

Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency  
Advisory Committee Meeting Packet  
September 13, 2022











basin. We shouldn't 'kick the can' down the road, we should decide the fees now. We need to push voluntary conservation and demand reduction and double down on conservation. I support the hybrid option. I think buying time is illusory, the choices won't get easier, we have already had seven years. This is about making groundwater sustainable. Demand reduction will be a key action but will cost money too. I am also concerned that member agencies are providing corporate welfare. A \$1 million vineyard industry needs to be considered separately from a family winery.

**DuBay** – What do you mean by scope of Petaluma?

**Allebach** – Until very recently, we didn't pay any attention to the number of parcels, etc. in Petaluma, I thought we were only focusing on this basin and not comparing this basin to other ones.

**DuBay** – I see, you are responding to a comment by Director Rabbitt. As a Board of Supervisors' member, he needs to look more broadly at the region, maybe that is where the comment came from.

**Norman Gilroy** – On the extractions chart, just 3.8 acre-feet for indoor and zero acre-feet for outdoor cannabis cultivation – it seems inevitable that the number will rise over time and the acre-feet will change. Those two columns need to be populated; I want to understand why they are the way they are. In the 'other classes', and the extraction summary – you have urban irrigation. On the next page it is called urban wells. It is confusing, if they are the same, they should have the same name. Pumping agencies being charged should be a factor that isn't currently on the chart but should be. On the annual budget fluctuations chart, I suggest that likely usage be looked at over those years. Again, you are dividing the number of dollars spent less grants by the number of acre-feet. We need both usage and fee reflected in a chart like that. I also think the hybrid alternative has real possibilities but question whether there wouldn't need to be a vote.

**Bradshaw** – We have checked with Legal if the hybrid option is a regulatory fee or tax, it seems it qualifies as a regulatory fee. Keep in mind that 80% of all the acre-feet estimated is based on land use and water demand of that land use so, we are not measuring actual water pumpage on 80%. The Board can adjust rates easily, especially downwards. They have flexibility. We don't expect major fluctuations in the rates. On public charges, all the public agencies will be charged for the water they pump. Cannabis – we are still working on adding cannabis data in, it is a work in process, it is a small amount, it doesn't change the rates at this point.

**Trotta** – Cannabis estimates are from Permit Sonoma, actual permits in place.

**Allebach** – Can we get a breakdown on per capita groundwater use for both the City of Sonoma and Valley of the Moon Water District (VOMWD)?

**Trotta** – We should be able to do that. The numbers you see don't necessarily reflect their total groundwater use; it is just for the groundwater used with the subbasin. Most of the groundwater that Valley of the Moon Water District produces is from wells outside of the subbasin, those numbers are not included in the total.

**DuBay** (chat) – 2020 per capita data shows that VOMWD per capita use was 103 a day; Sonoma's per capita use was 166 per day. I don't have the 2021 numbers at my fingertips. You can find the regional municipal suppliers here: <https://www.savingwaterpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SMSWP-Annual-Report-20-21-Website.pdf>.



















































