

## **MINUTES**

### **NKGSA Advisory Committee Meeting**

**May 14, 2021**

**\*\*Clovis Public Safety Building**

### **VIA TELECONFERENCE:**

#### **In attendance:**

\*Scott Redelfs – City of Clovis

\*Shay Bakman – Bakman Water Co.

\*Brock Buche – City of Fresno

\*Glenn Allen – Fresno County

\*Adam Claes – FID

\*Peter Sanchez – FMFCD

\*Nick Keller – Garfield Water District

\*Eduardo Antunez – Biola CSD

Kassy Chauhan – NKGSA

Andrew Aller – NKGSA (legal counsel)

Ronnie Samuelian – Provost & Pritchard

Paul Armendariz – City of Clovis

Kristen Freberg – City of Clovis

Lisa Koehn – Clovis

Dao Lor – ABIRC

Mike Prandini (BIA)

\* - Voting representative on Advisory Committee

\*\*Note: *This meeting was conducted via web conference due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements.*

**Item 1 – Called to order at 1:30 PM**

Special Instructions:

Special teleconferencing procedures for the Advisory Committee meeting were read by Executive Officer Kassy Chauhan. The special instructions included information on written and verbal comments for the Advisory Committee members and members of the public participating via teleconference.

Following the special teleconference instructions, a roll call vote was taken with the following results:

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Name of Person</b>	<b>Present/Absent</b>
Bakman Water Company	Shay Bakman	Present
Biola CSD	Eduardo Antunez	Present
City of Clovis	Scott Redelfs	Present
City of Fresno	Brock Buche	Present
Fresno County	Glenn Allen	Present
Fresno Irrigation District	Adam Claes	Present
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District	Peter Sanchez	Present
Garfield Water District	Nick Keller	Present
City of Kerman	-	Absent
International Water District	-	Absent

**Item 2 – Approval of Minutes from 04/09/21 Meeting**

Motion by member Claes to approve the minutes; second by member Buche.

Committee votes as follows:

Bakman: Aye                      Redelfs: Aye                      Allen: Aye                      Sanchez: Aye  
 Antunez: Aye                      Buche: Aye                      Claes: Aye                      Keller: Aye  
*(City of Kerman and International absent)*

8 Aye; 2 Absent. Motion passed.

**Item 3 – Receive – Basin Coordination Update**  
 (Update presented by Ronnie Samuelian)

We've been officially approved for funding for round 1 of the Prop 68 SGMA implementation grant, as confirmed by DWR. The grant award was very competitive, with ½ point difference between some groups getting funding or not (the Kings Subbasin project had the highest score). The DWR agreement is being reviewed and funding should be in place within two to three months. Projects must be completed by 2024, although most are anticipated to be completed by 2023.

Additional funding may be available in the draft budget, which would be available in mid-summer. In order to qualify for this funding, projects need to be ready to go.

Spring 2021 contours are not yet complete; some data is still pending from another GSA.

Coordinated Basin outreach efforts are proceeding, which will be discussed in further detail during the Executive Officer update.

A map was shared on-screen demonstrating the change in water levels between Fall 2019 and Fall 2020, as well as a graph of estimated annual and cumulative groundwater storage change from Fall 2015 to Fall 2020.

Member Claes asked if the estimated demand data included agriculture, domestic wells, urban demands, etc. Mr. Samuelian explained that the data includes any type of demand for which there are records (urban use, etc.). Gaps are filled in via estimates (e.g. crop mapping used to estimate agricultural demands), but this information will need to be refined over time.

Chairman Redelfs asked about the large deficit happening to the west of the Kings Basin. Mr. Samuelian explained that neighboring GSAs with a low supply and high demand are contributing to the Subbasin's challenges as a whole, but most of it is not coming from North Kings.

#### **Item 4 – Financial Update**

(Update presented by Lisa Koehn)

##### **Item 4a – Discussion/Possible Action – Recommend Approval of the March 2021 Expense Report – Action Item**

Expenses for March 2021 were \$23,421.84. Those expenses consisted of membership dues to the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA),

legal fees, fees to Constant Contact and KRCD for public information work, FID for administration of NKGSA, P&P for Basin coordination and engineering consultant work.

**Item 4b – Discussion/Possible Action – Recommend Approval of the Financial Statements as of March 31, 2021 – Action Item**

Total assets on the statement total \$915,582.21. Current Accounts Payable are \$16,787.26. Income from July 2020 through March 2021 totaled \$684,113.20. Expenses through March totaled \$278,518.04, bringing us to 40.79% of the year's budget. The retention from the Prop 1 grant is still outstanding, in the amount of \$21,428.50.

Detailed versions of both financial reports were included in the meeting packet.

Regarding the dues and subscriptions portion of the expense report, Kassy clarified that the revised budget resulted in an increase in that line item, from \$1,000 to \$1,795, in anticipation of paying dues to ACWA JPIA. The final invoice reflected a charge of \$2,795, which was verified with ACWA by DeAnn Hailey. The formula for the dues is calculated based on operating expenses, resulting in a significant increase from the projected cost of dues.

Motion by member Keller to recommend approval of both of the preceding reports simultaneously; second by member Buche.

Committee votes as follows:

Bakman: Aye	Redelfs: Aye	Allen: Aye	Sanchez: Aye
Antunez: Aye	Buche: Aye	Claes: Aye	Keller: Aye

*(City of Kerman and International absent)*

8 Aye; 2 Absent. Motion passed.

**Item 4c – Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Proposed Budget**

**i. Consider FY 2021-2022 Proposed Budget – Possible Action Item**

The total income of \$769,113.20 includes \$762,000 from the member assessments, an increase from \$677,000.77 collected in 2020/2021. There are significant expenses that will be incurred over the next fiscal year. Some

of the major expenses include legal fees, professional services, public information, public affairs, and staff costs.

Legal fees are anticipated to increase. The current proposal is to contribute \$50,000 to the legal reserve each year for 6 years, establishing a reserve of \$500,000 for potential litigation. (This would be the second year of contributing \$50,000 to the legal reserve based on approval by the Board of Directors in June 2020. The current legal reserve balance is \$250,000.)

Professional services are proposed to total \$400,500, which includes the cost for Engineering Consultant for a variety of professional services including data collection and reporting, responding to comments on the GSP, and miscellaneous staff support.

Public information costs are proposed to total \$25,000, including e-news, social media content and management, website maintenance and development, and special campaigns for outreach events.

Staff expenses are proposed to total \$120,000, which is an increase of \$30,000 compared to FY 2020-2021. This includes the Executive Officer as well as support staff.

Member Buche remarked that there was an overall budget increase of \$85,000, the bulk of which would be covered by Fresno, Clovis, FID, and Fresno County, and that there should be strong justification for these increases. Member Claes responded that most of the increases seem to be due to preparations for potential GSP revisions, which will depend heavily on the comments received from DWR (due to us in January 2022). Kassy explained that the estimates are conservative and the hope is that the actual expenditures are much lower, but preparations have been made for “worst-case scenarios.” The boundary flow study is also a large item in the budget, which will result in information crucial to forming mitigation strategies.

Member Buche asked if this year’s contribution to the legal reserve could be suspended until some of these other large expenses were settled, in order to reduce the overall increase in the budget. Kassy cautioned that she would want to consult with legal counsel before doing so. She also mentioned that the general reserve is likely to be over its 10% minimum at

the end of this fiscal year, and refunds could potentially be issued to member agencies based on the excess amount. Member Buche felt that the legal fund contributions should still be postponed for the upcoming year.

Member Claes asked if the Board requested an increase in the legal reserve. Kassy explained that it was a recommendation from legal counsel that the Board approved during the FY 2020-2021 budget process.

Chairman Redelfs asked if the legal reserve contributions could be left as-proposed but the Engineering Consultant line item be lowered by the same amount, with the potential member agency refunds being contributed back to that line item instead. Kassy said it was a possibility, but that line item was increased in anticipation of the boundary flow study and more staff time being spent on addressing comments on the GSP from DWR.

Member Buche inquired as to what the general reserve currently was, which is estimated to be \$400,000 at the end of this fiscal year. He suggested that perhaps the legal reserve contributions could be reduced by a quarter, with the balance made up from the reserves. Member Keller suggested reducing the consultant cost by \$100,000.

Kassy summarized that the \$250,000 that is allocated for Engineering Consultant services could be reduced to \$187,500 (a decrease of 25%) and then the budget adjusted accordingly. Member Buche added that the remaining difference based on actual consultant expenses could be covered by the main reserves resulting in a net zero increase in the budget.

Motion made by member Buche to approve the proposed 2021-2022 budget with the Engineering Consultant contribution reduced from \$250,000 to \$171,500, and to hold \$100,000 in reserves to cover actual engineering consultant services, if needed; second by member Claes.

Committee votes as follows:

Bakman: Aye	Redelfs: Aye	Allen: Aye	Sanchez: Aye
Antunez: Aye	Buche: Aye	Claes: Aye	Keller: Aye

*(City of Kerman and International absent)*

8 Aye; 2 Absent. Motion passed.

**Item 4d – Interested Party Invoices Update**

Interested parties invoices were mailed out April 1<sup>st</sup>, with a requested due date of April 30<sup>th</sup>. Those are applied as income in the subsequent budget year, so whatever is received this year will be applied to next year's budget.

So far, payments have been received from Pinedale County Water District, Malaga County Water District, and Self-Help Enterprises. Payments from Pinedale and Malaga are credited back to the City of Fresno and FID, respectively.

**Item 5 – Administrative**

(Update presented by Kassy Chauhan)

**Item 5a – Update on Signing and Spending Authority Policy –  
NKGSA 2021-002**

The new Signing and Spending Authority Policy was approved by the Board of Directors on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, with an effective date of April 23<sup>rd</sup>. It has been posted to the website.

**Item 5b – NKGSA GSP – Call for Projects – Schedule and Update**

The project submittal deadline is May 27<sup>th</sup>. The project workgroup will be evaluating potential projects for inclusion on the project list between May 31<sup>st</sup> and June 4<sup>th</sup>. The Advisory Committee will consider recommended projects at the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Board will consider approval of recommended projects at their June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, at which point projects will be added to the project list in the GSP.

The project workgroup meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 28<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM (virtual).

**Item 6 – Workgroup Updates and Actions**

(Update presented by Kassy Chauhan)

The Member Agency Reporting Policy will hopefully be ready to be considered by the Advisory Committee in June or July. Currently, the groundwater mitigation

responsibilities are being finalized, with a large group discussion scheduled for May 25<sup>th</sup>. It may take more than one meeting to come up with a viable draft policy.

### **Item 7 – Executive Officer Update**

(Update presented by Kassy Chauhan)

#### **Item 7a – Kings Subbasin Annual Report – Water Year 2020**

There is an anticipated decline in water levels (an average of 5.5 feet in the Kings Subbasin), a factor which has been considered in the development of the GSP. This was covered in greater detail during Mr. Samuelian's Basin Coordination Update.

#### **Item 7b – Member Agency Mitigation Responsibility Update**

This item was covered during the Workgroup Update.

#### **Item 7c – Outreach Update**

The school webinar was held on April 20<sup>th</sup>, with about 30 participants. The webinar was well-received and there were several suggestions for follow-up webinars.

The San Joaquin Valley Water Collaborative Action Plan meetings continue. The large group is meeting next week. There has been increasing focus on drought issues.

A Drought Preparedness Coordination and Assistance Program is being put together. The proposal is for the program to be run through the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley. Sarge Green is spearheading the effort, which is still in its initial stages.

#### **Item 7d – External Affairs Update**

A short video series was done with KRCD and various agency representatives to address stakeholder groups and raise awareness about each agency's responsibility in groundwater management and sustainability.

Blog posts and e-news updates are continuing.

The website is being updated and new resources being added. KRCD is heavily involved in the effort. The new website will be available hopefully next month.

**Item 7e – Representative Monitoring Network Update**

This effort has slowed down because most wells are pumping now through (most likely) October. Right now, the focus is on securing well access agreements so that construction information gathering for the remaining wells can resume in the fall.

**Item 7f – Miscellaneous**

Since the approval of the New Well Review Policy, 103 permit applications have been reviewed. The policy has proven to be very helpful in clarifying the context of the new well permits that are being requested and better understanding the work being done.

UC Davis conducted a dry well analysis. They put together a report including their methodology and projected information on the number of dry wells and associated costs for replacing those wells. The analysis is being evaluated.

The Fresno County planning documents are still being reviewed.

NKGSA member agencies will be presenting on their projects beginning in July. They will continue to be scheduled periodically.

**Item 8 – Public Comments**

No public comments were received.

**Item 9 – Advisory Committee Member Comments**

Member Claes inquired as to when in-person meetings for the Advisory Committee might resume. Chairman Redelfs said he was unsure, but it was possible with changing requirements that it could be soon (perhaps in July).

Member Claes also provided a water supply update. Data of the Pine Flat Reservoir runoff from October – April was compared to rank the driest 14 years on record since the late 1800s. (2021 ranked as the 5<sup>th</sup> driest year; 2015 was ranked as the 2<sup>nd</sup> driest.) Out of the driest 14 years on record, 6 have occurred since 2007.

No rain is forecast for May. June water deliveries will happen as usual, but July deliveries are uncertain.

**Item 10 – Adjourned**

Motion by member Claes to adjourn; second by member Allen. Meeting adjourned at 3:11 PM.

**Item 11 – Future Meetings**

The future meeting schedule is as follows:

- a. June 11, 2021