

**SIERRA VALLEY GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Golden West Restaurant, Loyalton, CA
Monday, February 8, 2016 6PM**

MINUTES

1) CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL OF DIRECTORS

**Chairman Grandi called the meeting to order at 6:02PM.
Directors present: Genasci, Swofford, Roen, Ramelli, Roberti, Wallace.
Also present: Kristi Jamason, Carol Dobbas, Katie Tanner, Steve Baker,
and Jay Hubert.**

2) PUBLIC COMMENT

**Steve Baker, Operation Unite, presenting his opinion on
“Suggested Questions for the Formation of a Groundwater
Sustainability Agency”, copy on file.**

3) READING & APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR 1/11/2016

**Director Roen made a motion to approve, Director Swofford 2nd,
motion passed, all in favor, Directors Wallace and Ramelli abstain.**

4) REPORTS

A. GSA Formation – Juliana Walsh & Einen Grandi

**Please see the reply from Bill Ehorn, Senior Engineering
Geologist, Northern Region Office (NRO) of the Department of Water
Resources (DWR) below regarding Basin Prioritization (attachment)**

**The Secretary told the Directors that she had correspondence
with Mark Nordberg, Senior Engineering Geologist Sustainable
Groundwater Management Program, CA DWR who referred her to the
website link <http://water.ca.gov/groundwater/sgm/gsa.cfm> for
information on the GSA Formation process.**

**Director Roen told the Directors that Tim Beals, Director of
Building & Planning, Sierra County has coordinated a meeting/workshop
between the SVGMD and Bill Ehorn (and staff) to discuss the GSA
Formation and Basin Prioritization process. The meeting date is
February 29th.**

QUESTIONS TO ASK BILL EHORN & STAFF AT GSA FORMATION WORKSHOP

**What can the SVGMD do to change our medium priority?
ranking?**

**How often should the nesting monitoring wells be read for
best data? What would be the impact of reduced monitoring?
on all but 5 of the wells?**

**What are the court certified meter brands and what is the
importance of a certification on the meters required by the
State?**

**What are other areas of protocol that need to be addressed?
for the formation of a GSA?**

**B. Technical Report/Safe Yield (talk w/Ken Schmidt) Jim Roberti - The
differences between “confined “and “unconfined” aquifers were discussed.**

**The safe yield amount in Mr. Schmidt’s report was explained and talked
about by the Directors. The Directors would like a better explanation of the
6000 acre feet mentioned in the 2012-2014 Technical Report.**

**The data that has been collected for the District confirms that the
District is not in an overdraft.**

C. Audit & Technical Reporting Requirements – Carl Genasci,

**Please refer to California Code 26909 Article 1 “Duties Generally” (copy
on file)**

**It is a Board decision to go forward with the Financial Audit for the
District. Follow-up at next month’s meeting**

D. Sample 15-04 Resolution on Public Records Act (PRA) (Paul Roen) –

**Paul indicated that a resolution was not needed but a formal written
request for the District’s public records will be determined on an individual
basis with country counsel reviewing the non-disclosure or disclosure of
said request. Public funds dictate public information.**

5) DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

A. Elimination of storage fees for files – Juliana Walsh

The Directors unanimously voted to rescind the contract between the District and the secretary dated August 2008 for payment of \$250.00/month for file storage.

The District was offered shared office space for files and operation at the Sierraville School for an undetermined fee by the County. The files will remain at the Secretary's office/home.

B. Reducing meter readings and estimated cost savings (monitoring wells) –

There would be a potential savings of over \$1000/year reading the nested monitoring wells twice a year in Oct and in April. It is Ken Schmidt's opinion to monitor the flow meters on a monthly basis. It was suggested that a hydrograph of the monitoring process be established. This issue should be presented for discussion at the workshop meeting with Mr. Ehorn.

C. Green Gulch reimbursement –

There have been (2) meters that needed repair over the last year, DMS#11 an 8" meter and DMS#45 a 6" meter. DMS#11 dried up and remain stagnant for a couple of years until 2014 when a new was drilled. The meter from this well was sent in and repaired. SVGMD policy is no reimbursement on repaired meters. The Directors asked the secretary to invite Zach Harrison to the next meeting to discuss this issue.

D. Meter repairs/purchases

The cost of a new Senninger meter with telemetry capabilities is approximately \$1500 including adapter plate. To replace all of the McCrometer meters with Senninger would be an estimated cost of \$75K, over a 5 years period.

It is unknown why the McCrometer meters are failing. One possibility is that sand gets inside the bearings. The McCrometer meters are court certified, however it is uncertain if the Senninger meters are court certified. Follow-up at next month's meeting.

Irrigator fees – At the average 3 to 4 meters are being replaced per year. It is suggested that a flat fee be assessed on all meter sites. Director Genasci made a motion to impose a \$200/per meter site maintenance/administrative fee. Directors Roberti 2nd the motion, motion passed, all in favor. A dedicated fund would be used for all administrative and repair/replacement costs. All other miscellaneous costs associated with meters would also be included.

There was no action on purchasing a spare meter.

E. Plumas County parcel fees – Kristi Jamason presented her findings on the errors/omissions on the Plumas County parcel fees FY16. (copy on file)

Further discussion regarding how the Board chooses to implement credits and debits for these overcharges and undercharges will be carried over to next month's meeting. The Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and the District's By-laws will be scanned and emailed to all the Directors for perusal relating to this issue. County Counsels will also be contacted. Director Roen pointed out that County Counsel said that the fees are still due and payable even though there were errors in billing. Director Genasci made a motion to include this discussion at next month's meeting as it relates to the next fiscal year's assessments. The motion was 2nd, motion passed, all in favor.

Fees are assessed for fire districts but not for cemetery districts.

Fees for portions of parcels that span the District have been Identified and included in the analysis.

F. 218 Election Process and Cost –

The Finance Committee decided to raise the direct charges fees and go forward with the 218 election process. The details of this process will include the advice of County Counsel and the Assessor's office in Sierra County where the 218 election process was recently administered.

Director Roen forwarded a copy of the Sierra County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2015-061 pertaining to Solid Waste Fees for FY 15-16 to be used as an example.

G. Schedule Special Budget Meeting –

It was decided that a special budget meeting should be scheduled but not until after the workshop with Mr. Ehorn and DWR staff.

The focus of this special meeting would be for discussing the budget exclusively and not be a regular board of directors meeting.

- 5) CORRESPONDENCE – The secretary read the emails she has received for District business to the Directors. Copy on file.**
- 6) CASH BALANCE & FINANCIAL SUMMARY – The secretary presented the Financial Summary to the Directors. CB 2/4/16 \$9,989.82.**

Bills to be paid:	
AT&T	\$114.72
Downey Brand	\$220.00
AFCO (General Liability)	\$677.60
Wages	
Secretary	\$1,093.86
FICA/Med/OASDI	\$83.70
Total	\$2,189.28

Chairman Grandi requested a “running balance” worksheet to be used, on going, in lieu of the present format. The secretary will format a running balance worksheet to be presented at all future meetings.

7) AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING ON 3/14/16

GSA Formation
Prop 218 election raising direct charges
Plumas County parcel fee overcharges/undercharges
Technical Report Safe Yield data
Financial Audit Report
Special Budget meeting
 Senninger meter court certified status
 Reduction in meter readings
 Historical financial analysis
Green Gulch meter repair reimbursement

CLOSED SESSION EMPLOYEE EVALUATION

The Directors denied a raise in the secretary’s salary.

8) ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Grandi adjourned the meeting at 9:54PM.

Attachment (1)

Email from Bill Ehorn to Juliana Walsh regarding basin prioritization:

“Hi Juliana, we did the best we could gathering data for each groundwater basin statewide to perform the basin prioritization. We welcome better data where available. Towards the end of this year, we will be officially accepting data, where local entities can provide better data that may affect their prioritization score. We have 515 basins that have been ranked and we don’t have the time or resources to go into great detail (beyond the summaries I’ve already provided you) for each basin now questioning their score. The process for challenging a basin ranking score is to provide us better data for review during the open comment period toward the end of this year. At that time, we will review and consider what you provide. In the meantime, your population growth score is incorrect and we will look into it and figure out what the correct score should be. However, changing this value (even if it goes to “0”) will not change your basin ranking with the current scores reflected in the ranking categories. Thanks, Bill”

Juliana Walsh, Secretary