



SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

P. O. BOX 1810

STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA, 95201

TELEPHONE (209) 468-3000

FAX NO. (209) 468-2999

Kris Balaji
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION

May 19, 2021, 1:00 p.m.

Teleconference Only

Call-In Information Provided

AGENDA

- I. Roll Call**
- II. Approve Minutes for the Meeting of February 17, 2021**
- III. Discussion Items:**
 - A. DWR Presentation on FloodMAR Pilot Project Concept (Ajay Goyal, DWR)
 - B. DREAM Project & Monitoring Committee
 - C. Drought Conditions; Local and State Response
 - D. Drought Relief Package, May Budget Revise
 - E. Other Projects and Status
 1. Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 2. Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 3. Tracy Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan
 4. Upper Mormon Slough Erosion Repair Project
 5. Smith Canal Gate Project
 6. Lower San Joaquin Regional Food Management Plan
 - F. Reports from Member Agencies
- IV. Action Items: None**
- V. Public Comment: *Please limit comments to three minutes.***
- VI. Commissioners' Comments**
- VII. Future Agenda Items**
- VIII. Adjournment**

NOTICE: Coronavirus COVID-19

Based on guidance from the California Department of Public Health and the Governor's office, the following teleconference information is being provided to you for participation in the April 21, 2021 Advisory Water Commission Meeting.

You are strongly encouraged to listen to the Advisory Water Commission meeting 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: 231 322 388#

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

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

Once connected, we request you kindly mute your phone.

Next Regular Meeting
June 16, 2021, 1:00 p.m.
Location TBD

Commission may make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on any listed item.

If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact the Water Resources Staff at (209) 468-3089 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting. Any materials related to items on this agenda distributed to the Commissioners less than 72 hours before the public meeting are available for public inspection at Public Works Dept. Offices located at the following address: 1810 East Hazelton Ave., Stockton, CA 95205. These materials are also available at <http://www.sjwater.org>. Upon request these materials may be made available in an alternative format to persons with disabilities.

**REPORT FOR THE MEETING OF
THE ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION OF THE San Joaquin COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
February 17, 2021**

The regular meeting of the Advisory Water Commission of the San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District was held on Wednesday, February 17, 2021, beginning at 1:00 p.m., via the Microsoft Teams Meeting Platform.

Mr. Tom McGurk, Chairman of the Advisory Water Commission (AWC), called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm.

I. Roll Call

Present were Commissioners Nomellini, Torres-O'Callaghan, Swimley, de Graaf, Wright, Elizabeth, Hartmann, Price, and Neudeck; Alternates Reyna-Hiestand, Weststeyn, and Henneberry-Schermesser; Secretary Zidar, and Chairman McGurk. Also in attendance were Commissioners Breitenbucher, Winn, Herrick and Holbrook who arrived after roll call was completed.

Commissioner Holbrook arrived late and did not participate in voting.

Others present are listed on the Attendance Sheet. The Commission had a quorum.

II. Approval of Minutes for the January 20, 2020 Meeting

Commissioner Christopher Neudeck made the motion and Commissioner Reyna-Hiestand second to approve the minutes of January 20, 2021.

Chairman McGurk asked for any Opposed or Abstained. With none opposed, the motion passed unanimously.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

Mr. Tom McGurk, Chairman of the Advisory Water Commission (AWC), led the agenda.

III. Discussion Items:

A. American River Water Rights Applications Status Conference

Secretary Zidar provided details on the American River Water Rights Application and noted March 9th will be the date to file a Notice of Intent to Appear and March 16th will be the Hearing. Secretary Zidar provided a background on the American River Water Right which dates back to 1990 when the county filed the application and received watershed rights to the American River. Secretary Zidar noted that the state board convinced the county to move water demands to the American River initially in the 1950s and received protection in return. Secretary Zidar also mentioned that the American River Water Right, which costs approximately \$30,000 per year to maintain, provides the county seniority over other contractors interested in the waterway and allows for underground use and storage which would help address critical overdraft issues.

Secretary Zidar addressed questions which need to be answered in the Status Hearing and noted that the county is still interested in pursuing the application but will need partnerships to do so. Secretary Zidar answered the question about remaining protestors by claiming how both East Bay MUD and Sacramento

County were protestors but could be encouraged to be potential partners. Secretary Zidar also provided status updates on the action items found on the application-development schedule and noted that there has not been development of a project-specific Environmental Impact Report but that a programmatic EIR for the Regional Conjunctive Use Program. EBMUD has removed its protest. There have been limited discussion regarding the right to use the Freeport Diversion Facility as a point of diversion for the project. Secretary Zidar also noted that there has been no further resolution of protests beyond the attempt to work with EB MUD and addressed whether the AHO should schedule a public hearing to consider Application 29657 by recommending that the hearing be delayed 18-24 months.

Secretary Zidar emphasized the importance of developing larger, interregional partnerships as well as local partnerships for the Water Right and noted that the American River Water Right must be considered in context of other projects, investment priorities, worth of water, and other water rights such as the Mokelumne Water Right.

Commissioner George Hartmann agreed that is important to preserve the American River Water Right and asked if Commissioner Chuck Winn had more information regarding an incremental sales tax he had discussed last year to provide funding to finance these types of water projects. Commissioner Chuck Winn answered that he was previously in the process of talking with individuals who knew more about tax measures but such discussions stopped due to the economic downturn that resulted from the COVID-19 pandemic. Commissioner Winn, however, noted that similar measures were recently passed during the past election and believes that the tax measure should be revisited in future discussions and meetings.

Commissioner Dante Nomellini noted a potential list of interested agencies including Stanislaus and Sacramento County. Commissioner Nomellini stated that there are plenty of opportunities within the community and would like to consider alternatives to the Freeport Project which would allow for more control.

Mr. Dominick Gulli, member of the public, commented that he would like to see all the options available for use of the water that gets taken up to Pardee Dam and noted that a partnership with EB MUD would be necessary to use their facilities as a way to move the water. Mr. Gulli asked for clarification regarding the American River measurement of 45,000 acre feet and asked whether it is an average or wet year measurement. Secretary Zidar noted that it is a general average.

Commissioner Dante Nomellini explained that it is his understanding that the Freeport Project would go to some point below Comanche and connect in the aqueducts. Secretary Zidar agreed and noted that there were various alternatives discussed such as further lifting to come up with storage behind EB MUD facilities.

B. LAFCO Special District Reorganizations (e.g., SEWD/CSJWCD Consolidation), Jim Glaser, LAFCO Director

This agenda item was moved up to accommodate the guest speaker and their schedule.

Mr. Jim Glaser from LAFCO gave a general overview of the agency which has a group representing every county in the state and emphasized that LAFCO's priorities are preventing urban sprawl and ensuring special districts are organized. Mr. Glaser explained one of LAFCO's responsibilities is approving annexations and consolidations which is the agency's relation to the SEWD/CSJWCD Consolidation item. LAFCO's first two steps prior to approval are to conduct a municipal review and determine the sphere of influence of each district. Mr. Glaser highlighted that the legislative intentions of LAFCO are to create less districts and approve consolidations but these two steps are necessary prior to filing an application. Mr. Glaser briefly described the municipal review process which will contain chapters on population growth, availability of public services, and a financial review of each district and noted that Central San Joaquin may run into some issues regarding their debts at this point.

Commissioner Mary Elizabeth asked Mr. Glaser to elaborate on the protest process. Mr. Glaser informed the group that if 25-50% of voters protest, an election hearing is held and if more than 50% of voters protest, the consolidation is overturned. Mr. Glaser noted that there is a notice requirement but protest proceedings rarely occur or are successful in large districts.

Commissioner Will Price asks for further clarification if protests are mainly done to voice opinion or spark conversation. Mr. Glaser informed him that it is mainly a way to voice opinion. Commissioner Price then asked if there was a protest started for this consolidation and if any documentation was available for review. Mr. Glaser informed the group that no protests were started as the service review and sphere of influence are the first two steps that must happen prior and no documentation was currently available but would be once the draft document has been prepared.

Mr. Glenn Prasad, from San Joaquin County, said he was familiar with MSR and MOI updates but asked Mr. Glaser if there was a subsequent CEQA review planned. Mr. Glaser noted that, while CEQA has implications on any discretionary actions, the service review is technically exempt and the sphere of influence typically has either a short CEQA document or will be exempt.

C. Encampment Response Team (ERT)

This agenda item was moved up to accommodate the guest speaker and their schedule.

Ms. Zoey Merrill, from county council for San Joaquin County, provided information on the Encampment Response Team (ERT) which was created in response to a county policy and consists of various agencies such as environmental health, human services, sheriff's office, etc. Ms. Merrill gave a general overview of the ERT proceeding which begins with an individual notifying county staff of an encampment having negative impact on the community and stated that Environmental Health is then sent to do an initial review of the site within a week followed by an inspection report by the ERT team. Ms. Merrill noted that ERT must reasonably respond given the situation and, often times, this would include sending over public service officials and case workers to the encampment to provide information to occupants. Ms. Merrill also highlighted that, once a decision is made, the county can contact a contractor to deal with the encampment site and also noted that this process works within county jurisdiction but is approved to work in jurisdictions where such a process does not exist.

Commissioner Christopher Neudeck mentioned the fee ownership and asked if there have been any issues with Reclamation Districts due to their easements. Ms. Merrill stated that as long as the easement gives you legal access to the property an MOU can be created and a model can be used to implement the ERT process. Commissioner Neudeck thanked Ms. Merrill and mentioned that when expenses for Reclamation Districts are run through the reimbursement program they are often rejected whenever any items mention homelessness despite demonstrating impact on public infrastructure. Ms. Merrill acknowledged the comment and stated that many ERT inspections have taken place on public infrastructure as long as legal access is available to approach the property.

Commissioner Dan Wright asked Ms. Merrill if she had any information regarding a settlement that had been reached with homeless advocates which would allow for more flexibility in terms of forcing individuals to use existing shelter space. Ms. Merrill noted that she had no further information but stated that she believes the ERT process helps better meet the needs of the community and does not believe it will change in response to the settlement.

Commissioner George Hartmann asked Ms. Merrill how to best reach out to report an encampment issue. Ms. Merrill answered that an MOA can be drafted in order to bring on board the ERT and begin the ERT process in a given jurisdiction.

Commissioner David Breitenbucher asked if the city is allowed to use a similar ERT process where they can report an encampment site that needs to be cleaned up. Ms. Merrill noted that the process would be the same for any given public jurisdiction and that the process would only be different when approaching private property.

Commissioner Dan Wright commented that the City of Stockton has also been doing its part by having regular cycles of inspection and action on public properties, and noted that the City has recently completed a project picking up thousand tons of garbage on Mormon Slough. Ms. Merrill additionally commented that she commends the City of Stockton's effort and willingness to collaborate with county staff.

Commissioner Chuck Winn noted that the Board had discussed using the public works department to focus on cleaning encampments. Commissioner Winn also stated that there could be potential negotiations to hire contractors who could help clean encampments and become partners which would result in overall better legal defensibility.

Commissioner Henneberry Schermesser asked Ms. Merrill if occupants are known to return to encampment sites after they are closed or cleaned. Ms. Merrill noted that the county takes various steps to prevent return rates such as tree trimming, under bridge patrols, and more. However, Ms. Merrill emphasized that ERT is not a one-stop solution and returning occupants can still be an issue.

D. Grants and Funding

Secretary Zidar provided brief updates on the following grants, noting if they are either pending or lost.

1. Prop 68 Implementation, NSJWCD North Systems Improvement.

North San Joaquin had filed the Prop 68 grant on behalf of GWA for the whole region but the status remains unknown.

2. Watershed Coordinator Grant via GWA

The Watershed Coordinator Grant was meant to assist the GWA in outreach programs but was not received.

3. CV / Delta System Wide Flood Risk Reduction Program Guidelines (pending)

The CV/Delta System Wide Flood Risk Reduction Program is currently pending and not competitive but DWR will still be seeking proposals.

4. Statewide System Wide Flood Risk Reduction Program Guidelines (pending)

The Statewide: System Wide Flood Risk Reduction Program is currently pending and considered competitive.

Secretary Zidar noted that the bureau had released a Water Smart Marketing grant and Conservation grant for partner districts that are interested.

Mr. Dominick Gulli, member of the public, commented that he would like to see the list of grants from the last meeting and have an updated list of all the grants to keep as a record in the minutes.

E. County Project Updates

Secretary Zidar states that the 2019 Addendum to the IRWMP was adopted by the Coordinating committee and also mentioned that funds are successfully being implemented to help with disadvantaged community projects. Secretary Zidar noted that Tracy Subbasin will be moving forward and will have a meeting tomorrow to go over their water sustainability management. Secretary Zidar also mentioned that East San Joaquin will be working with TAC and start projects using the Prop. 68 GSP implementation money such as drilling a monitoring well to watch for salt water migration. Secretary Zidar noted that DWR has finished construction on two deep monitoring well clusters in North San Joaquin and Stockton East as well as six to ten shallow monitoring wells thanks to the GSP development funds granted previously.

Commissioner Kris Balaji asked Secretary Zidar to let commissioners know when the IRWM addendum will go to the Board. Secretary Zidar stated that all members of the IRWM coordinating committee or anyone seeking funds needs to formally adopt the IRWMP and the Board of Supervisors will be acting on that in the next meeting.

Mr. Glenn Prasad, from San Joaquin County, mentioned the Upper Mormon Slough project. Mr. Prasad provided updates on the repairs being conducted south of Escalon and stated that construction will start this summer.

F. SJAFCA Project Updates

Secretary Zidar asked Chris Elias for SJAFCA updates. Chris Elias did not respond.

G. Reports from Member Agencies

Commissioner John Holbrook reminded Glenn Prasad that all entities must be passed by the IRWMC revision in order to receive funds for the Upper Mormon Slough project.

Commissioner Christopher Neudeck stated that the Central Valley Flood Control Agency (CVFCA) is currently developing a \$2 million flood control bond and is searching for senate and assembly authors.

IV. Action Items:

None provided.

V. Informational Items:

None provided.

VI. Public Comment: Public comments, adopted by the Advisory Water Commission on January 17, 2018, will be limited to 3-minutes, unless extended to the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. Dominick Gulli, member of the public, addressed the Commission. Mr. Gulli noted that he had submitted written comments on the SJAFCA project updates, budget items, and general public comments for review once again and asked that they continue to be submitted along with the meeting minutes.

VII. Commissioner's Comments:

None provided.

VIII. Future Agenda Items:

Chairman McGurk would like to follow up on the American River Water Right.

Next Regular Meeting: March 17, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.
Location TBD

IX. Adjournment:

Chairman McGurk adjourned the meeting at 2:47 p.m.

Dominick Gulli PE, PLS
209 649 4555
greenmountaindom@hotmail.com
Savadadspoint.org

The San Joaquin Flood and Water Conservation District
Advisory Water Commission

2/17/21

Re: Correspondence relative to the agenda for the 2/17/21 public meeting to be included in the minutes.

Item III Discussion Items.

F. SJAFCA Project Updates.

- Lower San Joaquin River Project.

SJAFCA in process of budgeting and scoping for the local assessment District (A proposition 218 Election) that would cover the entire LSJR project area. (9/17/20 item 4.2) This equates to a LOCAL share of \$121M over the course of 10-15 years or between or \$12.1 M to \$8.1M per year. This is in addition to the cost to develop the funding mechanisms and all lands easements and right of way.

For Fiscal Year 2021 the Local Share is \$3.7M. SJAFCA's 2020/2021 annual budget include allocation of agency reserves to provide the Local Share. The only remaining reserve left is from the \$10.6M Federal Government received relative to the original Flood Protection Restoration Project. \$5M of this reserve has already been committed to the Smith Canal Gate project (1/28/20 item 5.3).

The Flood Protection Restoration Project completed around 1998. In 2009 there remained \$17,007,652 in the construction fund #1 and #3 reserves. In 2019 the balance was **ZERO**. No construction has taken place, the money has gone to consultants, working to promote feasibility studies, strategic planning and preliminary engineering and design work separate from the original Flood Protection Restoration Project.

The bottom line is this SJAFCA will have spent nearly \$27,000,000 of reserves/residual funding from the FPRP. This money should have been returned to the assessment district that providing the Cash Flow and funding in the first place for the FPRP

- Smith Canal Gate.

Enclosed is the published budgets of the project. What started in 2008 as a \$25M project, was sold to voters in 2013 as a \$40.8M project is now an \$86.7M project that *"exceeds immediately available funding for a myriad of reasons"* (1/18/20) to the tune of \$13.7 M which has flip-flopped the cost share to:

(\$48.5M) Local 56% and
(\$38.3M) State 44%

Item VI Public Comments

Dominick Gulli Professional Engineer, Land Surveyor, Reclamation District Engineer for numerous Delta Levees and Trustee for RD 1614, was the only person to submit an application for the Urban Flood Control Representative position, back in January. He was excluded from the position by

Supervisors Patti and Miller who decided to re-advertise the position. Dr. Michael Panzer, DDS was unanimously selected and is your newest member, Congratulations Doc Panzer.

Flood Control in this county is very complex. The San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency has assumed most of the planning and implementation of the major projects. The only voice of reason is Dominick Gulli. The Advisory Water commission has at least been open to free speech for the people to hear of one's concern. Thank you and I trust you will continue to be open and transparent.

As requested numerou-stimes in the past, Please Consider having the Flood Technical Advisory Committee meetings on a monthly basis. The updates from SJAFCA do nothing to inform the PEOPLE of flood control issues in this county.

I thank You and God Bless



Dominick GulJi PE, PLS



- Table of Published Budgets SJAFCA Smith Canal Gate Dated' 1/26/21
- 1/18/20 Item 5.3 Approve allocation of agency reserves funding the Smith Canal Gate Project
- 9/17/20 Item 4.2 Lower San Joaquin River Funding Evaluation

Tallied by Civil Engineer 50,887

Description	6/27/08 PBI Technical Me mo	2/26/13 Prop 218 Election	10/24/17 UFRR Grant Fund Request Summaray Current	11/29/18 Amendment Fund Request Summaray Proposed	11/1/19 Preliminary Official Stat e ment	5/5/20 Final Official Statement	6/18/20 Final Official Statement Plus Cost
Project Components Expected Cost			Budget	Bud get			of Item 5.3
Program Management (Design Phase]	\$918,000	\$929,349	\$1,966,23	\$1,902.63	\$1,902,639	\$1,902,639	\$1,902,63
Engineering Design	\$1,835,000	\$2,250,000	\$3,160,2.B	\$3,090.43	\$3,090,438	\$3,090,438	\$3,090,43
Independent Re vie w		\$300,000	\$300.00	\$143,668	\$143,668	\$143,668	\$143,66
Environmental Re vie w & Perm itti ng	\$1,835,000	\$1,375,000	\$2,067.13	\$1,270,975	\$1,270,975	\$1,270,975	\$1,270,97
Real Estate Planning & Acquisition		\$141,000	\$94,33	\$125,806	\$125,806	\$125,806	\$125,80
Public Outreach		\$80,000	\$88,44	\$81.70	\$81,705	\$81,705	\$81,70
Financini/FundinR Costs (Application)	\$551,000	\$1,000,000	\$100,00	\$57,128	\$57,128	\$57,128	\$57,12
Total DesiRn Phas<l			\$7,776.36	\$6,672.35			
Balance DesignPhase			-\$7,776.36	-\$6,672.35			
Supplemental Eng ineer ing			\$1,166.71	\$2,801,43	\$2,801,431	\$2,851,431	\$2,851,43
Additional Design Engine ering (6/18/20]							\$909.00
Program Management			\$718,76	\$818,766	\$818,766	\$2,068,766	\$2,068,76
Pump Station to Pump Sto rwat er with Gate Closed	\$5,700,000						
Construction (13]	\$12,650,000	\$24,730,955	\$26,743,00	\$41,157,00	\$49,578,500	\$50,159,208	\$49,487,97
Genera l Requirements		\$2,850,688					
Recreational Features			-\$270,00	-\$487.50			
Contingency		\$4,946,883	\$4,759,00	\$B,909,00			\$12,371,99
Total Construction Phase	\$18,350,00		\$31,232,00	\$49,578,50			
Balance Construction Phase	-\$18,350,00		-\$31,232,00	-\$49,578.50			
Published total	\$18,350,00		\$31,609,00	\$49,578,50			
Balance Published total	-\$18,350,00		-\$31,609,00	-\$49,578,50			
Delta Bust	\$		\$377,00	\$0			
Construction Management	\$1,835,000	\$2,018,901	\$1,750,00	\$5,669,00	\$5,669,000	\$7,288,088	\$7,288,08
Additional Conctruction Managemnt per 6/18/20							\$1,600,000
Real Est ate Acquisition		\$379,553	\$208,00	\$360,00	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
Re al Estate Contingency			\$121,00	\$90,00	\$90,000	\$240,000	\$240,000
Public Outreach		\$57,683	\$50,00	\$70,00	\$70,000	\$80,000	\$50,000
Env ironment al Mit igat ion		\$721,036	\$625,00	\$835,00	\$835,000	\$2,351,550	\$2,351,550
Expected Water Quality Me asur e s			\$1,034,00				
Recreational Enhancements			\$270,00	\$487,500	\$487,500	\$487,500	\$487,500
Total Project Costs	\$25,324,000	\$40,851,048	\$45,328,845	\$67,382,556	\$67,382,556	\$72,528,902	\$86,738,664
Published toatl Delta			\$45,328,845	\$67,382,556			
Project Funding Sources							
State EIPFunding (DWR No. 4600009799)		\$2,412,500	\$2,412,500	\$2,412,500	\$2,412,500	\$2,412,500	\$2,412,500
State UFRR Funding (DWR No. 4600012026)			\$22,309,666	\$22,309,666	\$22,309,666	\$22,309,666	\$22,309,666
State UFRR Funding (DWR No. 4600012026) Amend #110/4/19					\$13,562,092	\$13,562,09	\$13,562,09
Subtotal State Funding			\$24,722,166	\$24,722,166	\$38,284,258	\$38,284,258	\$38,284,258
Agency Smith Canal Assessment Pay-Go- Revenues(1)					\$13,251,525	\$15,516,006	\$15,516,006
Agency Smith Canal AR Re venu es Bonds Estimat e Proje ct Fund Depos it (2)					\$21,787,707	\$23,257,458	\$23,257,458
Agency Debt Se rvic e During Construction(3)					(\$3,523,795)	(\$4,049,658)	(\$4,049,658)
Subtotal Local Funding			\$0	\$0	\$31,515,437	\$34,723,806	\$34,723,806
Total Project Funding Sources					\$69,799,695	\$73,008,064	\$73,008,064
Net Funding Sources in excess of e xpe cted Project Costs (4)					\$2,417,139	\$479,162	(\$13,730,600)
DWR					57% \$38,284,258	53% \$38,284,258	44% \$38,284,258
Locals					43% \$29,098,298	47% \$34,244,644	56% \$48,454,406

June 18, 2020

TO: San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency

FROM: Chris Elias, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ALLOCATION OF AGENCY RESERVE FUNDING TO THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT AND UPDATE OF THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT FY 20/21 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) BUDGET**

RECOMMENDATION

Allocate up to \$5,000,000 from the Agency's operating reserve funds to the Smith Canal Gate Project (Project) to cover potential additional construction costs of the project and authorize the Executive Director to approve Change Orders of up to \$5,000,000 for the Project. Further, supplement the FY 2020/21 CIP budget approved on April 30, 2020 for the Project to incorporate additional costs and the associated allocation of funding.

DISCUSSION

Background

On April 30, 2020, the Board approved Resolution 20-14 authorizing the Executive Director to execute a contract with Shimmick Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$49,487,976. At that time, the Board received a report from staff explaining that the costs for the Project exceeded immediately available funding for a myriad of reasons. Further, the exact amount of the overage was difficult to determine because of certain unknown information at that time including:

- The exact *amount* of proceeds that would be generated from sale of bonds for the Project;
- Outstanding negotiations regarding additional construction management and engineering services during construction costs; and,
- The amount of contingency that should be budgeted for the Project.

Since April, Agency staff has worked on multiple fronts to resolve these unknowns, and further, to seek out additional funding for the Project and reduce costs. These efforts are still ongoing, however, at this time staff is prepared to recommend an allocation of reserves to the Project.

In addition, on May 30, 2020, the Board conducted a Public Hearing as part of the annual levy of the Smith Canal Area Assessment District Assessment. Incorporated into that action is the approval of the FY 2020/21 CIP Budget for the Smith Canal Gate Fund. In order to incorporate the contingency and additional expenses for the Project, staff is presenting, as part of this action, a supplement to that previously approved budget.

Present Situation

Staff has continued to update the financing plan for the Project based on additional information from the engineering and financing team. The following provides additional information regarding the Project that was uncertain back in April.

AGENDA ITEM 5.3

ALLOCATION OF AGENCY RESERVE FUNDING TO THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT AND UPDATE OF THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT FY 20/21 CIP BUDGET (Page,2)

Bond Issuance Proceeds

SJAFCA's issuance and sale of Smith Canal Area Assessment District Revenue Bonds closed on May 20, 2020. On the day of closing, the Underwriter, Hilltop Securities, Inc. deposited \$23,257,457 into the Project Fund. Earlier in April prior to the Board meeting, the working estimate of Bond Proceeds was approximately \$22.3 million, about \$950,000 less. Based on actual market conditions on the day of pricing, creative structuring of the bonds, along with the approval of a surety reserve fund policy, the Agency was able to yield a greater amount of bond proceeds available for construction.

Estimates of Construction Management and Design Services during Construction

Primarily as a result of the construction of the project extending an additional construction season as well as the incorporation of additional environmental mitigation measures, the Construction Management (CM) costs of the Project have increased. On April 30, 2020 the Board approved a two-year Construction Management (CM) Contract with KSN, which including the previously approved Constructability Review Contract and the approved three amendments extended the limit on the entire CM contract services up to \$5,066,562. However, that contract was approved to ensure that a CM contract was in place at the time of the award of a construction contract. It was noted by staff that a 4th amendment was needed in order to provide CM services for the entire duration of the Project. The additional cost of a pending Amendment with KSN to cover an additional construction season are estimated to be approximately \$1.6 million.

Similarly, Task Order 6 for Design Services During Bidding and Construction with PBI currently only provides services for two construction seasons. This task order includes 3 amendments and currently has a limit of \$2,282,500. The estimate for additional services for an additional construction season is approximately \$909,000.

It is important to note that these additional costs would be incurred later in the Project. As a result, staff is not recommending any additional increase in costs for these items in the current FY 2020/21 Smith Canal CIP budget currently.

Construction Contingency Budget Allocation

At this time, after consultation with the design engineering and construction management team, Staff is recommending the Project proceed with a contingency allocation of 25% of the construction bid amount for the Project. Further, because of the financial constraints on the Project, staff is further recommending that the Board allocate funding for only the first year of construction for the Project. Based on the projected cash flow of the Project, this amount would be \$4,360,000.

Allocation of Agency Indirect Overhead Costs

As part of the adoption of the Agency's FY 2020/21 Operating Budget adoption (Item 5.1 on this Agenda), Staff is recommending that the Board adopt a process for allocating Agency Operating costs to the Programs / Projects that are being advanced by Agency. This approach would allocate approximately \$640,000 of costs to the Smith Canal Project for the FY. This is important to do because the Agency does not have a separate long-term sustainable funding source for operations.

Taking into consideration the added costs of the project and offsetting revenues, Staff recommends that the Board allocate up to \$5.0 million of the \$10.6 million prior Federal Project reimbursement now held in reserves toward the Smith Canal Project. Further, Staff recommends

June 18, 2020

**ALLOCATION OF AGENCY RESERVE FUNDING TO THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT AND
UPDATE OF THE SMITH CANAL GATE PROJECT FY 20/21 CIP BUDGET (Page 3)**

that the Board update the FY 2020/21 CIP budget for the Project as shown in the attached Exhibit A.

The allocation of a portion of the federal reimbursement SJAFCA currents holds in reserves is consistent with past Board direction (see Item #5.2 from the September 19, 2019 Board Meeting). These funds are available to fund other SJAFCA projects as needed. Use of those funds for this Project (if necessary) has a further advantage: The Smith Canal Gate Project is a part of the Lower San Joaquin River Project (LSJRP) which will be constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Any money spent on the Smith Canal Gate Project acts as a credit toward SJAFCA's obligation as a Non-Federal sponsor of the LSJRP. In effect, the allocation of funding has the ability to offset a portion of the Non-Federal sponsor obligations related to the first increment of the LSJRP. Ultimately, SJAFCA, will have an obligation to contribute to the remaining increments of the LSJRP when it enters into a Project Partnership Agreement with the United States Army Corps of Engineers which is expected to occur on or before September 30, 2020. Thus, any money spent on the Smith Canal Gate Project does double duty in providing funds for two projects.

Finally, considering the cost increases of the Project, SJAFCA Staff has engaged in discussions with DWR to seek a pledge of additional funding toward the Project. Staff has scheduled meetings with DWR and will be prepared to report on the status of these discussions at the Board meeting on June 18th. However, because of the timeframe it may take to secure additional funding from DWR, Staff recommendation today is that the Board take action to allocate reserve funds to the Project.

Fiscal Impact

The recommended action would increase the CIP budget for FY 20/21 by \$5,000,000 and allocate the same amount of additional funding for the Project from Agency's Reserves. The change in the CIP Budget is shown in Exhibit A.

h

APPROVED:

CHRIS ELIAS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Attachments :

- Exhibit A - Updated SJAFCA Smith Canal Gate Project Fiscal Year 2020/21 Budget
- Exhibit B - Resolution

September 17, 2020

TO: San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency

FROM: Chris Elias, Executive Director
Seth Wurzel, Principal, LWA

SUBJECT: **LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT FUNDING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS**

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an informational update on the status of the financing approach to support the Lower San Joaquin River (LSJR) Project; and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into agreement with Willdan Financial Services' (WFS) to prepare a feasibility analysis of an assessment to fund the LSJR Project.

DISCUSSION

Background

The LSJR Project is a Federally authorized flood risk reduction project under the partnership of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and SJAFCA. The project includes several flood protection improvements throughout the greater Stockton Area.

Federal flood projects require local cost sharing; therefore, SJAFCA will be responsible for approximately \$121M of the \$1.38 total cost, over the course of the next 10-15 years. Through the implementation planning process, SJAFCA has projected its local matching costs over time and presented several local revenue generating options during prior Board meetings. The Board of Directors has advised staff to proceed with the budgeting and scoping of a local assessment district that would cover the entire LSJR Project area.

Present Situation

As prepared under the Strategic Plan update agenda item, one top priority of the agency is delivering on the first increment of the LSJR Project in the coming year. This requires advancing several actions, which are underway. The pre-construction, engineering and design (PED) phase of the project has begun with the first increment of design at the Delta Front (TS30L); along with advancing this design, the partner agencies must enter into a project partnership agreement (PPA), which is planned for CVFPB execution during their September board meeting. In the Federal fiscal year 2020, the Federal government has also authorized a "new start" and contributed \$22.8 million in federal appropriations plus another \$300,000 in USACE work plan funding toward advancing the first increment of the project. This is a significant milestone because it was one of a few new starts in the nation and thus represents a substantial commitment to deliver this project via dedicated USAGE resources and congressional appropriations.

The State, represented by the CVFPB, and SJAFCA must commit to their partnership terms - cost share match and lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and disposal/borrow areas (LERRDs). This comes at a cost share of 35% non-Federal sponsor (a portion of which is

AGENDA ITEM 4.2

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT FUNDING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

The State, represented by the CVFPB, and SJAFCA must commit to their partnership terms - cost share match and lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and disposal/borrow areas (LERRDs). This comes at a cost share of 35% non-Federal sponsor (a portion of which is LERRDs) in which SJAFCA has further setup a corresponding agreement with the CVFPB, referred to as a Local Project Partnership Agreement (LPPA), ultimately resulting in a 10.5% cost commitment by SJAFCA. The PPA and the companion LPPA are scheduled to be considered for approval by the CVFPB at its September 25, 2020 Board meeting.

For Federal Fiscal Year, 2020, as noted above, the Federal government committed \$23.1 million toward the Project. This commitment required a local match by SJAFCA of approximately \$3.7 million. SJAFCA's annual budget for FY 2020/21 included the allocation of Agency reserves to provide a portion of this matching funding. The source of the match was an allocation of a portion of the \$10.6 million reimbursement received for SJAFCA legacy Federal project.

For the LSJRP, SJAFCA has requested, for Federal FY 2021, USACE Work Plan funding of \$25 Million for additional design work. The partnership arrangement requires SJAFCA and the State to provide approximately \$13.4 million of which SJAFCA's share would be approximately \$4.0 million. For Federal FY 2022, SJAFCA is advocating for \$35 million within the Administration's Budget which would require matching funds from SJAFCA and the State of approximately \$18.8 million. SJAFCA's share of this would be approximately \$5.65 million. This process of annual appropriations is expected to occur each year until the project is complete. Currently, SJAFCA does not have a secured funding source to provide its share of the local match. However, at the time of the Agency's budget adoption in June, SJAFCA staff noted that there would be remaining funds from the \$10.6 million reimbursement after allocations to current budget items and that these remaining funds should be focused on developing the long-term funding needed to generate the remaining local share of the overall LSJRP.

In the near term, the Smith Canal Project affords credit toward a significant chunk of the above commitment; however, additional funding and LERRDs are still required and the timing of the funds will require the agency to garner additional revenue in as soon as two years (by mid-2022), but this depends on USAGE project development plans and future Federal appropriations.

Staff presented to the Board of Directors during its April and June board meetings various options to advance revenue generating initiatives. The Board decided to further explore the feasibility of a single assessment district that would generally cover the benefit area of the LSJR Project. Staff recommended and the Board agreed to scope and seek a proposal from WFS given the recent qualification and selection process completed for these services for efforts within the Mossdale Tract.

WFS's proposal for the evaluation of an Assessment District to fund the LSJR Project is attached to this report.

Next Steps

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT FUNDING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

SJAFCA Board of Directors should review and consider the matching funds requirements of the LSJR Project, including the timing required to contribute cost sharing funds and the anticipated timing required to develop and administer an assessment district. Further, the Board should consider some of the companion activities associated with the development of an assessment district including the following tasks:

- The scope, cost and ability to finance other flood risk reduction measures that go beyond the footprint of the LSJR Project.
- The scope of the beneficiaries and the underlying data needs to assess the benefit associated with flood risk reduction measures proposed to be funded by an assessment district.

To start to address this effort now, staff recommends that the Board consider the proposal prepared by WFS and delegate authority to the Executive Director to advance Task A as outlined within the proposal. This effort is the most practical way for SJAFCA to start the process of securing the necessary funding in support of the LSJR Project at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT

At this time, efforts to secure local funding for the LSJR Project are not included within the approved budget for the LSJR Project. However, as noted in June 2020, upon adoption of the Agency's budget, Staff noted that there would be remaining funds from the \$10.6 million reimbursement, which is now part of SJAFCA's reserves. Staff also noted that this remaining funding should be utilized to develop the long-term funding needed to generate the remaining local share of the LSJRP.

Staff is currently coordinating with the Department of Water Resources to develop the detailed scope of work for Phase 3 of the Regional Flood Management Planning (RFMP) program grant. SJAFCA will be the grant recipient for the Lower San Joaquin / Delta South Region. One portion of the Scope of Work for the RFMP grant includes Financial Planning and Funding Support. Because implementation of the LSJR Project is priority for the Region, Staff feels that the scope of work proposed by Willdan is a good fit for this broadly defined task. Staff expects to meet with DWR and propose that all or a portion of this effort be funded through the RFMP program. If DWR's agrees with this approach, then Staff will structure the task to align the expenses with the RFMP budget. However, if DWR does not agree to fund this task, then the expenses will need to be funded from available reserves.

At this time, Staff recommends that as part of the approval of this recommendation, that Staff allocate up to \$500,000 from available reserves to advance the Willdan evaluation effort and other supporting assessment district formation efforts as described above. Staff will return to the Board for authorization of any additional tasks supporting this effort.

Strategic Plan Consistency Analysis

The material found in this report is consistent with the Mission and Goals of the Board-adopted Strategic Plan, specifically Goal 1 to Plan for and Implement System Resiliency and Goal 3 Facilitate Funding Structures that are Most Beneficial to Local Interests.

September 17, 2020
(Page 4)

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT FUNDING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

APPROVED BY:



RUBÉN S. ELÍAS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Attachments:

1. Proposal to San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency to Prepare the Lower San Joaquin Assessment Feasibility Study (Willdan)

ATTACHMENT



September 2, 2020

Mr. Chris Elias
Executive Director
San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
22 East Weber Avenue #301
Stockton, California 95202

Re: Proposal to the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency to Prepare the Lower San Joaquin Assessment Feasibility Study

Dear Mr. Elias:

Willdan Financial Services ("Willdan") is pleased to submit the following proposal to the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency ("SJAFCA") to prepare a benefit assessment feasibility study specific to the Lower San Joaquin River. One of the main objectives of this engagement is to ensure that the proposed special district is fair, equitable and consistent with the provisions of the California Constitution (Proposition 218) and recent court cases regarding assessments. Willdan also understands the importance of a revenue stream that provides appropriate full cost recovery of improvements and maintenance (excluding general benefit costs), including not only the annual maintenance costs but also the long term repair, replacement and rehabilitation of those improvements.

For the following reasons, we are confident that you will find our proposal fully responsive to SJAFCA's objectives:

Depth of Experience - Willdan possesses unmatched experience in the formation and administration of Community Facilities Districts (CFD), Assessment Districts (AD), and special charges for agencies throughout California. **We have prepared Engineers Reports for over 800 separate ADs for local governments in California**, including Business Improvement Districts (BID), Landscaping and Lighting Districts (LLD), and ADs formed to finance infrastructure improvements. **Our recent assessment engineering/formation clients include the Cities of Lemoore, Yorba Linda, Guadalupe, Ridgecrest, Santa Clarita, Chino Hills and Tehachapi.** For each of these clients, Willdan has completed research, developed budgets, evaluated improvements, assisted in the notice, ballot and tabulation processes, prepared property owner databases, benefit assessment methodologies, Engineer's Reports, and provided plans and reports to appropriate third parties, including legal counsel. Furthermore, through our administration of special financing districts over the past 32 years, we have gained invaluable insight that helps us establish new districts and develop policies that will help SJAFCA anticipate and be prepared for administrative considerations.

Proposition 218 Defensibility - Since the passage of Proposition 218 in November of 1996, greater focus has been placed on assessment methodologies, determination of benefit, and corresponding assessments. Willdan has prepared hundreds of levy reports implementing various assessment methodologies tailored to the specific attributes of the special district. As such, we understand our clients' concerns with respect to the legality of assessments and have years of unmatched experience in developing and implementing appropriate assessment strategies. We are fortunate to be in a position in which our Proposition 218 expertise, coupled with our prior experience working directly with SJAFCA, will provide a tremendous benefit to the engagement proposed herein.

We appreciate this opportunity to continue to serve the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency. Please feel free to contact Principal Consultant Jim McGuire directly at (909) 229-0826 or via email at jmcguire@willdan.com with questions.

Sincerely,
Willdan Financial Services

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gladys Medina', with a blue ink scribble below it.

Gladys Medina
Vice President and Group Manager

and access to pertinent documentation and data, including but not limited to construction cost estimates and the phasing of the improvements. We will also discuss and finalize the assessment engineering project timeline based on critical events identified and availability of needed information.

It is anticipated that the benefit assessment analysis, identified within Task A, could be completed in six to eight months upon receipt of a notice-to-proceed. In order to meet this deadline, requested data, GIS files, and documents to be provided by SJAFCA or other consultants will need to be provided in a timely manner. The Willdan Team will attempt to complete Task A sooner if possible.

Deliverables: Based on discussions during this meeting a timeline (schedule of events) specific to the benefit assessment feasibility study will be prepared and provided to the team members, if necessary. At SJAFCA's request a comprehensive timeline involving other third-party consultants can be coordinated.

Meetings: One (1) project kick-off meeting at SJAFCA offices or via video conference, depending upon the current directive of the California stay at home order.

Task A.2: Develop Parcel Database and District Diagrams

Objective: Establish an electronic parcel database for the proposed district and corresponding district diagrams.

Description: Using updated parcel information from the current County Assessor's Office secured roll and the GIS shape files provided by SJAFCA and/or the engineering consultant team, Willdan will establish a district assessment database and corresponding district diagrams. This database will ultimately contain all benefiting properties within the project area and will identify each parcel's specific land use, proposed zone designation (if applicable due to project phasing), assigned benefit units and proposed assessments, related property characteristics, other outstanding parcel debt, and property ownership information (owner name(s) and mailing address).

Initially, this database will incorporate all parcels that may reasonably or will potentially benefit from the improvements. As the benefit analysis and district boundaries are refined the database will be modified to incorporate only those parcels to be included in the proposed district.

This base data will serve as the master database for the proposed assessments to be outlined in the Engineer's Report. The information contained in this database will be enhanced and updated, as needed, through parcel research and specific information provided by SJAFCA and/or the engineering consultant team. Furthermore it can be utilized as the basis for the mailing of the Proposition 218 notices and ballots. This database will also be linked to available GIS mapping files to generate the district diagram and/or exhibits for the Engineer's Report.

Deliverables: - **SJAFCA:** Various maps or diagrams (either electronically or in hardcopy) of the proposed improvements, GIS shapefiles of the improvements, flood plains, development plans, proposed phasing, and parcel flood depth and elevations within the project area.

Willdan: Once the district boundaries are finalized and relevant property owner information is updated, an electronic file and related diagram(s), identifying an overview of the location and extent of the improvements, will be provided to SJAFCA upon request.

Task A.3: Review of Benefits/Improvements and Assessment Analysis

Objective: Evaluate various factors that must be considered for compliance and application of special/general benefit pursuant to the provisions of the California Constitution (Proposition 218), the applicable state legislation (Act), and current case law to develop an appropriate and defensible assessment methodology and district structure (benefit zones).

2021 ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION ROSTER, ROLL CALL & VOTE SHEET

Roll Call

(5 members necessary for quorum)

AGENCY	REP	TERM	ALT	TERM	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV
					20	17	17	21	19	16	21	18	15	20	17
CDWA	Nomellini, Dante J. •	12/11/23	Nomellini, John Dante, Jr	12/11/23	X	X									
CSJWCD	Roberts, Reid	12/12/22	Thompson, Grant	12/12/22											
City of Escalon	Murken, Walter	02/24/20	Alves, Edward B.	02/24/20											
City of Lathrop	Torres-O'Callahan, Jennife •	12/12/22	Lazard, Diane	12/12/22	X	X									
City of Lodi	Swimley, Jr., Charlie •	02/21/21	Richle, Andrew	02/21/21	X	X									
City of Manteca	Breitenbucher, David • <i>Late</i>	03/13/23				X									
City of Ripon	de Graaf, Daniel •	06/27/21	Uecker, Dean	06/27/21	X	X									
City of Stockton	Wright, Dan •	03/14/23	Canepa, Paul	03/14/23	X	X									
City of Tracy	Sharma, Kuldeep	01/16/23	Reyna-Hiestand, Stephanie •	01/16/23	X	X									
NSJWCD	Starr, Charlie	12/11/23	Valente, Joe	12/11/23											
OID	VACANT		VACANT												
BOS	Sup. Winn, Chuck • <i>Late</i>	01/01/21	Sup. Miller, Kathy	01/01/21	X	X									
SDWA	Herrick, John • <i>Late</i>	01/27/24	Ruiz, Dean	01/27/24	X	X									
SSJID	Holbrook, John • <i>Late</i>	01/17/21	Weststeyn, Mike •	01/18/21	X	X									
S/W County	Weisenberger, David	09/26/18	VACANT												
WID	Christensen, Anders	12/12/22													
Enviro/Fish/Wildlife Org	Elizabeth, Mary •	03/13/23	N/A		X	X									
Urban Flood Control RD	Hartmann, George •	08/20/23	N/A		X	X									
Urban Flood Control RD	Panzer, Michael • <i>late</i>	08/20/23	N/A			X									
General Bus Com	Price, Will •	08/21/23	N/A		X	X									
Bldg & Constr Industry	Neudeck, Christopher •	08/20/23	N/A		X	X									
SECRETARY	Zidar, Matt •	N/A	N/A		X	X									
At-Large Rep	AT LARGE REP Wells-Brown, Terry	01/16/23	AT-LARGE ALT Annette Henneberry Schermesser •	01/16/23		X									
CHAIRMAN	SEWD McGurk, Thomas •	12/11/23	SEWD Sanguinetti, Paul	12/11/23	X	X									
STOP HERE ON ROLL CALL															
CA Water Service Co	VACANT	PERM													

We Have Quorum

2021 ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION ROSTER, ROLL CALL & VOTE SHEET

(5 members necessary for quorum)

Minute Approval

AGENCY	REP	TERM	ALT	TERM	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV
					20	17	17	21	19	16	21	18	15	20	17
CDWA	Nomellini, Dante J.	12/11/23	Nomellini, John Dante, Jr	12/11/23	X	Y									
CSJWCD	Roberts, Reid	12/12/22	Thompson, Grant	12/12/22											
City of Escalon	Murken, Walter	02/24/20	Alves, Edward B.	02/24/20											
City of Lathrop	Torres-O'Callahan, Jennife	12/12/22	Lazard, Diane	12/12/22	X	Y									
City of Lodi	Swimley, Jr., Charlie	02/21/21	Richle, Andrew	02/21/21	X	Y									
City of Manteca	Breitenbucher, David	03/13/23													
City of Ripon	de Graaf, Daniel	06/27/21	Uecker, Dean	06/27/21	X	Y									
City of Stockton	Wright, Dan	03/14/23	Canepa, Paul	03/14/23	X	Y									
City of Tracy	Sharma, Kuldeep	01/16/23	Reyna-Hiestand, Stephanie	01/16/23	X	Y									
NSJWCD	Starr, Charlie	12/11/23	Valente, Joe	12/11/23											
OID	VACANT		VACANT												
BOS	Sup. Winn, Chuck	01/01/21	Sup. Miller, Kathy	01/01/21	X										
SDWA	Herrick, John	01/27/24	Ruiz, Dean	01/27/24	X										
SSJID	Holbrook, John	01/17/21	Weststeyn, Mike	01/18/21	X	Y									
S/W County	Weisenberger, David	09/26/18	VACANT												
WID	Christensen, Anders	12/12/22													
Enviro/Fish/Wildlife Org	Elizabeth, Mary	03/13/23	N/A		X	Y									
Urban Flood Control RD	Hartmann, George	08/20/23	N/A		X	Y									
Urban Flood Control RD	Panzer, Michael	08/20/23	N/A												
General Bus Com	Price, Will	08/21/23	N/A		X	Y									
Bldg & Constr Industry	Neudeck, Christopher	08/20/23	N/A		X	Y									
SECRETARY	Zidar, Matt	N/A	N/A		X										
At-Large Rep	AT LARGE REP Wells-Brown, Terry	01/16/23	AT-LARGE ALT Annette Henneberry Schermesser	01/16/23		Y									
CHAIRMAN	SEWD McGurk, Thomas	12/11/23	SEWD Sanguinetti, Paul	12/11/23	X	Y									
STOP HERE ON ROLL CALL															
CA Water Service Co	VACANT	PERM													

Approved



**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL & WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 2021**

ATTENDANCE SHEET

INITIAL	NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHONE
Present	Nomellini, Dante J	CDWA		
	Nomellini, John Dante Jr	CDWA		
	Roberts, Reid	CSJWCD		
	Thompson, Grant	CSJWCD		
	Murken, Walter	City of Escalon		
	Alves, Edward B	City of Escalon		
Present	Torres-O'Callaghan, Jennifer	City of Lathrop		
	Lazard, Diane	City of Lathrop		
Present	Swimley, Charlie Jr	City of Lodi		
	Richle, Andrew	City of Lodi		
Present	Breitenbucher, David	City of Manteca		
		City of Manteca		
Present	De Graff, Daniel	City of Ripon		
	Uecker, Dean	City of Ripon		
Present	Wright, Dan	City of Stockton		

	Canepa, Paul	City of Stockton		
	Sharma, Kuldeep	City of Tracy		
Present	Reyna-Hiestand, Stephanie	City of Tracy		
	Starr, Charlie	NSJWCD		
	Valente, Joe	NSJWCD		
	Doornenbal, Herman	OID		
Present	Sup. Winn, Chuck	BOS		
	Sup. Miller, Kathy	BOS		
Present	Herrick, John	SDWA		
	Dean Ruiz	SDWA		
Present	Holbrook, John	SSJID		
Present	Weststeyn, Mike	SSJID		
	Weisenberger, David	SW County		
	Christensen, Anders	WID		
		WID		
Present	Elizabeth, Mary	Enviro/Fish/Wildlife Org		
Present	Hartmann, George	Urban Flood Control RD		
Present	Panzer, Michael	Urban Flood Control RD		
Present	Price, Willard	General Business Community		
Present	Neudeck, Christopher	Building & Construction Industry		
Present	Zidar, Matt	Secretary		
	Wells-Brown, Terry	At Large Rep		
Present	Henneberry-Schermesser, Annette	At Large Alternate		



**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL & WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**ADVISORY WATER COMMISSION
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 2021**

ATTENDANCE SHEET

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHONE
Andrew Watkins	SEWD		
Kristy Smith	SJC		
Arleth Pelayo	SJC		
Jeremiah Mechem	Cal Water		
Scot Moody	SEWD		
Jim Glaser	LAFCO		
Betty Wilson			
Brandon Nakagawa	SSJID		
Zoey Merrill	SJC		
Mel Lytle	Clo Stockton		
Grace Su	EBMUD		
Gerald Schwartz			
Jane Wagner-Tyak			
Dominick Gulli			
Jenn Spaletta			

