MEETING SUMMARY
February 23, 2017
Colusa Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) – Governance Workgroup Meeting #13

MEETING RECAP
- The Workgroup reviewed a potential funding structure for the first two years of JPA operation.
- The Workgroup finalized the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), with three changes.
- The Workgroup was not opposed to including the County portions of the West Butte Subbasin in the multi-party GSA.

For more local information, including all meeting materials, visit the Colusa County Water Resources Webpage. For information on SGMA visit the Department of Water Resources SGMA Webpage.

MEETING SUMMARY

- Opening Remarks
As Mr. Ceppos was delayed due to road conditions, Ms. Fahey opened the meeting and asked for introductions. Noting that Mr. Vanderwaal (Reclamation District 108) had to leave the meeting early, Ms. Fahey asked him to describe a funding proposal that he had developed (Appendix A). (Mr. Ceppos arrived during Mr. Vanderwaal’s presentation). Mr. Vanderwaal based his proposal on first year of startup assuming no grant funding. He referred to the Work Plan developed by Grant Davids (Appendix B). He numbered the Work Plan items #1 - #15. The near-term items (#4–#8) were taken into consideration for the first year. Total for these items is estimated at $340,000 and we are assuming $100,000 for administration costs for the first year. $290,000 is the estimated cost to actions that are equally beneficial to each agency. $150,000 is the estimate for expenses that are weighted based on acreage. Rather than acreage, population is used to calculate the weighted percentages for the cities. The total estimated cost for first year of operation is $440,000.

**Question:** Could you explain which items are fixed and which are percentage items? **Answer:** The fixed fee items added up to $240,000. Probably #4, 5, 7 and 8 were fixed fee items. **Comment:** $100,000 for Administration, so $240,000 is the sum of #4, 5 and 7 plus the Administrative fee. The concept is that the items that benefit everyone should be part of the fixed fee.

**Comment:** Mr. Vanderwaal and Ms. Fahey agreed that we need to get better estimates on the acreages of each agency.

Mr. Ceppos asked the group where they want to go next to keep the ball rolling. GSA funding is not something that has to be reconciled before the June 30 deadline.

**Comment:** Mr. Bettner (Glenn Colusa Irrigation District) stated that his board discussed the funding proposals. They are in both Colusa and Glenn Counties and they need to have an idea about costs. They would like to keep the ball rolling and get some of the near-term work plan items done as soon as possible.

Mr. Ceppos said that Glenn County is going to go through the same Work Plan exercise as Colusa and there may be opportunities to work together on some of these items for economies of scale. Mr. Ceppos reminded the group about Grant Davids’ “Crystal Ball” presentation which was his perspective on the work that will likely need to be done in Colusa County related to the sustainability Indicators. He stated that we need to be moving towards technically-sound, defensible information that will define that we are sustainable or not sustainable, and we do need to start working on action planning. What do we need to do to get to that point?
Comment: We are gathering initial funds that are relatively small. We need to take the risk and unknown out of the equation. We should complete these studies ASAP.

Question: Are we at a point where we can put these Work Plan items out for quotes?

Comment: There may be some items in the Work Plan that can be held off for a while. It’s good to have these cost estimates, but maybe some of the high initial costs can be forestalled to take the pressure off. Work Plan items #4, 5, 7 and 8 are probably necessary to have completed at some point, but are these studies important to form the GSA? Answer: Mr. Ceppos provided a recent update regarding the specifics of GSA noticing by June 30. He had recent correspondence with the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) regarding exactly what needs to be provided by June 30. DWR feels that they are limited to ministerial authority. SWRCB has a different interpretation. SWRCB’s stance is that any legal agreement must state, that by action of the signatories, the group is creating a GSA. There has to be an explicit statement that we are forming a GSA. This is important because ALL of the agencies have to agree, even with the MOA, that we are forming a single GSA.

Mr. Ceppos said that two things are happening simultaneously: continued development of governance and immediate program management. If we are going to start getting bids for studies, someone or a group has to start developing Requests for Proposals and associated work to get us to the next level. He asked the group if they want to keep going informally, or form a subcommittee, or pull Grant Davids back in. Ms. Fahey mentioned that we need to think about coordinating these efforts with Glenn County.

Question: Where is Glenn County in the process? Answer: They are one step behind this group. They are in the process of getting ready to ask Mr. Davids to start working on their version of a Work Plan.

Mr. Ceppos asked that, even if we don’t have all of the answers to some of the pending questions such as funding, etc. in the next couple of months, will the agencies all be willing to sign on to the GSA? How far do we need to go to get the answers you need to feel comfortable signing on the multi-party Agreement?

Comment: Princeton Codora Glenn and Provident Irrigation District’s boards have agreed to the single JPA and we should keep moving forward, even if it’s not 100% finalized. It’s time to coordinate with Glenn County and get on the same page. Let’s keep the costs minimal and keep it simple. Let’s get on with it.

Comment: The city of Williams has questions from their Council about costs and work involved. We need to send Requests for Proposals (RFPs), and maybe we can coordinate with Glenn. It helps to know costs going into it.

Mr. Ceppos asked RD 108 if it would be okay to share Mr. Vandwerwaal’s funding proposal with Glenn County and start conversations of economies of scale to further refine costs.

Question: Does this mean there will be no back-out language in the JPA? Answer: No, there will be opt-out language in the JPA.

Ms. Fahey mentioned that she has an upcoming meeting with Mr. Hull (DWR) to discuss the upcoming proposition 1 grant opportunity, and to discuss if any of the work plan items could be folded into that effort. There is no guarantee we will get funded, but we will have a good chance. She is also meeting with Ms. Hunter (Glenn County) and the consultants working on the current Proposition 1 grant funded projects in Colusa and Glenn Counties to see if/how the two projects can be integrated to gain some efficiencies basin-wide. Mr. Ceppos said that this could bring greater clarity to our project planning efforts. Mr. Ceppos asked Ms. Fahey if she and Ms. Hunter could work together to help ensure that coordination is taking place.

Comment: Mr. Williams would like to see the group push forward with the modelling and other items in the Work Plan. We have a unique opportunity right now to show the recharge capacity of the subbasins. We have just been through the worst drought in modern history and one of the wettest years this year. When can we
start having joint meetings with Glenn County? **Answer:** We have the first joint meeting scheduled for March 8 at 1:00. We will put the Work Plan on that agenda.

**Comment:** Ms. Reinhard volunteered Mr. Vanderwaal to work with County staff on the RFP process.

**Question:** How are we going to collect the funding for the GSA? **Answer:** At the next meeting, or the meeting after, we will discuss the full cost proposal. **Question:** But how do we get that money and where do we put it? **Answer:** By June 30, the State wants a statement that you are forming a GSA. They do not need to see how you are funding the effort. You have to work it out, but you don’t have to prove it to the State on June 30.

Mr. Ceppos went around the room with a straw poll (non-binding); if we reach June 28, could you accept the funding proposal as presented by Mr. Vanderwaal as a framework? All answered yes, as a reasonable starting point. Mr. Ceppos mentioned that the group should consider development of a separate Funding/Financing MOA.

**Next Steps:**

- Utilize Mr. Vanderwaal’s funding structure as a framework to get to the June 30 deadline, but continue to refine it as much as possible.
- Mr. Vanderwaal’s funding proposal will be shared with the Glenn County GSA Workgroup tomorrow.
- Ms. Fahey, Ms. Hunter (Glenn County) and Mr. Vanderwaal will coordinate Work Plan refinement and RFP development, and report to the group at our next meeting (on March 23).
- By our next meeting (March 23), we need to know the comfort level of each agency re: signing the JPA.
- Mr. Ceppos to work with Mr. Donlan on development of a separate funding MOA.

**Review/Finalize – Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)**

Mr. Ceppos stated that the Colusa County MOA has been shared with the Glenn County GSA Workgroup. The Colusa Workgroup had asked for one more round of feedback. There were two items to be addressed.

**Item 5.2.3**

“*The Parties agree that the Plan should encourage utilization of surface water to its full extent as available and feasible, and groundwater should be conserved for use during dry periods when surface water is not readily available or affordable.*”

Mr. Bressler (RD 1004) stated that he does not see why this item needs to be in the Agreement. It says that a district should not pump groundwater if surface water is available. It should not tell the districts what they have to do.

**Comment:** it is just saying that it encourages everyone to utilize surface water when available.

**Comment:** I don’t think this applies to districts, but more to landowners.

**Comment:** This could give an environmentally friendly tone to the Agreement. It doesn’t say you have to use surface water over groundwater, but it sets a nice tone to the document.

**Comment:** If we take the word “should” out of the statement, it softens the language.

**Action:** Remove the two occurrences of “should” from item 5.2.3

**Item 5.2.5**

“*Implementation of the Agreement and the Plan is not intended to affect any rights of surface water users and right holders to recapture or maintain rights to surface water seepage and leakage from canals and distribution*
and drainage systems, and to recover deep percolation of applied surface water for crop irrigation. Additional technical studies will assist the Parties in determining the quantity and availability of such recharge, and it is contemplated that the Plan will account for groundwater extraction and sustainable yield in a manner consistent with rights to recapture seepage, leakage and other surface water recharge in the Subbasin.”

**Comment:** I would like to strike this item and address it in the Plan.

**Comment:** Mr. Williams said that this statement claims a right to water that has previously been abandoned during normal practices. This language goes too far in scope for an Agreement. Mr. Williams has previously provided the following alternative language:

“The Agency recognizes that groundwater recharge occurs through many different means. Applied surface water, precipitation, porous supply and drain ditches, and Best Management Practices utilized by beneficial users contribute to the basins recharge. Studies will quantify the availability of such recharge and provisions will be included in the GSP to ensure that future groundwater extractions are consistent with quantified recharge and the sustainable yield of the Colusa Sub-Basin.”

Mr. Ceppos asked the group if anyone was opposed to striking this language.

**Comment:** I like the alternative language because it addresses this concept and also talks about further studies.

Mr. Ceppos asked the group if anyone was opposed to the alternative language.

**Comment:** Mr. Bettner said that he is okay with this. He mentioned that the surface water districts spent a lot of time on this. They want to hear what other groups want, not just what they do not like.

No one was opposed to the alternative language.

**Action:** Replace 5.2.5 with the alternative language supplied by Mr. Williams.

**Comment:** 5.2.7 should be moved to the Governance and Implementation section.

“The Parties agree that the Plan should encourage board members to act on behalf of and represent all landowners within their service areas to ensure collective compliance with the Act.”

**Action:** Move 5.2.7 to the Governance and Implementation section.

Mr. Ceppos said that Mr. Donlan and Mr. O’Brien thought that the MOA should be placed into the JPA as an attachment, rather than integrating the MOA language throughout the JPA.

Ms. Fahey explained that Mr. Donlan felt that it would be best to include the MOA as an Appendix or Exhibit. He also recommends that we ratify the MOA. Mr. Donlan feels that signatures will make it a stronger document. It will also provide a signed document that is ready to go if we do not get the JPA completed by June 30.

Mr. Ceppos proposed that we table the ratification discussion for now while Glenn is finalizing their version, and we can get Mr. Donlan at the table at a future meeting for this discussion. The group agreed.

**Discussion – Joint Powers Agreement Outline**

Ms. Fahey pulled up for reference on the screen the latest version of the JPA with the most recent modifications made by Mr. Donlan. This is the first time the group has had a chance to review the JPA.

Mr. Ceppos explained that this document is the proposed structure of the JPA and Mr. Donlan has begun populating the document. The first two items are the Recitals and the Definitions. There are three items in
Organizing Principles which are embedded in the MOA. Do we need this in the JPA, or could this be where the reference to the MOA resides?

**Action:** Put a reference to the MOA in the Organizing Principles.

Article 3 – there were no comments.

Article 4, Governance - this is where details about voting will be defined.

Article 5, Financial Provisions – no comments.

Article 6, Changes to membership - Mr. Ceppos asked if this should be part of Article 4.

**Question:** Is Article 4 where it talks about how board members are appointed? **Answer:** Yes. Would it make sense to have information about membership under one Article?

**Comment:** It says that a representative for RD 1004 is appointed by the Board of RD 479.

**Action:** Article 4: Governance, last bullet - Change “appointed by Reclamation District 479” to “appointed by Reclamation District 1004.”

**Comment:** I think it’s okay to leave Article 4 and Article 6 separate.

**Comment:** Section 5.11 talks about voting structure and expenses. Should Voting Structure be in Article 4?

**Action:** Split Section 5.11 into two Sections, Voting Structure in Article 4 and Allocation of Expenses to remain in Article 5.

**Comment:** Article 8 addresses Management Areas (MAs) that are more specific to Yolo County. The Colusa group is not there yet. All you have done is indicated a willingness to develop MAs.

**Comment:** 8.1 limits the activities of the GSA to coordination and administration. The GSA should have more authority than that.

**Comment:** Yes, Yolo is heavily pushing authorities down to the Management Areas.

**Comment:** We could put in language that Management Areas will be part of our solution. It is too early to go into too much detail, but at least address the fact that this will be an option if everyone agrees.

**Action:** Provide a placeholder for Management Areas and add language that Management Areas will part of the structure.

**Comment:** In Article 8, there should be language about groundwater banking. The Authority should have the ability to borrow water from member agencies.

**Action:** Mr. Bergson will provide draft language related to groundwater banking.

**Comment:** There is no mention of conflict or dispute resolution in the Agreement. This is very important and should be included.

**Action:** Include a section for Conflict/Dispute Resolution.

**Comment:** Ms. Fahey mentioned that Mr. Donlan had suggested another Legal Review Subcommittee meeting.

**Action:** After the Workgroup has a chance to review the JPA and after the next iteration of the document, a Legal Review Subcommittee meeting will be scheduled.
Comment: Under membership, there is one Private Pumper member, there should be two.

**Action: Change language to two members from the Groundwater Commission.**

Further discussion was held regarding dispute resolution. Mr. Ceppos mentioned a Concept Paper that he co-authored and will send to Ms. Fahey to send to the group, including the attorneys. The Concept paper includes model language for a JPA that combines consensus-based decision making with Robert’s Rules of Order. It could be part of a dispute resolutions section.

**Action: Mr. Ceppos to send Concept Paper to Ms. Fahey to send to the group, including the attorneys.**

**Question:** Under membership, why does the County appoint Colusa Drain Mutual Water Company (CDMWC)?

**Answer:** Mutuals cannot be signatory to a JPA, but there is a question of who appoints them.

**Action: Clarify if CDMWC can be appointed by the entire GSA, or if they have to be appointed by a single agency.**

Comment: We may need to consider language about coordination with the Glenn County GSA. We don’t need this for the Agreement, but we will need it for the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). We may want to consider this now. The agencies that cross counties might need this. Mr. Ceppos asked if anyone was opposed to including language referencing coordination with Glenn County. No one was opposed.

**Action: Provide language regarding coordination between Colusa and Glenn Counties.**

Comment: Regarding Section 6.1, changes to membership. Our MOA says we will accept new agencies. This says the board has the authority to accept new agencies but it also says they have the authority to remove agencies.

Comment: Section 6.3 goes into more detail.

Comment: The basin needs to be sustainable and kicking out a member doesn’t solve the problem, it makes it worse. There needs to be a remedy to a bad situation.

Comment: If we kick a member out because of non-compliance, the State will go after them, not the whole basin.

Mr. Ceppos said that the group should put some thought into this. Think about what happens if an agency stops attending meetings, contributing funds, etc. Do you want to have the tools to deal with this?

Comment: Section 5.1 discusses the agencies funding the GSA. At some point, the populace will be funding implementation.

Mr. Ceppos asked if anyone is opposed to having Mr. Donlan develop a separate legal Agreement that deals with financial aspects. No one was opposed.

**Action: Mr. Donlan to work on development of a separate MOA that addresses finances.**

Comment: The way Section 6.3 is written, if one agency does not agree with the others they could be kicked out. Disagreements with an agency doesn’t necessarily mean that that agency is a “bad apple.” This process needs to be better defined.

**Action: Mr. Williams will draft language to refine Section 6.3, Mr. Ceppos will work with him.**

- Discussion – West Butte Subbasin

Ms. Fahey mentioned that the group has talked about the West Butte Subbasin, but has not gotten into much detail. We’ve looked at the multi-party GSA bringing in the County portion of the West Butte. The County
prefers this structure. There has also been some discussion about a future basin boundary adjustment to pull in the County portion of the West Butte Subbasin. There are agencies in the Butte and Glenn portions of the West Butte that are proposing to do a basin boundary adjustment that would cut us off from the Butte County portion of the West Butte. RD 2106 is restructuring and talking about joining in with Western Canal to be included in the basin boundary adjustment. Glenn County’s position is to keep their basins separate.

**Question:** What does DWR think about this? Are there other instances where one GSA covers two subbasins?  
**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** So we would have two GSPs? One for each basin?  
**Answer:** If the Colusa GSA covers both basins, it would be simpler – only one GSA would need to be formed. Then the question comes in 2018 whether or not to submit a basin boundary adjustment to pull the Colusa portion of the West Butte into the Colusa Subbasin. It could still be treated as a Management Area. There is precedent with DWR, when given appropriate information, to approve boundary adjustments based on political boundaries. There could be an issue with the West Butte Subbasin if Colusa County wants an adjustment and the agencies in Butte and Glenn apply for a boundary modification and the West Butte Subbasin is pulled in too many directions. It’s complex and won’t get resolved until 2018.

The other option is to just do the bare minimum in the West Butte to meet the June 30 deadline, and wait it out until 2018.

**Question:** Would the County have to file a separate GSA for the private pumpers in the West Butte if RD 1004 files as a separate GSA?  
**Answer:** Not sure. It’s up to RD 1004. You could propose to the RD 1004 board that you include them (RD 1004) in the Colusa multi-party GSA. There would probably need to be language regarding this added to the JPA.

**Question:** What happens if we don’t include RD 1004?  
**Answer:** Colusa County and RD 1004 forms one GSA in the West Butte, or the County and RD 1004 form separate GSAs.

**Comment:** Let’s include RD 1004 in for now, then get the data, then if they want to do something later based on the data, they can go off on their own. I think that looking at costs and administration, it would be better for RD 1004 to be part of the larger group.

**Comment:** Mr. Bressler, RD 1004, said that if the GSA proposed a basin boundary adjustment in 2018, there are some landowners that will not be on board.

**Comment:** The simplest thing now is to pull the West Butte subbasin into the GSA and keep the basins separate (do not request a basin boundary modification). Now they have some protections regarding transfers. We should maintain the West Butte as a separate subbasin.

**Comment:** Even if Colusa County does not apply for a basin boundary modification, some boundary modifications are going to be applied.

Ms. Fahey asked the group if anyone was opposed to including the Colusa County portion of the West Butte Subbasin in the Colusa multi-party GSA. No one was opposed.

Ms. Fahey and Ms. Carter will be attending a special RD 1004 Board meeting on March 2 at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the options. This is a public meeting and all GSA Workgroup members are welcome to attend.
Action Items from This Meeting:
• Joint Colusa and Glenn Workgroup meeting March 8 Agenda items:
  o Work Plan and integration between Counties
• Use Mr. Vanderwaal’s funding structure as a framework, but continue to refine it
• Ms. Fahey, Ms. Hunter (Glenn County) and Mr. Vanderwaal will coordinate with Work Plan refinement and RFP development, and report to the group at the next meeting on March 23.
• By the next meeting (March 23), we need to know the comfort level of each agency re: signing the JPA.

Action Items from This Meeting Regarding the MOA
• Remove the two occurrences of “should” from item 5.2.3.
• Replace 5.2.5 with the alternative language supplied by Mr. Williams.
• Move 5.2.7 to the Governance and Implementation section.

Action Items from This Meeting Regarding the JPA
• Article 2: Organizing Principles - Include a reference to the MOA in the Organizing Principles and remove 2.1-2.3.
• Article 4: Governance, third to last bullet - Clarify if CDMWC can be appointed by the entire GSA, or if they have to be appointed by a single agency.
• Article 4: Governance, second to last bullet re: private pumper representation - change language to two members from the Groundwater Commission.
• Article 4: Governance, last bullet - Change “appointed by Reclamation District 479” to “appointed by Reclamation District 1004.”
• Article 5: Financial Provisions - Split Section 5.11 into two Sections, Voting Structure in Article 4 and Allocation of Expenses to remain in Article 5.
• Article 8, Section 8.1: Refine language to better reflect Colusa County. Provide a placeholder for Management Areas and add language that Management Areas will part of the structure.
• Mr. Bergson will provide draft language related to groundwater banking to be integrated into the JPA.
• Include a section for Conflict/Dispute Resolution
  o Mr. Ceppos to send Concept Paper regarding consensus-based decision making.
• After the Workgroup has a chance to review the JPA and after the next iteration of the document, Ms. Fahey to schedule a Legal Review Subcommittee meeting.
• Provide language regarding coordination between Colusa and Glenn Counties.
• Article 6, Section 6.3: Mr. Williams will draft language to refine this section, Mr. Ceppos will work with him.
• Mr. Donlan to work on development of a separate MOA that addresses finances.

For copies of all meeting materials, visit the Colusa County Water Resources Webpage.
## Participant List

### GSA Workgroup Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Garner</td>
<td>Princeton Codora Glenn and Provident Irrigation Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Mitchell</td>
<td>City of Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrin Williams</td>
<td>Colusa County Groundwater Commission/ Private Pumper Advisory Commission (PPAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Carter</td>
<td>Colusa County Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Bressler</td>
<td>Reclamation District 1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Vanderwaal</td>
<td>Reclamation District 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thad Bettner</td>
<td>Glenn Colusa Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wallace</td>
<td>Colusa Drain Mutual Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Cain</td>
<td>City of Colusa (left early)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Boyd</td>
<td>Princeton/Provident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Murphy</td>
<td>Colusa County Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Bergson</td>
<td>City of Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Reinhard</td>
<td>RD 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Members of the Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Marsh</td>
<td>Colusa County Groundwater Commission/PPAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Matzke</td>
<td>Cortina Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Ellis</td>
<td>Glenn County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Bradford</td>
<td>Mayflower Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Carrillo</td>
<td>Interested party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Moresco</td>
<td>PPAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Mendiz</td>
<td>U.C. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Alves</td>
<td>Kanawa and Glide Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Peterson</td>
<td>PPAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ceppos</td>
<td>Center For Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fahey</td>
<td>Colusa County Water Resources Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A: Funding Proposal

#### Per Agency Cost, by year (assumes 15 seats on board) Initial Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Municipality</th>
<th>Fixed Fee (per Seat for 1 year)</th>
<th>Fixed Fee (per year if 2 years)</th>
<th>Weighted Cost</th>
<th>All in One Year Total</th>
<th>Estimated Acreage within Colusa &amp; W. Butte Basin (less NWR) = 422,123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District #108</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa County Water District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Water District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell Irrigation District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton-Cordova-Glenn &amp; Provident Irrigation District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District #479</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa Drain Mutual Water Company</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Williams - Note 2</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colusa - Note 2</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Berlin Water District</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Commission #1 - Note 3</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Commission #2 - Note 4</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Colusa - Note 5</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District #1004</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contribution after Two Years</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>Note 7</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1** - Assumptions are that Davids Engineering Estimate for “Near Term Benefits” is $340,000 and there are $100,000 in administration costs during the first year. Also, **no grant funding** is included in these calculations. $290,000 is the estimated cost to actions that are equally beneficial to each agency, $150,000 is the estimate for expenses that are weighted based on acreage.

**Note 2** - The cities population is equated to one person equaling one acre in the Weighted % distribution column. Williams Population estimated to be 579 and Colusa Population estimated to be 5946. Total of the two is 11,138.

**Note 3** - This is for acreage in areas that are not within a GSA eligible agency in Colusa Subbasin (~37,700 acres).

**Note 4** - This is for acreage in areas that are not within a GSA eligible agency - in West Butte Subbasin (~22,000 acres).

**Note 5** - This is for acreage in agencies that could file as GSA’s but are not, including cities/towns (~62,000 acres).

**Note 6** - Assumes the District Formation is making consistent, significant progress towards formation.

**Note 7** - This column, above, shows the cost per year if these costs are extended through a two year period, instead of during the first year.
## Appendix B: Cost Estimate based on Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>High Cost</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 - County Wide Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>In Progress Funded by State Grant and County In-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ County In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 - Develop GW Data Mgmt System</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ County In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 - Describe Existing GW Wells</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ County In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 - Recon Level Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 - Develop detailed Surface Layer Water Budgets</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 - Estimate reduction of GW Storage over time in areas of declining GW levels &amp; sustainable GW yield</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Near Term Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 - Compare &amp; Evaluate alternative existing models</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 - ID &amp; Initiate refinements to selected model</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 - ID &amp; describe all beneficial uses &amp; users of GW in County</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 - Identify Management Areas</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 - ID &amp; Implement monitoring improvements to address data gaps</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 - Formulate Recon Level Plans &amp; Projects to Increase Recharge &amp;/or Decrease pumping in areas of depletion</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Can Be Completed Later During Plan Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14 - Assemble/analyze data to evaluate existing &amp; potential effects on Land Subsidence, Streamflow &amp; GW Dependant Ecosystems due to GW Pumping</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15 - Assemble/analyze data w/r to Well Drawdown &amp; Water Use in areas with Declining GW Levels</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,192,000</td>
<td>$2,157,000</td>
<td>$827,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA Administrative Estimate (1st year)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Fee Amount</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$367,000</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Fee Amount</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1 year</strong></td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$642,000</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>