



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Teleconference Meeting Only

Call-In Information Provided

NOTICE: Coronavirus COVID-19

See Attached Notice Regarding COVID-19

- I. **Call to Order/Roll Call** (*Please remember to keep your phone line muted and unmute when announcing yourself for attendance or speaking)
- II. **Scheduled Items – *Presentation materials to be posted on ESJGroundwater.org and emailed prior to the meeting.***
 - A. **Discussion / Action Items:**
 1. Approval of the May 12, 2021 meeting minutes (attached)
 2. Proposed GWA FY 21-22 budget (attached)
 3. Resolution rescinding R-20-06 and adopting a resolution authorizing the secretary of the GWA to approve expenditures and execute contracts within the designations and limitations of the approved budget (attached)
 4. FIROMAR concept and opportunity
 5. DWR comment response plan
 6. Basin accounting framework
- III. **Staff Reports**
- IV. **Public Comment (non-agendized items)**
- V. **Director Comments**
- VI. **Future Agenda Items**
- VII. **Adjournment**

NOTICE: Coronavirus COVID-19

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Steering Committee Meeting

AGENDA

(Continued)

Important Notice Regarding COVID 19 and Closure of Board Chambers to the Public During Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee Meeting

On March 18, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 recognizing that COVID 19 continues to spread throughout our community resulting in serious and ongoing economic harm. Governor Newsom has therefore waived certain requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act relating to public participation and attendance at public meetings.

Based on guidance from the California Department of Public Health and the California Governor's Officer, effective immediately and while social distancing measures are imposed, the meetings of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Steering Committee Meetings are to be conducted via teleconference.

In order to minimize the spread of the COVID 19 virus, the following options are available to members of the public to listen to these meetings and provide comments to the Committee Members before and during the meeting:

1. You are strongly encouraged to listen to the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee meetings by attending the teleconference:

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+1 209-645-4071 United States, Stockton

Phone Conference ID: 511 005 914#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Once connected, we request you kindly mute your phone.

2. If you wish to make a comment on a specific agenda item, please submit your comment via email by 5:00 p.m. on the Tuesday prior to the meeting. Please submit your comment to the Secretary of the Board at ksmith@sjgov.org. Your comment will be shared with the Board members and placed into the record at the meeting. Every effort will be made to read comments received during the

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Steering Committee Meeting

AGENDA

(Continued)

meeting into the record but some comments may not be read due to time limitations. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting.

Next Scheduled Meeting

Wednesday, July 14, 2021

8:30 am to 10:00 am

Location TBD

ESJGWA Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 12, 2021

Meeting called to order: at 8:32 a.m.

The meeting was conducted via teleconference using Microsoft Teams. Chairman Winn called the meeting to order. Reminders were provided to the attendees regarding meeting procedures.

Roll Call taken:

Roll call taken of members only.

In attendance were Chairman Chuck Winn; Directors Mike Henry; Robert Holmes; Tom Flinn and Alternate Directors Mel Lytle; Walter Ward; Andrew Watkins.

Others in attendance were logged via their sign in to Microsoft Teams.

Discussion / Action Items:

1. Approval of the April 14, 2021 Meeting Minutes (Attached)

Director Robert Holmes noted that an amendment to the meeting minutes were needed due to his comment under the Grants and Funding section about private companies doing irrigation recommendations based on ET measurements being mistakenly credited to Alternate Director Walter Ward.

Motion: Alternate Director Walter Ward

2nd: Director Robert Holmes

Chairman Winn asked for any Opposed or Abstains. With none provided, the minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Drought Conditions and Response

Mr. Matt Zidar from San Joaquin County displayed a San Joaquin Precipitation chart and noted the data shows the years from 2012 to present were considerably drier than usual. Mr. Zidar displayed snow pack average data which gave similar conclusions. Mr. Zidar provided a "Current Drought Summary" which demonstrated that all major reservoirs in the Central Valley are below the Historic Average, noting that New Melones was in better shape than the others, and that drought conditions are similar to May 2014. Impacts resulting from drought were noted and included an increase in groundwater pumping due to a decrease in agriculture surface water, dry wells and subsidence resulting from declining groundwater, wildlife suffering habitat loss and temperature increase, and environmental damages to vegetation increasing wildlife risk. Mr. Zidar reviewed the State's Drought Response and noted the drought emergency was expanded to include the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and that the State Water Board would consider modifying requirements for reservoir releases and diversion limitations to conserve water.

3. State and Federal Budgets and Funding

A Golden State Stimulus package proposing \$2B for payment of past due water, electricity, and gas bills and a water infrastructure and drought response package worth \$5.1B were also highlighted. Mr. Zidar covered more details regarding the State Water Infrastructure and Drought Response Package which included funding for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, groundwater cleanup and water recycling projects, Sustainable Groundwater Management implementation, and water conveyance improvements.

Alternate Director Walter Ward commented that, in terms of SGMA, it is likely that some Minimum Thresholds might be exceeded but wants to make sure everyone understands that would be ok. Alternate Director Ward stated that there is resiliency built into the SGMA process and that, in terms of measurement of sustainability, the state board will not intervene with any type of enforcement action for exceeding minimum thresholds. Mr. Zidar agreed and stated that they should gather information from the representative wells as the water levels are influenced by increased pumping. Mr. Zidar also hopes to provide this information to the Technical Advisory Committee and Steering Committee. Alternate Director Ward also noted that, if minimum thresholds are exceeded, they should consider if that triggers a response.

Alternate Director Ward noted that Stanislaus County will be meeting with a risk assessment group to decide whether or not to declare a local condition. Thus, Alternate Director Ward asked Chairman Winn and the general body if San Joaquin County was planning on similarly declaring a local emergency and what this local declaration would be. Chairman Winn responded that at the last Board meeting the group did discuss the drought and actions that could be taken such as conservation, restriction on water use, etc. Chairman Winn also noted that they should consider what they have been doing since 2017 in preparation for the drought and what they can do in the future – which is one of his major concerns. Chairman Winn also asked to consider how they can advocate to the state legislature that some money needs to go to water infrastructure. Mr. Zidar stated that they should seek both reactive and proactive methods to the drought response, emphasizing the need for regional and multi-participant projects. Mr. Zidar also mentioned that typically during a drought people often do not think long term but believes that investments in projects are needed to be able to respond to drought, noting that we need a better funding mechanism.

Alternate Director Ward commented that the funding provided by the Drought Response Package is not a lot and, while it may be the 2nd year of the drought and it is early to panic, noted that additional groundwater pumping is not necessarily bad in the short term and that recovery is likely. The long term projects being considered are needed for drought response and to overcome ongoing overdraft. Alternate Director Ward also said outreach is an opportunity, suggesting the creation of a small well registration program so that dry wells can be identified and more water level information can be obtained throughout the basin. Mr. Zidar noted that DWR provides an internet based dry well reporting tool which is meant to help the state target those water systems that are failing as result of declining water levels. However, Mr. Zidar also stated that they do not have any local programs designed to provide relief to these systems. In addition, Mr. Zidar emphasized that mutual water companies and privately-held domestic wells are currently on their own, but the state is exploring ways to get resources to those communities. Alternate Director Ward commented that human right to water is on the top of Governor Newsom's priority list.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid added to Mr. Zidar's comments on funding by stating that the North San Joaquin project missed funding in round one of Prop 68, and noted that there are potential FloodMAR projects that should be funded. Ms. Kincaid stated that if they are able to tie projects to the GSP the area will be more successful in obtaining state money. Ms. Kincaid recommended getting behind projects as a group on a basin level rather than through individual GSA's. Mr. Zidar stated that we need to take single projects and give them regional context, set up priorities, and find the right funding resources. Mr. Zidar noted that a sub-group with balanced representation, including certain GSA representatives, could be created and be used to develop the details for such an approach.

Mr. Glenn Prasad, from San Joaquin County, stated that the guarantee of funding based on funding areas in the IRWM program was beneficial. Mr. Prasad noted that the IRWM project selection process helped prioritize projects and allowed the region to decide which projects would proceed. Mr. Zidar added that finding a commonality as a group would help in terms of pushing for legislative actions.

Chairman Winn, in response to Alternate Director Ward's comments, stated that there is a concern regarding metering wells in his District. Chairman Winn, in response to Ms. Kincaid's comments, stated that they had a Central Valley water sub-committee and noted that there was a lot of interest on the metering topic. Chairman Winn also stated that as regional bodies they have the potential to work together and also emphasized that grants should have dedicated funds for smaller counties --- since funding has historically gone to larger counties in Southern California and the Bay Area. Mr. Zidar stated that he would like to review projects as a group and discuss the drought response at the next TAC meeting.

4. Review of FY 2021-22 Budget (attached)

Mr. Zidar noted that the same basic approach as the FY 20/21 Budget was being used for the new FY 21/22 Budget which included forecasting known revenue, estimating proposed expense, and using a cost allocation approach to cover the difference between known revenues and planned expenses. Mr. Zidar provided a Budget Scenario spreadsheet that listed revenues, GWA GSAs Cost, Other Government Aid, Zone 2, State (DWR) Grants; planned expenditures for a high level and low level of effort, and proposed reserves. He also presented a cost allocation based on groundwater pumping.

It was noted that the scenarios shown today were different than those sent with the agenda package.

The different expense categories were explained, noting the difference between the high and low level of activity scenarios. Alternate Director Ward stated that there could be litigation expenses related to the lawsuit filed when the GSP was first adopted. Mr. Fritz Buchman noted that the GWA was dismissed from the lawsuit – only the individual GSA's were still involved.

Mr. Zidar stated that we will track reserves through a reserve account.

Director Henry asked for clarification if the Steering Committee meeting would occur before the Board next month. Mr. Zidar answered that he would like to have the Steering Committee moved to June 2nd. Mr. Rodney Fricke asked to see the cost allocation chart again and asked question related to how the data was used. Mr. Zidar explained that a number of the columns (e/g/; acres) were not used, and that for purposes of cost allocation only pumping was used for this year's budget. Discussion followed noting that the prior years used both pumping and population (60/40 ratio) to allocate costs and that this should be the basis for cost allocation again this year. It was noted that it had been suggested last year

to move to groundwater pumping as the basis for cost allocation. There was consensus that the 60/40 pumping/population ratio should still be used for cost allocation for the FY 21-22. This direction will be used to develop the budget and cost allocation scenarios for presentation to the Ad Hoc budget committee June 2.

Alternate Director Lytle noted that when the GSP was formulated, there was a debate as to the role of the GWA versus that of the GSAs. For example, are the GSA's the only ones responsible for projects? Alternate Director Lytle emphasized that he believes the budget will bring up similar worthy discussions. Mr. Zidar noted that the GWA could support individual GSA projects and the projects could benefit the region as a whole.

5. Water Budget and Accounting Framework

Mr. Zidar provided an overview of the different accounting frameworks that were explored by Ms. Valerie Kincaid at the last TAC meeting. Mr. Zidar explored the different basis for basin accounting; a groundwater budget (hydrology/physics), a groundwater allocation (policy), and water markets (economics). Mr. Zidar reviewed the different case studies that were provided and concluded that few basins take the same approach but generally developed rules and then applied the rules to facts.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid noted that all of the basins that were reviewed had very different political and physical conditions, noting that Eastern San Joaquin does have more tools and water available than other basins but still believes the case studies provide useful information to formulate an approach for the GWA. It was noted that groundwater conditions are not homogeneous in a basin and that any accounting framework should recognize the variability; the legal assignment to different waters do not always match up with the geophysical conditions. Mr. Zidar stated that there is a difference between a "basin benefit" and an "extractive benefit," and that both should be factored into any accounting framework; and that there are social benefits and specific to project beneficiaries. The discussion continued regarding the legal system, use of rules, groundwater as a common pool, policy incentives for net rechargers, credits variance in water costs and value of land, and economic impacts.

Different methods for basin accounting were discussed. Mr. Zidar noted that he would like to engage both the TAC and Steering Committee to bring water budget and policy together and develop comparative accounting frameworks for the basin. It was noted that there is a difference between an accounting framework and a process for allocating water, with a preference towards the former. It was noted that there needs to be an equitable approach to identifying project beneficiaries, varying costs, and deciding who has to pay for a project.

Chairman Winn asked Ms. Valerie Kincaid, in terms of accounting frameworks, what the enforcement mechanisms were or if they were voluntary. Ms. Kincaid answered that everyone took a different approach, but water budgets were used to identify when or if a GSA was going over the water budget. Mr. Zidar noted that trade and economics has driven some of the allocation strategies and accounting frameworks, and that water markets were being established. Mr. Zidar noted that the model water budgets were to be prepared and used to inform the TAC and Steering Committee during development of a framework for our basin, recommending taking a deeper dive into the accounting frameworks over a series of meetings.

6. DWR Review Process

Mr. Zidar provided details on the timing of the DWR Review Process and noted that locations outside of the Central Valley would get early consultations. It is expected that the ESJ basin would have DWR consultation in the late summer to discuss our GSP and their pending comments. Mr. Zidar also mentioned that official, formal comments and a final determination on the ESJ GSP “substantial compliance” would occur in January 2022, at which point we would have 180 days to respond. It is anticipated that the GSAs and GWA legal representatives would participate in a response to DWR comments.

Ms. Chelsea Spier from DWR stated that even plans that are approved are likely to still have comments or recommendations for improvement. Ms. Kincaid stated that there are three possibilities which include complete, incomplete, and inadequate and noted that either a complete with recommendations or an inadequate with comments will still require a team to field that response. Ms. Kincaid also noted that the plan will be challenged and litigated as there may be others who do not agree with the GWA or DWR. Ms. Kincaid emphasized that all conversations are part of an administrative record, and they must consider getting a team together that include technical experts, consultants, etc. Mr. Zidar commented that they will be working with the TAC and Steering Committee to define how the communication process will work.

Director Holmes noted that the budget committee should keep Woodard and Curran on a retainer so they are available to help with this project. Mr. Zidar stated they can issue task orders as long as the planned expenditure is within the budget. Director Holmes stated that keeping Woodard & Curran available is important to help with any responses they might have to make to DWR.

Staff Reports

1. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Mr. Zidar stated that the TAC debriefed on annual reports and accounting frameworks.

2. Drought Conditions and Response

This item was moved up the agenda.

Alternate Director Ward asked to have the two referenced drought response documents (Legislative Analyst Office, California Natural Resources Agency) sent to the group for their review.

3. State and Federal Budgets and Funding

This item was moved up the agenda.

4. DWR Update (attached)

Ms. Chelsea Spier from DWR stated that they are working on extracting data from the dry well reporting sites and that RCAC is doing private well inspections for free. Ms. Spier also noted that they published the 2018 Land Use data and that the EPA has allocated money towards water infrastructure projects. Ms. Spier also reminded the group that there is missing groundwater data and asked the group to please upload the data. Mr. Zidar asked for clarification if she meant this year’s data. Ms. Spier replied that it was Fall 2020 data.

5. News

Mr. Zidar stated that he did not send out a news clipping this meeting but would start working on gathering useful news information.

Public Comment:

None.

Director's Comments:

None.

Future Agenda Items:

Mr. Zidar confirmed that the Steering Committee meeting was moved to June 2nd, and they would cover the drought in the June Board meeting.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 10:46 am.

minutes
approved

II. A.1

Approved

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority
Steering Committee Meeting Roll Call / Vote
May 12, 2021 **8:30 AM**

Chuck Winn *	San Joaquin County	209-953-1160	cwinn@sigov.org	
Mel Lytle *	City of Stockton	209-937-5614	mel.lytle@stocktonca.gov	
Mike Henry *	Lockeford Community Services District	209-712-4014	midot@att.net	
Walter Ward *	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	209-525-6710	wward@envres.org	
Robert Holmes *	South San Joaquin GSA	209-484-7678	rholmes@ssjid.com	
Andrew Watkins *	Stockton East Water District	209-948-0333	watkins.andrew@verizon.net	
Tom Flinn *	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	209-663-8760	tomflinn2@me.com	

motion- ward
2nd - Holmes

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee Meeting Sign-In

May 12, 2021

8:30 A.M.

Chuck Winn	San Joaquin County	209-953-1160	cwinn@sigov.org	Present
Mel Lytle	City of Stockton	209-937-5614	mel.lytle@stocktonca.gov	Present
Mike Henry	Lockeford Community Services District	209-712-4014	midot@att.net	Present
Walter Ward	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	209-525-6710	wward@envres.org	Present
Robert Holmes	South San Joaquin GSA	209-484-7678	rholmes@ssjid.com	Present
Andrew Watkins	Stockton East Water District	209-948-0333	watkins.andrew@verizon.net	Present
Tom Flinn	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	209-663-8760	tomflinn2@me.com	Present
Kris Balaji	San Joaquin County	468-3100	kbalaji@sigov.org	Present
Fritz Buchman	San Joaquin County	468-3034	fbuchman@sigov.org	Present
Matt Zidar	San Joaquin County	953-7460	mzidar@sigov.org	Present
Brandon Nakagawa *	South San Joaquin GSA - Alternate	209-249-4613	bnakagawa@ssjid.com	Present
Steven Smith	EHD			Present
Allison Felkay				Present
Stacie Ann	NCWL			Present
Max Storms				Present
Chelsea Spier	DWR			Present
Glenn Prasad				Present

Table 1. FY 2021-22 Budget Scenarios

Revenue	High Activity		
	FY 21-22	6221100802	
	Contract /ODC	Staff	Total
Interest Income			
GWA GSAs Cost Allocation	\$ 700,000		\$ 700,000
Other Govt Aid From Zone 2	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
State (DWR) Sustainable GW Grant	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
P68 Implementation Grant	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
Rebates & Refunds			\$ -
Carry Over (use of fund balance)	\$ 100,000		
Allocated from FY 20/21 Reserve	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 1,555,000		\$ 1,555,000
Expense			
General Office Supplies	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Expense	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Supplies-Purch-ISF			\$ -
Website Maintenance	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Advertising			\$ -
Rents Structures & Grounds	\$ 4,800		\$ 4,800
Small Tools & Instruments			\$ -
Postage	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Auditor's Payroll & A/P Charges	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Professional Services PW Admin		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Professional Services Public Outreach	\$ 45,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 60,000
Professional Services GWA Support/Coordination		\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Special Studies & Reports			\$ -
WaterSMART Applied Science 2021	\$ 12,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 20,000
Response to DWR Review	\$ 50,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 65,000
2022 Annual Report	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 45,000
Project Development: FIRO/FloodMAR/GRAT	\$ 200,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 215,000
Grants and Matching Fund Support	\$ 150,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 175,000
Prof Services Prop 1 Grant (A-18-01)			\$ -
Professional Services (WC A-18-01) Shallow Wells	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
Professional Services (WC A-20-01)			\$ -
A-20-1 Original (TO1). 2020 Annual Report& Support			\$ -
(P 68, TO2) DMS Implementation		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
(P 68, TO2) Monitoring Network Expansion Engineering		\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500
(P68, No TO) Monitoring Network Expansion Drilling	\$ 175,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 185,000
TO 3. 2021 Annual Report			\$ -
TO 4 Model Devel & Support	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
Professional Services P68 Grant			\$ -
(P68, No TO) Funding and Financing (P68 Impl Grant) (No	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 57,500
County Counsel Legal Services	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Professional Services Counsel	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000
Reserve- dedication of carry over	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Reserve Costs (\$50K model, \$150K GSP update)	\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 1,385,300	\$ 167,500	\$ 1,552,800

		Reserve Balance FY 21/22
Reserve 20/21		\$ 200,000
FY 20/21, Allocated to TO4 model		\$ 130,000
Reserve Balance at end of 2021		\$ 70,000
FY 21/22 Reserve Contribution	\$ 200,000	\$ 270,000
Estimated Carry over bal to Reserve	\$ 100,000	\$ 370,000

Revenue	Medium Activity		
	FY 21-22	6221100802	
	Contract /ODC	Staff	Total
Interest Income			\$ -
GWA GSAs Cost Allocation	\$ 450,000		\$ 450,000
Other Govt Aid From Zone 2	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
State (DWR) Sustainable GW Grant	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
P68 Implementation Grant	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
Rebates & Refunds			\$ -
Carry Over (use of fund balance)	\$ 100,000		
Allocated from FY 20/21 Reserve	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 1,305,000		\$ 1,305,000
Expense			
General Office Supplies	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Expense	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Supplies-Purch-ISF			\$ -
Website Maintenance	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Advertising			\$ -
Rents Structures & Grounds	\$ 4,800		\$ 4,800
Small Tools & Instruments			\$ -
Postage	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Auditor's Payroll & A/P Charges	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Professional Services PW Admin		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Professional Services Public Outreach	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 30,000
Professional Services GWA Support/Coordination		\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Special Studies & Reports			\$ -
WaterSMART Applied Science 2021	\$ 12,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 20,000
Response to DWR Review	\$ 50,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 65,000
2022 Annual Report	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 45,000
Project Development: FIRO/FloodMAR/GRAT	\$ 200,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 215,000
Grants and Matching Fund Support	\$ 150,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 175,000
Prof Services Prop 1 Grant (A-18-01)			\$ -
Professional Services (WC A-18-01) Shallow Wells	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
Professional Services (WC A-20-01)			\$ -
A-20-1 Original (TO1). 2020 Annual Report& Support			\$ -
(P 68, TO2) DMS Implementation		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
(P 68, TO2) Monitoring Network Expansion Engineering		\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500
(P68, No TO) Monitoring Network Expansion Drilling	\$ 175,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 185,000
TO 3. 2021 Annual Report			\$ -
TO 4 Model Devel & Support	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
Professional Services P68 Grant			\$ -
(P68, No TO) Funding and Financing (P68 Impl Grant) (No	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 57,500
County Counsel Legal Services	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Professional Services Counsel	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000
Reserve- dedication of carry over	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Reserve Costs (\$50K model, \$150K GSP update)	\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 1,155,300	\$ 152,500	\$ 1,207,800

	Reserve Balance FY 21/22
	\$ 200,000
	\$ 130,000
	\$ 70,000
	\$ 200,000
	\$ 370,000

Revenue	Minimal Activity		
	FY 21-22	6221100802	
	Contract /ODC	Staff	Total
Interest Income			\$ -
GWA GSAs Cost Allocation	\$ 325,000		\$ 325,000
Other Govt Aid From Zone 2	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
State (DWR) Sustainable GW Grant	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
P68 Implementation Grant	\$ 225,000		\$ 225,000
Rebates & Refunds			\$ -
Carry Over (use of fund balance)	\$ 100,000		
Allocated from FY 20/21 Reserve	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 1,180,000		\$ 1,180,000
Expense			
General Office Supplies	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Expense	\$ 500		\$ 500
Office Supplies-Purch-ISF			\$ -
Website Maintenance	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Advertising			\$ -
Rents Structures & Grounds	\$ 4,800		\$ 4,800
Small Tools & Instruments			\$ -
Postage	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Auditor's Payroll & A/P Charges	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,000
Professional Services PW Admin		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Professional Services Public Outreach	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 30,000
Professional Services GWA Support/Coordination		\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Special Studies & Reports			\$ -
WaterSMART Applied Science 2021	\$ 12,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 20,000
Response to DWR Review	\$ 50,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 65,000
2022 Annual Report	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 45,000
Project Development: FIRO/FloodMAR/GRAT	\$ 200,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 215,000
Grants and Matching Fund Support	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
Prof Services Prop 1 Grant (A-18-01)			\$ -
Professional Services (WC A-18-01) Shallow Wells	\$ 175,000		\$ 175,000
Professional Services (WC A-20-01)			\$ -
A-20-1 Original (TO1). 2020 Annual Report& Support			\$ -
(P 68, TO2) DMS Implementation		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
(P 68, TO2) Monitoring Network Expansion Engineering		\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500
(P68, No TO) Monitoring Network Expansion Drilling	\$ 175,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 185,000
TO 3. 2021 Annual Report			\$ -
TO 4 Model Devel & Support	\$ 130,000		\$ 130,000
Professional Services P68 Grant			\$ -
(P68, No TO) Funding and Financing (P68 Impl Grant) (No	\$ 75,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 82,500
County Counsel Legal Services	\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Professional Services Counsel	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000
Reserve- dedication of carry over	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Reserve Costs (\$50K model, \$150K GSP update)	\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 1,030,300	\$ 147,500	\$ 1,077,800

	Reserve Balance FY 21/22
	\$ 200,000
	\$ 130,000
	\$ 70,000
	\$ 200,000
	\$ 370,000

Table 2 - Low Scenarios, Cost Allocation Based 60/40 w/ Minimum and East Side z2 Adjustment

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
GSA	Total Pumping-Projected (AFY)	Population (2017)	Minimum	Pumping	GSA Funding			Total	%
					Population	EastSide GSA Non-Zone 2 Adjustment			
CDWA	9,611	1,629	\$ 8,500	\$ 1,363	\$ 205	\$ (1,000)	\$ 9,068	2.8%	
CSJWCD	138,809	8,047	\$ 8,500	\$ 19,684	\$ 1,015	\$ (1,000)	\$ 28,199	8.7%	
Eastside SJ GSA	63,500	10,498	\$ 8,500	\$ 9,005	\$ 1,324	\$ 15,000	\$ 33,829	10.4%	
LCSD	1,153	1,558	\$ 8,500	\$ 164	\$ 196	\$ (1,000)	\$ 7,860	2.4%	
LCWD	485	2819	\$ 8,500	\$ 69	\$ 356	\$ (1,000)	\$ 7,924	2.4%	
Lodi	14,520	58,174	\$ 8,500	\$ 2,059	\$ 7,336	\$ (1,000)	\$ 16,896	5.2%	
Manteca	18,985	64,279	\$ 8,500	\$ 2,692	\$ 8,106	\$ (1,000)	\$ 18,299	5.6%	
NSJWCD	146,158	21,977	\$ 8,500	\$ 20,727	\$ 2,772	\$ (1,000)	\$ 30,998	9.5%	
OID	39,952	1,890	\$ 8,500	\$ 5,666	\$ 238	\$ (1,000)	\$ 13,404	4.1%	
SDWA	4,532	7,136	\$ 8,500	\$ 643	\$ 900	\$ (1,000)	\$ 9,043	2.8%	
SEWD	165,025	41,134	\$ 8,500	\$ 23,402	\$ 5,187	\$ (1,000)	\$ 36,090	11.1%	
SJC #1	74,448	16,859	\$ 8,500	\$ 10,557	\$ 2,126	\$ (1,000)	\$ 20,184	6.2%	
SJC #2	8,183	39,779	\$ 8,500	\$ 1,160	\$ 5,017	\$ (1,000)	\$ 13,677	4.2%	
SSJ GSA	60,031	38,080	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,513	\$ 4,802	\$ (1,000)	\$ 20,815	6.4%	
Stockton	23,035	277,120	\$ 8,500	\$ 3,267	\$ 34,948	\$ (1,000)	\$ 45,715	14.1%	
WID GSA	31,238	8,488	\$ 8,500	\$ 4,430	\$ 1,070	\$ (1,000)	\$ 13,000	4.0%	
	799,665	599,467	\$ 136,000	\$ 113,400	\$ 75,600	\$ -	\$ 325,000	100.0%	
							\$ 325,000		

Table 3 Percentage

	% Split	GW 60%	Pop 40%
Low Cost			
Need and without minimum	\$ 325,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 130,000
Balance after Minimum	\$ 189,000	\$ 113,400	\$ 75,600
Minimums total	\$ 136,000		

Table 4 Comparison of Scenarios

GSA	Low		Med		High	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
CDWA	\$ 9,068	2.8%	\$ 10,106	2.2%	\$ 12,180	1.7%
CSJWCD	\$ 28,199	8.7%	\$ 41,889	9.3%	\$ 69,269	9.9%
Eastside SJ GSA	\$ 33,829	10.4%	\$ 40,660	9.0%	\$ 54,323	7.8%
LCSD	\$ 7,860	2.4%	\$ 8,098	1.8%	\$ 8,574	1.2%
LCWD	\$ 7,924	2.4%	\$ 8,205	1.8%	\$ 8,766	1.3%
Lodi	\$ 16,896	5.2%	\$ 23,109	5.1%	\$ 35,537	5.1%
Manteca	\$ 18,299	5.6%	\$ 25,441	5.7%	\$ 39,724	5.7%
NSJWCD	\$ 30,998	9.5%	\$ 46,539	10.3%	\$ 77,621	11.1%
OID	\$ 13,404	4.1%	\$ 17,309	3.8%	\$ 25,118	3.6%
SDWA	\$ 9,043	2.8%	\$ 10,063	2.2%	\$ 12,103	1.7%
SEWD	\$ 36,090	11.1%	\$ 54,998	12.2%	\$ 92,815	13.3%
SJC #1	\$ 20,184	6.2%	\$ 28,572	6.3%	\$ 45,349	6.5%
SJC #2	\$ 13,677	4.2%	\$ 17,762	3.9%	\$ 25,933	3.7%
SSJ GSA	\$ 20,815	6.4%	\$ 29,622	6.6%	\$ 47,235	6.7%
Stockton	\$ 45,715	14.1%	\$ 70,989	15.8%	\$ 121,538	17.4%
WID GSA	\$ 13,000	4.0%	\$ 16,638	3.7%	\$ 23,914	3.4%
	\$ 325,000		\$ 450,000		\$ 700,000	

**Before the Board of Directors of the
Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority**

Resolution R-21-XX

**RESOLUTION RESCINDING R-20-06 AND ADOPTING A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE
SECRETARY OF THE EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY TO APPROVE
EXPENDITURES AND EXECUTE CONTRACTS WITHIN THE DESIGNATIONS
AND LIMITATIONS OF THE APPROVED BUDGET**

WHEREAS, The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (ESJGWA) is a joint powers agency created pursuant to California Government Code section 6500 *et seq.*, and

WHEREAS, Section 5.10 of the ESJGWA Joint Powers Agreement provides "expenditures within the designations and limitations of the applicable approved budget shall be made upon the approval of any officer so authorized by the Authority Board of Directors"; and

WHEREAS, the ESJGWA Board of Directors wishes to designate the Secretary of the Board of Directors as the officer authorized to execute contracts and approve expenditures within the approved budget designations and limitations.

WHEREAS, the ESJGWA Board of Directors adopted Resolution R-20-06 on December 14, 2020.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Resolution R-20-06 is rescinded.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors' of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority hereby approves and designates, consistent with the provisions of Section 5.10 of the Joint Powers Agreement, the Secretary of the ESJGWA Board of Directors' as the officer authorized to approve expenditures and execute contracts within the designations and limitations of the applicable approved ESJGWA budget without prior Board of Directors approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Secretary is authorized to make modifications to any approved agreements. The modifications a Secretary may make are limited to schedule (term) or dollar amount as long as the modifications are consistent with the adopted GWA budget and are made in consultation and with concurrence of the Steering Committee.

The foregoing Resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority on the 9th day of June 2021. On motion of Director _____, seconded by Director _____, this Resolution was duly passed by the Board of Directors.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 9th day of June 2021 by the following vote of the Board of Directors of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority, to wit:

MOTION:

AYES:

ABSTAIN: