

This meeting has been noticed according to the Brown Act rules. This agenda was posted on October, 13, 2017.



Ordinance No. 152

Oversight Panel

Members:

John Bottomley
Paul Bruno
Jason Campbell
Jody Hanson
George Riley
Susan Schiavone
John Tilley

MPWMD Contacts:

General Manager,
David J. Stoldt

Administrative Services
Manager, Suresh Prasad

Executive Assistant,
Arlene Tavani

AGENDA

**Ordinance No. 152 Oversight Panel
Of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**

Tuesday, October 17, 2017, 2 pm
District Conference Room, 5 Harris Court, Building G, Monterey, CA

Call to Order

Comments from Public -- *The public may comment on any item within the District's jurisdiction. Please limit your comments to three minutes in length.*

Action Items – *Public comment will be received on Action Items. Please limit your comments to three minutes in length.*

1. Consider Adoption of Minutes of June 6, 2017 Committee Meeting
2. Provide Guidance on Preparation of 2017 Annual Report of the Committee

Discussion Items -- *Public comment will be received on Discussion Items. Please limit your comments to three minutes in length.*

3. Review of Revenue and Expenditures of Water Supply Charge Related to Water Supply Activities
4. Discuss Performance of Reinstated District User Fee, To Date, and Timeline for Consideration of Sunset for Water Supply Charge

Other Items -- *Public comment will be received on Other Items. Please limit your comments to three minutes in length.*

5. Water Supply Project Update

Adjourn

Staff reports regarding these agenda items will be available for public review on Thursday, October 12, 2017 at the District office and website. After staff reports have been distributed, if additional documents are produced by the District and provided to the Committee regarding any item on the agenda, they will be made available at 5 Harris Court, Building G, Monterey, CA during normal business hours. In addition, such documents will be posted on the District website at www.mpwmd.net. Documents distributed at the meeting will be made available in the same manner. Upon request, MPWMD will make a reasonable effort to provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable

individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a description by 5 PM on Friday, October 13, 2017. Requests should be sent to the Board Secretary, MPWMD, P.O. Box 85, Monterey, CA, 93942. You may also fax your request to the Administrative Services Division at 831-644-9560, or call 831-658-5600.

U:\staff\Board_Committees\Ord152\2017\20171017\Ord-152-OversightPanel-Oct-17-2017.docx

ORDINANCE NO. 152 OVERSIGHT PANEL

ACTION ITEM

1. CONSIDER ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF JUNE 6, 2017 COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting Date: October 17, 2017

**From: David J. Stoldt
General Manager**

Prepared By: Arlene Tavani

CEQA Compliance: This action does not constitute a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15378

SUMMARY: Draft minutes of the June 6, 2017 committee meeting are attached as **Exhibit 1-A**.

RECOMMENDATION: Review the minutes and adopt them by motion.

EXHIBITS

1-A Draft Minutes of June 6, 2017 Committee Meeting



EXHIBIT 1-A

DRAFT MINUTES
Ordinance No. 152 Oversight Panel of the
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
June 6, 2017

Call to Order The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am in the conference room at the offices of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District.

Committee members present:
John Bottomley (arrived at 9:25 am)
Paul Bruno
Jason Campbell
Christine Monteith
George Riley
Susan Schiavone

MPWMD Staff members present:
David J. Stoldt, General Manager
Suresh Prasad, Administrative Services Manager
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

District Counsel Present:
David Laredo

Committee members absent:
Jody Hanson
John Tilley

Comments from the Public:
No comments were directed to the committee.

Action Items

- 1. Consider Adoption of Minutes of March 15, 2017 Committee Meeting**
On a motion by Campbell and second of Monteith, the minutes were approved on a vote of 5 – 0 by Bruno, Campbell, Monteith, Riley and Schiavone. Bottomley, Hanson and Tilley were absent.

Discussion Items

- 2. Review of Revenue and Expenditures of Water Supply Charge Related to Water Supply Activities**
Stoldt reported that the FY 2017-18 Budget anticipates revenues from both the User Fee and Water Supply Charge. The Water Management District expects that by the end of June 2017, California American Water will remit the first installment of User Fees. A review of the Water Supply Charge database will be conducted in 2018, as an update is necessary to identify properties that have changed use or are exempt from the charge.

Prasad reviewed Exhibits 2-A Water Supply Charge Receipts, and 2-B Water Supply Charge Availability Analysis. Prasad noted that Exhibit 2-B was updated through March 31, 2017, and that the \$932,358 deficit will be balanced by the end of the fiscal

year when all revenues are realized. Also \$1.7 million not spent on projects in 2016-2017 will be carried forward for use in 2017-2018.

3. Review Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Water Supply Charge Budget

Prasad reviewed Exhibit 3-A, Water Supply Charge Proposed Budget. Stoldt explained that the Indirect Supplies & Services includes the cost for a federal lobbyist to assist with obtaining federal funds for the Pure Water Monterey project. He stated that the Water Management District's costs for PWM will be significantly reduced in FY 2017-2018 due to the issuance of a State Revolving Fund Loan that will cover costs incurred after March 9, 2017. However, it has not been determined what percentage of the pre-construction costs will be covered from the loan.

At the suggestion of committee members, Prasad agreed to footnote the budget to describe the plan for expenditure of unutilized funds, for example, the General Fund Balance of \$238,500. Prasad stated that it appears as a surplus, but would be used to cover the negative fund balance from Fiscal Year 2016-2017.

Other Items

3. Water Supply Project Update

In response to a question from the committee, Stoldt reported on potential challenges to the desalination project proposed by California American Water. Comments submitted on the draft EIR on the project indicate that lawsuits based on water rights or CEQA issues could be filed by Marina Coast Water District or the City of Marina. District Counsel Laredo stated that a CEQA challenge would be directed to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) which, by law, must send the issue to the California Supreme Court. The Supreme Court could remand the issue to an appellate court, or appoint a special master. Any challenge to water rights for the project would be considered by the Superior Court.

Stoldt stated that one solution to concerns about competing water rights would be to utilize an open water intake, such as the purchase of product or raw water from DeepWater Desal or purchase of additional recycled water from PWM. However, if the project changed direction, the result would be multi-year delays and fines to the ratepayers because milestones established in SWRCB Order 2016-0016 would not be achieved.

Stoldt described the studies funded by the District and California American Water that will form the basis for decisions on the future of Los Padres Dam. The question to be answered is would the Carmel River environment benefit from removal of the Los Padres Dam, or would it be more beneficial to maintain a regulated river by means of improvements to Los Padres Dam or other options. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) had originally recommended that the dam be removed, because it was a barrier to fish passage. Eventually, after the Water Management District expressed concern about that determination to federal agency authorities, the NMFS recommended that a study be conducted on removal of the dam.

The District believes that a regulated river utilizing Los Padres Dam would be beneficial, considering that non-Cal-Am water rights holders will continue to take water

from the river after Cal-Am withdrawals cease. A regulated river could protect seasonal flows for protected species, and maintain the water supply for water rights holders. If the dam were to be removed, a replacement source of 2,800 acre-feet, must be developed. If the dam were to be raised, a portion of Cal-Am's right that that was lost to siltation would be restored. Or, with the addition of a rubber dam storage could be increased by 1,000 AF. If only 2,500 acre-feet of replacement storage were needed, additional water from aquifer storage and recovery or other sources might be developed. There is always a possibility that a future regulatory action could be taken by the SWRCB that would reduce the water rights of Cal-Am and the Water Management District.

Paul Sciuto, General Manager of Monterey One Water presented an update on the Pure Water Monterey project. His presentation can be viewed on the Water Management District website, or at the agency office. Sciuto made the following comments in response to questions about the product water quality. He stated that nano filtration will not be employed due to the high cost. Of the four raw-water sources sent to the water filtration plant, agricultural drainage water represents 12 to 14 percent of the total. No DDT was detected in the source waters. Studies of soil samples in California have indicated the presence of DDT, but it is a hydrophobic compound that does not adhere to water molecules. Through membrane treatment, 99.98% of constituents the State requires must be tested for, are removed. No DDT or DDE was detected in the treated water. Following membrane treatment the water undergoes further disinfection before it is injected underground and subsequently extracted for distribution in the California American system. The injected water is monitored regularly. If any harmful constituents are detected, the water would be pumped out, treated and then injected back underground. The sludge that remains after water treatment is used for average daily coverage at the landfill, which is lined. On average, 5 – 10 truckloads of sludge are delivered to the landfill each day.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 am.

ITEM: ACTION ITEM

2. PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON PREPARATION OF 2017 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: October 17, 2017 **Budgeted:** N/A
From: David J. Stoldt **Program/
General Manager** **Line Item No.:** N/A
Prepared By: David J. Stoldt **Cost Estimate:**

General Counsel Approval: N/A

Committee Recommendation: N/A

CEQA Compliance: This action does not constitute a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15378.

SUMMARY: The Panel has the opportunity to make recommendations or provide guidance to the District Board. **Exhibit 2-A** shows the 2016 Annual Report and **Exhibit 2-B** shows the 2016 Annual Report. In 2015, the Panel did not choose to file an Annual Report, and the Panel has the option to do so again. Recommendations provided in the Annual Report are non-binding on the Board.

RECOMMENDATION: The Panel should determine (a) if it wishes to submit an annual report for 2017, (b) reach consensus recommendations and/or guidance, and (c) develop a plan for drafting and approval of the report.

EXHIBITS

2-A Example: 2016 Annual Report

2-B Example: 2014 Annual Report

EXHIBIT 2-A

Ordinance 152 Citizens' Oversight Panel

2016 Annual Report

2015-16 Topics of Discussion

The following areas of discussion represent four key topics the Panel has identified of particular interest or concern during the current year.

1. **Reinstatement of District User Fee:** District Ordinance No. 152 which established the Water Supply Charge states in its Section 10.C(b) that the District shall not collect a Water Supply Charge “to the extent alternative funds are available via a charge collected on the California American Water Company bill.” On January 25, 2016 the California Supreme Court filed its opinion in the suit the District brought against the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or PUC), determining “PUC Decision No. 11-03-035 (rejecting Cal-Am’s application for authorization to collect the District’s user fee, and also rejecting the settlement agreement entered into by Cal-Am, the District, and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates [now ORA]) and PUC Decision No. 13-01-040 (denying the District’s application for rehearing) are set aside. The matter is remanded to the PUC for further proceedings consistent with the views expressed herein.” The District, Cal-Am, and ORA filed a Joint Motion to reinstate the User Fee last week.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Board to examine its needs and availability of its two primary funding sources and develop a plan for their use, including reductions or possible sunsets of either or both.

The General Manager and Chief Financial Officer thoroughly examined the issue and in April the Board adopted the following recommended strategy:

Collect both charges for at least 3 years. This would be done for 4 key reasons: (i) the User Fee would primarily fund programs already in Cal-Am surcharges (District conservation and river mitigation), so there is little “new” revenue; (ii) the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association lawsuit over the Water Supply Charge remains unresolved, hence that revenue remains at risk; (iii) there are still large near-term expenditures required on water supply projects; and (iv) Cal-Am has a recent history of significant revenue undercollection, so the viability of the User Fee is at risk until the CPUC rules on a more stable rate design, and the predictability of the User Fee revenue is better known. After that time, begin to sunset or reduce collections of either or both, if possible.

Have only a single MPWMD User Fee Surcharge on Cal-Am bill, instead of a mitigation surcharge, a conservation surcharge, and the User Fee. Remove the existing Conservation Surcharge and Mitigation Program expenses from the Cal-Am rates as soon as practicable. Capture in MPWMD User Fee budget. Cal-Am to remain responsible for its rebate budget until the User Fee has capacity.

Remove the same programs from the next GRC period (2018-2020).

Calculate solely on “Total Water Service Related Charges” line on bill, plus any prior-year uncollected water service related surcharges, ensuring that the User Fee is based solely on Cal-Am water and meter revenues.

The Citizens Oversight Panel cautiously supports this plan. The panel believes progress is being made on a permanent water supply solution for which large scale expenditure of District funds are being made. A 3-year “wait-and-see” period makes sense. However, the Panel expects the District to maintain fiscal discipline and keep its financial “house in order.”

The Panel believes that during this period the District should (a) develop a meaningful plan to sunset the Water Supply Charge, in whole or in part, and (b) develop a plan to retire the Rabobank loan that was initiated to pay for the Aquifer Storage and Recovery water supply project in a timely fashion after the District’s User Fee was suspended by the CPUC.

2. **15% Overhead Calculation:** The District presently allocates “indirect labor, supplies, and services” to the calculation of overhead. However, the District continues to include certain labor costs of the General Manager, division managers, and other staff as direct costs of “water supply.” Some members of the Panel believe that some costs identified by the District as direct costs should not be included as overhead. District staff disagrees. The Panel will continue to examine levels of associated overhead.
3. **Deficit Spending:** The Pure Water Monterey groundwater replenishment (GWR) project budget continues to cause the District to incur borrowing from its credit line or use of reserves. It is expected that the practice will continue in the 2016-17 budget for GWR. Such near-term borrowing to meet current pay-as-you-go capital costs is expected by the District to be repaid from future Water Supply Charge collections and, ultimately a reimbursement from State Revolving Fund loan proceeds. The Panel is very concerned that obligating future collections does not result in a balanced budget and results in future claims on the Water Supply Charge which impairs the ability of the District to “sunset” the charge in a timely fashion.
4. **Local Projects:** The Panel continues to support the use of a portion of the Water Supply Charge for Local Projects, such as the Pacific Grove non-potable water source and the Airport well repurposing. As such, the Panel recommends appropriation of a similar sum of money from the Water Supply Charge from future budgets. A summary of such projects to-date is attached.

Local Water Project Funding To-Date

Project	Status
Pacific Grove \$200,000	First \$100,000 spent; Anticipate construction start this fall; Will save 88 AFY
Old Del Monte Golf Course \$80,000	Two wells completed; Awaiting CEQA review of pond; Expect pond construction by February; Will save 40-50 AFY
Monterey Regional Airport \$30,000	Completed study; Identified 104 AFY of non-potable supply; Will attempt to find users in FY 2016-17
City of Monterey \$85,000	Storm water capture study; No expenditures to date; Trying to obtain state grant moneys
City of Seaside \$106,900	Laguna Grande non-potable well; No expenditures to date
Monterey County Fairgrounds \$75,000	Replumb bathrooms to well water; No expenditures to date; Almost 50% reduction in water due to retrofits; Suggest canceling grant

Primary Panel Function

The Ordinance 152 Citizen's Oversight Panel (the "Panel") is a committee formed for the sole purpose of providing a forum for public involvement in the budgeting and expenditure of the District's annual Water Supply Charge. The Panel is directed to meet quarterly and review proposed expenditure of funds for the water supply activities of the District. The Board does not seek consensus from the Panel, but rather input on the ongoing budgeting and expenditure of revenues raised by the water supply charge on water supply related activities. The Panel will submit an annual report for consideration by the Board of Directors. This document serves as that annual report. In the Panel's by-laws, the report is to be submitted at the September Board meeting, however, the initial panel was not constituted until December 2012, meeting for the first time in early 2013. Hence, the first year of the Panel's activities just closed.

Also under its by-laws, the Panel is expected to visit District facilities – to be scheduled by the District – to become better acquainted with water supply projects and operations. During the past year, the Panel visited the Aquifer Storage and Recovery site and heard a presentation on the Pure Water Monterey Groundwater Replenishment project.

The Panel will also, from time to time, be requested to provide community input with respect to water supply-related activities. One key area during the past year was the Panel's encouragement of the creation of funding for Local Water Project, as discussed more within this report.

Pursuant to the Ordinance, proceeds of the water supply charge may only be used to fund District water supply activities, including capital acquisition and operational costs for Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), Groundwater Replenishment (GWR), and desalination purposes, as well as studies related to project(s) necessary to ensure sufficient water is available for present beneficial water use in the main CAW system. In addition to direct costs of the projects, proceeds of this annual water supply charge may also be expended to ensure sufficient water is available for present beneficial use or uses, including water supply management, water demand management, water augmentation program expenses such as planning for, acquiring and/or reserving augmented water supply capacity, including engineering, hydrologic, legal, geologic, financial, and property acquisition, and for reserves to meet the cash-flow needs of the District and to otherwise provide for the cost to provide services for which the charge is imposed. No more than fifteen (15%) of proceeds collected by reason of Ordinance No. 152 shall be used to fund general unallocated administrative overhead.

Panel Composition

The Panel meets the definition of a "legislative body" as defined by the Brown Act; therefore, all meetings shall be noticed and open to the public in compliance with the Brown Act.

The Panel is comprised of 9 members who shall reside within the boundaries of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. Members of the Panel shall serve at the pleasure of the District Board.

The Board shall appoint one member from a panel of three persons nominated by the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association, and the Board shall appoint one member from a panel of three persons nominated by the Monterey County Association of Realtors, and each Director shall appoint 1 member to the Panel. Appointees must reside within the District boundaries and may be associated with a community group, but does not have to officially represent any community group.

- a) Each appointee shall serve a term of two years, with terms expiring on January 1, or on the date the appointing Director vacates office as a member of the MPWMD Board of Directors, whichever shall occur first.
- b) A quorum of five (5) Panel members shall be required for an official meeting to be conducted. Action may be taken by majority vote of those Panel members present.
- c) The General Manager will serve as Chair to the Panel, for purposes of facilitating meetings. District staff will provide support to the committee as appropriate.

EXHIBIT 2-B

Ordinance 152 Citizen's Oversight Panel

2014 Annual Report

2013-14 Topics of Discussion

The following areas of discussion represent five key topics the Panel has identified of particular interest or concern.

1. **15% Overhead Calculation:** The District presently allocates “indirect labor, supplies, and services” to the calculation of overhead. However, the District continues to include certain labor costs of the General Manager, division managers, and other staff as direct costs of “water supply.” Some members of the Panel believe that several costs identified by the District as direct costs should be included as overhead. District staff disagrees.
2. **Deficit Spending:** Given the mid-year budget adjustment to the Pure Water Monterey groundwater replenishment (GWR) project budget, the District did not identify a current source of funds for all costs and will, in fact, incur borrowing from the credit line or use of reserves to meet some GWR costs. It is expected that the practice will continue in the 2014-15 budget for GWR. Such near-term borrowing to meet current pay-as-you-go capital costs is expected by the District to be repaid from future Water Supply Charge collections. The Panel is very concerned that obligating future collections does not result in a balanced budget and results in future claims on the Water Supply Charge which impairs the ability of the District to “sunset” the charge in a timely fashion.
3. **GWR Overhead:** The Panel does not necessarily agree that MRWPCA internal staff costs should be charged to the GWR project and would like additional information about overhead charged to the project.
4. **Measure O Initiative:** District staff has indicated that it believes that Ordinance 152 would allow the Water Supply Charge to be utilized for the proposed feasibility study should Measure O be passed by the voters on June 3rd. To the contrary, at its January 2014 meeting the Panel unanimously agreed that use of the Charge for such purposes is inappropriate and strongly urges the District Board to avoid designating the Water Supply Charge for such purposes.
5. **Local Projects:** The Panel continues to support the use of a portion of the Water Supply Charge for Local Projects, such as the Pacific Grove non-potable water source and the Airport well repurposing. As such, the Panel recommends appropriation of a similar sum of money from the Water Supply Charge for the FY 2014-15 budget.

Primary Panel Function

The Ordinance 152 Citizen's Oversight Panel (the "Panel") is a committee formed for the sole purpose of providing a forum for public involvement in the budgeting and expenditure of the District's annual Water Supply Charge. The Panel is directed to meet quarterly and review proposed expenditure of funds for the water supply activities of the District. The Board does not seek consensus from the Panel, but rather input on the ongoing budgeting and expenditure of revenues raised by the water supply charge on water supply related activities. The Panel will submit an annual report for consideration by the Board of Directors. This document serves as that annual report. In the Panel's by-laws, the report is to be submitted at the September Board meeting, however, the initial panel was not constituted until December 2012, meeting for the first time in early 2013. Hence, the first year of the Panel's activities just closed.

Also under its by-laws, the Panel is expected to visit District facilities – to be scheduled by the District – to become better acquainted with water supply projects and operations. During the past year, the Panel visited the Aquifer Storage and Recovery site and heard a presentation on the Pure Water Monterey Groundwater Replenishment project.

The Panel will also, from time to time, be requested to provide community input with respect to water supply-related activities. One key area during the past year was the Panel's encouragement of the creation of funding for Local Water Project, as discussed more within this report.

Pursuant to the Ordinance, proceeds of the water supply charge may only be used to fund District water supply activities, including capital acquisition and operational costs for Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), Groundwater Replenishment (GWR), and desalination purposes, as well as studies related to project(s) necessary to ensure sufficient water is available for present beneficial water use in the main CAW system. In addition to direct costs of the projects, proceeds of this annual water supply charge may also be expended to ensure sufficient water is available for present beneficial use or uses, including water supply management, water demand management, water augmentation program expenses such as planning for, acquiring and/or reserving augmented water supply capacity, including engineering, hydrologic, legal, geologic, financial, and property acquisition, and for reserves to meet the cash-flow needs of the District and to otherwise provide for the cost to provide services for which the charge is imposed. No more than fifteen (15%) of proceeds collected by reason of Ordinance No. 152 shall be used to fund general unallocated administrative overhead.

Panel Composition

The Panel meets the definition of a "legislative body" as defined by the Brown Act; therefore, all meetings shall be noticed and open to the public in compliance with the Brown Act.

The Panel is comprised of 9 members who shall reside within the boundaries of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. Members of the Panel shall serve at the pleasure of the District Board.

The Board shall appoint one member from a panel of three persons nominated by the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association, and the Board shall appoint one member from a panel of three persons nominated by the Monterey County Association of Realtors, and each Director shall appoint 1 member to the Panel. Appointees must reside within the District boundaries and may be associated with a community group, but does not have to officially represent any community group.

- a) Each appointee shall serve a term of two years, with terms expiring on January 1, or on the date the appointing Director vacates office as a member of the MPWMD Board of Directors, whichever shall occur first.
- b) A quorum of five (5) Panel members shall be required for an official meeting to be conducted. Action may be taken by majority vote of those Panel members present.
- c) The General Manager will serve as Chair to the Panel, for purposes of facilitating meetings. District staff will provide support to the committee as appropriate.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

Water Supply Charge Availability Analysis

	FY 2012-2013 Revised Budget	FY 2012-2013 Audited Actuals	FY 2013-2014 Revised Budget	FY 2013-2014 Expected Actuals	FY 2014-2015 Prelim. Budget	FY 2015-2016 Prelim. Budget
Water Supply Charge	\$3,300,000	\$3,400,873	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000
Carry-Forward Prior Year Water Supply Charge	0	0	1,413,218	1,812,885	789,939	(624,331)
Loan Proceeds for ASR	0	0	1,496,101	1,496,101	0	0
Capacity Fee	175,000	115,972	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
Project Reimbursement	3,736,300	2,001,556	2,326,762	2,326,762	360,450	-
Watermaster-Reimbursement	91,000	69,710	94,000	94,000	69,000	70,000
Property Taxes	115,800	162,318	317,848	317,848	507,030	300,000
Interest	1,000	4,068	3,000	3,000	4,500	5,000
Other	4,300	8,025	-	-	-	-
Capital Equipment Reserve Fund	-	-	-	-	41,800	-
Total Revenues	\$7,423,400	\$5,762,522	\$9,225,929	\$9,625,596	\$5,347,719	\$3,325,669
Direct Personnel	738,361	784,190	764,549	764,549	907,536	930,224
Legal	130,000	302,954	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
Project Expenditures [see below]	2,219,050	785,943	5,734,179	4,905,846	3,716,650	1,610,000
Project Expenditures-Reimbursements [see below]	3,756,300	1,508,253	2,235,762	2,235,762	398,450	-
Fixed Asset Purchases	20,500	15,944	34,300	34,300	78,150	50,000
Contingencies	10,250	-	10,250	10,250	10,250	10,250
Debt Service	145,600	80,169	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
Election Expense	-	-	52,500	52,500	-	100,000
Indirect Labor*	242,339	281,816	205,051	205,051	200,314	205,322
Indirect Supplies & Services*	161,000	190,368	167,399	167,399	200,700	205,718
Total Expenditures	\$7,423,400	\$3,949,637	\$9,663,990	\$8,835,657	\$5,972,050	\$3,571,514
Net Revenue Over Expenses**	\$0	\$1,812,885	(\$438,061)	\$789,939	(\$624,331)	(\$245,845)

<u>Project Expenditures</u>	FY 2012-2013 Revised Budget	FY 2012-2013 Audited Actuals	FY 2013-2014 Revised Budget	FY 2013-2014 Expected Actuals	FY 2014-2015 Prelim. Budget	FY 2015-2016 Prelim. Budget
Groundwater Replenishment Project	\$736,600	\$475,751	\$3,656,351	\$3,466,351	\$1,613,000	\$250,000
ASR Phase I	\$898,700	\$169,817	\$1,168,478	\$461,045	\$894,150	\$0
Reimbursement Projects	\$3,756,300	\$1,508,253	\$2,235,762	\$2,235,762	\$398,450	\$0
Cal-Am Desalination Application	\$0	\$96,037	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$115,000	\$160,000
Peninsula Water Supply Projects Operations Studies	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASR Expansion	\$150,000	\$0	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$105,000	\$750,000
Other Water Supply Projects - IFIM/GSFlow	\$250,000	\$2,898	\$275,000	\$275,000	\$225,000	\$150,000
Local Water Projects	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
Alternate Desal Project	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$100,000
Other Project Expenditures	\$33,750	\$41,440	\$89,350	\$108,450	\$164,500	\$0
Total Commitments	\$5,975,350	\$2,294,196	\$7,969,941	\$7,141,608	\$4,115,100	\$1,610,000

*: Indirect costs as percent of Water Supply Charge 12.2% 13.9% 11.0% 11.0% 11.8% 12.1%

Recent Activities:

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Deep Water Desal cost sharing agreement approved	August 19, 2013	\$ 800,000
Cal-Am Desal Project Public Funds Financial Consultant (Total cost \$250,000; Phase I cost \$90,000)	September 16, 2013	90,000
GWR bond counsel services	September 16, 2013	90,000
GWR accounting services for debt equivalence	September 16, 2013	10,000
GWR Consultant to assess externalities	September 16, 2013	80,000
GWR evaluation of reclamation ditch (Schaaf & Wheeler)	October 21, 2013	40,000

** Deficit balances are paid from combination of loan, interfund borrowing, or line of credit proceeds

ORDINANCE NO. 152 OVERSIGHT PANEL

DISCUSSION ITEM

4. DISCUSS PERFORMANCE OF REINSTATED DISTRICT USER FEE, TO DATE, AND TIMELINE FOR CONSIDERATION OF SUNSET FOR WATER SUPPLY CHARGE

Meeting Date: October 17, 2017

From: David J. Stoldt
General Manager

Prepared By: Suresh Prasad

CEQA Compliance: This action does not constitute a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15378

SUMMARY: Attached as **Exhibit 4-A** is a chart titled MPWMD User Fee Revenue Collections that is presented for discussion.

EXHIBITS

4-A MPWMD User Fee Revenue Collections

EXHIBIT 4-A

