

**Omochumne-Hartnell Water District**

P. O. Box 211

Wilton, CA 95693

**May 19, 2026 @ 10 am**

8970 Elk Grove Blvd, Elk Grove, CA

*Notice of meeting of the Omochumne-Hartnell Water District*

*Notice is hereby given that the Omochumne-Hartnell Water District calls a meeting. This meeting is open to the public. This meeting will be conducted by teleconference and in person.*

**To Join by Teleconference:**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86774305120?pwd=T1YyV2RHsk9nOHViMXBmcGNFNldHdzO9>

+1 669 900 9128 US

Meeting ID: 867 7430 5120

Passcode: 865005

One tap mobile

+16699009128,,86774305120#,,,,\*865005# US (San Jose)

**In person:**

8970 Elk Grove Blvd, Elk Grove, CA. 95624

*Any member of the public on the telephone may speak during Public Comment or may email public comments to [info@ohwd.org](mailto:info@ohwd.org) and comments will be read from each member of the public.*

**Call to Order:**

1. Introductions
2. Determine if quorum is present

**Public comments** – comments are limited to 3 minutes for each presenter

*(Comment will be received at this time for any items not on the agenda but are in purview of the Boards jurisdiction or any agenda item that does not specifically state public comment will be accepted)*

**Action Items:**

**1. Consent Items**

- a. Review and Approve Agenda
- b. Minutes from April 21, 2026
- c. Financial report
  - i. Financial statement
  - ii. Invoices
- Public Comment

**2. SGMA Compliance**

- a. Sacramento Valley – South American Groundwater Sub Basin (5-21.65)
  - i. Update
  - ii. 2026-2027 Proposed Budget for South American Subbasin GSP Implementation
  - iii. Amendment to MOU for South American Subbasin
- Public Comment
- b. San Joaquin Valley – Cosumnes Groundwater Sub Basin (5-22.16)
  - i. Update - Cosumnes Groundwater Authority
  - ii. FY 2026-27 Funding Agreement
- Public Comment

**3. Draft 2026-2027 budget**

- Public Comment

- 4. CalSIP Grant**
  - a. Update
    - Public Comment
- 5. OHWD Expansion Update**
  - a. MSR Status
    - Public Comment
- 6. Groundwater Recharge Projects**
  - a. Consideration of OMOCHUMNE-HARTNELL WATER DISTRICT:GROUNDWATER RECHARGE PROJECT Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration State Clearinghouse # 2018072026
    - Public Comment
- 7. Informational items:**
  - a. DWR Interagency Drought Task Force update
  - b. SSCAWA Meeting
  - c. Received communications
  - d. Water Coordinator's Report
- 8. General Managers Report:**
  - a. Meetings and Correspondences
- 9. Directors Comments**
- 10. Next meeting – Scheduled for June 16, 2026 at 10:00 am**

**SASb Cost Sharing Tracker**

		Prior	New	FY 2026 - Rev		FY 2027
				Budget	Invoice	Budget
<b>Contributions (Prior Years)</b>	<b>Contributions (FY 2027)</b>			<b>657,050.00</b>		<b>195,000.00</b>
Sacramento County GSA	Sacramento County GSA	2.6%	2.7%	17,083.30	17,083.30	5,257.59
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District	Omochumne-Hartnell Water District	13.0%	13.5%	85,416.50	85,416.50	26,287.95
Northern Delta GSA/ RD 551 GSA	Northern Delta GSA/ RD 551 GSA	5.8%	6.0%	38,108.90	38,108.90	11,728.47
Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District		3.7%	0.0%	24,310.85	TBD	0.00
Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority	Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority	74.9%	<b>77.7%</b>	492,130.45		151,459.04
<b>Expenses (Prior Years)</b>	<b>Expenses (FY 2027)</b>			<b>657,050.00</b>		<b>195,000.00</b>
SCGA Staff	SCGA Staff			45,000.00		0.00
DWR Admin Staff (20%)	Annual Report, Data Mgmt System					110,000.00
DWR Engineering Support (20%)	Semi Annual Monitoring					5,000.00
DWR GSP Implementation (100%)	GSP Amendment Outreach and Adoption					40,000.00
Larry Walker Associates (100%)	ISW: Scoping for Compliance					10,000.00
Woodan & Curran (100%)	MOU GM and EC Tech Support			100,000.00		15,000.00
GEI (20% of Task 1 & 2.2; 100% of Task 2.1)	SASb Tech Project Mgmt					15,000.00
GEI (GSP 5-yr Update)	Fee Study			512,050.00		0.00

## **Interim Amendment to South American Subbasin GSP Implementation MOU**

This Side Letter Agreement (“Side Letter”) is entered into by and among the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (“SCGA”), Sacramento County Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“Sacramento County GSA”), Northern Delta Groundwater Sustainability Agency / Reclamation District 551 (“NDGSA”), and Omochumne-Hartnell Water District (“OHWD”), collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.”

### **RECITALS**

WHEREAS, the Parties entered into that certain Memorandum of Understanding Establishing a South American Subbasin Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Executive Committee and General Manager Committee and Identifying Cost Share Provisions for Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation, effective February 28, 2023 (“MOU”); and

WHEREAS, the Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District (“SRCD”) was previously a Party to the MOU and served as a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“GSA”) within the South American Subbasin; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 4.13 of the MOU, SRCD provided written notice dated December 17, 2025 of its withdrawal from the MOU and withdrawal as a GSA in the South American Subbasin;

WHEREAS, the remaining Parties desire to document the resulting change in MOU membership and establish revised interim cost-sharing allocations pending a more comprehensive amendment and update to the MOU anticipated following revisions to the SCGA Joint Powers Agreement during Fiscal Year 2027;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties agree as follows:

#### **1. Removal of SRCD as Party**

Effective December 17, 2025, SRCD is no longer a Party to the MOU and shall no longer participate in the Executive Committee, General Manager Committee, or cost-sharing obligations for costs incurred after the effective withdrawal date, except as otherwise provided under Section 4.13 of the MOU for obligations incurred prior to withdrawal.

#### **2. Interim Revision to Exhibit A Cost Sharing**

Effective July 1, 2026, Exhibit A of the MOU is temporarily revised solely for purposes of shared cost allocation among the remaining Parties as follows:

<b>Party</b>	<b>Interim Cost Share</b>
Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority	77.8%
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District	13.5%
Northern Delta GSA / RD 551	6.0%
Sacramento County GSA	2.7%
Total	100.0%

The Parties acknowledge that these interim percentages reflect proportional redistribution of SRCD's former allocation among the remaining Parties and are intended solely for interim administration of the MOU pending comprehensive amendment.

### **3. No Other Amendments**

Except as expressly provided in this Side Letter, all other provisions of the MOU shall remain in full force and effect.

### **4. Future Comprehensive Amendment**

The Parties acknowledge their intent to consider broader revisions to the MOU following completion of anticipated updates to the SCGA Joint Powers Agreement and related South American Subbasin governance structure.

### **5. Counterparts**

This Side Letter may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute one instrument.

## **COSUMNES GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY MEMBER AGENCY CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT**

THIS AGREEMENT is made this \_\_\_\_\_, 2026 between COSUMNES GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (“CGA”), a California Joint Powers Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, and the seven Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (“GSAs”) of the Cosumnes Subbasin, which are: Amador County Groundwater Management Authority (“Amador”), City of Galt (“City”), Clay Water District (“Clay”), Sacramento County Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“County”), Galt Irrigation District (“Galt ID”), Omochumne-Hartnell Water District (“OHWD”), and Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District (“Sloughhouse RCD”), each of which is a “Party” to or a “Member” of this Agreement.. Each of the parties to this Agreement shall individually be referred to as the “Party,” or collectively, as the “Parties.” This Agreement is effective as of the date the last Party signs the Agreement.

### **RECITALS:**

WHEREAS, the CGA was formed to implement certain aspects of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”) and the Cosumnes Groundwater Sustainability Plan (“GSP”); and

WHEREAS, Section 5.2 of the Joint Powers Agreement forming CGA directs that members “shall share in the general operating and administrative and project costs of operating the Authority, as outlined in the annual budget documents;” and

WHEREAS, the JPA Agreement further provides that each Member will be responsible for contributing its share of such costs through an agreed upon contribution; the implementation of a groundwater fee program; or other written agreements; and

WHEREAS, consistent with that direction, the Members entered into an Initial Funding and Revenue Agreement for Implementation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan in 2021, and have provided annual contributions under that structure since that time, based on a cost allocation of roughly \$10/irrigated acre per member; and

WHEREAS, each Member’s share of costs of the Authority, not otherwise covered by fees directly collected by the Authority, shall be assessed twice yearly pursuant to Section 5.2(f) of the JPA; and

WHEREAS, CGA approved its Cosumnes Groundwater Authority Rate and Fee Study in April 2024 (“2024 Fee Study”), expanding upon the prior irrigated acreage to provide specific consideration for residential, commercial, and public water system use in calculating groundwater related fees.

WHEREAS, the CGA Board of Directors adopted its Fiscal Year 2026-2027 budget in June 2026; a summary of that budget is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties, on the terms and conditions herein set forth, hereby agree as follows:

**TERMS:**

1. **Member FY 2026-2027 Contributions:** The Members' 2026-2027 budgeted contributions are set forth in Exhibit 2 ("2026-2027 Cosumnes Groundwater Authority Income"). CGA will issue invoices for each Party's 2026-2027 member contributions based on the amounts identified in Exhibit 2. Invoices will be issued in January 2026, unless multiple invoices are requested, with final payment due in full on or before July 1, 2027.
  - a. **Membership Contributions:** Each member's contribution will be applied first to the proportionate share of the budget attributable to that member. Collections more than operating administrative expenses will be deposited into a restricted reserve, for use in the preparation of the GSP 5-year Update. This is reflected in the Reserves Budget, as noted in Exhibit 2.
2. **Adjustments to FY 2026-2027 Member Contribution Obligation:** The Member contributions set out in Exhibit 2 are based on Members allocated collections under the 2024 Fee Study, adjusted based on feedback from the Members during the 2026-2027 Budget development process.
  - a. Reductions in Contributions: In the event that any Member is unable to collect its budgeted contribution, that Member must provide the Board with justification for the reduced contribution including documentation to support the reduction, including, but not limited to landowner groundwater fee appeals.
3. **In-Kind Contributions:** No in-kind contributions will be collected for Fiscal Year 2026-2027.
4. **Agreement Term:** This Agreement sets out Members' FY 2026-2027 Member contributions. It may be modified, amended, or extended by written agreement of the Parties.

**SIGNED:**

---

, President  
Cosumnes Groundwater Authority

---

---

Date:

---

---

**President  
Amador County Groundwater  
Management Authority**

---

**Date:**

---

**Director of Public Works  
City of Galt**

---

**Date:**

---

**President  
Clay Water District**

---

**Date:**

---

**Sacramento County Groundwater  
Sustainability Agency**

---

**Date:**

---

**President  
Galt Irrigation District**

---

**Date:**

---

**President  
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District**

---

**Date:**

**President**  
**Sloughouse Resource Conservation**  
**District**

**Date:**

**EXHIBIT 1**  
**Draft Budget - July 1, 2026 - June 30, 2027**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>FY 25-26 Draft Budget</b>
<b>Operating Administrative Budget</b>	
Personnel	\$ 80,000
Legal	\$ 10,000
Public Outreach Supplies	\$ 10,000
Annual Report	\$ 33,000
GSP Technical Support/Recommended Corrective Actions	\$ 65,000
Groundwater Monitoring	\$ 7,000
GSP On Call Support/RCAs	\$60,000
GSP Periodic Evaluation	\$186,000
GSP Plan Amendment	\$227,000
Financial Audit & Accounting	\$10,000
Data Gaps	\$5,000
Office Supplies & Subscriptions	\$5,000
<b><i>Operating Expenses Total</i></b>	<b>\$ 708,000</b>
<b>Revenue Budget</b>	
Membership Contribution	\$496,999
5 Year GSP Plan Update - Restricted Reserves Transfer	\$ 211,001
Additional Restricted Reserves per Fund Agreement	
<b><i>Revenue Total</i></b>	<b>\$ 708,000</b>

## EXHIBIT 2

### FY 2026-2027 Cosumnes Groundwater Authority Income

#### Revenue - Member Contributions\*

GSA	FY 26-27 Contributions
City of Galt	\$30,445
Amador CGMA	\$10,558
Galt Irrigation District	\$191,677
Clay Water District	\$15,003
OH Water District	\$31,352
Sloughouse RCD	\$166,194
County of Sacramento	\$51,770
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$496,999</b>

\*See Term 2.a for explanation of adjustments to this proposed member contributions

# OMOCHUMNE-HARTNELL WATER DISTRICT: GROUNDWATER RECHARGE PROJECT

Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration  
State Clearinghouse # 2018072026

Prepared for  
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

May 2026



# OMOCHUMNE-HARTNELL WATER DISTRICT: GROUNDWATER RECHARGE PROJECT

Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration  
State Clearinghouse # 2018072026

Prepared for  
Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

May 2026

2600 Capitol Avenue  
Suite 200  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
916.564.4500  
esassoc.com

Bend	Pasadena	San Francisco
Irvine	Pensacola	San Jose
Los Angeles	Petaluma	Santa Barbara
Mobile	Portland	Sarasota
Oakland	Rancho Cucamonga	Seattle
Orlando	Sacramento	Tampa
Palm Beach County	San Diego	Thousand Oaks



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Omochumne-Hartnell Water District: Groundwater Recharge Project Addendum

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Section 1. Background and Purpose of the Addendum</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Purpose of this Addendum.....	1
<b>Section 2. Description of Project Changes</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 Project Overview .....	3
2.2 Proposed Project Changes .....	3
<b>Section 3. Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 Aesthetics .....	7
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	7
3.3 Air Quality .....	8
3.4 Biological Resources.....	8
3.5 Cultural Resources.....	13
3.6 Geology, Soils and Seismicity.....	15
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	16
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	16
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality .....	17
3.10 Land Use and Planning.....	17
3.11 Mineral Resources .....	18
3.12 Noise .....	18
3.13 Population and Housing .....	18
3.14 Public Services.....	19
3.15 Recreation .....	19
3.16 Transportation and Traffic.....	19
3.17 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	20
3.18 Utilities and Service Systems.....	21
3.19 Issues Not Discussed in MND.....	21
<b>Section 4. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>23</b>

### List of Figures

Figure 1	Original and Addendum Components.....	4
Figure 2	Elderberry Observations and Landcover (Page 1 of 3) .....	9
Figure 2	Elderberry Observations and Landcover (Page 2 of 3) .....	10
Figure 2	Elderberry Observations and Landcover (Page 2 of 3) .....	11

### Figures

Table 1	Special-Status Species with Potential to Occur in the Project Area.....	12
---------	---	----

This page intentionally left blank

# SECTION 1

---

## Background and Purpose of the Addendum

### 1.1 Background

The Omochumne-Hartnell Water District (District, or OHWD) Groundwater Recharge Project Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) (SCH# 2018072026) was developed to divert excess water during the off-irrigation season from the Cosumnes River to discharge the water onto dormant agricultural fields to recharge the groundwater aquifer.

OHWD has historically managed flows of the Cosumnes River to allow for water deliveries to landowners within its boundaries. Historically, the Cosumnes River has had a physical connection to the groundwater basin, which helped improve the flow within the river for fish migration, among additional beneficial uses. However, years of groundwater pumping have lowered groundwater levels. The Project is intended to increase groundwater recharge adjacent to and under the Cosumnes River, allowing the groundwater level to be raised to historic levels that would reconnect with, and thereby allow, the Cosumnes River to run for longer periods during the spring and summer and begin flowing earlier in the fall.

By increasing water levels in the South American Groundwater Subbasin, OHWD reduces the pumping cost for their customers. The higher the water level, the less energy it takes to pump the groundwater and the more efficient the District's pumps become. Instead of building new pipelines or canals to deliver surface water, the District will be utilizing the groundwater basin to transport and store water.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) awarded funding to the District to construct the Project adjacent to the Cosumnes River in southeast Sacramento County. The Project will use two existing diversion points on the Cosumnes River to flood agricultural fields in the off-irrigation season between the months of November and March when streamflow is high and excess water is available.

On September 24, 2018, the District adopted the MND and approved the OHWD Groundwater Recharge Project. The MND is on file at the District's office at 8970 Elk Grove Blvd., Elk Grove, CA 95624. Since certification of the MND and Project approval, additional pumps are needed to allow for the planned ultimate capacity diversion and a fish screen is needed on an existing intake. See Section 2 for a description of proposed refinements.

### 1.2 Purpose of this Addendum

The CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15162 and 15164) require that a lead agency prepare an addendum to a negative declaration if some changes or additions to the environmental evaluation of a project are necessary but none of the following occurs:

1. There are no substantial changes in the project which require major revisions to the mitigated negative declaration or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects:
2. There are no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which require major revisions to the negative declaration; or
3. No new information of substantial importance, which could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of negative declaration adoption, shows any of the following:
  - i. the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the negative declaration,
  - ii. the project will result in impacts substantially more severe than those disclosed in the negative declaration,
  - iii. mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt it, or
  - iv. mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt it.

The purposes of this document are to (1) evaluate the proposed Project changes described in Section 2.2, and (2) to provide documentation to support that the proposed refinements would not result in effects that meet the criteria described in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 and; therefore, an Addendum is appropriate.

## SECTION 2

---

# Description of Project Changes

## 2.1 Project Overview

The District proposed to utilize two existing diversion points along the Consumnes River to flood the adjacent dormant agricultural fields in the off-irrigation season between the months of November and March when streamflow is high and excess water is available. Phase 1 of the Project was for only a portion (4,000 acre-feet [AF]) of the ultimate diversion (6,000 AF).

## 2.2 Proposed Project Changes

The District is proposing several changes as shown in **Figure 1**. The revised Project would result in the upgrading of the existing pump and the addition of a new pump at Field Site 1 – Teichert Ranch (Kautz Property 1). Another new pump would be constructed at Teichert Ranch, approximately 4,300 feet upstream of Field Site 1. A new pump would also be added at Field Site 2 – Rooney Ranch (Kautz Property 2).


The existing pump station at Teichert Ranch would be upgraded by adding a C78-21TA cone fish screen. The screen unit consists of a conical-shaped wedgewire screen, an external brush cleaning system, and brush drive assembly with controls. The mechanical brushing action prevents debris buildup, sedimentation, biofouling, and increased head loss at the screen.

A new pump would be added to the existing pump station at Teichert Ranch. The second pump at this location would allow a maximum diversion capacity of 4,000 gallons per minute (gpm). Currently, the existing pump cannot reach its flow rate due to pump design. The pump would be placed on a smoothed-out earthen 10x25-foot area. A connection would be made to the existing conveyance pipeline.

A second new pump would be located at Teichert Ranch, approximately 4,300 feet upstream of the existing pump station. This pump would be the same as the pump to be installed at the existing Teichert Ranch site. The pump would be placed on a smoothed-out earthen 10x25-foot area and have a 4,000 gpm capacity. A new intake line would be installed through the levee and a connection would be made to the existing conveyance pipeline.

A third new pump would be added to the Rooney Ranch site at the existing pump station. This pump would be similar to the other new pumps and would also require a new intake line through the levee and connection to the existing conveyance pipeline. The capacity of this pump would be approximately 4,000 gpm.

In total, capacity at Teichert Ranch would increase from 5,000 gpm to approximately 13,000 gpm. Capacity at Rooney would increase from 3,465 gpm to approximately 7,500 gpm. In total, the diversion capacity would increase from approximately 8,345 to 20,500 gpm.



**Figure 1**  
Original and Addendum Project Components

Construction is anticipated to require approximately 5 days per pump and would be consistent with the construction considerations described in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Final MND page 2-9. This may occur consecutively or as separate events for a total of approximately 15 days. The new pumps would be connected to electrical service and may require electrical upgrades. Staging for construction would be adjacent to the pump sites and approximately 30 feet by 200 feet. Minimal equipment storage may be utilized on the existing levee road or farm roads. Operation would involve additional electric pump operation but would not produce emissions or odors. As with the MND, the revised Project would require regular operation personnel to authorize diversions. Maintenance would be essentially the same as existing operations and occur on an as-needed basis.

This page intentionally left blank

## SECTION 3

---

# Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

### 3.1 Aesthetics

Section 3.1 of the MND analyzed impacts to the aesthetics of the Project area and concluded that the construction of water diversion infrastructure, pump stations, and conveyance systems would have a less than significant impact on the existing visual character or quality of the Project area. The Project site lies within the Cosumnes River viewshed but the Project would not obstruct scenic resources, and no State Scenic Highways are present nearby. The MND found that the new basin and facilities would be consistent with existing uses, involve no artificial lighting, and generate only minimal maintenance traffic after construction, so the Project would not degrade visual character or introduce significant light or glare.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction is expected to last approximately 5 days per pump (approximately 15 days total), with staging areas adjacent to pump sites and minimal equipment storage on the existing levee or farm roads. These changes do not introduce new visual elements beyond those previously analyzed and would occur within the same disturbed areas identified in the MND. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant aesthetic impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### 3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Section 3.2 of the MND analyzed impacts to agriculture and forestry resources and concluded that no existing farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses due to the Project. The Project site is designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance, with a portion within a Williamson Act Preserve. The Project would utilize the land that existing crops are grown on for recharge while the crops are dormant to support groundwater replenishment, consistent with SGMA goals. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use. Additionally, there is no timberland in the region or near the Project site, nor is the site zoned for forestland or timberland. The Project would not convert forest land to non-forest use.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. These Project changes would occur within the areas previously analyzed in the MND and would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use or affect forest resources. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result

in new significant impacts to agriculture or forest resources or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### 3.3 Air Quality


Section 3.3 of the MND analyzed impacts to air quality and concluded that the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate any air quality standards, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors affecting substantial number of people.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction is anticipated to last approximately 5 days per pump (approximately 15 days total), with staging areas adjacent to pump sites. Given the limited duration of the revised Project construction, the increase in emissions, criteria air pollutants and air pollutant emissions would be anticipated to be less than the respective Sacramento Metro Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) thresholds. In addition, given the rural nature of the revised Project and limited nature of construction, the increase in lifetime cancer risk and non-cancer hazard index from exposure to construction DPM emissions from the revised Project is anticipated to be less than the respective SMAQMD thresholds and the revised Project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Operation would involve additional electric pump operation but would not produce emissions or odors. Maintenance would be essentially the same as existing operations. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant air quality impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### 3.4 Biological Resources

Section 3.4 of the MND analyzed impacts to biological resources and concluded that the Project could result in significant impacts to special-status species and their habitats, sensitive riparian habitat, federally protected wetlands, and conflict with local policies protecting biological resources. As identified within the MND, all of the impacts associated with Project activities would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of MND Mitigation Measures 1a-c, 2a-d, 3a-c, 4a-c, 5, and 6a-b.

Two Environmental Science Associates (ESA) biologists conducted a field reconnaissance survey of the sites for the three proposed new pumps to reassess the revised Project on December 3, 2025. The existing conditions remained largely the same as the initial survey conducted by Live Oak Associates in December 2017. Habitat landcover types observed in the Project area remained the same as described in the 2018 MND. Additional elderberry shrubs (*Sambucus* sp.) with stems greater than one inch in diameter were identified and are mapped in **Figure 2**. These shrubs were surveyed for signs of valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*) (VELB) in the form of exit holes and none were observed. No new ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*) burrows or other suitable habitat were observed for burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*).



**Figure 2**  
 Elderberry Observations and Landcover  
 Page 1 of 3



**Figure 2**  
 Elderberry Observations and Landcover  
 Page 2 of 3



**Figure 2**  
 Elderberry Observations and Landcover  
 Page 3 of 3



An updated query of published accounts for all of the relevant special-status plant and animal species was conducted in 2025 for the Sloughhouse and Elk Grove USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles, where the pump sites are located, and for the ten surrounding quadrangles (Sacramento East, Carmichael, Buffalo Creek, Folsom SE, Florin, Carbondale, Bruceville, Galt, Clay, and Goose Creek) using the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) Rarefind 5, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consulting (IPaC), and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare Plant Inventory Database. Several species with potential to occur in the Project area have an updated listing status since the writing of the 2018 MND. Two insect species, Crotch’s bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*) and monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), became candidates for listing in 2019 and 2024 under the California Endangered Species Act and the federal Endangered Species Act, respectively. Burrowing owl was designated as a candidate endangered species in California in 2024. Northwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*) was designated as proposed threatened federally in 2023. A table of newly listed special-status species or species with changed listing status or potential to occur can be found in **Table 1**. Any species not listed in Table 1 were determined to have the same potential to occur as previously found in the MND.

**TABLE 1  
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES WITH POTENTIAL TO OCCUR IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Listing Status	Updates Since 2018 MND and Potential to Occur
<b>Same Listing Status as MND</b>		
Bald Eagle ( <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> )	FDL*, CE*, CFP	<b>Present.</b> A bald eagle was observed flying overhead onsite during the 2025 site visit. Thus, its potential to occur was changed from possible to present. It is still unlikely to nest on or near the site as they are more likely to nest near larger bodies of water. *The Federally Delisted (FDL) and California Endangered (CE) listing statuses were not shown in the 2018 MND potential to occur table and were added in this table.
<b>Listing Status Differs from MND</b>		
Northwestern pond turtle ( <i>Actinemys marmorata</i> )	FPT, CSC	<b>Likely.</b> Potential to occur has not changed from 2018 MND based on the 2025 site visit. Listing status has changed from California Species of Special Concern (CSC) in 2018 to CSC and Fully Protected (FPT) in 2025. The common name has changed from western pond turtle to northwestern pond turtle.
Burrowing Owl ( <i>Athene cunicularia</i> )	CCE, CSC	<b>Unlikely.</b> Potential to occur has not changed from 2018 MND based on the 2025 site visit. Listing status has changed from CSC in 2018 to California Candidate Endangered (CCE) in 2025.
<b>Not Included in MND</b>		
Crotch’s Bumble Bee ( <i>Bombus crotchii</i> )	CCE	<b>Unlikely.</b> The Project site is within the historical range, however it is now mostly declined from the Central Valley (Xerces 2025). It prefers open grassland and scrubland over the riparian habitat on site.
Monarch Butterfly ( <i>Danaus plexippus</i> )	FPT	<b>Likely.</b> Narrowleaf milkweed ( <i>Asclepias fascicularis</i> ), a host plant for the monarch, was observed adjacent to pump 3 during the 2025 site visit. The site may be used for foraging.

NOTES:

\* = Listing statuses were not included in the original MND bio section PTO table

**Occurrence Terminology:**

Present: Species observed on the site at time of field surveys or during recent past.

Likely: Species not observed on the site, but it may reasonably be expected to occur there on a regular basis.

Possible: Species not observed on the site, but it could occur there from time to time.

Unlikely: Species not observed on the site, and would not be expected to occur there except, perhaps, as a transient.

Absent: Species not observed on the site and precluded from occurring there because habitat requirements not met.

**Status Codes:**

FPT Federally Threatened (Proposed)

FDL Federally Delisted

CFP California Fully Protected

CSC California Species of Special Concern

CE California Endangered

CCE California Candidate Endangered

SOURCE: Data compiled by ESA in 2025

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 1a-c, 2a-d, 3a-c, 4a-c, 5, and 6a-b from the MND would reduce potential impacts to biological resources, including VELB, special-status fish, northwestern pond turtle, nesting raptors and migratory birds, water quality, and native trees and riparian vegetation through completion of preconstruction surveys, avoidance, monitoring, minimization, relocation, use of buffers, use and maintenance of fish screens and erosion and sediment control. No additional mitigation measures are needed to reduce the revised Project impacts on biological resources to less than significant. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in severity of impacts over those identified and evaluated in the MND.

## References

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2025. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) search for the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute Sloughhouse and Elk Grove topographic quadrangles and surrounding ten quadrangles. Information accessed December 19, 2025.
- Calflora. 2025. Information on California plants for education, research, and conservation [web application]. Berkeley, CA: The Calflora Database [a nonprofit organization]. Available: <http://www.calflora.org/>. Accessed December 19, 2025.
- Xerxes Society. 2024. “Crotch’s Bumble Bee | Xerxes Society.” Available: [Xerxes.org, 2024,xerxes.org/endangered-species/species-profiles/at-risk-bumble-bees/crotchs-bumble-bee](https://www.xerxes.org/2024/xerxes.org/2024/04/29/endangered-species/species-profiles/at-risk-bumble-bees/crotchs-bumble-bee/). Accessed on December 19, 2025
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2025. Information Planning and Consultation Species Database Results for the Elverta Bridge Replacement Project. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, CA. Accessed on December 19, 2025

## 3.5 Cultural Resources

Section 3.5 of the MND analyzed impacts to cultural resources and concluded that the Project could result in significant impacts to the significance of historical resources, archaeological resources, unique paleontological resources, and human remains. As identified in the MND, all of the impacts associated with Project activities would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of MND Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.

The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline, and two new intake lines.

To support the MND, Jensen (2018) prepared a cultural resources technical report that documented the results of a records search and field survey for the proposed pipeline corridor. Jensen (2018) did not identify any archaeological or cultural resources in the original Project site. Seven cultural resources were identified within ¼-mile of the original Project. Additionally, no formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist on the Project site. Despite these negative findings, Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 were included to reduce potential impacts on unknown cultural resources and human remains. The MND concluded that implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to previously unidentified archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

To support the revised Project, ESA received the results of a records search conducted by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) on January 7, 2026 (File No. SAC-26-1). The purpose of the search was to identify if any resources have been newly documented or updated within the revised Project site and vicinity. The 2026 records search included the entirety of the two Kautz properties, the Mosher property, as well as the three proposed pump station sites as part of the revised Project. The 2026 records search identified two cultural resources along the original Project conveyance pipeline that were previously identified in the Jensen (2018) records search as located within a ¼-mile radius of the Project site. The 2026 records search also identified an additional three cultural resources in the larger Kautz and Mosher properties, but outside of both the original and revised Project site. Seven additional cultural resources were identified in the 2026 record search within ¼-mile of the Kautz and Mosher properties.

No cultural resources have been identified within the revised Project site as a result of the records searches and pedestrian survey (Jensen 2018; NCIC 2026). The nearest recorded cultural resource is 750 feet from the revised Project site.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 from the MND would reduce potential impacts to inadvertently discovered cultural resources through implementation of archaeological consultation. However, the language of CUL-1 is vague, requiring only that archaeological consultation should be “sought immediately”. CUL-1 has been revised below to better clarify the procedure to follow in the event of an inadvertent discovery during Project construction.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 from the MND would reduce the potential impacts to human remains by requiring that the laws and regulations that outline the procedure for human remains discovery are followed. The language of this mitigation measure is sufficient for the revised Project.

No additional mitigation measures are needed to reduce the revised Project impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in severity of impacts over those identified and evaluated in the MND.

### ***Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (Revisions in Underline)***

Consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery of cultural material: The present evaluation and recommendations are based on the findings of an inventory-level surface survey only. There is always the possibility that significant unidentified cultural materials could be encountered on or below the surface during the course of future development or construction activities. This caveat is particularly relevant considering the constraints generally to archaeological field survey, and particularly where substantial ground disturbance has occurred, as in the present case. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of previously unidentified cultural material, archaeological consultation should be sought immediately. Archaeological consultation in the event of inadvertent discovery would be implemented in the following procedure:

If pre-contact or historic-era archaeological resources are encountered during Project implementation, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt, and a qualified archaeologist, defined as an archaeologist meeting Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (SOI PQS) for Archeology, shall inspect the find within 24 hours of discovery and notify OHWD of their initial

assessment. Pre-contact archaeological materials might include: obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools (e.g., hammerstones, pitted stones). Historic-era materials might include building or structure footings and walls, and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse.

If OHWD determines, based on recommendations from the archaeologist and, if the resource is indigenous and a Native American tribe has expressed interest, a Native American tribe, that the resource may qualify as a historical resource or unique archaeological resource (as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5) or a tribal cultural resource (as defined in PRC Section 21080.3), the resource shall be avoided, if feasible. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), this may be accomplished through planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.

## References

Jensen, Sean Michael. 2018. *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Groundwater Recharge Project, Linear Corridor Extending approximately 15,000', Sacramento County, California*. Prepared by Genesis Society. Prepared for Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group.

North Central Information Center (NCIC). 2026. Records Search File No. SAC-26-1. On file, ESA, January 7, 2026.

## 3.6 Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Section 3.6 of the MND analyzed impacts to geology and soils and concluded that the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving faults, ground shaking, seismic related ground failure or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable; be located on expansive soils; or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks. The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and is in an area with low seismic activity. It would comply with Sacramento County land use plans and construction requirements, reducing seismic hazard impacts to less than significant. Earthmoving activities (excavation, grading for pipeline installation) could cause minor soil erosion, but the flat terrain and compliance with State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) requirements, including a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), would minimize this risk. The area lacks substantial topographic changes, so hazards like landslides, liquefaction, or subsidence are unlikely. Soils have low expansiveness, and the Project is non-habitable, requiring no building permits. No wastewater disposal systems are included. Overall, all potential impacts are less than significant or nonexistent.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. While these changes introduce additional construction activities and facilities, they would not alter site geology, increase seismic risk, or create new conditions that would result in landslides, liquefaction, subsidence, or soil

instability. Compliance with existing construction requirements and erosion control measures would remain in place. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to geology, soils, or seismicity or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## 3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section 3.6.3.5.1 of the MND analyzed impacts to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and concluded that the Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Construction of the Project would generate up to 121.20 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, but emissions would be temporary during construction, lasting about 2.5 months. Long-term operational emissions would be minimal, limited to occasional worker trips. The Project would comply with SMAQMD GHG thresholds and guidance, and be consistent with the Sacramento County Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any applicable GHG reduction plans or policies and would have a less than significant impact on the environment.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction is anticipated to last approximately 5 days per pump (approximately 15 days total), with staging areas adjacent to pump sites and minimal equipment storage on existing levee or farm roads. These activities represent a minor increase in short-term construction emissions compared to the approved Project and would not introduce new operational sources of GHG emissions. Compliance with SMAQMD thresholds and applicable construction requirements remains unchanged. Therefore, the Project would not result in new significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Section 3.7 of the MND analyzed impacts to hazards and hazardous materials and concluded that the Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine handling of hazardous materials or through accidental releases during foreseeable upset conditions. The Project would also have no impact related to handling hazardous materials near schools, being on a listed contaminated site, proximity to airports or airstrips, interference with emergency plans, or exposure to wildland fire risks. The Project would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, except for diesel fuel for construction equipment. There are no designated hazardous materials transportation routes near the Project site, and any accidental spills during construction would be remediated by the contractor per best management practices and County requirements. The Project would not emit hazardous emissions within ¼ mile of a school, is not located on or near a listed hazardous materials site, and no cleanup sites exist within two miles (per SWRCB Geotracker and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor searches). The Project would not involve residential components, permanent staff, or activities that would exacerbate airport-related hazards. It would not impede emergency access or evacuation routes. The Project site and surrounding lands are actively cultivated agricultural areas with no adjacent wildlands. Maintenance would be limited to weekly trips.

The revised Project includes upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. No hazardous materials sites were documented at the Project site during an updated online search of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Project changes would result in similar impacts from accidental discovery and/or release of hazardous materials, interference with emergency vehicle access, and wildfire as identified in the MND. As further discussed under section 3.9 *Hydrology and Water Quality*, adherence to Best Management Practices (BMPs) as part of obtaining coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit would reduce impacts from waterborne pollutants (such as oils, gasoline, and heavy metals) entering natural waters to less-than-significant. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in new significant impacts to hazards or hazardous materials or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Section 3.8 of the MND analyzed impacts to hydrology and water quality and concluded that the Project would not violate water quality standards, deplete groundwater, alter drainage patterns, increase flooding or runoff, degrade water quality, place structures in flood hazard areas, or expose people to flooding, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A SWPPP, required under the NPDES permit program for projects disturbing one acre or more, would include site planning, limiting soil disturbance, and best management practices to prevent pollution and sediment discharge. Compliance with SWPPP ensures the Project would not alter drainage patterns, cause erosion, or discharge to surface waters.

The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction would last approximately 15 days total, with staging areas near pump sites and minimal equipment storage on levee or farm roads. These changes would improve groundwater storage and reduce stormwater system overload by creating a diversion and recharge area. During installation, the Project changes would also be required to comply with the conditions of the NPDES General Construction Permit, including applicable BMPs, which would ensure that potential water quality impacts would be minimized. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to hydrology and water quality or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### 3.10 Land Use and Planning

Section 3.9 of the MND analyzed impacts to land use and planning and concluded that the Project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, regulations, or habitat conservation plans. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. These changes would occur within the same Project area and would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations of Sacramento County. Therefore, installation of the Project

changes would not result in new significant impacts to land use or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.11 Mineral Resources**

Section 3.10 of the MND analyzed impacts to mineral resources and concluded that the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of regional or statewide value, nor the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. These changes would occur within the same Project area and would not be located over any mineral resource area, thereby avoiding interference with future resource excavation. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to mineral resources or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.12 Noise**

Section 3.11 of the MND analyzed noise impacts and concluded that the Project would not expose people to noise levels exceeding local standards, cause excessive groundborne vibration, or result in substantial permanent or temporary increases in ambient noise, nor would it expose people to excessive noise related to proximity to public airports or private airstrips. Construction may involve temporary noise sources and minor excavation or grading for pipeline installation; however, these activities would be minimal and short-term. The proposed Project is located within agricultural lands where noise from farming equipment is common, and construction noise would be consistent with these existing conditions. Operation and maintenance of the recharge basin and associated infrastructure would not cause a noticeable permanent increase in noise levels in this rural agricultural area with scattered residences.

The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction would last approximately 15 days total, with staging areas near pump sites and minimal equipment storage on levee or farm roads. These changes would occur within the same Project area, and would not introduce new noise sources beyond those previously analyzed. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to noise or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.13 Population and Housing**

Section 3.12 of the MND analyzed impacts to population and housing and concluded that the Project would not induce substantial population growth, displace existing housing, or displace substantial numbers of people. No residential structures would be built, and no housing or people would be displaced by the Project. Population growth would not be influenced directly or indirectly by Project implementation. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. These

changes would occur within the same Project area, would not involve residential development. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to population or housing or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.14 Public Services**

Section 3.13 of the MND analyzed impacts to public services and concluded that the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. These changes would not increase the demand for the kinds of public services that would support new residents, such as schools, parks, fire, police, or other public facilities. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to public services or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.15 Recreation**

Section 3.14 of the MND analyzed impacts to recreation and concluded that the Project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities in a way that would cause substantial physical deterioration, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch) and a new intake line. These changes would not result in interference with access to these or other recreation facilities. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to recreation or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

### **3.16 Transportation and Traffic**

Section 3.15 of the MND analyzed impacts to transportation and concluded that the Project would not conflict with applicable transportation plans or congestion management programs, alter air traffic patterns, increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses, result in inadequate emergency access, or conflict with adopted policies for public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction would last approximately 15 days total, with staging areas near pump sites and minimal equipment storage on levee or farm roads. These changes would occur within the same Project area, would not alter existing transportation patterns, and would result in similar, temporary construction-related traffic impacts as previously analyzed. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to transportation and traffic or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## 3.17 Tribal Cultural Resources

Section 3.16 of the MND analyzed impacts to tribal cultural resources and concluded that the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any tribal cultural resource, as defined under Public Resources Code Section 21074.

To support the MND, Jensen (2018) submitted a sacred lands file and tribal contacts list request to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on December 18, 2017. The NAHC responded on December 21, 2017 that the sacred lands file search was negative and provided a list of ten tribal representatives from eight tribes. OHWD had previously received a formal consultation request from Wilton Rancheria, as per Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. No other tribes requested to be consulted. OHWD initiated consultation with Wilton Rancheria on the original Project on December 18, 2017. Wilton Rancheria responded on December 20, 2017, requesting to consult with OHWD on the Project. OHWD then made several attempts to meet with Wilton with no response. OHWD sent Wilton Rancheria the Cultural Resources Report (Jensen 2018) on March 29, 2018, and GIS data of the original Project site on April 18, 2018. OHWD sent a copy of the Draft MND via UPS on July 11, 2018 and sent Wilton Rancheria a Notice of Extension of the public comment period via UPS on August 14, 2018. No response was received from any of the outreach efforts as part of the original Project. As such, OHWD concluded consultation with Wilton Rancheria with publication of the Final MND in September 2018.

To support the addendum to the MND, ESA contacted NAHC on January 6, 2026, to request a search of their Sacred Lands file and a list of Native American tribes in the vicinity who may have an interest in the revised Project. On January 6, 2026, the NAHC responded, stating that the file search was positive for sacred sites. The NAHC also provided contact information for thirty-six tribal representatives from twelve tribes for additional information. As OHWD had previously consulted with Wilton Rancheria on the original Project, OHWD again reached out on February 9, 2026, to notify the Tribe of the revised Project. Wilton Rancheria responded on February 9, 2026, that they would like to be consulted with on the revised Project and provided times to meet with OHWD. A meeting was held between representatives of OHWD, Wilton Rancheria, and ESA on February 25, 2026 to discuss the addendum MND and proposed Project changes. During the meeting, OHWD representatives presented a summary of the proposed Project changes and the anticipated minor ground-disturbance associated with these activities. Wilton Rancheria asked about the anticipated depth and location of ground disturbance for the revised Project. Wilton Rancheria asked if it would be possible to conduct a site visit and mentioned the possibility of monitoring the ground-disturbing activities associated with the addendum. OHWD responded that access to the Project site is restricted by landowners, but they will reach out to see if they can get access for a site visit. The Project schedule is not yet known and as such OHWD would reach out once the schedule and work plans are available to discuss monitoring. Wilton Rancheria also requested shapefiles of the revised Project boundary and the 2018 MND during the meeting. On February 27, 2026, ESA provided the requested data as well as the 2026 NCIC results via email to Wilton Rancheria. Consultation is ongoing. No tribal cultural resources or potential tribal cultural resources have been identified by Wilton Rancheria or OHWD that would be impacted by the proposed Project changes.

The MND did not identify any potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources as a result of the original Project. No tribal cultural resources have been identified as a result of recent consultation efforts for the revised Project. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant

impacts to tribal cultural resources or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## References

Jensen, Sean Michael. 2018. *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Omochumne-Hartnell Water District, Groundwater Recharge Project, Linear Corridor Extending approximately 15,000', Sacramento County, California*. Prepared by Genesis Society. Prepared for Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group.

North Central Information Center (NCIC). 2026. Records Search File No. SAC-26-1. On file, ESA, January 7, 2026.

## 3.18 Utilities and Service Systems

Section 3.17 of the MND analyzed impacts to utilities and service systems and concluded that the Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, require new or expanded water, wastewater, or stormwater facilities, or fail to comply with applicable regulations. The Project would not generate significant wastewater, would not require expansion of stormwater systems, and is intended to improve groundwater supply. Construction would produce only minimal, temporary solid waste, and all activities would comply with federal, state, and local solid waste regulations. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Construction would last approximately 15 days total, with staging areas near pump sites and minimal equipment storage on levee or farm roads. These changes would occur within the same Project area and would not result in additional demand for water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater facilities, or other utilities. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to utilities and service systems or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## 3.19 Issues Not Discussed in MND

The MND did not discuss the Energy and Wildfire resource topics. The revised Project would upgrade the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and install three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines. Fuel consumption during construction would be temporary and localized and would not utilize inefficient equipment. The new pumps would be connected to electrical service and may require electrical upgrades. Operation would involve additional electric pump operation. Although operation would require more energy than originally anticipated, it wouldn't result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Maintenance would be essentially the same as existing operations and occur on an as-needed basis. The revised Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency or impede progress toward achieving any goals and targets. The revised Project is adjacent to lands occupied by irrigated agriculture and would not exacerbate the risk of wildfire or impede emergency response or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, installation of the Project changes would not result in new significant impacts to Energy or Wildfire or substantially increase the severity of impacts beyond those as part of the Project.

This page intentionally left blank

## SECTION 4

---

### Conclusion

On the basis of the evaluation presented in Section 3, *Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects*, the proposed changes to the Project including upgrading the existing pump at Field Site 1 (Teichert Ranch) and installing three new pumps—one at Field Site 1, one upstream at Teichert Ranch, and one at Field Site 2 (Rooney Ranch), connections to the existing conveyance pipeline and two new intake lines would not trigger any of the conditions, listed in Section 1.2 of this Addendum, requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental MND. All mitigation measures from the MND apply to the proposed changes to the Project, as described above in Section 3. This Addendum satisfies the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164. Under CEQA, modifications that are not substantial, but represent minor changes or additions may be presented in an addendum and the addendum does not require circulation. This document will be made part of the administrative record and will be available with the lead agency decision-making body along with the certified MND to provide clarification regarding proposed changes outlined above and to comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164.

This page intentionally left blank

## Omochumne-Hartnell Water District Board

**Meeting April 21, 2026 @ 10:00 am**

Meeting held by teleconference, video conference, and in person.

### **Call to Order: 10:02 am**

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Determine if quorum is present
  - a) Directors Mark Stretars, Paul Hensleigh, and Ken Mitchell were in attendance.

**Public Comments** – No public comments at this time.

### **Action Items:**

- 1) Consent Items: The Board reviewed the agenda and the minutes of the Board Meeting on April 21, 2026. A motion to approve the agenda for the Regular Board Meeting on April 21, 2026 made by Mr. Hensleigh, second by Mr. Mitchell. The motion passed 3/0/0  
A motion to approve financial report accounts payable only as presented. Mr. Wackman separated GSA Assessment form regular property tax assessment, and to approve accounts payable presented in the board meeting packet, made by Mr. Mitchell, second by Mr. Hensleigh. Motion passed 3/0/0.
- 2) SGMA Compliance
  - a) Sacramento Valley- South American Groundwater Sub Basin
    - i. Update- Mr. Stretars reported that there is a meeting today to discuss annual report and update where the budget is headed for the next fiscal year. Meeting put on by SCGA. Sloughhouse removal of GSA, and billing conversation for late removal and possibly still paying for a portion of being involved for a portion of the year.
  - b) San Joaquin valley – Cosumnes Groundwater Sub Basin
    - i. Update on Cosumnes Groundwater Authority- April meeting was cancelled and moved to May. Report has been submitted. Irrigated lunch in was held and had a good turnout.
- 3) CalSIP Grant
  - a) Update Laura Foglio from Larry Walker and Associates reported stage and flow and rating curves and data will be available from the website measurements shortly. Calibration has been consistent and Larry Walker and Associates is pleased how things are moving along at this point.
- 4) OHWD Expansion Update
  - a) MSR Status- Update only. Mr. Wackman talked to contractor this is doing it and LAFCo is currently reviewing and available for review for public comment in the coming weeks.
- 5) Groundwater Recharge Projects –
  - a) Annual Diversion Report –Report has been submitted to the state.
  - b) EIR Amendment- Laura Foglio will be reaching out to local tribes and Environmental Services company to review for additional pumping stations and fish screens at Teichert.

- 6) Informational items:
  - a) DWR Interagency Drought Task Force Update – Meeting was held on Friday in person. Projects this year are roles and responsibilities of water management.
  - b) SSCAWA Meeting – April meeting was cancelled. Meeting will be held in early May.
  - c) Received Communications – EBMUD BBQ invitation will be held on May 15, 2026 at McClean Hall- Pardee Center- Valley Springs, CA
  - d) Water Coordinator’s Report – Rain yesterday and today was good for river levels.
- 7) General Managers Report:
  - a) Meetings and Correspondences – Continued meeting with Freshwater Trust and discussion of funding opportunities and projects. AB2447 Discussion for Nitrogen Management restrictions.
- 8) Directors:
  - a) Comments – No updates.
  - b) Director’s meeting attendance report: No reports at this time.
- 9) Next Meeting: May 19, 2026 at 10:00 am. Mr. Hensleigh made the motion to adjourn the meeting on April 21, 2026 at 10:46 AM second by Mr. Mitchell. The motion passed unanimously. 3/0/0

The next meeting – May 19, 2026 at 10 a.m.  
\*\* 8970 Elk Grove Blvd., Elk Grove, CA.\*\*

Adjourn Meeting – The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 AM

# Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

## A/P Aging Summary Report

As of May 18, 2026

	CURRENT	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	91 AND OVER	TOTAL
Chase Card Services	184.85					184.85
Cosumnes Groundwater Authority	31,352.00					31,352.00
Downey Brand Attorneys LLP	1,118.00					1,118.00
Justin Oldfield	50.00					50.00
Ken Mitchell	50.00					50.00
Kurt Kautz	50.00					50.00
Larry Walker Associates	7,125.28					7,125.28
Mark L. Stretars	50.00					50.00
Paul Hensleigh	100.00					100.00
Sacramento County Farm Bureau	200.00					200.00
Shasta Burns	600.00					600.00
Wackman Consulting	4,000.00					4,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44,880.13</b>					<b>\$44,880.13</b>

# Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

## Balance Sheet As of May 18, 2026

	TOTAL
<hr/>	
Assets	
Current Assets	
Bank Accounts	
ICS Cash Sweep	\$378,892.80
SGMA Fee - Reserve Account	281,921.40
<b>Total for ICS Cash Sweep</b>	<b>\$660,814.20</b>
LAIF	237,675.30
River City Bank	-17,452.67
<b>Total for Bank Accounts</b>	<b>\$881,036.83</b>
Accounts Receivable	
Accounts Receivable	405.00
<b>Total for Accounts Receivable</b>	<b>\$405.00</b>
<b>Total for Current Assets</b>	<b>\$881,441.83</b>
Other Assets	
Loan Receivable - SSCAWA	0.00
<b>Total for Other Assets</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total for Assets</b>	<b>\$881,441.83</b>
<hr/>	
Liabilities and Equity	
Liabilities	
Current Liabilities	
Accounts Payable	
Accounts Payable	44,880.13
SAFCA Bridge Loan	0.00
<b>Total for Accounts Payable</b>	<b>\$44,880.13</b>
Credit Cards	
Chase Visa	0.00
<b>Total for Credit Cards</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total for Current Liabilities</b>	<b>\$44,880.13</b>
<b>Total for Liabilities</b>	<b>\$44,880.13</b>
Equity	
Opening Bal Equity	296,356.48
Retained Earnings	506,261.78
Net Income	33,943.44
<b>Total for Equity</b>	<b>\$836,561.70</b>
<b>Total for Liabilities and Equity</b>	<b>\$881,441.83</b>
<hr/>	

# Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

## Budget vs. Actuals: Budget\_FY26\_P&L revised - FY26 P&L

July 2025 - June 2026

	TOTAL			
	ACTUAL	BUDGET	OVER BUDGET	% OF BUDGET
<b>Income</b>				
2023-2024 Delinquent GSA Assessment	930.89		930.89	
CalSIP Grant Reimbursements	117,735.67	150,000.00	-32,264.33	78.49 %
Freshwater Trust Groundwater Recharge Contract	30,000.00	30,000.00	0.00	100.00 %
GSA Assessment	95,437.25	124,000.00	-28,562.75	76.97 %
Interest	2,764.67	4,000.00	-1,235.33	69.12 %
Property Taxes	111,535.62	225,000.00	-113,464.38	49.57 %
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>\$358,404.10</b>	<b>\$533,000.00</b>	<b>\$ -174,595.90</b>	<b>67.24 %</b>
<b>GROSS PROFIT</b>	<b>\$358,404.10</b>	<b>\$533,000.00</b>	<b>\$ -174,595.90</b>	<b>67.24 %</b>
<b>Expenses</b>				
Accountant Fees	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00	100.00 %
Dam Installation & Removal	7,501.20	10,000.00	-2,498.80	75.01 %
Director's Per Diem	1,900.00	3,500.00	-1,600.00	54.29 %
District Annexation				
Annexation LAFCO expenses		45,000.00	-45,000.00	
Engineering	6,010.00	15,000.00	-8,990.00	40.07 %
Legal		5,000.00	-5,000.00	
<b>Total District Annexation</b>	<b>6,010.00</b>	<b>65,000.00</b>	<b>-58,990.00</b>	<b>9.25 %</b>
Dues and Support Payments	4,308.00	4,500.00	-192.00	95.73 %
Election Expenses	607.50	0.00	607.50	
Engineering Fees				
CalSip Stream Gauge Installation	77,534.83	150,000.00	-72,465.17	51.69 %
General	25,011.81	35,000.00	-9,988.19	71.46 %
Grant Application Engineering		10,000.00	-10,000.00	
Ground Water Recharge	285.00	15,000.00	-14,715.00	1.90 %
<b>Total Engineering Fees</b>	<b>102,831.64</b>	<b>210,000.00</b>	<b>-107,168.36</b>	<b>48.97 %</b>
General Manager Services	44,000.00	51,000.00	-7,000.00	86.27 %
Groundwater Recharge Project				
Ground Water Recharge - Construction	6,090.71	10,000.00	-3,909.29	60.91 %
Groundwater Recharge - Utilities		5,000.00	-5,000.00	
Groundwater Recharge Operations	759.90	5,000.00	-4,240.10	15.20 %
Groundwater Recharge Permit Fees		7,000.00	-7,000.00	
<b>Total Groundwater Recharge Project</b>	<b>6,850.61</b>	<b>27,000.00</b>	<b>-20,149.39</b>	<b>25.37 %</b>
Legal Fees				
Legal - General	5,132.50	25,000.00	-19,867.50	20.53 %
Legal - Groundwater Recharge		5,000.00	-5,000.00	
Legal - SGMA		1,000.00	-1,000.00	
<b>Total Legal Fees</b>	<b>5,132.50</b>	<b>31,000.00</b>	<b>-25,867.50</b>	<b>16.56 %</b>
Liability Insurance	2,543.79	2,500.00	43.79	101.75 %
Office Rent	2,200.00	2,400.00	-200.00	91.67 %
Office Supplies	2,962.42	3,000.00	-37.58	98.75 %
Postage-Post Office Box	244.00	500.00	-256.00	48.80 %

# Omochumne-Hartnell Water District

## Budget vs. Actuals: Budget\_FY26\_P&L revised - FY26 P&L

July 2025 - June 2026

	TOTAL			
	ACTUAL	BUDGET	OVER BUDGET	% OF BUDGET
Secretarial Services	6,600.00	7,200.00	-600.00	91.67 %
SGMA Expenses				
SGMA - Cosumnes Groundwater Basin	31,352.00	32,000.00	-648.00	97.98 %
SGMA - South American Groundwater Basin	85,417.00	82,000.00	3,417.00	104.17 %
<b>Total SGMA Expenses</b>	<b>116,769.00</b>	<b>114,000.00</b>	<b>2,769.00</b>	<b>102.43 %</b>
SSCAWA - JPA Membership	6,000.00	4,500.00	1,500.00	133.33 %
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$324,460.66</b>	<b>\$544,100.00</b>	<b>\$ -219,639.34</b>	<b>59.63 %</b>
<b>NET OPERATING INCOME</b>	<b>\$33,943.44</b>	<b>\$ -11,100.00</b>	<b>\$45,043.44</b>	<b>-305.80 %</b>
<b>NET INCOME</b>	<b>\$33,943.44</b>	<b>\$ -11,100.00</b>	<b>\$45,043.44</b>	<b>-305.80 %</b>



Piret Harmon  
Executive Director

December 18, 2025

California-American  
Water Company

Mike Wackman  
Omochumne Hartnell Water District  
PO Box 211  
Wilton, CA 95693

City of Elk Grove

RE: FY 2026 SASb Contribution to the Sacramento Central  
Groundwater Authority (SCGA)

City of Folsom

City of Rancho Cordova

Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding Establishing a South American Subbasin Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Executive Committee and General Manager Committee and Identifying Cost Share Provisions for Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation, February 28, 2023 (MOU). The parties to the MOU agree to the allocation of the certain GSP administration and implementation costs.

City of Sacramento

County of Sacramento

Florin Resource Conservation  
District/Elk Grove Water  
Service

Golden State Water Company

Please remit the annual contribution for FY 2026 to SCGA in the amount shown below.

Sacramento Area Sewer District

Agricultural Representative

Omochumne Hartnell Water District **\$85,417.00**

Agricultural-Residential  
Representative

Remittance is due and payable within 30 days of receipt of this billing. Please remit payment electronically (ACH/wire) to Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority using the following instructions:

Commercial/Industrial  
Representative

Conservation Landowners

Public Agencies/Self Supplied  
Representative

**Beneficiary Bank  
Five Star Bank  
2240 Douglas Blvd.  
Roseville, CA 95661  
ABA#121143037  
Short Name: Five Star BK Rose  
Beneficiary Name: Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority  
Account Number: 1575430**

If you have any questions regarding this, please contact Piret Harmon at [executivedirector@scgah2o.com](mailto:executivedirector@scgah2o.com).