

## **Appendix T: Interbasin Coordination Communications**

---

# **NORTH AMERICAN SUBBASIN GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN**

## **APPENDIX T Interbasin Coordination Communications**

**December 2021**



**Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority**  
*Managing Groundwater Resources  
 in Central Sacramento County*

827 7<sup>th</sup> St, Rm 301  
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 874-6851  
 Fax: (916) 874-5698  
 scgah2o.saccounty.net

John Woodling  
 Interim Executive Director

November 24, 2021

California-American  
 Water Company

**Rob Swartz**  
 North American Subbasin Plan Manager  
 Sacramento Groundwater Authority  
 5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180  
 Citrus Heights, CA 95610

City of Elk Grove

City of Folsom

City of Rancho Cordova

City of Sacramento

**Subject: Interbasin Coordination Between North American and South American Subbasins**

County of Sacramento

Florin Resource Conservation  
 District/Elk Grove Water  
 Service

Dear Mr. Swartz:

Golden State Water Company

The purpose of this letter is to document the coordination activities and to summarize our understanding related to the adjacent Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) covering the South American Subbasin (SASb) and the North American Subbasin (NASb).

Omochumne-Hartnell  
 Water District

Rancho Murieta Community  
 Services District

Coordination meetings between representatives of the SASb and the NASb occurred on the following days:

Sacramento Regional  
 County Sanitation District

Agricultural Representative

- February 17, 2021
- March 16, 2021
- April 6, 2021
- April 21, 2021
- May 28, 2021
- July 27, 2021

Agricultural-Residential  
 Representative

Commercial/Industrial  
 Representative

Conservation Landowners

- Plus additional calls in summer 2021 to coordinate on CoSANA modeling, development of a regional conjunctive use project, development of modeling scenarios, and development of sustainable yield estimates.

Public Agencies/Self-  
 Supplied Representative

At the July 27, 2021 meeting, we discussed the following topics:

- Groundwater flow across our common boundary
- Projected land use changes along our common boundary
- Monitoring network along our common boundary
- Minimum Thresholds (MTs) along the boundary
- How to document our coordination (e.g., letter to include in GSP? something more formal?)

Based on our coordination, the SASb concludes the following with respect to the NASb:

1. Current and projected groundwater flow, projected land use changes, and MTs near our common boundary do not appear to impede our respective abilities to achieve our sustainability goals. We are particularly comfortable with the model-related results as we worked together to develop a single model (CoSANA) that encompasses the entirety of our basins.
2. The monitoring network along our common boundary is sufficient to detect significant changes that could impact our respective GSPs and we will actively share monitoring information along our common boundary.
3. It is currently preferable to document our coordination through this correspondence rather than through a more formal inter-basin agreement.

As noted regarding the above coordination, we have been able to share information to the mutual benefit of each subbasin's GSP development effort and have been able to confirm that the implementation of our respective GSPs will not adversely impact the attainment of our sustainability goals. We have examined findings in each GSP along our boundaries and either confirmed consistency or have agreed to work together during GSP implementation to resolve differences, to the extent they merit such effort.

We recommend a minimum of an annual meeting between our respective GSAs after the completion of each GSP annual report to facilitate the exchange of technical information, coordinate on implementation activities, and to identify and address any emerging trends that may be of concern along our common boundary.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'J' and 'W' intertwined, with a horizontal line extending to the right.

John Woodling  
GSP Manager, South American Subbasin

# Yolo Subbasin Groundwater Agency

Groundwater Sustainability Agency

34274 State Highway 16 • Woodland, CA 95695 • 530.662.3211 • [www.yologroundwater.org](http://www.yologroundwater.org)



November 22, 2021

Mr. Rob Swartz  
North American Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Manager  
Sacramento Groundwater Authority  
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180  
Citrus Heights, CA 95610  
Emailed: [rswartz@rwah2o.org](mailto:rswartz@rwah2o.org)

Mr. Swartz,

Like your letter, this letter documents the coordination activities and summarizes our understanding of the adjacent Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) covering the and Yolo Subbasin and North American Subbasin (NASb).

Coordination meetings between representatives of the Yolo Subbasin and NASb occurred on the following:

- August 31, 2020
- July 13, 2021
- August 10, 2021

On August 31, 2020, you and I briefly touched based on our individual efforts for developing the Yolo Subbasin and NASb GSPs, respectively. And we outlined a process for coordinating once plan development was further along.

At the July 13, 2021 meeting, we discussed the following topics:

- Groundwater flow across our common boundary
- Projected land use changes along our common boundary
- Monitoring network along our common boundary
- Minimum Thresholds (MTs) along the boundary
- Documentation of coordination efforts

At the August 10, 2021 meeting, our modeling consultants met to discuss technical aspects of our modeling effort, which was necessary because we are using different modeling platforms. Our modeling teams agreed that small differences in boundary flows calculated by the models are immaterial.

Based on our coordination, the Yolo Subbasin concludes the following related to NASb:

1. Current and projected groundwater flow, projected land use changes, and MTs near our common boundary do not appear to impede our respective abilities to achieve our sustainability goals.
2. The monitoring network along our common boundary is sufficient to detect significant changes that could impact our respective GSPs and we will actively share monitoring information along our common boundary.
3. It is currently preferable to document our coordination through this correspondence rather than through a more formal interbasin agreement.

As a result of the above coordination, we have shared information to the mutual benefit of each subbasin's GSP development effort and have confirmed that the implementation of our respective GSPs will not adversely impact the attainment of our sustainability goals. We have examined findings in each GSP along our boundaries and either confirmed consistency or have agreed to work together during GSP implementation to resolve differences, to the extent they merit such effort.

We recommend a minimum of an annual coordination meeting after the completion of each GSP annual report to share information on monitoring results and other implementation activities and to identify and address any emerging trends that may be of concern along our common boundary. Additionally, we will coordinate through quarterly meetings of the Northern California Water Association Groundwater Management Task Force, and Association of California Water Agencies Groundwater Management Committee.

Thank you for being our neighbor,



Kristin Sicke  
Executive Officer

☎ 530.741.5000  
✉ info@yubawater.org  
🌐 yubawater.org



November 24, 2021

Rob Swartz  
North American Subbasin Plan Manager  
Sacramento Groundwater Authority  
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180  
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Dear Mr. Swartz:

The purpose of this letter is to document the coordination activities and to summarize our understanding related to the adjacent Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) covering the North American Subbasin (NASb) and the South Yuba Subbasin.

At our July 22, 2021 meeting, we discussed the following topics:

- Groundwater flow across our common boundary
- Projected land use changes along our common boundary
- Monitoring network along our common boundary
- Minimum Thresholds (MTs) along the boundary
- How to document our coordination (e.g., letter to include in GSP? something more formal?)

Based on our discussion, Yuba Water Agency concludes the following with respect to the North American Subbasin:

1. Current and projected groundwater flow, projected land use changes, and MTs near our common boundary do not appear to impede our respective abilities to achieve our sustainability goals.
2. The monitoring network along our common boundary is sufficient to detect significant changes that could impact our respective GSPs and we will actively share monitoring information along our common boundary.
3. It is currently preferable to document our coordination through this correspondence rather than through a more formal interbasin agreement.

As a result of the above coordination, we have been able to share information to the mutual benefit of each subbasin's GSP and have been able to confirm that the implementation of our respective GSPs will not adversely impact the attainment of our sustainability goals. We have examined findings in each GSP along our boundaries and either confirmed consistency or have agreed to work together during GSP implementation to resolve differences, to the extent they merit such effort.

We recommend a minimum of an annual coordination meeting after the completion of each GSP annual report to share information on monitoring results and other implementation activities and to identify and address any emerging trends that may be of concern along our common boundary. We will also coordinate through quarterly meetings of the Northern California Water Association Groundwater Management Task Force.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Scott Matyac". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed over a white rectangular background.

Scott Matyac  
Groundwater Sustainability Plan Manager  
Yuba Water Agency

Main Office: 1220 F Street, Marysville, CA 95901  
Colgate Power House: 12700 Lake Francis Road, P.O. Box 176, Dobbins, CA 95935



# SUTTER COUNTY

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Building Inspection  
Code Enforcement

Engineering/Water Resources  
Environmental Health

Planning  
Road Maintenance

---

November 22, 2021

Rob Swartz  
North American Subbasin Plan Manager  
Sacramento Groundwater Authority  
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180  
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Dear Mr. Swartz:

The purpose of this letter is to document the coordination activities and to summarize our understanding related to the adjacent Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) covering the North American Subbasin (NASb) and the Sutter Subbasin.

At our August 20, 2021 coordination meeting, we discussed the following topics:

- Groundwater flow across our common boundary
- Projected land use changes along our common boundary
- Monitoring network along our common boundary
- Minimum Thresholds (MTs) along the boundary
- How to document our coordination (e.g., letter to include in GSP? something more formal?)

Based on our discussion, the Sutter Subbasin concludes the following with respect to the NASb Subbasin:

1. Current and projected groundwater flow, projected land use changes, and MTs near our common boundary do not appear to impede our respective abilities to achieve our sustainability goals.
2. The monitoring network along our common boundary is sufficient to detect significant changes that could impact our respective GSPs and we will actively share monitoring information along our common boundary.
3. It is currently preferable to document our coordination through this correspondence rather than through a more formal interbasin agreement.

As a result of the above coordination, we have been able to share information to the mutual benefit of each subbasin's GSP and have been able to confirm that the implementation of our respective GSPs will not adversely impact the attainment of our sustainability goals. We have examined findings in each GSP along our boundaries and either confirmed consistency or have agreed to work together during GSP implementation to resolve differences, to the extent they merit such effort.



We recommend a minimum of an annual coordination meeting after the completion of each GSP annual report to share information on monitoring results and other implementation activities and to identify and address any emerging trends that may be of concern along our common boundary.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G. Rivera', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Guadalupe Rivera  
Sutter County  
Groundwater Sustainability Plan Manager  
Sutter Subbasin