

Program Manager Report

September 8, 2020

General Updates:

- Golden State Risk Management Authority trainings offered (email attached)
 - [Safe Driving Practices, September 10th @10AM](#)
 - [Customer Service for Public Entities, featuring "Give 'em the pickle!", October 8th @10AM](#)
 - [GSRMA: An Overview of Programs and Services, November 12th @ 10AM](#)
 - [The Power of Words, December 10th @ 10AM](#)

Administrative Updates:

- Continued coordination with Mary Fahey, Colusa Groundwater Authority (CGA), and others as needed to organize and direct joint tasks and upcoming activities
- Northern Sac Valley Inter-Basin Coordination
 - Staff level communication and planning
 - Meeting participation
 - Meeting included technical consulting team leads to begin a more formal coordination of the technical efforts across basin boundaries
- Various meeting preparations and post meeting tasks
 - Board
 - CGA/GGA Joint TAC
 - Project coordination meetings
 - Executive Committee
- Submitted letter to Butte Local Agency Formation Commission re: support of Tuscan Water District Formation on August 13, 2020 (attached)
- Opposition of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) July 6 Proposed Decision on Water Conservation and Affordability- Rulemaking 17-06-024.
 - Follow up with CalWater representative Shannon McGovern
 - Received draft copy of the second opposition letter to CPUC from Ms. McGovern for review (attached)
 - Receive email from Shannon McGovern re: CPUC Decision (attached)
- Various website updates
- Coordination with Legal Counsel and Chairman

Project Updates:

- Outreach (August/September)
 - Updates provided at the Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Board meeting (8/3/20)
- Colusa Subbasin GSP Development Proposition 1 & Proposition 68 Grant (CGA contracting agency)
 - Agreement Amount: \$1,999,600; Billed: \$301,486.32 (through June 2020- Invoice 7)
- HCM/Water Budget Project Update (GGA contract with Davids Engineering)

- Continuing bi-weekly meetings with M. Fahey, L. Hunter, and consulting team on project updates (now also merged with GSP Development bi-weekly meetings)
- Colusa Subbasin model review meeting
- Davids Engineering provides monthly update memos on work progress
- Contract Amount: \$378,000.00; Spent: \$333,110.15
- Colusa Subbasin GSP Development (GGA contract with Davids Engineering)
 - Meeting and continued discussions on developing consistent tracking methods for outreach activities
 - Davids Engineering staff provides monthly update memos on work progress
 - Bi-weekly meetings with M. Fahey, L. Hunter, and consulting team on project updates (merged with HCM/Water Budget bi-weekly meetings)
 - Planning and participation in the Joint TAC meeting held August 14, 2020
 - Prepare and finalize notice to proceed for option task: Funding Mechanism Evaluation (one signature remaining)
 - Prepare and finalize amendment to agreement to include the three additional projects (one signature remaining)
 - Contract Amount: \$1,261,400.00; Spent: \$18,278.00 (This includes the additional projects and optional task)
- Technical Support Services (TSS) Project (CGA is DWR's point of contact)
 - Continue to explore possibility of requesting services for translating materials, monitoring wells, or other needs
- Facilitation Support Services (CGA lead)
 - Continue to explore future needs and potential requests for services
- Property-Related Fee- Tax Year 2020-2021 Direct Charge Preparation (Provost & Pritchard)
 - Coordinated with Provost & Pritchard Staff and Glenn County Department of Finance
 - File packet submitted on August 12, 2020 to Glenn County Department of Finance which includes 5,590 records for a total of \$419,777.86
 - Received email on September 3, 2020 from Department of Finance indicating the need for one correction
 - Provost & Pritchard staff are preparing the correction
- Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Annual Audit
 - Monitor for updates
- Sustainable Groundwater Management Watershed Coordinator Grant
 - Coordination emails with potential partner agencies
 - Meeting with potential partner agency staff
 - Receive and begin to review draft application

Attachments:

- Golden State Risk Management Authority Trainings email
- Letter supporting formation of Tuscan Water District
- Draft Water Coalition Letter regarding opposition to CPUC Decision
- Email communication from Shannon McGovern regarding CPUC Decision

Lisa Hunter

From: Brian Edinger <bedinger@gsrma.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 11:15 AM
To: Lisa Hunter
Subject: GSRMA Upcoming Training Schedule

Good morning valued GSRMA members,

We would like to invite you to our upcoming September training session of **Safe Driving Practices**, which will take place on **September 10th @10AM**. This one-hour course will cover safe driving at work, as well as safe driving off work. We will also focus on some of the leading causes of losses that occur behind the wheel. [Please click here to register for Safe Driving Practices.](#)

Also, we invite you to look at our list of upcoming trainings throughout the remainder of 2020, listed below:

- [Documenting Employee Performance \(taught by Attorney Robert Hunt\), September 22nd @10AM](#)
- [Customer Service for Public Entities, featuring "Give 'em the pickle!", October 8th @10AM](#)
- [GSRMA: An Overview of Programs and Services, November 12th @ 10AM](#)
- [The Power of Words, December 10th @ 10AM](#)

Please reach out should you have any questions regarding any of the upcoming trainings. We appreciate your continued interest in our training programs. Thank you for being members of Golden State Risk Management Authority!

Regards,

Brian Edinger, Risk Control Advisor
Golden State Risk Management Authority
243 W. Sycamore Street, P. O. Box 706
Willows, CA 95988
(530) 934-5633 – Phone (530) 934-8133 – Fax
Website: www.gsrma.org



This email and all attachments to it are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain proprietary information of Golden State Risk Management Authority. This email may also contain information which is confidential or which is protected from disclosure by privilege. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution of this email and its attachments is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, let us know by reply email and then erase and destroy all electronic or other copies of this message.

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: lhunter@countyofglenn.net

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bedinger@gsrma.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Glenn Groundwater Authority

Groundwater Sustainability Agency

PO Box 351, Willows, CA 95988 | 530.934.6501

August 1, 2020

Stephen Lucas, Executive Officer
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission
1453 Downer Street, Suite C
Oroville, CA 95965

RE: Formation of the Tuscan Water District

Dear Mr. Lucas,

The Glenn Groundwater Authority (Authority) is the Groundwater Sustainability Agency for the Glenn County portion of the Colusa Subbasin, which neighbors portions of the proposed TWD. The Authority supports the formation of the Tuscan Water District (TWD) to represent landowners within its jurisdiction. It is the Authority's understanding that the proposed TWD plans to support and participate collaboratively with existing Groundwater Sustainability Agencies and other state and local agencies in groundwater management activities, specifically Groundwater Sustainability Plan development in the Vina and Butte Subbasins. Landowner outreach is required by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and landowner participation is important to the successful development and implementation of plans affecting groundwater management in our region.

Sincerely,



John Amaro
Glenn Groundwater Authority, Chairman

August 26, 2020

The Honorable Commissioners
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Delivered via email

RE: The water conservation and customer bill consequences of the Proposed Decision in Rulemaking 17-06-024 warrant more thorough analysis in a separate proceeding.

Dear President Batjer and Commissioners:

Thank you very much for continuing to allow time to examine the potential pitfalls of the Proposed Decision (proposal) in Rulemaking 17-06-024. Because of the legitimate concerns that have been raised about the elimination of the water-conservation best practice of decoupling, we urge you to move this portion of the proposal to a separate proceeding where it can be fully analyzed to ensure action is not taken that would needlessly raise water rates for millions and thwart water conservation in the state.

We appreciate the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) commitment to sustainability and affordability, and we believe adoption of this proposal is counter to those objectives.

While the proposal is motivated by a well-meaning desire to protect low-income customers from higher water bills, it would have the opposite effect and **lead to rate increases on everyone except those who use the most water.**

According to an independent analysis that modelled the average customer bill impacts of eliminating decoupling for two of the state's largest water providers and replacing it with an approach similar to that used by non-decoupled water providers, this proposal could:

- Increase average monthly bills by 9% for everyone except the highest-volume water users, with some customers seeing average bill increases of 16%.
- Increase average monthly bills for customers who use the least amount of water by 14%, with some customers who are enrolled in Low-Income Ratepayer assistance programs – the households that are the most vulnerable to rate increases – seeing their average bills increase by 26%.

Currently, a significant proportion of the costs of providing safe, reliable water service are covered by higher-volume water users, which helps send a conservation price signal. Instead, this proposal would force the affected water providers to rely more heavily on fixed monthly service charges, shifting costs to medium- and low-volume water customers.

Not only would the proposal unnecessarily increase water bills for millions of Californians, but because it eliminates a regulatory best practice called decoupling, it would jeopardize significant water conservation progress in the state. In the first six years after decoupling was implemented, the four water providers that are impacted by this proposal achieved 29% more water savings than their counterparts who do not use decoupling. This amounts to about 7.9 billion gallons of additional water

that was saved, enough to meet the needs of approximately 90,000 families in California for an entire year.

In addition to making it more difficult to address future water supply challenges, backtracking on water conservation will trigger higher water rates for all customers. As you know, water conservation is the cheapest source of new supply and can significantly reduce customer bills. For example, the Alliance for Water Efficiency found that the customers of one supplier that has implemented decoupling are saving 27% thanks to the supplier's conservation efforts. The proposal in this proceeding risks foreclosing these benefits for the customers of the affected suppliers.

Clearly, these negative cost and water conservation outcomes should give the Commission, key stakeholders, and all Californians pause.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hunter

From: McGovern (Ding), Shannon <smcgovern@calwater.com>
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:40 PM
To: Lisa Hunter; 'Gary Hansen'
Cc: Markey, Evan
Subject: CPUC Decision

Good afternoon Lisa and Mayor Gary,

Thank you for joining with more than 30 other organizations on a letter to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) encouraging commissioners to reject a proposal that would eliminate a best-practice water conservation tool and increase water bills for millions of Californians, especially those who use the least amount of water.

Unfortunately, the CPUC voted to adopt the proposal. While we are disappointed in the outcome, we are pleased that efforts to have the decision become effective immediately were rejected. As a result, there will be no near-term rate impacts to low-volume water users from this decision.

We have seen some media coverage of this matter, so you may, too. It is being touted as good for customers. We do not see it that way, nor do we think the actual data shows that.

Between now and next summer – when the CPUC will next review our operations, rates, and proposed infrastructure improvements – we look forward to having the opportunity to continue to improve water forecasting and to evaluating other options that allow us to implement this decision in a manner that seeks to minimize bill impacts on low-volume water customers, many of whom are low-income.

Thank you again for your interest and involvement. We will continue to keep you informed about issues that impact the availability and affordability of water.

All the best,

Shannon

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain California Water Service Group proprietary information and is confidential. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this e-mail and then deleting it from your system.

Shannon (Ding) McGovern

Reg. Com. Affairs Specialist

CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE

209-715-0252



Quality. Service. Value.

calwater.com

[Total Control Panel](#)

[Login](#)

To: lhunter@countyofglenn.net

[Remove this sender from my allow list](#)

From: smcgovern@calwater.com

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.