.00	0.0%
	Total Revenues	532,000.00	175,600.40	33.01%
	Interest	0.00	561.28	
	Total Interest	0.00	561.28	
	Grand Total Revenues	532,000.00	176,161.68	33.11%
51021	Communication Expense (SCWA Outreach)	30,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51041	Insurance - Liability	2,250.00	0.00	0.0%
51201	Administration Services (Gold Ridge RCD)	120,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51204	Property Tax/Assessment Admin (Fee Study)	65,000.00	55,723.13	85.73%
51206	Accounting/Auditing Services	10,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51212	Legal Services	60,000.00	19,964.80	33.28%
51213	Engineer Services (SCWA Tech Suppot)	180,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51226	Consulting Services (Monitoring/AC Facilitation)	35,000.00	826.88	2.36%
51249	Other Professional Serv (SCWA Grant Administration)	18,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51251	Claims Processing	2,800.00	0.00	0.0%
51301	Publications and Legal Notices	4,000.00	0.00	0.0%
51421	Rents and Leases - Bldg/Land (Meeting Room)	2,400.00	0.00	0.0%
	Subtotal Services	529,450.00	76,514.81	14.45%
52031	Food	500.00	0.00	0.0%
52111	Office Supplies	1,050.00	0.00	0.0%
52117	Mail and Postage Supplies	500.00	0.00	0.0%
52118	Printing and Binding Supplies	500.00	0.00	0.0%
	Subtotal Supplies	2,550.00	0.00	0.0%
51000	Grand Total Expenses	532,000.00	76,514.81	
	Net Income	99,646.87		

MEMBER AGENCY	TOTAL CONTRIBUTION	First Invoice	Received
County of Sonoma	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000
City of Cotati	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000
City of Rohnert Park	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000
City of Santa Rosa	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000
Town of Windsor	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000
Independent Water Suppliers*	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 59,108
Sonoma RCD	\$ 26,600	\$ 6,600	\$ 6,600
Gold Ridge RCD (partial in kind)	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ -
Sonoma County Water Agency (in kind)	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 643,600	\$ 175,600	\$ 170,708

*Invoices to Independent Water Suppliers were issued in October

Agenda Item: 4A

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Action Item

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Andy Rodgers, Administrator
SUBJECT: Consider Resolution Commending Director Mark Millan

Summary: Chairwoman Lynda Hopkins will introduce for board consideration a proposed resolution commending Director Mark Millan for his dedicated and thoughtful contributions and service to the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA).

Background

Representing the Town of Windsor, Mark Millan served as a board member during the formation and development of the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. Mark Millan also served on the ad hoc committee for the rate and fee study, an essential component to the future of the GSA.

Staff Recommendation

Approval

Vote Required

Majority

List of Attachments

1. Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Resolution No. SRP-18-004

Contact

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, 707-508-3672, arodgers@westyost.com

Agenda Item: 4A, Attachment 1

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

**Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Resolution No. SRP-18-004**

**RESOLUTION NO. 18-004 OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SANTA ROSA PLAIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY**

**IN APPRECIATION OF
OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE BY MARK MILLAN**

WHEREAS, Mark Millan has lived in the Town of Windsor with his family since it was incorporated over 25 years ago; and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan was elected Councilmember for Town of Windsor in November 2014 and served as Mayor in 2016; and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan is an active member of our community, serving on behalf of the Town of Windsor as a member of the Executive Board of the North Bay Division of the League of California Cities; and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan has led regional water entities as Chair of the Russian River Watershed Association and Chair of the Sonoma County Water Agency Water Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan served as a board member and ad hoc member on the formation and development of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA); and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan volunteered numerous hours above and beyond his community responsibilities, incurred personal sacrifice and exhibited outstanding community spirit and leadership in his service, acting as an agent of change and progressive compromise; and

WHEREAS, Mark Millan's unwavering commitment, willingness and ability to understand and respond to the concerns of the people of the Town of Windsor, Santa Rosa Plain and Russian River watershed has made a substantial contribution to the betterment of Sonoma County and beyond.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Rosa Plain GSA does hereby commend Mark Millan for his time-honored legacy of dedication, enthusiasm and outstanding public service given to the groundwater basin and watershed region.

I certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the Santa Rosa Plain GSA at a GSA board study session thereof held December 13, 2018.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this day, December 13, 2018, by the following vote:

DIRECTORS:

**Dutton: _____ Harvey: _____ Hopkins: _____ Millan: _____ Ryan: _____ Schwedhelm: _____
Stafford: _____ Zane: _____**

VOTES:

Ayes: _____ Noes: _____ Absent: _____ Abstain: _____

**By:
Lynda Hopkins,
Chairperson Santa Rosa Plain GSA**

Date:

**By:
Andy Rodgers,
Administrator Santa Rosa Plain GSA**

Date:

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Rate and Fee Study Session

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Andy Rodgers, Administrator
SUBJECT: Study Session topics for Board discussion

Summary: Staff will provide a background overview and status of the rate and fee study being conducted for the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) to inform the study session. The purpose of the study session will be to discuss key questions and topics that have emerged during progress on the rate and fee study and to provide staff/consultants clarity and direction for moving forward.

Background

The GSA is currently funded by contributions from member agencies. The Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) expects that contributions will be made through June 2019, at which point it is anticipated that the GSA will become self-funded. The GSA will need a funding source to ensure that it can meet basic operational expenses and can pay for the preparation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). While the \$1 million Proposition 1 grant will play a significant role in meeting the costs of preparing the GSP, the GSA will also need its own source of funds.

A study of possible rate or fee options began in December 2017, and since then, the following activities have occurred:

- Consultants met with GSA staff, legal counsel, Advisory Committee and Board to discuss GSA goals and objectives, and to identify and discuss the pros and cons of funding options;
- Multiple funding options were identified, including fees based on parcels, acreage, land-use type, estimated groundwater use or combinations of the above. Data was gathered from a variety of sources, including Sonoma Water; Permit Sonoma; water and recycled water suppliers; Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District; UC Cooperative Extension; Department of Water Resources; US Geological Survey; State Water Resources Control Board, and others;

Agenda Item: 7A

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

- Data assumptions and funding options were reviewed with staff, the Advisory Committee, Ad hoc committee and Board, and the feedback was used to modify assumptions and refine, eliminate or add options;
- A community workshop was held in March, and feedback further informed data gathering and refinement of options;
- Estimates of fees were calculated for a variety of options, with multiple scenarios, and presented to the Board;
- At its June meeting, the Board agreed to eliminate a parcel tax as a possible funding option because of the high cost of placing a measure on the ballot. The Board also agreed to continue with the rate/fee study rather than pursue ongoing member agency contributions;
- At its August meeting, the Board voted to extend the contract with Raftelis Financial Consulting (Raftelis) to complete the rate/fee study;
- In September/October Raftelis met with the Advisory Committee and Ad hoc committee twice;
- At its October meeting, the Board was presented an update on the progress and projected schedule of the rate/fee study including refined groundwater use estimates; and
- In November, Raftelis met with the Ad hoc committee twice and an irrigated pastures committee.

The December Board meeting will include a study session to review and discuss key questions for a well registration program, addressing boundary parcels and developing fees.

Staff Recommendation

The board will provide feedback to staff/consultants on a series of key questions needing to be resolved before moving forward.

Fiscal Information

None

Vote Required

None

List of Attachments

1. Agenda for Santa Rosa Plain GSA Board Study Session: Rate/Fee Options
2. Rate and Fee Study Presentation
3. Summary of Board & Advisory Committee Discussions and Actions

Contact

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, 707-508-3672, arodgers@westyost.com

Agenda Item: 7A, Attachment 1

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Agenda

Santa Rosa Plain GSA Board Study Session

Rate/Fee Options

December 13, 2018

Introduction

Purpose, goals, and context of December 13 study session: There are key questions that the Board needs to resolve before it can move forward. The purpose of the study session is to have a robust discussion framed around these questions, and to provide staff/consultants clarity for moving forward.

Chairwoman Lynda Hopkins

Background and Work to Date

Fee Options; Review of Board decisions and Advisory Committee & Community input and how that has shaped current thinking.

Jay Jasperse, GSA Staff

Key Topics/Questions

1. Well registration program: Member agency feedback on the following program assumptions:
 - a. Registration is free to well owners. Program funded by GSA.
 - b. Registration is 'opt-out', with a process to appeal
 - c. Registration program is run through a contract with Permit Sonoma with input on development and implementation by the Ag Commissioner
 - d. Outreach/education/information provided by GSA, with possible outreach subcontractor (if funding is available)

GSA Staff
2. Boundary parcels: How should parcels that are partially within the basin be considered?
GSA Staff
3. Fee development: Should GSA member agency contributions for years 1 and 2 be paid back (partially or entirely) in years 3 through 5 - OR - deferred for consideration of reimbursement during Step 3?
GSA Staff
4. Economic impacts: Are there opportunities to reduce potential economic impacts on some payors?
GSA Staff

Proposed study and adoption schedule

Revised/updated key dates and meetings, public hearings, community meetings (schedule partly dependent on whether Sebastopol is in or out of the basin).

Andy Rodgers, GSA Staff

Next Steps and Action Items



SANTA ROSA PLAIN
GROUNDWATER
SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

**Santa Rosa Plain Rate/Fee Study
Summary of Board & Advisory Committee
Discussions and Actions
November 2017 – December 2018**

Purpose & Background of the Rate/Fee Study

When creating the Joint Exercise of Powers Authority (JPA) that created the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency, the member agencies* committed to funding the first two years of GSA operations. The member agencies assumed that the GSA would adopt a rate or fee structure that would support operations for Years 3-5, until a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) was adopted. To this end, the GSA contracted Raftelis Financial Consultants and The Reed Group in late 2017 to conduct a rate/fee study. Over the past 12 months, the consultant group has shared its study results and sought input and direction from the advisory committee, the wider public and the GSA Board. The table below summarizes presentations and feedback, with key public meetings that determined direction and/or actions highlighted in yellow.

Timeline and Decisions

DATE	ENTITY	SUMMARY
November 20, 2017	Board	Approved contract with Raftelis Financial Consultants
December 2017	Staff	December Monthly Update (sent to about 1,200 subscribers) describes rate/fee study. All subsequent Monthly Updates provide information on the study.
December 12, 2017	Advisory Committee	Presentation by Raftelis; Advisory Committee members comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about how recharge is counted • Water conservation should be taken into account • Concerns about charging de minimis users • Provide information on state fee charges
February 8, 2018	Board	Overview of Rate/Fee Study presented by staff and Raftelis. Topics covered included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study scope and approach; • Overview of Prop. 218 and Prop. 26 for fee authority; • Public outreach and education plan Board provided feedback, including information on data sources and asking that all property owners be notified about study.

Agenda Item: 7A, Attachment 3

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

February 12, 2018	Advisory Committee	<p>Presentation by Raftelis regarding possible fee options. Multiple comments (see 2/12/18 meeting summary), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take recycled water into account • How to account for open space • Use USGS study as basis • Incentivize conservation • Consider a fee that would be partially based on owning a well and partially based on groundwater use. • Get community input!
March 21, 2018	Community Meeting	<p>Common themes included 1) use more/pay more, 2) everyone should pay, 3) tiered or hybrid option that everyone pays something and those who use more, pay more; and 4) re-charge and conservation.</p>
April 9, 2018	Advisory Committee	<p>Advisory Committee divided into four groups and discussed pros/cons of (1) pure extraction methodology; (2) hybrid methodology; (3) parcel tax; (4) state intervention. Input can be summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State intervention is not a good idea. • Several groups lean towards options 1 and 2, though many noted that each still has pros and cons and need refinement. • Parcel tax is too difficult due to not enough time to put in place, cost, potential lack of political feasibility. • Community outreach remains important. • Needs to be a balance between more data and less cost. <p>Public suggested that member agencies continue to pay – even for an additional year.</p>
April 12, 2018	Board	<p>Update on funding options provided by staff and consultants. Presentation focused on current options under consideration.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Board created an ad hoc, which included Chair Hopkins and Directors Dutton, Millan and Nagle (Note: Ad hoc committees from Sonoma and Petaluma were also formed and coordinated with the SRP ad hoc.)</p>
May 7, 2018	Advisory Committee	<p>Staff provided an update, including a review of the latest data estimates. AC members asked multiple questions.</p>
June 11, 2018	Advisory Committee	<p>Staff provided an update on the options including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parcel charge 2. Categorical Benefit Fee (hybrid option of estimated groundwater use divided into categories + fee based on estimated “share of pie”) 3. Proportional Benefit Fee (falls under Prop. 26 Regulatory Fee and spreads the cost of land use + parcel size); 4. Continued agency contributions. <p>Concerns/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcel charge doesn’t reflect groundwater use; similar to parcel tax. • Categorical benefit fee should continue to be explored.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportional benefit fee should be explored. • Member agency contributions must be unanimously approved, and several member agencies are opposed.
June 14, 2018	Board	<p>Staff provided update on rate/fee study timeline, budget implications and current options. Board took the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not pursue a parcel tax, as the costs of placing it on the ballot are too high. 2. Do not pursue ongoing member agency contributions. 3. Continue evaluating “categorical benefit fee” (a fee based on estimated groundwater use, divided by categories of users) and “proportional benefit fee” (a fee charged to all parcel owner, based on a combination of land use & parcel size) 4. Pursue possible well registration program, to allow de minimis users to be charged
August 9, 2018	Board	<p>Staff provided short update on rate/fee study timeline (including the need to extend the study) and current status of data. Board approved a contract extension with Raftelis to complete the study. (NOTE: Petaluma and Sonoma Valley GSA boards decided to continue member agency contributions and are no longer coordinating with Santa Rosa Plain GSA on the rate/fee study.)</p>
September 9, 2018	Advisory Committee	<p>Staff & Raftelis provided update. Purpose is to make sure AC understands groundwater use estimates and to get feedback. AC comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Residential use estimate seems high. • Sonoma State University groundwater use should be included; along with golf courses; industrial water users; recycled water use. • Cannabis should be broken out. • Recharge is still an issue. • Need to make sure there is an appeal process. • Pasture estimates seem high, as most people use recycled water. • Emphasize that numbers are evolving. <p>Overall, the fee model is getting toward what the public said it wanted, which is a charge based on estimated groundwater use. Not all data is known at this pre-GSP stage and some data remains particularly elusive (e.g., cannabis groundwater use)</p>
October 11, 2018	Board	<p>Advisory Committee Chair Bob Anderson provided updates and provided brief discussion on rural residential groundwater use estimate of 0.5 acre feet annually. Board asked about issues regarding pasture land, recycled water use, groundwater use estimates and accounting for surface water rights.</p> <p>Staff & Raftelis provided an update, including the refined groundwater use estimates, and Board provided the following comments (for full discussion, see draft meeting summary):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report should include an addendum with resources

Agenda Item: 7A, Attachment 3

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Phase 1” and “Phase 2” – may be hard for public to understand • Would like to have a specific proposal regarding deferring member agency contributions. • The numbers will be scary for agriculture. • Board workshop should be held at the next meeting. <p>Public comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s important to not pave over urban areas that provide recharge; recharge occurs at different rates and locations. • Cities checked with their counsels, and unanimously agreed to continue rate study, but may be flexible on payback for member agency contributions. • Concern about 0.5 acre feet per year estimate for rural residential. • Gold Ridge RCD has information on rural residential use in Bodega area and will share this.
December 13, 2018	Board	Study session

*Member agencies: Cities of Cotati, Rohnert Park and Santa Rosa; Town of Windsor; Gold Ridge and Sonoma Resource Conservation Districts; County of Sonoma; Sonoma County Water Agency. In addition, the GSA has a memorandum of agreement with the Independent Water Suppliers (mutual and investor owned water districts within the basin).

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Action Item

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Andy Rodgers, Administrator
SUBJECT: Consider Resolution appointing Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator, as Secretary of the Board

Summary: The Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Board of Directors appoints the Board Secretary. With the recent addition of a new GSA Administrator, the Board needs to also appoint a new Board Secretary.

Background

On November 1, 2018, Andy Rodgers, West Yost Associates was hired to serve as Administrator for the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. Part of the Administrator duties can include serving as Secretary of the Board, per Section 3.1(b) of the Agency's Bylaws.

The Board Secretary is appointed by the Board, and is responsible for the following:

- (i) Provide a record of all proceedings conducted at meetings retained at the Santa Rosa Plain GSA office.
- (ii) Maintain accurate, up-to-date records.
- (iii) Post all legal notices.
- (iv) Receive all correspondence or documents addressed to the Board and serve as the Santa Rosa Plain GSA's agent for receipt of subpoenas, petitions or other legal documents that are served on the Santa Rosa Plain GSA.
- (v) Call meetings to order in the absence of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson and preside until the remaining members present select one of themselves to preside at the meeting.
- (vi) Administer the Oath of Office to members of the Board.

Agenda Item: 8A

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

- (vii) Verify and attest signatures on all legal documents.
- (viii) In consultation with Legal Counsel, respond to all Public Records Act requests.
- (ix) Possess working knowledge of the Ralph M. Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order.

Fiscal Information

N/A

Staff Recommendation

Consider Resolution No. 18-005

Vote Required

Majority

List of Attachments

1. Resolution No. 18-005 of the Board of Directors of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Appointing Andy Rodgers as Board Secretary

Contact

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, 707-508-3672, arodgers@westyost.com

Agenda Item: 8A, Attachment 1

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Resolution No. SRP-18-005

**RESOLUTION NO. 18-005 OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA ROSA PLAIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
APPOINTING ANDY RODGERS AS BOARD SECRETARY**

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors ("Board") of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency ("Agency") seeks to appoint a Board Secretary consistent with Section 3.1(b) of the Agency's Bylaws.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency that:

1. The Board hereby appoints Andy Rodgers, Administrator of the Agency as Board Secretary pursuant to Section 3.1(b) of the Agency's Bylaws.

The foregoing resolution was duly passed at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency held on December 13, 2018 by the following vote on roll call:

DIRECTORS:

Hopkins: _____ Schwedhelm: _____ Dutton: _____ Harvey: _____ Millan: _____

Nagle: _____ Stafford: _____ Zane: _____

Ayes: _____ Noes: _____ Absent: _____ Abstain: _____

By: _____

Lynda Hopkins, Chairperson, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Attested by: _____

Date: _____

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Agenda Item: 8B

Meeting Date: December 13, 2018

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Action Item

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: Andy Rodgers, Administrator
SUBJECT: Consider adding Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator, as signatory of GSA account

Summary: Duties of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Administrator include signing forms and checks on behalf of the GSA pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Agency's Bylaws. The Board will consider adding Andy Rodgers, Santa Rosa Plain GSA Administrator, as signatory of the GSA account.

Background

On November 1, 2018, Andy Rodgers of West Yost Associates was hired to serve as Administrator for the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. Administrator duties include managing the Agency's financial operations; expend budgeted funds in compliance with Chapter 2, Article V of the Sonoma County Code of Ordinances; authorize purchases in accordance with the annual Board-approved budget; execute time and cost change orders; and solely sign Santa Rosa Plain GSA checks and/or claims requests.

Fiscal Information

N/A

Staff Recommendation

Consider adding Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator, as signatory of GSA account.

Vote Required

Majority

List of Attachments

1. Sonoma County Signature Authorization Form

Contact

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, 707-508-3672, arodgers@westyost.com

ERICK ROESER
 AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
 TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR

AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR
 585 FISCAL DRIVE, SUITE 100
 SANTA ROSA, CA 95403
 PHONE (707) 565-2631
 FAX (707) 565-3489



JONATHAN KADLEC
 ASSISTANT AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
 TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR

AMANDA THOMPSON
 ASSISTANT AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
 TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR

Signature Authorization Form

It is necessary that this office have the following information from your organization. Original signatures are needed for claim verifications. You may contact ACTTC-Claims@sonoma-county.org with any questions.

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____
 _____ Street
 _____, CA _____
 _____ City _____ Zip Code

CONTACT INFORMATION:

MAIN CONTACT: _____
 _____ Name _____ Telephone No.

ADDITIONAL CONTACT: _____
 _____ Name _____ Telephone No.

Authorized Signers

1. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature
2. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature
3. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature
4. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature
5. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature

Board Member Approval (i.e. highest level of authority)

1. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature Term Expires
2. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature Term Expires
3. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature Term Expires
4. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature Term Expires
5. _____
 Title Printed Name Signature Term Expires