**ITEM 9C - AGENCY FUNDING**

**RECOMMENDED PROCESS**

1. Decide on funding mechanisms or combination of funding mechanisms for further evaluation.

2. Staff and counsel to develop implementation options/details for further consideration.

3. Select and adopt funding mechanism.
1. Revenue that balances with projected expenses (no guarantee of grants)

2. Revenue that is reasonably predictable and reasonably steady

3. Avoid large fluctuations in rates
ITEM 9C - AGENCY FUNDING
BASIC FUNDING OPTIONS

1. Member Agency Contributions
2. Groundwater Extraction Fees
3. Parcel-Based Charge
   a. Three forms: parcel fee, tax, or assessment
4. Combination of the above options
   a. Note: implementation of multiple fee mechanisms will increase costs).
## ITEM 9C - AGENCY FUNDING
### BASIC FUNDING OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Mechanism</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Agency Contributions</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>May require agreements between GSA and member agencies. Invoicing and A/R costs significantly lower than other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW Extraction Fee</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Unpredictable revenue if based on metered extractions each year. Moderate invoicing and A/R costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Based Charge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Coordination for collection through County. May take longer to receive revenue. Some sub-options require a vote. May be more difficult to defend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combinations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Difficulty and cost depends on the specific combination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Staff Report Attachment A for additional considerations
ITEM 10B – DEGRADED WQ SMC
WHY RECONSIDER?

1. Board concerns about criteria for determining undesirable results

2. Further review of other GSPs

3. Review of additional surface water quality data
ITEM 10B – DEGRADED WQ SMC
SMC IN DRAFT GSP

1. MTs & MOs for TDS, chloride, sulfate, boron and nitrate.

2. Undesirable results if 2/3 of wells exceed MTs

3. Goal met if at least 1/3 of wells meet MO
1. Causation remains a concern – GSA is only responsible for WQ degradation caused by GW pumping or GSP projects/management actions.

   a. Review of additional surface water flow and water quality data provides better evidence that changes in concentrations are driven by surface water flow conditions not pumping

      i. Common ions controlled by VR water quality, esp. chloride and boron

      ii. Nitrate increases in some wells when VR flows are low – less dilution in aquifer
2. MTs & MOs are applied at wells
   a. Although other GSAs have identified MTs and MOs at specific wells, this approach is may not be consistent with GSP regulations. (Regs. call for isocontour, volume of water impacted, or number of wells impacted)
1. No SMC for naturally occurring constituents (i.e. delete SMC for TDS, chloride, sulfate, and boron).
2. Modify SMC for nitrate:
   a. Mira Monte / Meiners Oaks (MMMO) Area – no SMC – this is already impacted
   b. Goal – prevent pumping or GSP projects/mgmt. actions from causing spreading of nitrate to other areas.
   c. Nitrate MT remains 10 mg/L but change from applying at wells to an isocontour.
   d. Undesirable results: Any isocontour >10 mg/L outside of MMMO area with active domestic wells that lacks alternative drinking water source
   e. MO - no change in values, but use isocontours instead;
2. Modify SMC for nitrate (continued)
   
f. If MT or MO is exceeded, UVRGA will investigate to determine if caused by pumping of GSP project/mgmt. action.