

Cost Share Proposal

Prepared by Farmers Water District

Revised 8/21/2023

Current Cost Share Agreement Assumptions:

Each GSP - GSP Group shares 1/6 of the **coordinated costs** of the Subbabsin.

Each GSP - GSP Group to develop their individual GSP at their expense.

Development of a single GSP has not been deemed a coordinated cost.

The \$200,000 initial EKI budget to be shared on a 1/6 basis.

Single GSP Development Recommendation:

First Choice - Jarrett 1/7

Future Cost Share Recommendations:

This proposal is specifically a cost share for the development of the Single GSP.

Each GSP - GSP Group future Coordinated cost to be a % of the coordinated costs determined by the number Coordination Committee seats.

| | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S |
|----|----------------------------------|---|-------------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 2 | Single GSP Budget Proposal | | \$1,401,052 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Optional CVHM2 Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Current Single GSP Cost Proposal | | \$1,401,052 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | Hybrid 50% CC Member Split, 50% Acre % or Pump % | | | | Hybrid 60% CC Member Split, 40% Acre % or Pump % | | | | |
| 7 | GSA Group | Acres | Acre % | Pump % | Acres | Pump | GSA's | 1/7 | 1/6 | 1/7 Hybrid Acres | 1/7 Hybrid Pump | 1/6 Hybrid Acres | 1/6 Hybrid Pump | 1/7 Hybrid Acres | 1/7 Hybrid Pump | 1/6 Hybrid Acres | 1/6 Hybrid Pump | Jarrett 1/7 |
| 8 | North Group | 152,140 | 19.95% | 24.26% | \$279,548 | \$339,895 | \$380,721 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$239,849 | \$270,023 | \$256,528 | \$286,702 | \$231,909 | \$256,048 | \$251,924 | \$276,063 | \$238,179 |
| 9 | Central Group | 163,787 | 21.48% | | \$300,949 | | \$197,975 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$250,550 | | \$267,229 | | \$240,470 | \$260,485 | | \$238,179 | |
| 10 | Grassland | 104,137 | 13.66% | 16.11% | \$191,346 | \$225,709 | \$76,144 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$195,748 | \$212,930 | \$212,427 | \$229,609 | \$196,628 | \$210,374 | \$216,643 | \$230,389 | \$224,168 |
| 11 | SIREC | 291,069 | 38.17% | 32.21% | \$534,822 | \$451,279 | \$563,467 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$367,486 | \$325,715 | \$384,165 | \$342,394 | \$334,019 | \$300,602 | \$354,034 | \$320,617 | \$238,179 |
| 12 | Aliso | 26,636 | 3.49% | 21.71% | \$48,942 | \$304,168 | \$60,915 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$124,546 | \$252,159 | \$141,225 | \$268,839 | \$139,667 | \$241,758 | \$159,682 | \$261,773 | \$182,137 |
| 13 | Fresno County | 22,519 | 2.95% | 3.46% | \$41,377 | \$48,476 | \$60,915 | \$200,150 | | \$120,764 | \$124,313 | | \$140,993 | \$136,641 | \$139,481 | | \$159,496 | \$140,105 |
| 14 | Farmers | 2,214 | 0.29% | 2.25% | \$4,068 | \$31,524 | \$60,915 | \$200,150 | \$233,509 | \$102,109 | \$115,837 | \$139,477 | \$132,516 | \$121,717 | \$132,700 | \$158,283 | \$152,715 | \$140,105 |
| 15 | Total | 762,502 | 100.00% | 100.00% | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 | \$1,401,052 |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | Calculations: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | Acres: | \$1,401,052 / Acre Percentage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Pump: | \$1,401,052 / Pump Percentage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | GSA'S | (\$1,401,052 / Total GSA's) * GSA's Represented | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 1/7: | \$1,401,052 / 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | 1/6: | \$1,401,052 / 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | 1/7 Hybrid Acres 50/50 %: | (\$700,526 / 7) + (\$700,526 X Acre %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | 1/7 Hybrid Pump 50/50 %: | (\$700,526 / 7) + (\$700,0526 X Pump %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | 1/6 Hybrid Acres 50/50 %: | (\$700,526 / 6) + (\$700,526 X Acre %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | 1/6 Hybrid Pump 50/50 %: | (\$700,526 / 6) + (\$700,526 X Pump %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | 1/7 Hybrid Acres 60/40 %: | (\$940,631 / 7) + (\$560,421 X Acre %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | 1/7 Hybrid Pump 60/40 %: | (\$940,631 / 7) + (\$560,421 X Pump %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 1/6 Hybrid Acres 60/40 %: | (\$940,631 / 6) + (\$560,421 X Acre %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | 1/6 Hybrid Pump 60/40 %: | (\$940,631 / 6) + (\$560,421 X Pump %) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Jarrett 1/7: | Allocation based on Acre %: 0-3% pay 10% cost, 3-10% pay 13% of cost, 10-15% pay 16% cost, greater than 15% pay 17% cost. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* Did not have separate pump data for North & Central Group, they are combined for all pump calculations.

* Fresno County & Farmers WD are discussing combining their seat on the coordination committee, they are combined for all 1/6 calculations.

* Assumed the Exchange Contractors would have one seat on the coordination committee going forward.

EXHIBIT “D”**ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS FOR THE SUBBASIN**

The Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (“GSAs”) in the Delta-Mendota Subbasin (the “Subbasin”) acknowledge that the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”) has a long-term horizon to achieve sustainability and that management of the Subbasin will require an iterative process on the part of the GSAs and the Coordination Committee to review groundwater conditions at least annually and propose revisions to underlying data, methodologies, assumptions, sustainable management criteria, projects, management actions, and other Subbasin-wide coordinated information as necessary to meet changing conditions. Accordingly, the GSAs in the Subbasin establish the following framework for addressing necessary changes to the GSP during the SGMA implementation period:

1. The Subbasin-wide GSP Consultant shall initiate a review of Subbasin-wide data within thirty (30) days after that data is due to be submitted by each GSA (the “Review”). As reporting dates vary based upon the SMC, this Review will be done on a regular basis and will be a regular agenda item on the Coordination Committee agendas.
2. The Review shall take into account all matters to be considered in the Annual Report pursuant to the DWR Regulations, section 356.2, including, but not limited to, changes in groundwater elevation, groundwater storage, subsidence, water quality and the status of minimum thresholds and interim milestones in the Subbasin GSP.
3. Should GSA activities result in a minimum threshold exceedance, the Coordination Committee (at the recommendation of the Plan Manager, a designated subcommittee, or the Subbasin-wide GSP Consultant) shall immediately notify the GSA and add the exceedance information to the next Coordination Committee agenda packet.
4. The GSA may request the Subbasin-wide GSP Consultant to coordinate such exceedance information with that GSA’s own consultant, as applicable. Within thirty (30) days of said notice, the GSA shall present a plan of action to the Coordination Committee to address how the GSA will mitigate an exceedance and in what timeframe. The intent is for the Coordination Committee to discuss the mitigation plan in an effort to provide helpful ideas to the GSA. However, the GSA is solely responsible for the management actions within its boundaries and the costs to remedy the cause of the exceedance if it is attributed to activities occurring within such GSA’s jurisdictional boundaries. At its sole cost and expense, the responsible GSA may ask the Subbasin-wide GSP Consultant to further determine: (a) what caused the exceedance; (b) whether or not the GSA has control over the cause of the exceedance; (c) whether it is an intra-basin impact from another GSA or an inter-basin impact by a neighboring subbasin; and (d) whether or not the exceedance caused damage.
5. If there is a determination by the Subbasin-wide consultant that any exceedance was caused by intra-basin impacts from another GSA within the Subbasin, such determination will be brought back to the Coordination Committee for further discussion and potential Subbasin-wide action. The Coordination Committee will work with other GSAs to increase

existing GSA coordination to remedy the issues causing the exceedance and to remedy the responsibility of costs associated with identifying and mitigating the exceedance.

6. If there is a determination that any exceedance was caused by a neighboring subbasin, this should be brought back to the Coordination Committee for further discussion and potential Subbasin-wide action. The Coordination Committee will work with other subbasins to expand existing inter-basin coordination to remedy the issues causing the exceedances.

7. In the event that the GSA is unable to mitigate or avoid future minimum threshold exceedances with its existing management actions and within the timeframe presented to the Coordination Committee, the GSA may seek assistance from the Coordination Committee. The Coordination Committee may recommend policies or programs to the GSA that the GSA could, in its discretion, adopt to remedy the existence of a minimum threshold exceedance and to avoid undesirable results. Furthermore, the Coordination Committee may consider setting triggers in the GSP for GSAs to implement management actions [e.g., sequencing projects and management actions (“P&MAs”)] or work on alternative options.

