AGENDA

Each item on the agenda, no matter how described, shall be deemed to include any appropriate motion, whether to adopt a minute motion, resolution, payment of any bill, approval of any matter or action, or any other action. Items listed as “For Information” or “For Discussion” may also be the subject of an “action” taken by the Board or a Committee at the same meeting.

1. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

2. PUBLIC COMMENT
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3.

3. CLOSED SESSION 12:00-1:00 P.M.

OPEN SESSION MEETING 1:00 P.M.

4. CLOSED SESSION REPORT

5. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

6. INVOCATION

7. PUBLIC COMMENT
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3.

8. ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO THE AGENDA
   Determine the need to add items to the agenda. In order for the Board to add an item to the agenda it must make a determination that: (i) The item came to the attention of the Board after the posting of the agenda; (ii) That there is a need for immediate action to be taken by the Board. If these two tests are met, the Board may add the item in question to the agenda for consideration consistent with the provisions of the Brown Act.

9. GROUNDWATER RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT FACILITY (GRIP AWTF) DESIGN-BUILD ENTITY (DBE) SELECTION AND AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS
   **CIP Committee Recommendation:** The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.
10. ASSET MANAGEMENT PHASE I PILOT- COMPUTERIZED MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMMS) SOFTWARE SELECTION
   
   **CIP Committee Recommendation:** The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.

11. LEO J. VANDER LANS EMERGENCY WATER LEAK UPDATE
   
   **Staff Recommendation:** For information.

12. CALIFORNIA CONTRACT CITIES SPRING CONFERENCE
   
   **External Affairs Committee Recommendation:** The External Affairs Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.

13. RECEIVE AND FILE 2016 COST OF SERVICE REPORT
   
   **CIP Committee Recommendation:** The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.

14. FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 DRAFT BUDGET
   
   **Finance/Audit Committee Recommendation:** For discussion and possible action.

15. BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC) REPORT
   
   **Budget Advisory Committee Recommendation:** Receive the BAC recommendation to approve the fiscal year 2016-17 budget presented at the March 22, 2016 BAC meeting, reflecting a 6.7% increase to the replenishment assessment for fiscal year 2016-17 to $302 per acre-foot.

16. CONVENE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT
   
   **Staff Recommendation:** For discussion and possible action.

17. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

18. AB1234 COMPLIANCE REPORTS AND DIRECTORS' REPORTS

19. DISTRICT COUNSEL'S REPORT

20. ADJOURNMENT

The Board will adjourn to the next meeting currently scheduled on April 21, 2016 at 12:00 p.m.

Agenda posted by Scott M. Ota, Chief Financial Officer, April 4, 2016. In compliance with ADA requirements, this document can be made available in alternative formats upon request.

**In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if special assistance is needed to participate in the Board meeting, please contact the Chief Financial Officer at (562) 921-5521 for assistance to enable the District to make reasonable accommodations.**

All public records relating to an agenda item on this agenda are available for public inspection at the time the record is distributed to all, or a majority of all, members of the Board. Such records shall be available at the District office located at 4040 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712.

Agendas and minutes are available at the District’s website.

**EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES** – If you challenge a District action in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Chief Financial Officer at, or prior to, the public hearing. Any written correspondence delivered to the Chief Financial Officer before the District’s final action on a matter will become a part of the administrative record.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: GROUNDWATER RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT FACILITY (GRIP AWTF) DESIGN-BUILD ENTITY (DBE) SELECTION AND AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

SUMMARY
On July 2, 2015, the Board approved the release of the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) to gauge industry interest from experienced DBE’s, and on July 16, 2015 the Board adopted Resolution No. 15-1016 authorizing the use of Design-Build as the preferred project delivery method, and the release of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for procurement of the DBE for the GRIP AWTF.

On July 7, 2015, the REOI was posted on the District's website and GRIP AWTF project portal with a total of eight (8) firms submitting a Letter of Interest on July 29, 2015. Because participation in the REOI round was not mandatory, on August 10, the RFQ was released to all respondents to the REOI as well as posted on the District’s website and GRIP AWTF project portal.

On September 9, 2015, Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) were received from the following eight (8) DBEs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Additional Subs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>United Water</td>
<td>SVA Architects Separation Processes, Inc. Neal Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td>Overaa CMS Collaborative TLF Consulting, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>Newport Beach, CA</td>
<td>Arcadis</td>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>Veolia</td>
<td>Hazen &amp; Sawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F.Shea</td>
<td>Walnut, CA</td>
<td>TetraTech</td>
<td>J.F. Shea</td>
<td>PERC Water</td>
<td>Gillis+Panichapan Architects Prousys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each submitted SOQ provided specific information which was required by the RFQ. This information included the following selection criteria areas:

- Project Understanding,
- Approach and Key Issues,
- Project Team Organization,
- Project Experience and References,
- Financial Information and Litigation History,
- Insurance Coverage, and
- Safety Record.

To review and evaluate the SOQs, a Procurement Advisory Team (PAT) was assembled, consisting of the following five (5) individuals:

1. Jim McDavid, Project Manager (Water Replenishment District)
2. Phuong Ly, Engineer (Water Replenishment District)
3. Paul Hermann, Project Manager (Owner's Engineer/Agent)
4. Ken Hume, Procurement Lead (Owner's Engineer/Agent)
5. Shivaji Deshmukh, Assistant General Manager (West Basin Municipal Water District)
6. Jamal Awad, Deputy Project Manager (Owner's Engineer/Agent)

The PAT followed a pre-established evaluation process in accordance with both State enabling legislation for using a design build procurement process, and the formal resolution passed by the Board on July 16, 2015. The evaluation process was further prescribed in the Evaluation Handbook (included as an appendix in the RFQ) which identified roles and responsibilities for PAT members, scoring guidelines to ensure consistent scoring, description of procedures, and methodology and standard forms for scoring.
In addition to the analysis of the Statement of Qualifications submitted by each of the applicants, an interview was conducted with each team, the results of which were included as part of the overall evaluation scoring. The results of the evaluation process were presented to the Joint Ad Hoc GRIP and Water Resources Committees on October 7, 2015. The Board of Director’s approved the selection of the three (3) short-listed firms DBEs, and on November 6, 2015, the Request for Proposals (RPF) was issued.

McCarthy Building Companies formally withdrew (decided to drop out of consideration and not submit a Preliminary Proposal) from the DBE selection process shortly after the RFP was released. On January 11, 2016, Preliminary Proposals were received from the following two (2) DBEs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Additional Subs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.F. Shea</td>
<td>Walnut, CA</td>
<td>TetraTech</td>
<td>J.F. Shea</td>
<td>PERC Water</td>
<td>Gillis+Panichapan Architects Separation Processes, Inc. ProUsys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Carollo</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Sacyr</td>
<td>H2O Innovation Main Street Architects Mia Lehrer + Associates Michael Baker International ADS Engineering Neal Electric Katz &amp; Associates In Balance Green Consulting Leighton Enterprise Protection Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each DBE submitted Preliminary Proposals with specific information required by the RFP. This information included the following selection criteria areas:

- Transmittal Letter and Team Qualifications,
- Project Approach,
- Technical Approach,
- Construction Process,
- Transitional Operation and Training, and
- Indicative Capital and Operational Cost Estimate.

Individual meetings with the respondents were held on February 9-10, and 23-24, 2016 to discuss technical comments to the Preliminary Proposal. Additionally, individual meetings with each respondent were held on January 19 and February 1 to discuss comments to the draft contract.

On March 7, 2016, each DBE submitted the Final Proposal. The aforementioned five (5) PAT members were joined by Jamal Awad (Owner’s Engineer/ Agent) to review and evaluate the Final Proposals.
The PAT followed a pre-established evaluation process to conduct the Final Proposal reviews and final scoring. The evaluation process was prescribed in Volume I of the RFP Section 5 Final Proposal Requirements which identified roles and responsibilities for PAT members, scoring guidelines to ensure consistent scoring, description of procedures, and methodology.

In addition to the analysis of the Final Proposal submitted by each of the applicants, an interview was conducted with each team on March 24, 2016; the results of which were included as part of the overall evaluation scoring completed on March 29, 2016.

The results of the evaluation process were presented to the CIP Committee on April 4, 2016.

**FISCAL IMPACT**
To be determined.

**CIP COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**
The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: ASSET MANAGEMENT PHASE I PILOT- COMPUTERIZED MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMMS) SOFTWARE SELECTION

BACKGROUND
On April 20, 2015, the District’s Board approved the development of an Asset Management Master Plan (AM) and Phase 1 Pilot project, which includes the selection of a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS). A CMMS is a core system critical to effective planning, service delivery, performance monitoring and decision making with respect to assets. It allows all stakeholders to have up-to-date, complete, consistent, and readily accessible information for decision-making. The CMMS is intended to be piloted at the Leo J. Vander Lans Advanced Water Treatment Facility. Staff initiated a streamlined process to select a pilot CMMS software.

In January 2015 four software submittals were provided in response to a Request for Information (RFI) for CMMS selection. All four submittals were asked to provide a three-hour demonstration of their software to the CMMS Selection Committee, which included WRD staff from various departments. Key considerations during the CMMS demonstrations included the ability to support a robust Geographic Information System (GIS), integration with a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) and other systems like OnBase document management and Abila MIP finance system.

Based on the four software products submitted through the RFI process and demonstrated to WRD staff, Cityworks provides the best match for WRD’s work and asset management requirements. Cityworks also complements WRD’s initiative to centralize an asset repository and share the data to other systems. In addition, Cityworks provides web-based and mobile platforms that can be accessed with laptop computers, tablets, and smartphones (IOS and Android).

Following the completion of the pilot, the CMMS is expected to be expanded to the Robert W. Goldswothy Desalter, maintenance tracking for groundwater monitoring wells, water production wells, and upon completion, the GRIP advanced water treatment facility.

FISCAL IMPACT
None at this time.

CIP COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM
ITEM NO. 11

DATE: APRIL 7, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: LEO J. VANDER LANS EMERGENCY WATER LEAK UPDATE

On March 17, 2016, the Board of Directors adopted Resolution 16-1028 to make a finding that an emergency exists for a water leak incident at the Leo J. Vander Lans Water Treatment Facility. In accordance with California Public Contract Code Section 22050(b), the Chief Engineer of WRD was granted the authority to order any action necessary and required by the emergency including the procurement of the necessary equipment, services, and supplies for those purposes necessitated by the emergency without giving notice for bids to let contracts.

Since then the Chief Engineer has entered into an agreement with Mike Prlich & Sons, Inc. to perform field investigation and repairs for the water leak. After an extensive field excavation, a leak was found through the cracks of a pipe joint from the reverse osmosis flushing piping. The leak was repaired on April 2, 2016. The Vander Lans Facility is expected to resume continuous operations on April 4th while the contractor continues to backfill the open trenches and finish restoring the site. Staff will present a verbal report to the Board during the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT
The contractor is preparing a cost estimate for the leak investigation and repairs. Cost information will be reported to the Board during the meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
For information.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: CALIFORNIA CONTRACT CITIES SPRING CONFERENCE

BACKGROUND

The California Contract Cities Association (CCCA) is a collection of member 70 cities united to address shared policy issues. Among the cities in WRD’s service area, 35 are members of CCCA. The Association offers WRD the unique opportunity to address multiple cities through a single forum. Consequently, WRD has been a member of the CCCA and joined to support many conferences and events.

The CCCA Spring Municipal Seminar provides a new opportunity to educate and update our regional leaders about relevant and critical water issues facing local governments, specifically the status of the Groundwater Reliability Improvement Project located in Pico Rivera. The Spring Seminar provides the chance to focus on key issues, drill down, and work toward public policy positions that best serves the Association’s stated goals and objectives. This year, the CCCA will focus on “The Power of Cities” and has invited WRD to be host and give a presentation at the Outgoing President’s Reception, a gathering of local leaders. As the reception sponsor, WRD will have the opportunity to discuss key water issues/solutions impacting local cities and have the special opportunity to profile WIN and GRIP.

As part of this involvement, WRD has been invited to participate as a sponsor for the Outgoing President’s Reception.

FISCAL IMPACT

CCCA Fall Conference Sponsorship: Not to exceed $3,500. This is not a budgeted item.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The External Affairs Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM

ITEM NO. 13

DATE: APRIL 7, 2016

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: RECEIVE AND FILE THE 2016 COST OF SERVICE REPORT

SUMMARY

Consistent with the proportionality requirements of Article XIII D, Section 6 of the California Constitution, the District recently completed the Draft 2016 Cost of Service (CoS) Report. The Report describes the projects, programs, administration, and other work efforts that are necessary to support the District’s operation to provide water replenishment, monitoring, and related services. The preliminary cost estimates for the different projects, programs, and other work efforts are summarized in the Report; the cost estimates are subsequently allocated proportionally for the purpose of calculating the Replenishment Assessment (RA).

The CoS Report is intended for use in the Fiscal Year 2016/17 (FY16/17) budget review and public input process. Depending on the recommendations from the various committees and public inputs, the estimates contained in the CoS Report will be revised to show the approved budget line item amounts and corresponding levels of services. Consequently, the RA will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the revised cost estimates.

The Draft CoS report was presented at the Capital Improvement Projects Committee meeting and is provided as an attachment to this staff report. Copies will also be available at the Board meeting. Also attached is a supplementary memorandum from the WRD General Manager to the Board of Directors describing the CoS Report and justification for the RA for the WRD Service Area.

FISCAL IMPACT

None at this time.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The CIP Committee met on April 4, 2016 and will provide their recommendation at the Board meeting.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016
TO: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP) COMMITTEE
FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: COST OF SERVICE REPORT – SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

This memorandum is intended to accompany the Cost of Service Report dated April 7, 2016 to inform and support the Board's decision making in connection with its April 28, 2016 hearing on the District's 2016-17 replenishment assessment.

The April 28 hearing will be conducted in the manner set forth in Article XIII D, Section 6 of the California Constitution, which was added to the Constitution in 1996 by the adoption of Proposition 218. Proposition 218 imposes a number of substantive requirements on property-related fees. These substantive requirements are found in Article XIII D, Section 6(b) of the California Constitution. This memorandum sets forth each of those requirements, and summarizes how the proposed $322.00 per acre-foot replenishment assessment complies with these requirements. This memorandum should not be interpreted to be an admission that the replenishment assessment is a property-related fee or that the replenishment assessment is subject to the requirements of Article XIII D, Section 6(b) of the California Constitution.

Requirement 1: "Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not exceed the funds required to provide the property related service."

The service being provided by the District is the management of the Central and West Coast Basins (the "Basins"). The District manages the Basins to ensure that the Basins are available to pumpers as a reliable and low-cost source of safe, high-quality water.

The Section 5 of the Cost of Service Report explains why stakeholders in the Basins chose to establish the District in 1959 to provide continuous active management of the Basins. Section 6 of the Cost of Service Report describes how the Basins would be unable to support adjudicated levels of pumping without the District's active management. Sections 7 and 9 of
the Cost of Service Report describe the activities of the District and the cost of those activities. Every activity of the District is a part of the management services provided by the District.

The vast majority of pumping from the Basins is done by water retailers serving the water demands of customers not located at the well sites. In lieu of purchasing water at wholesale or retail, each pumper chooses to meet all or some water demand by pumping water from the Basins. The District facilitates this pumping by recharging the Basins with imported water and recycled water and by undertaking activities that protect and preserve the quality of water in the Basins. In effect, the District uses the Basins as a giant natural reservoir through which water is delivered to wells operated by the pumpers. Activities such as groundwater monitoring, resource planning, desalting, and water quality improvement are necessary to maintain the Basins as an effective delivery system. Education and conservation efforts leverage the effectiveness of this system. By recharging the basins in a strategic manner, using both spreading grounds and injection wells, the District is able to ensure that water is available throughout the Basins, allowing pumpers access to the water introduced into the Basins by the District and to the naturally occurring water with which it is mixed.

Section 9 of the Cost of Service Report determines that the total cost of management services, net of revenues from water sales, will be $70,917,000 for Fiscal Year 2016-17. It is estimated that 220,000 acre-feet of water will be removed from the Basins by pumpers in Fiscal Year 2016-17. If a $322.00 per acre-foot replenishment assessment is collected from pumpers of 220,000 acre-feet of water, the replenishment assessment will generate $70,917,000. Therefore, the revenues from the replenishment assessment will not exceed the cost of providing management services.

Requirement 2: "Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the fee or charge was imposed."

All of the District's activities are part of the District's management services. The District does not use replenishment assessment revenues for any other purpose.

Requirement 3: "The amount of a fee or charge imposed upon any parcel or person as an incident of property ownership shall not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel."

As demonstrated in Section 6 of the Cost of Service Report, activities that remove or replenish water anywhere in the Basins have an effect on water levels and water quality throughout the Basins. Section 5 of the Cost of Service Report amply evidences that the interdependent nature of the uses of the Basins was a primary reason for the formation of the District in 1959, and was the reason why a single entity was created to manage all parts of the Basins. Section 8 of the Cost of Service Report summarizes the reasons why it would be inaccurate to allocate some District costs to some users of the Basins and other costs to other users of the Basins.

Therefore, it is appropriate to treat the entirety of the District as a single service area, so each acre-foot of water removed from the Basins is allocated an equal share of the costs of managing the Basins. The proposed $322.00 per acre-foot replenishment assessment allocates to each pumper a share of the costs of management services that is proportional to
the amount of water the pumper removes from the Basins. The amount of the replenishment assessment upon each pumper is therefore proportional to the cost of serving that pumper.

Requirement 4: "No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question. Fees or charges based on potential or future use of a service are not permitted."

Only those who pump or otherwise remove water from the Basins pay a replenishment assessment. The District's management services enable the water extraction and the District's services are immediately available to any person or entity that legally removes water from the Basins.

Requirement 5: "No fee or charge may be imposed for general governmental services including, but not limited to, police, fire, ambulance or library services, where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners."

The District's management services are not general government services, because the services are provided to ensure the availability in the Basins of safe, high-quality water for removal by those who by court judgment have groundwater extraction rights and who pay the replenishment assessment. Many pumpers sell water from the Basins to their customers, and may pass through the replenishment assessment cost to those customers. While the public may participate in, or be targeted by, certain educational and water conservation programs of the District, these programs are provided for the benefit of pumpers, as they are part of the efficient management of the Basins and are intended, over time, to reduce the cost of managing the Basins by reducing the need for artificial replenishment to augment naturally occurring processes.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 DRAFT BUDGET

Staff will provide the Committee with a presentation of the draft 2016-17 budget at the Board meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT
The budget and replenishment assessment has a direct fiscal impact to the District’s operations in the ensuing fiscal year.

FINANCE/AUDIT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
For discussion and possible action.
DATE: APRIL 7, 2016
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER
SUBJECT: BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

BACKGROUND
The 2016-17 budget process began with the District presenting the 2015-16 Midyear Budget Review to the Finance/Audit Committee on February 23, 2016, to the Budget Advisory Committee on February 25, 2016 and to the Board of Directors on March 3, 2016. The Midyear Review assists the District in developing the ensuing year’s budget.

The District held several public budget workshops related to the 2016-17 draft budget as follows:

- February 23, 2016 – Finance/Audit Committee Meeting
- February 25, 2016 – Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Meeting #1
- March 3, 2016 – Board of Directors Meeting
- March 8, 2016 – Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Meeting #2
- March 14, 2016 – Finance/Audit Committee Meeting
- March 22, 2016 – Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Meeting #3

On March 22, 2016, the BAC adopted their recommendation to be provided to the Board of Directors in accordance with SB620:

The BAC shall make recommendations to the Board of Directors at least 10 days prior to the hearing held pursuant to Section 60306 of the California State Water Code. The BAC recommendation(s) shall be included in the documents comprising the agenda package for that meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT
None.

BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Receive the BAC recommendation to approve the fiscal year 2016-17 budget presented at the March 22, 2016 BAC meeting, reflecting a 6.7% increase to the replenishment assessment for fiscal year 2016-17 to $302 per acre-foot.
DATE:    APRIL 7, 2016

TO:      BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM:    ROBB WHITAKER, GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: CONVENE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 PROPOSED
REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENT PER WATER CODE SECTION 60306

SUMMARY

On March 3, 2016 the Board of Directors received and filed the 2016 Engineering Survey and
Report (ESR) and adopted Resolution No. 16-1026 declaring that funds shall be raised in the
ensuing fiscal year to purchase replenishment water and to fund groundwater quality and
replenishment projects and programs by means of a Replenishment Assessment (RA).

In compliance with the California Water Code Section §60306, notice of a Public Hearing on
the fiscal year 2016-17 RA was published at least 10 days prior to the opening of the Public
Hearing. The notice was published by the Metropolitan News Company in the daily Los

The Public Hearing will be opened at the WRD office in Lakewood, CA during the regular
Board of Directors’ meeting on Thursday, April 7, 2016, at 1:00 p.m. The purpose of the Public
Hearing is to determine whether and to what extent the estimated cost of (1) purchasing water
for groundwater replenishment for the ensuing year and accomplishing acts reasonably
necessary for replenishment, (2) removing contaminants from groundwater supplies and
undertaking other groundwater quality projects, and (3) the District’s operating and
administrative expenses, shall be paid by a RA levied upon groundwater producers within the
WRD Service Area.

The public is invited to attend the hearing and provide comment on any proposed RA, the
ESR, or any other matters related to the District’s rate setting process. The Public Hearing
may be continued to subsequent Board meetings and budget workshops as the Board
considers additional information related to the upcoming RA.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned public hearing set in accordance with the California Water
Code, the District has mailed “Notice of Public Hearing” pursuant to the procedural
requirements of Article XIII D, Section 6 of the California Constitution. This separate Public
Hearing (“Prop 218 Hearing”) will be held at the WRD office, on April 28, 2016, at 1:00 p.m.
Detailed information on the Prop 218 Hearing will be included in the staff report to the Board
for the April 28, 2016 Board of Directors’ meeting.
FISCAL IMPACT
None at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
For discussion and possible action.