



Groundwater is a vital resource, together let's protect it.

5180 Soquel Drive • Soquel, CA 95073 • (831) 454-3133 • midcountygroundwater.org

Proposed Agenda

Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)

Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Monday, November 3, 2017, 4:00 – 6:15 pm
Community Foundation Santa Cruz County
7807 Soquel Drive, Aptos, 95003
Solari Conference Room

Meeting Objectives

1. Increase Advisory Committee understanding of the Brown Act and its implications for the GSP Advisory Committee Process.
2. Review and discuss edits to Advisory Committee Charter, and approve the Charter.

Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter & Materials
3:30 p.m.	<i>Arrivals</i>	
4:00 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions, Objectives, and Agenda Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Ricker, County of Santa Cruz • Eric Poncelet, Facilitator
4:10 p.m.	Brown Act 101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ron Duncan, Soquel Creek Water District
4:25 p.m.	Review, discuss, and approve updated GSP Advisory Committee Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator • All <p><i>Materials: Updated Charter</i></p>
5:35 p.m.	Public Comment on updated GSP Advisory Committee Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator • All
5:45 p.m.	Approve updated GSP Advisory Committee Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator • All
5:55 p.m.	Public Comment on General Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator
6:05 p.m.	Discuss GSP Process Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator • All <p><i>Materials: GSP Process Flow Diagram</i></p>
6:10 p.m.	Recap and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator
6:15 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>	



Groundwater is a vital resource, together let's protect it.

5180 Soquel Drive • Soquel, CA 95073 • (831) 454-3133 • midcountygroundwater.org

Charter

Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Sustainability Plan Advisory Committee

Approved by the Advisory Committee: November 13, 2017

This Charter outlines the charge and operating protocols for the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee). The purpose of this Charter is to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee during the GSP process. In this GSP process, the Charter is being used to create common expectations about how the Committee will work together to foster and reinforce constructive interaction throughout their deliberations. Its intent is to emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, the pursuit of mutual gains, and use of best available information. The Advisory Committee can reconsider and revise this Charter if it appears not to serve the Advisory Committee process.


Outline

- A. Introduction
- B. Charge and Responsibilities
- C. Membership and Participants
- D. Meeting Formats and Sub Groups
- E. Decision Making Process
- F. Protocols and Ground Rules
- G. Role of Support Staff
- H. Schedule and Work Plan

A. Introduction

1. **Problem Statement – from the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency** (adopted text in italics)

Our primary source of drinking water in the Mid-County Basin (see map below) is groundwater. Our Basin has been in overdraft for over 30 years. Lowered groundwater levels have allowed seawater intrusion and pose the threat of more widespread saltwater contamination if left unabated. Local streams are losing water flow, which adversely impacts aquatic ecosystems. We need to ensure safe, reliable, and sufficient water resources to support our community and the natural environment.



2. Background

California’s Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) became law on January 1, 2015. SGMA required the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to designate groundwater basins into High, Medium, Low and Very Low priority classifications. DWR’s Basin classifications are based on a variety of criteria, including the local population’s dependence on groundwater and local groundwater levels. All basins classified as medium and high priority must prepare a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) by 2022. High priority basins that are also classified in critical overdraft must complete their GSPs by January 31, 2020. GSPs will replace groundwater management plans that were required under AB3030. Groundwater Management Plans had some of the features of a GSP, but did not include State mandated sustainability indicators or mandatory deadlines to reach sustainable groundwater management goals. In contrast, SGMA requires medium and high priority basins to make measurable progress toward sustainability, to report that progress annually, and to achieve ongoing sustainability. Basins in critical overdraft must achieve sustainability by 2040. The Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Basin is a high priority basin in critical overdraft.

During the work of the Soquel-Aptos Groundwater Management Committee’s Groundwater Sustainability Agency Formation Subcommittee (GSA Formation Subcommittee), the Subcommittee considered several possible approaches to meeting the SGMA’s requirement for broad stakeholder engagement in the development and implementation of GSPs.

The agencies that formed the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency (MGA) Board purposefully included three positions on the Board as a first step to meeting the SGMA’s requirements for stakeholder involvement. However, the GSA Formation Subcommittee recognized that even with those Board slots, it would be desirable to expand the engagement of stakeholders in the GSP development process.

Under a grant provided by the State Water Resources Control Board, resources from the California State University and Sacramento’s Center for Collaborative Policy were made available to the SAGMC to create a Community Engagement Plan. As part of the GSA Formation Subcommittee’s process, it considered a range of options of broadening engagement of stakeholders in the development of the GSP. The recommendation included in the Community Engagement Plan was to create an advisory committee with expanded representation of key interests as well as MGA Board members. This committee would be tasked with working with staff and consultants to develop the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) and provide the Board with recommendations on how to address key policy issues that will need to be covered by the plan.

After considering the range of relevant stakeholders and interests that it would be desirable to include in a committee to advise the Board on the GSP, the MGA Working Group recommended that the Board create a committee representing the following interests: MGA Member Agencies, MGA Board Member Private Well Owners Representative, Institutional Users, Agricultural Users, Business Interests, Environmental Interests, Small Water System Management, Water Utility Rate Payers, and Representatives of the Community At Large. These particular interests were chosen for inclusion in the GSP Advisory Committee by the MGA Working Group because they cover the key user groups and interests. Tribal and state or federal fish and wildlife agencies were not included because the MGA Working Group provided for their involvement on an as needed basis through the use of short term working groups that would operate during the planning process.

As a committee that is advisory to the MGA Board, the GSP Advisory Committee is subject to the (State of California) Brown Act (see additional details below).

3. Groundwater Sustainability Plans

Groundwater sustainability plans contain, among other things, the following information: a description of the plan area, a description of current and historical groundwater conditions in the basin, a descriptive hydrogeologic conceptual model of the basin, a water budget for the basin, a description of management areas, an articulation of sustainable management criteria and a sustainability goal, identification of undesirable results, a description of minimum thresholds, identification of measurable objectives to achieve the sustainability goal for the basin within 20 years of plan implementation, and description of a monitoring network.

B. Charge and Responsibilities

1. Charge to the Advisory Committee from the MGA (adopted text in italics)

The Groundwater Sustainability Plan Advisory Committee will provide guidance to staff and the Santa Cruz MGA Board for the creation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The Committee will analyze and provide recommendations to the MGA Board on key policy issues that will form the Plan. The Committee’s final presentation to the MGA Board will take place no later than the MGA’s July 2019 Board Meeting.

Committee members will represent diverse interest groups within the Basin. They will deliberate based on scientific data to understand current and projected basin conditions. The Committee will work collaboratively in an open and public process to ensure community concerns are addressed within the Plan.

The Committee will recommend strategies to the MGA Board to achieve a sustainable groundwater basin by 2040. Responsibilities include:

- *Evaluate scientific information and recommendations from staff on the impacts to the Basin, and assess various management approaches to reach sustainability,*
- *Consider the effect of changing climate and sea level on groundwater conditions,*
- *Establish objectives and thresholds for State mandated sustainability indicators,*
- *Analyze options and recommend supplemental water supply alternatives to meet projected demand,*
- *Promote public education about Plan decisions and the Basin’s sustainability, and*
- *Recommend approaches to funding projects and allocation of project costs.*

The Advisory Committee will be tasked to work with staff and consultants to develop the Plan. They will provide the MGA Board with recommendations on how to address key policy issues required by the State’s legal mandate. The Committee will make periodic reports to the MGA Board for input and feedback. They will report on key milestones in the development of the Plan, including: groundwater pumping impacts, key alternatives to reach groundwater sustainability, thresholds and measurable objectives for each sustainability indicator, possible program funding strategies, and recommendations for Plan implementation.

2. Additional Objectives and Responsibilities

The ultimate objective of the Advisory Committee is to contribute to the development of a GSP that satisfies the requirements of SGMA, that can be broadly supported by diverse stakeholder communities in the Mid-County Basin, and that can be successfully implemented.

Additional Advisory Committee responsibilities include:

- **Policy questions:** As part of their deliberations, Advisory Committee members will address policy questions associated with GSP development. Support staff will help in identifying these questions for Advisory Committee consideration and deliberation.
- **Interest-based discussions.** Advisory Committee members will be willing to express fundamental interests (rather than fixed positions)¹ and to clearly convey the interests of one or more constituent groups.
- **Collaborative Approach.** Advisory Committee members will be willing to work collaboratively with each other, seeking to integrate the interests of a broad range of constituencies.
- **Checking back with constituencies.** Advisory Committee members have been recruited based upon their ability to ably represent diverse interests within the Basin. Advisory Committee members are encouraged to coordinate with interested constituents as appropriate throughout the GSP process to bring their views into Advisory Committee discussions. Staff are available to support these coordination efforts as needed.
- **Report back to MGA.** Advisory Committee members may be asked to participate in MGA meetings through, for example, reports to the MGA at its board meetings, periodic joint-study sessions, and issue specific sub-committee meetings. Advisory Committee members

¹ A “position” is a particular stance taken by a party—a preferred solution to an issue. “Interests” are the intangible motivations (fundamental needs, desires, concerns) underlying the preferred solution.

will make every effort to participate in these meetings when requested. Individual presenters to the MGA will be identified by the Advisory Committee as a whole when presentations are warranted.

- **Commitment to the Process.** Advisory Committee members will be committed to achieving all elements of their charge as described above.

C. Membership and Participants

1. Committee Composition

The Advisory Committee was appointed by the MGA to represent a diversity of interests and expertise. The Committee consists of the following 14 members (*=MGA Board representatives):

- Kate Anderton – Environmental Representative
- John Bargetto – Agricultural Representative
- *David Green Baskin – City of Santa Cruz
- Rich Casale - Small Water System Management
- Chris Coburn – Institutional Representative
- *Bruce Jaffe – Soquel Creek Water District
- Dana Katofsky McCarthy - Water Utility Rate Payer
- *Jon Kennedy - Private Well Representative
- Jonathan Lear - At-Large Representative
- *Allyson Violante – County of Santa Cruz
- Douglas P. Ley – Business Representative
- *Marco Romanini – Central Water District
- Charlie Rous - At-Large Representative
- Ned Spencer - At-Large Representative

Committee members are expected to attend all meetings (to the extent feasible). There are no alternate members.

2. Committee Member Additions and Withdrawal

It is not anticipated that new members will be added to the Advisory Committee unless to replace another Committee member.

Advisory Committee members have made the commitment to participate for the duration of the groundwater sustainability planning process. In the event where a member must withdraw from the Advisory Committee, he or she may do so by providing a letter of resignation to the MGA Board Chair, with copies to the facilitators to be distributed to the other members. At that point, the MGA may elect to replace the Committee member to ensure balanced interest representation on the Committee.

If an Advisory Committee member consistently deviates from the operating protocols and ground rules established in this Charter and agreed to by all, that member will meet with the facilitation team and the Executive Team to discuss the transgressions and steps necessary to rectify them. If the behavior does not improve, the matter will be brought to the MGA Board.

D. Meeting Formats and Sub Groups

1. Advisory Committee meetings

The full Advisory Committee will meet twice during the fall of 2017 and then monthly between January 2018 and July 2019. During 2018-2019, Advisory Committee meetings will take place on the [fourth] Wednesday of every month. Meetings will typically last 3 hours and will run from 4:00-7:00 p.m., 5:00-8:00 p.m., or 6:00-9:00 p.m. Meeting locations will be selected taking several factors (e.g., A/V facilities, commute traffic, etc.) into consideration. The meeting times and locations will be posted on the MGA calendar of events and the Advisory Committee page on the MGA website. All Advisory Committee meetings will be open to the public.

A minimum of eight Committee members must be present to hold a meeting. Committee members who are not able to attend a meeting will inform project staff and facilitators in advance.

Membership on the Committee was designed to provide broad representation of the various interests that need to be considered in the planning process. In order to maximize the potential for all members to participate actively, fully, and equally in the process, Advisory Committee meetings will be organized and run by the Facilitation Team rather than a Committee chair/vice chair. This approach optimizes the opportunity for full participation by all Committee members in the group's deliberations.

As part of their ongoing work, the Advisory Committee will periodically take stock of the Committee's progress and discuss how best to achieve its charge and to stay on schedule. These discussions will take place either in regularly scheduled Advisory Committee meetings or in targeted working group meetings (see below) as appropriate.

2. Issue Area Working Groups

As needed, Advisory Committee members can create ad hoc working groups to address particular issue areas to help drive their work forward. Working groups will have specific, bounded charges and work products; they will not make decisions or recommendations. Rather, they will explore and research scientific, technical and policy issues, and will bring their work products back to the full Advisory Committee for action.

Working groups will not contain a majority of Advisory Committee members and are therefore not subject to the Brown Act. Within reason, the Advisory Committee can invite non Advisory Committee members to participate in these working group meetings. When deciding to convene a specific working group, Advisory Committee members will discuss and recommend invited participants to the full Advisory Committee for approval. When needed, the Advisory Committee may seek assistance from MGA board and staff to identify the people most knowledgeable to participate in specific issue area working groups. Working groups will not speak on behalf of the full Advisory Committee. Ad hoc working groups may be facilitated as needed.

3. Brown Act Requirements

As an advisory committee to the MGA, the GSP Advisory Committee process is subject to the Brown Act. As such, the following procedures (among others) will apply. For a more detailed guide to the Brown Act produced by the California League of Cities, see the [link](#) below.³

- All meetings of the Advisory Committee will be open and public.
- Advisory Committee meetings will be preceded by a posted agenda that advises the public of the meeting and the matters to be transacted or discussed. The agenda will be posted at least 72 hours before the regular meeting on the MGA website and in a location freely accessible to members of the public. The agenda must state the meeting time and place and must contain a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting, including items to be discussed in closed session.
- All meeting materials distributed prior to or during the meetings will be made publicly available.
- Serial meetings, which could be constituted by Advisory Committee members forwarding or replying all to an email string or referring to the project through social media, are prohibited.

4. MGA Bylaws Requirements

As a subcommittee to the MGA Board, the GSP Advisory Committee is also governed by the applicable sections of the MGA bylaws.⁴ The bylaws require capturing of meeting minutes or summaries.

- Minutes of committee meetings shall be recorded by the facilitation team and shared with the Advisory Committee along with the meeting packet in advance of the next meeting. At the beginning of the next Advisory Committee meeting, the facilitator will ask if Advisory Committee members have any additions or refinements to add to the meeting minutes, at which point they will be considered approved and forwarded to the MGA Board. They will also be posted on the MGA website.
- For the GSP Advisory Committee, the minutes will be in the form of key outcomes-focused meeting summaries intended to capture the main results of the Advisory Committee meetings. These meeting summaries will summarize who participated, key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward; these summaries are not intended serve as meeting transcripts.

E. Determining Levels of Support and Committee Recommendations

The GSP Advisory Committee will follow the general protocols established in this Charter; it is not required to follow specific rules of procedure.

The Advisory Committee will operate as a body seeking broad agreement in its preparation of advice for the MGA Board.

³ www.cacities.org/Resources-Documents/Resources-Section/Open-Government/Open-Public-2016.aspx

⁴ See [sections 4.6.3](#) and [5.3.4](#).

Formal proposed recommendations to the MGA Board will be presented verbally and/or in writing for consideration by the full Advisory Committee. Members will be allowed sufficient time to consider them before voting. Advisory Committee members will be invited to indicate whether they support, or not, an item under discussion. Support, here, is defined as “can live with”.

- **Level of support.** Advisory Committee members will be invited to indicate their “level of support” for any proposed recommendation. Different levels of support include: general support (“I like it”), qualified support (“I have some issues with it, but I can live with it”), and fundamental disagreement (“I don’t like it and cannot live with it”).
- **Voting and recording levels of support.** The level of support for decision items will be recorded for each Advisory Committee member, along with a summary of areas of agreement and disagreement. If fundamental disagreement exists over a particular decision item, the group will be asked to continue working to reach agreement or until it becomes clear that a resolution is either not necessary or not attainable. At that time, project staff will note the nature of the disagreement, and in consultation with the group, decide how best to frame the issues to present to the MGA Board for consideration.
- **Recommendations.** A “recommendation” from the GSP Advisory Committee will be achieved if a supermajority of Committee members (defined as at least 10 members) expresses support for a particular decision item. Every recommendation that is brought to the MGA Board will contain context in terms of which Advisory Committee members voted for or against a particular item. The Advisory Committee will strive to ensure that particular interests or perspectives are not disenfranchised by being consistently left out of recommendations.
- **Strive for broad-based support for proposals.** Advisory Committee members will strive to achieve a high level of agreement in developing advice for the MGA Board. The intent is to strive for recommendations that can earn broad-based, cross-interest support from Advisory Committee members.
- **Use of “straw polls”.** Advisory Committee members recognize the need to make simple process agreements to move their work forward. A straw poll is a method used for surveying a group on a particular issue and typically involves asking each group member to indicate a preference on a particular issue.
 - Project facilitators may use “straw polls” to develop a sense of the group’s views, track progress, and help the group arrive at short-term decisions to propel the process forward in an efficient fashion. Straw polls should be considered interim results.
 - Project facilitators, support staff, or an Advisory Committee member can request a straw poll.
 - Project facilitators will check in with the group to confirm the appropriateness of conducting the straw poll. Straw polls will be preceded by adequate Advisory Committee deliberation.
 - Project facilitators will record the intent and outcomes of each straw poll taken.

F. Operating Protocols and Ground Rules

1. Participation and Collaboration

- **Active, full participation.** Every Advisory Committee member is responsible for communicating his/her perspectives and interests on the issues under consideration. Voicing and actively listening to these perspectives is essential to achieving meaningful dialogue. Everyone will participate; no one will dominate.
- **Focused participation.** Advisory Committee members will come to the meetings prepared and will focus their discussions on the topics at hand. Everyone will help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Advisory Committee members will respect each other's personal integrity, divergent viewpoints, values and legitimacy of interests. Advisory Committee members will listen courteously while others are speaking. Only one person will speak at a time. Advisory Committee members will refrain from using deliberate misinformation, personal attacks, or stereotyping.
- **Integration and creative thinking.** Advisory Committee members will seek to balance advocacy and inquiry. In developing, reviewing and revising work products, Advisory Committee members will strive to be open-minded and to integrate each other's ideas, perspectives, and interests. Disagreements will be regarded as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won. Advisory Committee members will attempt to reframe contentious issues and offer creative solutions to enable constructive dialogue. Where Advisory Committee members do not support a specific solution or proposal, they are encouraged to offer alternative solutions.
- **Satisfy mutual interests.** Advisory Committee members will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other Advisory Committee members. Advisory Committee members are encouraged to be clear about their own interests and to recognize the important distinction between underlying interests and fixed positions.
- **Cell phone/PDA courtesy.** While participating in meetings, Advisory Committee members will refrain from cell phone use, emailing, and text messaging. Except during breaks, cell phones and other electronic communications devices will be turned off or set to "silent" mode.

2. Commitment to the Process

- **Good faith effort.** Advisory Committee members will make a good faith effort to achieve the goals of the project within the identified schedule.
- **Meeting attendance.** All Advisory Committee members will make every effort to attend all Committee meetings. Consistent attendance is critical to ensure the creation of shared knowledge and a common language. Meetings will start on time. Advisory Committee members who know that they will be absent, late, or have to leave early will inform project staff and facilitators in advance and coordinate with other Advisory Committee members to ensure that their ideas are brought to the table and that they are informed regarding Advisory Committee deliberations and decisions made. After a missed meeting, Advisory Committee members will work to get up to speed to keep the project from "backsliding."

- **Come prepared.** Advisory Committee members will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives. If specific “homework” is assigned, Advisory Committee members are expected to have the homework completed by the start of the meeting.
- **Commitment to ground rules.** Once they are ratified, Advisory Committee members commit to adhere to these ground rules as a set of mutual obligations. Advisory Committee members are encouraged to uphold these ground rules. Advisory Committee members commit to bring concerns about adherence to the ground rules or other process matters to the facilitation team rather than expressing such concerns in a manner that undermines the respect of any individuals or the process..

3. Advisory Committee Communication

- **Consistency with Brown Act.** Advisory Committee members will avoid oral or email communications with other Advisory Committee members outside of Committee meetings (e.g., serial meetings) that would be inconsistent with the Brown Act.
- **Representation.** Unless they have been appointed a spokesperson for a specific task, Advisory Committee members will always make it clear when they speak or write in public that they speak for themselves, and not as a spokesperson for the Committee or for other Committee members.

4. Involvement of Public

- **Public comment at Advisory Committee meetings.** Advisory Committee meetings will include opportunity for public comment on items within the purview of the Advisory Committee. Public comment will be keyed to specific Advisory Committee work product discussions and agenda items. Additionally, there will be an opportunity during the meeting for the public to raise items not on the agenda. Advisory Committee members are encouraged to consider public input into their deliberations.
- **Key purpose of verbal public comment.** Oral public comment provides an important opportunity for the broader public to inform Advisory Committee deliberations on the GSP development process. As such, to the extent possible, public comments should be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the Advisory Committee. Comments on subjects external to the GSP development process should be directed to other forums.
- **Other opportunities.** Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as Advisory Committee members. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit comments in writing (via email to: dp Pruitt@cfsc.org). Written public comments will be distributed to Advisory Committee members on a regular basis as part of their meeting packets.
- **Facilitation of public comment periods.** Public comment will be facilitated by the meeting facilitator. The meeting facilitator will ask for a show of hands (or use speaker cards) to assess the number of attendees wishing to comment at any public comment period. The time allocated to each speaker will be based on the total available time and the number of

individuals wishing to speak (with a minimum of one minute per speaker). In the case where a large number of public participants wish to comment, the facilitator may decide to extend the public comment period. When possible, the meeting minutes will identify the topic discussed and the speaker who introduced the topic.

- **Adherence to ground rules.** It is expected that members of the public will adhere to the same ground rules of focused interaction and respectful engagement as the Advisory Committee. Members of the public will be respectful of the Advisory Committee’s time.
- **Advisory Committee response.** Advisory Committee members and support staff will typically not respond in detail to the public during public comment periods. Committee members are encouraged to consider public input into their deliberations after the public comment period is over.

5. Information Sharing and Joint Fact-Finding

- **Information gathering and sharing.** The GSP development process will include multiple opportunities for data sharing and joint fact-finding among the Advisory Committee. Joint fact-finding refers to a process where: stakeholders are able to provide their knowledge and identify information sources, needs, and questions for analysis; deliberations of scientific advisors are transparent; data are pooled to support better informed recommendations; and a serious effort is made to identify and narrow sources of scientific disagreement. Advisory Committee members are encouraged to be as specific as possible in identifying types of information they believe will support the development of work products. This information may include a mix of peer-reviewed studies, other scientific studies, field notes from researchers, and first-hand knowledge from resource users. Accordingly, Advisory Committee members are encouraged to contribute their own first-hand knowledge to support the work of the Advisory Committee. Advisory Committee members seeking to share written information or data should transmit this directly to Darcy Pruitt as a staff point person (rather than sharing data directly with each other).
- **Best readily available information.** Advisory Committee members recognize that the Mid-County GSP development process relies on using the best readily available information. Tentative information will be treated as such. Development of the GSP will not be delayed in order to fill any perceived data gaps.

6. Media Contact

- **Meeting recordings.** Advisory Committee meetings are public and will be audio recorded. Audio archives of meetings will be available on the MGA website within approximately one week of each meeting.
- **GSP media contacts.** Media contacts regarding the GSP process from a “big picture” perspective will be handled by the Executive Team. First contacts should go to John Ricker, Santa Cruz County.
- **Advisory Committee media contact.** On occasion, reporters may contact individual Advisory Committee members for comment about a particular issue. Advisory Committee members who are contacted by the media will speak only on behalf of themselves or their group or

constituency. After commenting, the Advisory Committee member will provide the media entity with contact information for communications point persons Darcy Pruitt and Sierra Ryan and request that the media entity contact those individuals for further information.

- **Representation to media.** Advisory Committee members recognize the need to maintain a balance between providing timely information to constituents and making statements to the media that could undermine the success of the GSP process. Advisory Committee members agree to avoid: a) making statements to the media that may prejudice the project's outcome, b) representing another group's point of view or characterizing others' motives, or c) stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still being developed or refined by work groups or the Advisory Committee.
- **Use of meeting summaries.** In briefing constituents, Advisory Committee members are encouraged to rely primarily on the summaries to be produced for the GSP Advisory Committee meetings.

G. Role of Support Staff

1. Executive Team

- The Executive Team is composed of:
 - Ralph Bracamonte, Central Water District
 - Tim Carson, Regional Water Management Foundation
 - Ron Duncan, Soquel Creek Water District
 - Rosemary Menard, City of Santa Cruz
 - John Ricker, Santa Cruz County
- The Executive Team is responsible for providing process guidance to the GSP process and will assist in relaying Advisory Committee or public requests or inquiries to and from the MGA. Executive Team members will help determine when ideas brought up by the Advisory Committee or member of the public are outside of the scope of the Committee's charge; uncertain cases will be brought before the MGA. The Executive Team will provide periodic written reports to the MGA Board, pulling from Advisory Committee meeting summaries.

2. Other Key Support staff

- Darcy Pruitt, Regional Water Management Foundation: Darcy is responsible for compiling information and advice developed by Advisory Committee members and the technical team into a draft GSP. Darcy will also be the point person for receiving and coordinating GSP related inquiries from Advisory Committee members and the public. Darcy will draft press releases, provide text for the website, and support other outreach tasks.
- Sierra Ryan, Santa Cruz County: Sierra will provide support for public communication and outreach, website maintenance, and meeting planning.
- Julia Townsend, Regional Water Management Foundation: Julia is responsible for meeting logistics and transmitting meeting materials and information to the Advisory Committee and general public.

3. Technical Team – HydroMetrics

- HydroMetrics will be responsible for providing all technical analysis and support to the Advisory Committee. This includes presenting at orientation workshops, conducting groundwater modeling, and presenting and synthesizing other technical work that the Committee will need in its deliberations.
- HydroMetrics is a non-partisan contractor whose role is to provide technical support and best readily available information to the GSP process. During the project, it is possible that HydroMetrics will be working on other GSPs throughout the state; HydroMetrics will maintain a sensitivity to potential conflicts of interest and will disclose any that occur.

4. Facilitation Team – Kearns & West

- **Neutral facilitators.** The Kearns & West facilitation team is non-partisan; the facilitators have no stake in any content of the GSP and will not act as advocates for particular outcomes. The facilitators will strive to ensure that the Advisory Committee completes its charge in a well-informed, respectful, and timely fashion.
- **Foster alternatives with mutual benefit.** The facilitation team will seek to foster approaches to meeting management and to the identification and consideration of advice on the GSP process that maximize joint gains and mutual benefit.
- **Efficient use of time.** The facilitators will strive to structure and manage meetings and discussion so as to make efficient use of Advisory Committee members' time. This includes providing materials in advance of meetings, keeping the discussion focused, and monitoring discussions so that no individual or idea dominates.
- **Facilitators' discretion.** The facilitation team will use its discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitation team may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues and gauge the level of support for alternative options.
- **Meeting Summaries.** The facilitation team will prepare key outcomes-focused meeting summaries to capture the main results of the Advisory Committee meetings in accordance with MGA bylaws listed in section D.4 above.

H. Schedule and Work Plan

- The work of the Advisory Committee will proceed in three main phases according to the conceptual framework shown below.

Phase 1 -- October 1 to December 31, 2017:
Orientation and Groundwater Sustainability Plan
Advisory Committee convening and charter
development

Phase 2 -- January 1 to December 31, 2018: Basin
setting, sustainability indicators, risk analysis,
potential projects and actions to support basin
restoration and sustainability

Phase 3 -- January 1 to June 30, 2019: Final
recommendations, cost analysis and user impacts,
legal issues and implementation and financial
planning

- Project staff will work with the Advisory Committee to develop a more detailed work plan and approximate timing for key deliverables, and to update the process as appropriate. This will include early agreement about the form of work products. The Advisory Committee recognizes that its work developing advice on key policy issues will be an iterative process.
- The Advisory Committee will track its progress against this initial work plan and will discuss process adjustments as needed.
- [The Advisory Committee will formally present its final recommendations to the MGA Board at the July 2019 MGA Board meeting. At this meeting, the Advisory Committee will identify specific members to making this presentation to the MGA Board.
- It is anticipated that the process will move quickly and will need to make adaptations along the way.

**Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Process Overview
October 2017**

Phase 1: Orientation and Convening

Phase 2: GSP Advisory Committee Policy Development

Phase 3: GSP Advisory Committee Recommendations Development

10/1/2017 11/1/2017 12/1/2017 1/1/2018 2/1/2018 3/1/2018 4/1/2018 5/1/2018 6/1/2018 7/1/2018 8/1/2018 9/1/2018 10/1/2018 11/1/2018 12/1/2018 1/1/2019 2/1/2019 3/1/2019 4/1/2019 5/1/2019 6/1/2019

Committee and Public Orientation

- 9/25/2017: Orientation Session #1 10/05/17
- Orientation Session #2 10/25/17
- Orientation Session #3 11/13/17
- Orientation Session #4 12/07/17

Committee Convening and Charter Development

- GSP Advisory Committee Convening and Charter Development Meeting 10/25/17
- GSP Advisory Committee Convening and Charter Development Meeting 11/13/17

Develop and Evaluate Preliminary Criteria for Sustainability Indicators

- January 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting Workshop #1 – Detailed State of the Basin, Key SGMA Policy Questions, Initial Problem statement
- February 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting Workshop #2A – Developing the concepts related to undesirable effects, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for the last 3 Sustainability Indicators (conceptual inputs – numerics to come later)
- March 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting Workshop #2B – Developing the concepts related to undesirable effects, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for the first 3 Sustainability Indicators (conceptual inputs – numerics to come later)
- April 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Risk analysis, including policy analysis of basin recovery goal in a joint study session with the MGA Board
- May 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Overview of work to date on projects and costs to support basin recovery to sustainability, Preview of Workshop #3
- June 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting Workshop #3 – Present preliminary numerics for Sustainability Indicators
- July 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Revised Sustainability Criteria and discussion of which projects are to be modeled to assess their ability to contribution to basin restoration and sustainability

Groundwater Modeling

- August 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Mid-point review of progress, with a focus on where the group is on policy issues and questions
- September 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Part 1 - Results of groundwater modeling looking at how various projects would effect sustainability criteria
- October 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Part 2 - Results of groundwater modeling looking at how various projects would effect sustainability criteria

Sustainability Indicators

- November 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Workshop #4 on Management Areas, policy discussion on user impacts
- December 2018: Advisory Committee Meeting – Unfinished Business and holiday celebration

Cost Allocation to Users and Legal Issue

- January 2019 Advisory Committee Meeting 6/28/2019
- February 2019: Advisory Committee Meeting
- March 2019: Advisory Committee Meeting

Implementation and Financial Planning

- April 2019: Advisory Committee Meeting
- May 2019: Advisory Committee Meeting
- June 2019: Final Advisory Committee Meeting

10/1/2017 11/1/2017 12/1/2017 1/1/2018 2/1/2018 3/1/2018 4/1/2018 5/1/2018 6/1/2018 7/1/2018 8/1/2018 9/1/2018 10/1/2018 11/1/2018 12/1/2018 1/1/2019 2/1/2019 3/1/2019 4/1/2019 5/1/2019 6/1/2019