

Delta-Mendota Subbasin

Joint Meeting of Northern and Central Region Activity Agreement Management

Committee and Central GSA Steering Committee

February 28, 2019

Printed Name	District/Agency	Telephone #	Email Address
Augustine C. Ramirez	Fresno County	555-600-4266	
Amy Montgomery	SNCWD	209-826-0420	amontgomery@sncwd.ca.gov
Ulairé Howard	CIVICUS PARK / SLD MWA	303 587 4580	ulairé.howard@oldmwa.org
Andrew Garcia	SLD MWA	209 832 6229	
Kirsten Pringle	Startec	916 416 8243	kirsten.pringle@startec.com
Ben Fenters	SLDWD	209 826-4043	Bfenters@SLDWD.NET
Leslie Dumas	Woodward & Curran		
Danarian Anderson	WINTER WATER DISTRICT	209 826-0342	Danarian@Jppap.org
Ryan Steiger	One County	530-864-3860	rsteiger@cloughengiers.com
Diane Patterson	SLD MWA Districts	209 372 2141	
Juan Cadena	MWD / PWD	209 364 6136	<del>juan.cadena@pawsonhead.com</del>
Ann Snell	PALCO WD	209 677-6320	
Lacey Kerviatu	Merced County	209 385 7684	Kerviatu@MercedCountyAttnGSA.com
Gregory Luchessa	Patterson ID	209 842-6233	Ulrich@PattersonID.org
Bobby Pierce	WSED		
Fernando Ulloa	City of Patterson	209 845-8073	fuller@ci.patterson.ca.us
Danny Wade	Tranquillity ID	(559) 647-9175	danny@trigid.com
Sean Allen	Ca Dept Fish & Game / GAD	(559) 826-0463	Sean.Allen@wildlife.ca.gov
Seth Harris	SLD MWA	209-324-1033	Sethharris@SLDMWA.org

Northern Delta-Mendota Management Committee

	Agency	Member	Alternate Member	Member Present
1	Del Puerto	Anthea Hansen	Adam Scheuber	
2	West Stanislaus	Bobby Pierce	Jeanne Zolezzi	Bobby
3	Patterson ID	Vince Lucchesi	Steve Trinta	Vince
4	Oak Flat WD	John Beltran	Anthea Hansen	Fernando
5	City of Patterson	Maria Encinas	Fernando Ulloa	(Not in person)
6	Northwestern	Walt Ward	Jamie Eggers	Lacey
7	Merced County	Lacey Kiriakou	Steve Maxey	

Central Delta-Mendota Activity Agreement Management Committee

	Agency	Member	Alternate Member	Member Present
1	Eagle Field Water District	John Bennett	Randall Miles	
2	Fresno Slough Water District	Matthew Hurley	Liz Reeves	
3	Mercy Springs Water District	Brad Gleason	Juan Cadena	Juan
4	Pacheco Water District	Aaron Barcellos	Juan Cadena	Juan Arce
5	Panoche Water District	Joe McGahan	Michael Linneman	
6	San Luis Water District	Mike Wood	Ben Fenters	Ben
7	Santa Nella County Water District	Amy Montgomery	Jeff Black	Amy
8	Tranquillity Irrigation District	Jerry Silveira	Danny Wade	Danny
9	Fresno County	Brian Pacheco	Glenn Allen/Augie	Ausile
10	Merced County	Lacey Kiriakou	Steve Maxey	
11	Widren Water District	Damian Aragona	Jean Sagouspe	Damian
12	Oro Loma Water District	Ryan Stagler	Valerie Kincaid	Ryan

**JOINT MEETING OF THE NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION MANAEGMENT  
COMMITTEE, CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION GSA STEERING COMMITTEE, AND  
CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES FOR JANUARY 31, 2019**

**Management Committee Members Present**

Danny Wade – Tranquillity Irrigation District (Alternate)  
Liz Reeves – Fresno Slough Water District (Alternate)  
Augustine Ramirez – Fresno County (Member)  
Ben Fenters – San Luis Water District (Alternate)  
Ryan Stager – Oro Loma Water District (Member)  
Damian Aragona – Widren Water District (Member)  
Amy Montgomery – Santa Nella County Water District (Member)  
Aaron Barcellos – Pacheco Water District (Member)  
Vince Lucchesi – Patterson Irrigation District (Member)  
Juan Cadena – Panoche Water District / Mercy Springs Water District (Alternate)  
Lacey Kiriakou – Merced County (Member)  
Maria Encinas – City of Patterson (Member)  
Bobby Pierce – West Stanislaus Irrigation District (Member)  
Randy Miles – Eagle Field Water District (Alternate)  
John Bennett – Eagle Field Water District (Member)  
Anthea Hansen – Del Puerto Water District (Member) – Phone  
Walt Ward – Stanislaus County (Member) – Phone

**Authority Representatives Present**

Lauren Neves  
Andrew Garcia  
Claire Howard – CivicSpark

**Others Present**

Leslie Dumas – Woodard & Curran  
Joe Hopkins – Provost & Pritchard/Aliso Water District  
Lauren Layne – Baker Manock & Jensen (Phone)  
Diane Rathmann – Linneman Burgess Telles (Phone)

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Aaron Barcellos/Pacheco WD called the meeting to order at 10:11 AM.

**2. Committees to Consider Corrections or Additions to the Agenda of Items, as authorized by Government Code Section 54950 et seq.**

Vince Lucchesi/Patterson ID asked about the discussion of allocation of deficits based on water budget results. Andrew Garcia/SLDMWA explained that the allocation of deficits will not be discussed in this meeting; the Committees will only talk about categories and implementation costs briefly.

**3. Opportunity for Public Comment**

No public comment provided.

**4. Committees to Consider Approval of January 24, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

No comments or changes were made to the minutes. Amy Montgomery/Santa Nella County WD motioned to accept the minutes for the Central Management Committee, and Randy Miles/Eagle Field seconded.

**5. Committees to Consider Approval of Budget to Actual Report, Neves**

Agenda Item 5 was moved from Consent Calendar to Action Items. Garcia reviewed the compiled Budget to Actual Report, and explained that the first dues will not change from original estimate, even though the budget is tracking over for the current fiscal year. In July, the budget can be re-evaluated for the second set of dues depending on the timing of the grant receipt. The Committees are anticipating more money will be needed to cover meeting costs. It is anticipated that updated invoices will be included in the February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Barcellos asked for approval of the Budget to Actual Report. For the Northern Management Committee, Lucchesi motioned to approve and Bobby Pierce/WSID seconded. Amy Montgomery/Santa Nella County WD motioned to approve the report for the Central Management Committee, and Danny Wade/Tranquillity ID seconded.

**6. Committees to Consider Approval of Historic and Current Water Budgets and Authorize GSP Group Representatives' Votes at the Coordination Committee Level Consistent with the Committees' Directions, Garcia**

Garcia clarified that the language used in action items indicates that approvals from the Northern and Central Management Committees will move forward to the Coordination Committee level.

The Committees reviewed the results of the historic and current water budgets provided by Woodard & Curran. The results included information on land surface, groundwater, and change in storage. Lucchesi asked if the historic and current results will impact future projects or management actions, or if the results are just part of SGMA regulations. Leslie Dumas/W&C explained that these results are required within the regulations. Dumas clarified that shortfalls will be determined separately by GSP groups. Lucchesi expressed his intent to not support the water budget determinations if the results harm Patterson Irrigation District; Lucchesi explained

that since Patterson ID has pre-1914 water rights, he does not want to be punished unnecessarily for these historic water rights by the determined results of the water budgets.

Dumas reaffirmed that DWR will review the Subbasin as a whole. Ben Fenters/San Luis WD asked how the historic and current water budgets will affect the projected water budget results. Dumas reviewed the development of the historic and current water budgets. Dumas asked the attending members to share with her if their agencies use deficit irrigation or double cropping. Dumas noted that agencies should discuss results or provide comments prior to acceptance meetings regarding technical results when possible. Barcellos confirmed the process for approving the historic and current results: the North-Central Technical Working Group will review the historic and current water budgets and provide edits; once reviewed, the Northern and Central Management Committees will provide the final approval. Fenters provided the motion for the Central Management Committee and Juan Cadena/Panoche seconded. Lucchesi provided the motion for the Northern Management Committee, and Maria seconded.

**7. Committees to Authorize Execution of Local Project Sponsor Agreement for Delta-Mendota Subbasin Planning Grant Management, Garcia**

Garcia explained that Frances Mizuno signed the Local Project Sponsor Agreement on behalf of the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority. Each GSP group has a separate signature line. The Committees discussed the authority of the chairperson of each Management Committee for authorizing sub-agreements. Augustine Ramirez/Fresno noted that the earliest Fresno County is anticipating approval of the Local Project Sponsor Agreement is March 26<sup>th</sup>. The Committees agreed that both Chairpersons are to sign the Local Project Sponsor Agreement and ratification of authority for these signatures will take place after LPS submittal. Lucchesi provided the motion for the Northern Management Committee and Pierce seconded. John Bennett/Eagle Field WD provided the motion for the Central Management Committee and Wade seconded.

**8. Monthly Update from GSP Group Representatives, Lucchesi/Fenters**

Lucchesi and Fenters shared with the Committees recent updates from the Coordination Committee. The Coordination Committee approved a Subbasin-wide schedule and Common Chapter outline. The representatives explained that the schedule was designed to hold GSP groups and the Coordination Committee accountable and ensure the Subbasin stays on target with upcoming deadlines. Garcia mentioned the challenge of the lack of oversight of GSPs from his role with SLDMWA.

**9. Committees to Discuss Coordination Committee Activities and Necessary Noticing/Timeline Requirements for Topics and Approvals at Management Committee and GSA Levels, Garcia**

Garcia reminded the Committees that the noticing and timeline requirements had been previously discussed and that the coordinated schedule had been approved during the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. Dumas shared that the administrative/governance, hydrogeologic conceptual model, and plan review sections have already been distributed. The Committees discussed adding a line item to the coordinated schedule that would provide an internal deadline for the North-Central GSP group to review the final compiled GSP.

Pierce explained that he wants to provide landowners with the opportunity to review the GSP sections as they are finalized. Dumas responded that individual sections will be shared to the North-Central website as each is produced. The Committees explained the process for gathering public comment and incorporating this input into the final GSP prior to submission. Diane

Rathmann/Linneman suggested each agency approve the GSP only at the final draft stage, rather than bringing each chapter to each agency's respective board for approval.

Dumas concluded by explaining that she will circulate individual chapters to the Northern and Central Management Committees as they are finalized, gather comments from the Management Committee members, and will incorporate the comments prior to sharing the draft chapters online. This administrative draft will then be shared online, and public comments will be incorporated into an appendix. At this time, the chapters will be brought back to agencies for approval. Dumas explained that the final sections of the Common Chapter are for implementation and outreach, which allows time to incorporate comments. Dumas said that she will re-post completed chapters.

**10. Committees to Review Baseline Projected Water Budget Results with and without Climate Change Factors, Dumas**

Dumas explained that the baseline projected results incorporate data for San Joaquin River Indices, which dictates San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors and Mendota Pool allocations, as well as Shasta Critical information. Pierce asked how CVP deliveries will be represented. Dumas said it land surface data will have status quo results based on water year type.

Dumas explained that the surface water amounts are determined based on the amount of rain relative to crop needs. Precipitation, runoff, and evapotranspiration rates are based on the representative year. Land use type determines the deep percolation values. The "rolled up" results provide the long-term change in storage, the value to which the Subbasin be managed. Crop demand reduction based on dry years as well as double cropping and tile drain runoff from various agencies still need to be incorporated. Results featuring climate change factors are not being discussed yet. The Committees aim to accept the projected water budgets with and without climate change factors at the February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**11. Committees to Discuss Potential Methodologies for Allocating of Deficits Based on Water Budget Results, Garcia**

As discussed earlier, the Committees are not discussing allocation of deficits during this meeting; the Committees will discuss categories during this meeting, and implementation costs will be discussed more in-depth at the next meeting. Garcia explained that it will be necessary to consider group costs as well as internal costs. The agencies will consider examples of costs from other subbasins.

**12. Staff Update on Preliminary Sustainability Indicators and Management Areas, Dumas**

Dumas reviewed definitions associated with sustainability indicators with the Committees. Undesirable results are reached if a minimum threshold is crossed. The aim is to oscillate around a measurable objective. Dumas suggests using fewer management areas early on, but more can be added later. She explained that minimum thresholds and measurable objectives can be specific to management areas. Dumas noted that there is responsibility to maintain management areas, and it is necessary to determine the current status of each management area.

**13. Committees to Discuss List of Possible Projects and Management Actions to Address Shortfalls/Indicators, Dumas**

Possible projects and management actions will be discussed more in-depth at future meetings. Dumas explained that the water budgets will be related to the determined projects and management actions.

**14. Staff Update on Calculation of Lower Aquifer Change in Storage, Garcia/Dumas**

Dumas explained that an update to the lower aquifer change in storage was completed with available data. These results have improved relative to the results using a blind assumption of lower aquifer change in storage.

**15. Committees to Discuss GSP Implementation and Cost Estimate for North/Central Administrative Responsibilities, Garcia**

Garcia introduced GSP implementation and cost estimate discussion and mentioned the need to consider staffing requirements for implementation as well as for the Committees to consider differences in urban and agricultural implementation of the Plan. Future meetings will discuss implementation requirements and cost estimates pertinent to the North-Central GSP group.

**16. Committees to Discuss Outreach and Education Activities**

The Committees discussed the use of flyers and the monthly newsletter as outreach and education activities, as well as the upcoming workshops which will be held in Los Banos on February 19<sup>th</sup> and in Patterson on February 20<sup>th</sup>.

**17. Reports Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a)(2)**

**18. ADJOURNMENT**



**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY**  
**MARCH 1, 2018 - FEBRUARY 28, 2019**  
**NORTHERN SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT (FUND 64)**

Report Period 03/01/18 - 01/31/19

Delta-Mendota Subbasin Joint Northern & Central Activity Agreement Management Committee 2-28-19

<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>Annual Budget</b>	<b>Paid/ Pending</b>	<b>Additional Pending</b>	<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>Amount Remaining</b>	<b>% of Amt Remaining</b>	<b>Expenses Through</b>
Direct Expenditures:							
<u>Legal:</u>							
Linneman et al	\$ -	\$ 9,930.47	\$ -	\$ 9,930.47	\$ (9,930)	0.00%	1/31/19
Kronick Moskovitz et al	\$ -	\$ 1,650.01	\$ -	\$ 1,650.01	\$ (1,650)	0.00%	1/31/19
<u>Other Professional Services:</u>							
Contracts	\$ 384,561	\$ 389,404.27	\$ -	\$ 389,404.27	\$ (4,843)	-1.26%	
<u>Other:</u>							
General Counsel	\$ 1,286	\$ 2,194.12	\$ -	\$ 2,194.12	\$ (908)	-70.62%	1/31/19
Deputy General Counsel	\$ 1,010	\$ 1,019.40	\$ -	\$ 1,019.40	\$ (9)	-0.93%	1/31/19
Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 95	\$ 122.99	\$ -	\$ 122.99	\$ (28)	-29.46%	1/31/19
In-House Salary & Benefits							
Assistant Executive Director	\$ 14,842	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,842	100.00%	
Planning & Engineering Manager	\$ 1,894	\$ 350.01	\$ -	\$ 350.01	\$ 1,544	81.52%	1/31/19
Associate Civil Engineer	\$ 65,103	\$ 58,798.06	\$ -	\$ 58,798.06	\$ 6,305	9.68%	1/31/19
Water Resources Technician	\$ 76,017	\$ 24,465.65	\$ -	\$ 24,465.65	\$ 51,551	67.82%	1/31/19
Project Coordinator	\$ 1,139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,139	100.00%	
SLDMWA Accounting Staff	\$ -	\$ 192.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Hydrotech	\$ -	\$ 683.22	\$ -	\$ 683.22	\$ (683)	0.00%	1/31/19
Electrician	\$ -	\$ 1,708.55	\$ -	\$ 1,708.55	\$ (1,709)	0.00%	1/31/19
Other Services & Expenses	\$ 25	\$ 6,447.56	\$ -	\$ 6,447.56	\$ (6,423)	0.00%	1/31/19
License & Continuing Education	\$ 125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125	100.00%	
Conferences & Training	\$ 1,250	\$ 476.44	\$ -	\$ 476.44	\$ 774	61.88%	1/31/19
Travel/Mileage	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,695.62	\$ -	\$ 1,695.62	\$ (446)	-35.65%	1/31/19
Group Meetings	\$ 250	\$ 315.90	\$ -	\$ 315.90	\$ (66)	-26.36%	1/31/19
Telephone	\$ 125	\$ 1,569.13	\$ -	\$ 1,569.13	\$ (1,444)	0.00%	1/31/19
<b>Total Direct Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 548,972</b>	<b>\$ 501,023.42</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 500,831.40</b>	<b>\$ 48,141</b>	<b>8.77%</b>	
<u>Administrative Expenditures</u>	\$ 7,347	\$ 2,120.43	\$ -	\$ 2,120.43	\$ 5,227	71.14%	1/31/19
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 556,319</b>	<b>\$ 503,143.85</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 502,951.83</b>	<b>\$ 53,367</b>	<b>9.59%</b>	



**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY**  
**MARCH 1, 2018 - FEBRUARY 28, 2019**  
**CENTRAL SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT (FUND 65)**

Report Period 3/1/18 - 11/30/18

Delta-Mendota Subbasin Joint Northern & Central Activity Agreement Management Committee 1-31-19

EXPENDITURES	Annual Budget	Paid/ Pending	Additional Pending	Total Expenses	Amount Remaining	% of Amt Remaining	Expenses Through
Direct Expenditures:							
<u>Legal:</u>							
Linneman et al	\$ -	\$ 13,514.87	\$ -	\$ 13,514.87	\$ (13,515)	0.00%	1/31/19
Kronick Moskovitz et al	\$ -	\$ 287.01	\$ -	\$ 287.01	\$ (287)	0.00%	1/31/19
<u>Other Professional Services:</u>							
Contracts	\$ 384,561	\$ 389,404.24	\$ -	\$ 389,404.24	\$ (4,843)	-1.26%	
<u>Other:</u>							
General Counsel	\$ 1,288	\$ 2,257.94	\$ -	\$ 2,257.94	\$ (972)	-75.58%	1/31/19
Deputy General Counsel	\$ 1,010	\$ 1,177.13	\$ -	\$ 1,177.13	\$ (167)	-16.55%	1/31/19
Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 95	\$ 122.39	\$ -	\$ 122.39	\$ (27)	-28.83%	1/31/19
In-House Salary & Benefits							
Assistant Executive Director	\$ 14,842	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,842	100.00%	
Planning & Engineering Manager	\$ 1,894	\$ 174.99	\$ -	\$ 174.99	\$ 1,719	90.76%	1/31/19
Associate Civil Engineer	\$ 65,103	\$ 56,088.54	\$ -	\$ 56,088.54	\$ 9,014	13.85%	1/31/19
Water Resources Technician	\$ 76,017	\$ 24,245.22	\$ -	\$ 24,245.22	\$ 51,772	68.11%	1/31/19
Project Coordinator	\$ 1,139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,139	100.00%	
SLDMWA Accounting Staff	\$ -	\$ 192.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Hydrotech	\$ -	\$ 2,391.73	\$ -	\$ 2,391.73	\$ (2,392)	0.00%	1/31/19
Electrician	\$ -	\$ 1,397.68	\$ -	\$ 1,397.68	\$ (1,398)	0.00%	1/31/19
Other Services & Expenses	\$ 25	\$ 6,446.63	\$ -	\$ 6,446.63	\$ (6,422)	0.00%	1/31/19
License & Continuing Education	\$ 125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125	100.00%	
Conferences & Training	\$ 1,250	\$ 488.13	\$ -	\$ 488.13	\$ 762	60.95%	1/31/19
Travel/Mileage	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,635.72	\$ -	\$ 1,635.72	\$ (386)	-30.86%	1/31/19
Group Meetings	\$ 250	\$ 317.52	\$ -	\$ 317.52	\$ (68)	-27.01%	1/31/19
Telephone	\$ 125	\$ 1,179.99	\$ -	\$ 1,179.99	\$ (1,055)	-843.99%	1/31/19
Total Direct Expenditures	\$ 548,972	\$ 501,321.74	\$ -	\$ 501,129.73	\$ 47,842	8.71%	
<u>Administrative Expenditures</u>	\$ 7,347	\$ 2,120.43	\$ -	\$ 2,120.43	\$ 5,227	71.14%	1/31/19
Total Expenditures	\$ 556,319	\$ 503,442.17	\$ -	\$ 503,250.16	\$ 53,069	9.54%	

Project/Management Action	Source	Anticipated Implementation Time			Anticipated Benefits	Notes
		Next 5 years	Next 10 years	Further Out		
Los Banos Creek Recharge	CCID	X			200 AFY	From Ben Fenters via email: "For the Los Banos Creek Recharge and Recovery which in its current adaptation is a temporary storage, recharge, and recovery project we anticipate on average 200 AF/year being recharged. "
Orestimba Creek Recharge & Recovery Project	CCID; ESIRWMP	X			7,500 AFY	Current recharge estimate received from Jarrett Martin via email (just want to note that this is much higher than the estimate provided in the East Stanislaus Opti)
West Stanislaus ID Fish Screen Project	East Stanislaus IRWMP	X			3,000 AFY of runoff infiltrated 85,000 AFY increase in water supply through direct use 2,000 cfs reduction in peak flow discharge 3,500 AFY reduction in volume of potential flood water 3,500 acres of habitat protected or improved	This project would provide a resource to make more water available on the westside of the county. By implementing this project, state and federal approvals are possible that would allow available water from the San Joaquin River to be diverted and made available to west Stanislaus County water users. This project will also provide means of flooding up roughly 3,000 acres of floodplain resulting in groundwater recharge within the basin. This project will allow riparian water to flood wetlands within the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge and has the ability to divert floodwater onto the floodplain and also provides wildlife and floodplain connectivity within the refuge. This project has the ability of diverting floodwater onto the floodplain thereby recharging groundwater within the basin. Up to 3,000 acres can be flooded during storm events.
City of Patterson Percolation Ponds for Stormwater Capture and Recharge	East Stanislaus IRWMP	X	X		1,700 AFY of direct groundwater recharge	PP-1 Construct percolation ponds to capture and infiltrate storm water from Del Puerto Creek. The ponds should cover roughly 14 acres. Sizing of the percolation ponds was based on existing infiltration rate data and will be updated when field investigations are complete. The percolation pond project can be phased so that the ponds are constructed over a few years, allowing for the increase of aquifer recharge capacity.
Terra Linda Farms Recharge ditch (west of the Pool)	FWD/Fresno Mgt Area B					
Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir	Westside-San Joaquin IRWMP		X	X	5,260 cfs reduction in peak flow discharge 2 cfs stream flow improvement 85,000 AF of additional storage	The Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir (DPCR) Project will construct a 270 foot tall earthfill dam at the mouth of Del Puerto Canyon providing 85,000 AF of storage for Del Puerto Water District, Central California Irrigation District, Patterson Irrigation District, and West Stanislaus Irrigation District. Water would be pumped into the DPCR from the Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC) during wet years when excess water is available and discharged back to the DMC during dry periods. Minimal seasonal storm flows through Del Puerto Canyon would be captured by the DPCR and discharged perennially to Del Puerto Creek.
Kaljian Drainwater Reuse Project	Westside-San Joaquin IRWMP	X			500 AF to recharge	From Ben Fenters via email "The Kajian Project in combination with the Outside Canal – Charleston Drain Intertie Project would allow us to wheel SJR and Kings flood waters to the district and utilize for recharge as needed. Of the 2,700 AF/year annual average yield from this project let’s assume 500 AF would go to recharge. "
North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program (Turlock part)	Westside-San Joaquin IRWMP	X			48,000 AFY to DPWD and wildlife refuges (I think this is both the Turlock and Modesto comp	Recycled water will be used for irrigation rather than Central Valley Project (CVP) water. With the development of conveyance capability, the Cities of Modesto and Turlock could provide up to 48,000 AFY of tertiary-treated recycled water, produced from wastewater and stormwater collected from the Cities of Ceres, Turlock, and Modesto, to DPWD lands to supplement their CVP supplies, and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to supplement water supplies to wildlife refuges. Utilizing a new water supply – recycled water – DPWD’s dependence on highly unreliable CVP supplies will be reduced, its supply resiliency improved, and a resultant reduction in groundwater pumping should be realized, as well.
West Stanislaus Irrigation District Lateral 4-North Recapture and Recirculation Reservoir	Westside-San Joaquin IRWMP	X			1,800 AFY of recapture	This project consists of purchasing a 7 acre parcel, currently not in agricultural production or any other production. A reservoir would be design for construction on the parcel. The reservoir would collect operational spill from two distribution laterals and irrigation tailwater and stored for reliable use downstream. Estimated recapture amounts is roughly 1,800 AF. This project would also provide flexible water delivery service to users during time of drought, or in times of capacity constraints. The project will also improve water quality to downstream users because the water collected would mostly come from Delta-Mendota Canal deliveries and mix with water coming from the San Joaquin River, usually of lesser quality than Delta-Mendota Canal water.

**Note:** for Anticipate Benefits, please be as specific and quantiative as possible. Examples of benefits include 100 AF/Y of recharge to Upper Aquifer; 100 acres of almond orchards taken out of production; change in irrigation method resulting in 10% reduction in applied water.

## **MEMORANDUM OF INTENT TO COORDINATE BETWEEN THE MERCED SUBBASIN AND TURLOCK SUBBASIN**

**WHEREAS**, the Turlock Groundwater Subbasin (Subbasin No. 5-22.03) and the Merced Groundwater Subbasin (Subbasin No. 5-22.04) are adjacent subbasins that share a common boundary along the Merced River; and

**WHEREAS**, the Turlock Subbasin is a high-priority subbasin that is required to submit a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) by January 31, 2022 and the Merced Subbasin is a high-priority, critically overdraft subbasin that must submit a GSP to DWR by January 31, 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, the West Turlock Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (WTSGSA) and the East Turlock Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (ETSGSA) are working to develop a single GSP in the Turlock Subbasin; and

**WHEREAS**, the Merced Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency, the Merced Irrigation Urban Groundwater Sustainability Agency, and the Turner Island Water District Groundwater Sustainability Agency-1 are working to develop a single GSP in the Merced Subbasin; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) prohibits a GSP from adversely affecting an adjacent basin's ability to implement its GSP or impede the ability to achieve its sustainability goal (Water Code, § 10733(c)); and

**WHEREAS**, the parties to this Memorandum of Intent (MOI) (collectively "Party" or "Parties") desire to establish compatible sustainability goals and understanding regarding fundamental elements of the GSPs of each GSA as they relate to sustainable groundwater management.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Parties agree to coordinate in the following matter:

1. Each Party desires to comply with SGMA by assuring that its GSP actions do not negatively impact the adjacent GSA in complying with SGMA.
2. To assure this compliance, each Party commits to meeting as necessary to compare GSP development concepts and approaches to identify potential areas of concern that may negatively impact the other.
3. Each Party will commit to sharing data, analysis, methods, results, and any other information that is pertinent to the Parties' compliance with SGMA.
4. The Parties recognize that the development of the respective GSPs have different deadlines and may be developed using different timelines. Coordination is expected to continue, as needed, throughout GSP development and implementation.

5. The Parties recognize there may be data gaps that will need to be filled. Datasets will improve as the Parties develop and implement GSPs over time. The Parties agree to continue to work together to develop and refine understanding of the conditions over time. This common knowledge and understanding will be incorporated into future GSPs as data and information becomes available.
6. The Parties intend to coordinate messaging and outreach along the subbasin borders to maximize stakeholder outreach and understanding between the subbasins.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the parties have caused this Memorandum to be executed by and through their respective officers thereunto duly authorized.

Base Filing Fee	\$300 per well per year
De Minimis Fee	\$100 per well per year
Interim plan rate	\$55 per AF
Probationary rate	\$40 per AF

GSP Region	Number of Wells	
Aliso	79	\$23,700
Farmers	11	\$3,300
Fresno	72	\$21,600
Grassland	160	\$48,000
Northern & Central	924	\$277,200
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors	1,155	\$346,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,401</b>	<b>\$720,300</b>

Note: if we assume 4,206 wells, this cost would be \$1,261,800

GSP Region	Average Annual Historic Groundwater Pumping (AF), WY 2003-2012		Notes	
	Above Corcoran Clay	Below Corcoran Clay		
Aliso	82,860	Unavailable	Data limitations for Below Corcoran Clay; Aliso did not provide an estimate	\$4,557,300
Farmers	8,290	0	Unsure if Below Corcoran Clay pumping is actually 0 AF or this is a data limitation issue	\$455,950
Fresno	28,260	Unavailable	Unsure if this is actually a data limitation since Fresno provided change in storage for Below Corcoran Clay	\$1,554,300
Grassland	46,280	Unavailable	Data limitations for Below Corcoran Clay; Grassland did not provide an estimate	\$2,545,400
Northern & Central	70,418	37,110		\$5,914,040
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors	124,500	12,500		\$7,535,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>360,608</b>	<b>49,610</b>		<b>\$22,561,990</b>

Base Filing Fee	\$300 per well per year
De Minimis Fee	\$100 per well per year
Interim plan rate	\$55 per AF
Probationary rate	\$40 per AF

GSA	Number of Wells	
Central Delta-Mendota Multi-Agency GSA	550	\$165,000
City of Patterson GSA	9	\$2,700
DM-II GSA	184	\$55,200
Northwestern Delta-Mendota GSA	87	\$26,100
Oro Loma Water District GSA	11	\$3,300
Patterson Irrigation District GSA	25	\$7,500
West Stanislaus Irrigation District GSA	46	\$13,800
Widren Water District GSA	8	\$2,400
<b>Total</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>\$276,000</b>

GSA	Annual Average Historic Water Supply, AF (WY 2003 2012)		
	Surface Water Deliveries	Groundwater Pumping	
Central Delta-Mendota Multi-Agency GSA	177,048	31,174	\$1,714,552
City of Patterson GSA	0	3,797	\$208,835
DM-II GSA	75,154	49,619	\$2,729,028
Northwestern Delta-Mendota GSA	36,487	8,382	\$461,016
Oro Loma Water District GSA	481	4,584	\$252,109
Patterson Irrigation District GSA	54,432	6,900	\$379,525
West Stanislaus Irrigation District GSA	74,922	1,559	\$85,740
Widren Water District GSA	410	1,513	\$83,210
<b>Total</b>	<b>418,935</b>	<b>107,528</b>	<b>\$5,914,015</b>

**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY  
SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT  
NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION (FUND 64)**

Final BOD approved 2/7/19	FY19 Budget 3/1/18 - 2/28/19	FY19 Projected Actual @ 2/28/19	FY20 Budget 3/1/19 - 2/29/20 Final
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>			
Direct Expenditures:			
<u><b>Legal:</b></u>			
Linneman et al		\$ 10,000	
Kronick Moskovitz et al		\$ 1,957	
Kronick Moskovitz et al (annual cost)		\$ 105	
Outside Counsel			\$ 32,400
<u><b>Other Professional Services:</b></u>			
Contracts	\$ 384,561	\$ 384,561	\$ 139,472
<u><b>Other:</b></u>			
General Counsel	\$ 1,286	\$ 1,275	
Deputy General Counsel	\$ 1,010	\$ 2,648	
Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 95	\$ 164	
In-House Salary & Benefits			
Assistant Executive Director	\$ 14,842	\$ -	
Planning & Engineering Manager	\$ 1,894	\$ 467	
Senior Civil Engineer	\$ 65,103	\$ 57,523	\$ 39,868
SCADA Engineer		\$ 2,278	\$ 3,077
Water Resources Coordinator	\$ 76,017	\$ 29,877	\$ 45,000
Project Coordinator	\$ 1,139	\$ -	\$ 1,800
Accountant			\$ 22,500
Hydrotech 3	\$ -	\$ 911	\$ 22,500
Other Services & Expenses	\$ 25	\$ 8,597	\$ -
License & Continuing Education	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 250
Conferences & Training	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,000
Travel/Mileage	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,988	\$ 5,000
Group Meetings	\$ 250	\$ 421	\$ 500
Telephone	\$ 125	\$ 1,811	\$ 1,000
Equipment and Tools			\$ 3,825
Vehicle			\$ 15,000
Software			\$ 4,325
Total Direct Expenditures	\$ 548,972	\$ 505,958	\$ 341,517
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 7,347	\$ 3,827	\$ 382
Total Expenditures	<b>\$ 556,319</b>	<b>\$ 509,785</b>	<b>\$ 341,899</b>
<b>REVENUES</b>			
Fund Balance	\$ 300,205	\$ 300,205	\$ 158,576
Interest (allocated & posted at fiscal year end)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Membership Dues</b>	<b>\$ 256,114</b>	<b>\$ 256,114</b>	<b>\$ 183,323</b>
Total Revenues	<b>\$ 556,319</b>	<b>\$ 556,319</b>	<b>\$ 341,899</b>

<b>FUND BALANCE:</b>			
End of FY 18 (Budget Estimated)	\$ 300,205		
End of FY 18 (Estimated-Unaudited)		\$ 412,247	
End of FY 19 (Budget Estimate)	\$ -		
End of FY 19 (Estimated)			\$ 158,576
End of FY 20 (Estimated)			\$ -
Available/(Required)			<b>\$ 158,576</b>

<b>PRIOR YEAR:</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19</b>	<b>FY20</b>
<b>BUDGET</b>	\$ -	\$ 572,414	\$ 556,319	\$ 341,899
<b>MEMBERSHIP DUES</b>	\$ -	\$ 572,414	\$ 256,114	\$ 183,323



**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY**  
**MARCH 1, 2019 - FEBRUARY 29, 2020**

**SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT**  
**NORTHERN DELTA-MENDOTA REGION COST ALLOCATION**

Final  
BOD approved 2/7/19

GSA Acreage to Allocate Costs			TOTAL SGMA		Other Professional Services	Equal Split between # of GSAs 5	Authority & Legal
<b>FUND BALANCE - APPLY TO AUTHORITY &amp; LEGAL ONLY</b>					<b>\$ 139,472</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>\$ 202,427</b>
					<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ 158,576</b>
					<b>\$ 139,472</b>		<b>\$ 43,851</b>
<b>DIVISION 1</b>			<b>%</b>				
1. Banta-Carbona ID		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
2. City of Tracy		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
3. Del Puerto Water District (DPWD 57,073 ac + Oak Flat 4,503 ac)		35.61387%	\$ 58,442		\$ 49,671	20.00000%	\$ 8,770
3A. Del Puerto (92% of DPWD GSA Cost)				\$ 53,766			
3B. Oak Flat (8% of DPWD GSA Cost)				\$ 4,675			
4. Patterson Irrigation District (PID 15,696 ac + Twin Oaks 2,629 ac)		9.79439%	\$ 22,431		\$ 13,660	20.00000%	\$ 8,770
5. Byron Bethany Irrigation District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
6. West Side Irrigation District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
7. West Stanislaus ID (WSID 21,545 ac + Grayson/Westley 246 ac)		13.44420%	\$ 27,521		\$ 18,751	20.00000%	\$ 8,770
<b>Total Division 1</b>	<b>94,314</b>	<b>58.8525%</b>	<b>\$ 108,394</b>		<b>\$ 82,083</b>	<b>60.00000%</b>	<b>\$ 26,311</b>
<b>DIVISION 2</b>							
1. Panoche Water District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
2. San Luis Water District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
3. Westlands Water District (1)		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
4. Charleston Drainage District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
5. Panoche Drainage District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
6. Pleasant Valley		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 3</b>							
1. Central California Irrigation District**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
2. Firebaugh Canal Water District**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
3. Grassland Water District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
4. HMRD #2131**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
5. Columbia Canal Company (Friend Member)**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
6. Camp 13 Drainers		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 4</b>							
1. San Benito County Water District			\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
2. Santa Clara Valley Water District (2)			\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 5</b>							
1. Broadview Water District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
2. Eagle Field Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
3. Fresno Slough WD** -withdrew 8/31/11	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
4. James Irrigation District**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
5. Laguna Water District		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
6. Mercy Springs Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
7. Oro Loma Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
8. Pacheco Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
9. Reclamation District 1606**		0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
10. Tranquillity ID** -withdrew 8/31/11	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
11. Turner Island Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>OTHER</b>							
1. Northwestern Delta Mendota Subbasin GSA (Stan. Cty 56,766 ac + Merced Cty 3,035 ac)	59,801	37.31615%	\$ 60,816		\$ 52,046	20.00000%	\$ 8,770
1a. Merced County (5% of Northwestern DM GSA Cost)				\$ 3,041			
1b. Stanislaus County (95% of Northwestern DM GSA Cost)				\$ 57,775			
2. City of Patterson GSA	6,140	3.83139%	\$ 14,114		\$ 5,344	20.00000%	\$ 8,770
3. Fresno County	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
4. Merced County	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -	0.00000%	\$ -
5. Santa Nella County Water District	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
6. Widren GSA	0	0.00000%	\$ -		\$ -		
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>65,941</b>	<b>41.1475%</b>	<b>\$ 74,930</b>		<b>\$ 57,389</b>	<b>40.00%</b>	<b>\$ 17,541</b>
<b>160,255 100.00%</b>			<b>\$ 183,323</b>		<b>\$ 139,472</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 43,851.41</b>

Membership dues true up will be completed based on cost allocation and district percentages prior to FYE2020

Subject to Rounding

**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY  
SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT  
CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION (FUND 65)**

	FY19 Budget 3/1/18 - 2/28/19	FY19 Projected Actual @ 2/28/19	FY20 Budget 3/1/19 - 2/29/20 Proposed Final
<b>BOD 2/7/19</b>			
<b>Proposed Final</b>			
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>			
Direct Expenditures:			
<u>Legal:</u>			
Linneman et al		\$ 14,000	
Kronick Moskovitz et al		\$ 1,957	
Kronick Moskovitz et al (annual cost)		\$ 105	
Outside Counsel			\$ 32,400
<u>Other Professional Services:</u>			
Contracts	\$ 384,561	\$ 384,561	\$ 139,472
<u>Other:</u>			
General Counsel	\$ 1,286	\$ 1,355	\$ -
Deputy General Counsel	\$ 1,010	\$ 2,923	\$ -
Sacramento Administrative Office (SAO)	\$ 95	\$ 136	\$ -
In-House Salary & Benefits			
Assistant Executive Director	\$ 14,842	\$ -	\$ -
Planning & Engineering Manager	\$ 1,894	\$ 233	\$ -
Senior Civil Engineer	\$ 65,103	\$ 51,534	\$ 39,868
SCADA Engineer	\$ -	\$ 1,864	\$ 3,077
Water Resources Coordinator	\$ 76,017	\$ 35,243	\$ 45,000
Project Coordinator	\$ 1,139	\$ -	\$ 1,800
Accountant			\$ 22,500
Hydrotech 3	\$ -	\$ 3,189	\$ 22,500
Other Services & Expenses	\$ 25	\$ 8,596	\$ -
License & Continuing Education	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 250
Conferences & Training	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,000
Travel/Mileage	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,908	\$ 5,000
Group Meetings	\$ 250	\$ 423	\$ 500
Telephone	\$ 125	\$ 1,286	\$ 1,000
Equipment and Tools			\$ 3,825
Vehicle			\$ 15,000
Software			\$ 4,325
Total Direct Expenditures	\$ 548,971	\$ 510,688	\$ 341,517
Administrative Expenditures	\$ 7,347	\$ 3,827	\$ 382
Total Expenditures	<b>\$ 556,318</b>	<b>\$ 514,515</b>	<b>\$ 341,899</b>
<b>REVENUES</b>			
Fund Balance	\$ 298,576	\$ 298,576	\$ 155,115
Interest (allocated & posted at fiscal year end)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Membership Dues</b>	<b>\$ 257,742</b>	<b>\$ 257,742</b>	<b>\$ 186,784</b>
Total Revenues	<b>\$ 556,318</b>	<b>\$ 556,318</b>	<b>\$ 341,900</b>

<b>FUND BALANCE:</b>			
End of FY 18 (Budget Estimated)	\$ 298,576		
End of FY 18 (Estimated-Unaudited)		\$ 411,888	
End of FY 19 (Budget Estimate)	\$ -		
End of FY 19 (Estimated)			\$ 155,115
End of FY 20 (Estimated)			\$ -
Available/(Required)			<b>\$ 155,115</b>

<b>PRIOR YEAR:</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19</b>	<b>FY20</b>
<b>BUDGET</b>	\$ -	\$ 572,414	\$ 556,319	\$ 341,899
<b>MEMBERSHIP DUES</b>	\$ -	\$ 572,414	\$ 257,742	\$ 186,784

**SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY**  
**MARCH 1, 2019 - FEBRUARY 29, 2020**

**SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT SERVICES AGREEMENT**  
**CENTRAL DELTA-MENDOTA REGION COST ALLOCATION**

BOD 2/7/19

Proposed Final

		Central DM Multi Agency GSA	% of Central Region Acreage	Total SGMA Central	Contribution of <6% Total Acreage	% of Contribution	Contribution Based on 50% Service Area plus 50% Equal Split of Total Cost
<b>DIVISION 1</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Acres</b>		<b>\$ 186,784</b>			
1. Banta-Carbona ID -withdrew 5/31/11			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
2. City of Tracy			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
3. Del Puerto Water District - withdrew 5/31/11	0	0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
4. Patterson Irrigation District	0	0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
5. Byron Bethany Irrigation District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
6. West Side Irrigation District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
7. West Stanislaus ID -withdrew 5/31/11	0	0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 2</b>							
1. Panoche Water District*	38,317	38,317	23.74069%	\$ 26,023	\$ -	13.93%	\$ 26,023
2. San Luis Water District*	55,316	55,316	34.27304%	\$ 32,950	\$ -	17.64%	\$ 32,950
3. Westlands Water District (1)			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
4. Charleston Drainage District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
5. Panoche Drainage District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
6. Pleasant Valley			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 2</b>	<b>93,633</b>	<b>93,633</b>	<b>58.01373%</b>	<b>\$ 58,974</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>31.57%</b>	<b>\$ 58,974</b>
<b>DIVISION 3</b>							
1. Central California Irrigation District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
2. Firebaugh Canal Water District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
3. Grassland Water District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
4. HMRD #2131			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
5. Columbia Canal Company (Friend Member)			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
6. Camp 13 Drainers			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 4</b>							
1. San Benito County Water District				\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
2. Santa Clara Valley Water District (2)				\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00000%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>DIVISION 5</b>							
1. Broadview Water District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
2. Eagle Field Water District*	1,325	1,325	0.82095%	\$ 9,862	\$ 9,862	5.28%	\$ -
3. Fresno Slough WD*	1,459	1,459	0.90398%	\$ 9,862	\$ 9,862	5.28%	\$ -
4. James Irrigation District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
5. Laguna Water District			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
6. Mercy Springs Water District*	3,840	3,840	2.37921%	\$ 9,862	\$ 9,862	5.28%	\$ -
7. Oro Loma Water District (Not included in MA % Calc)	1,258		0.76926%	\$ 11,207	\$ 11,207	6.00%	\$ -
8. Pacheco Water District*	4,999	4,999	3.09731%	\$ 12,447	\$ -	6.66%	\$ 12,447
9. Reclamation District 1606			0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
10. Tranquillity ID*	10,750	10,750	6.66055%	\$ 14,791	\$ -	7.92%	\$ 14,791
11. Turner Island Water District		0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Division 5</b>	<b>23,631</b>	<b>22,373</b>	<b>13.86%</b>	<b>\$ 68,031</b>	<b>\$ 40,794</b>	<b>36.42%</b>	<b>\$ 27,238</b>
<b>OTHER</b>							
1. Northwestern Delta Mendota Subbasin GSA	0	0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
2. City of Patterson GSA	0	0	0.00000%	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -
3. Fresno County*	29,728	29,728	18.41906%	\$ 22,524	\$ -	12.06%	\$ 22,524
4. Merced County*	14,176	14,176	8.78326%	\$ 16,187	\$ -	8.67%	\$ 16,187
5. Santa Nella County Water District*	1,488	1,488	0.92194%	\$ 9,862	\$ 9,862	5.28%	\$ -
6. Widren GSA (Not included in MA % Calculation)	877		0.53628%	\$ 11,207	\$ 11,207.06	6.00%	\$ -
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>46,269</b>	<b>45,392</b>	<b>28.12%</b>	<b>\$ 59,779</b>	<b>\$ 21,069</b>	<b>32.00%</b>	<b>\$ 38,710</b>
	<b>163,533</b>	<b>161,398</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 186,784</b>	<b>\$ 61,863</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 124,921</b>

\*Note: 88% Factor due to Central DM Multi-Agency Allocation of 88%; Widren and Oro Loma flat 6% each.