TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

AGENDA

Wednesday July 15, 2026 @ 9:00 a.m.
Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) Board Room
326 Huss Drive, Chico, California 95928

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT (TWD) REGULAR BOARD MEETING

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Comment. Members of the public may address the Board on any matter not already listed below. The Board cannot act at this meeting on requests made under this section of the agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Approve Minutes of the June 17, 2026 Regular Meeting (Action)

4. Receive Financial Report and Approve Payment of Bills (Action)

5. Special Recognition: Adopt Resolution No. 26-__ Commending Outgoing General Counsel Joe Hughes (Action)

6. Approve Legal Services Agreement with Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, LLP, and Appoint David Cameron as General Counsel and Conclude Legal Services Agreement with Klein DeNatale Goldner (Action)

7. Consideration of Resolution 26-__ Certifying the District's FY 2026-27 Land-Based Assessment for Placement on the Butte County Secured Property Tax Roll and Authorizing the General Manager to Execute and Submit Required County Enrollment Documents (Action)

8. Consider Rescheduling the August 19, 2026 Regular Meeting (Action)

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

9. General Manager Report

    a. Projects: Updates & Status

    b. Grants: Updates & Status

    c. Vina GSA Periodic Evaluation & Plan Amendment Update

d. Well Ordinance Update
   i. Well Ordinance Public Mtg – July 22 (5:30pm, 3 County Center Dr, Oroville)
   ii. Water Well Advisory Group – Aug 6 (Time, Location TBD)
   iii. Survey (due Aug 21) - https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Butte_Update

e. GSA Vacancies:
   i. GSA Board: Domestic Well User Alternate
   ii. SHAC: Non-Irrigated/Rangeland Representative

f. Upcoming GSA & Other Meetings
   i. Butte County Water TAC – July 15, 1:30 pm (3 County Center Dr, Oroville)
   ii. Vina GSA SHAC Meeting – July 22 (9am, Location TBD)
   iii. Water Commission – Aug 5 (1:30pm, BOS Chambers)
   iv. Board of Supervisors – Aug 11 and 25 (9am, BOS Chambers)
   v. Vina GSA Board Meeting – Aug 12 (3:30pm, Chico City Hall Chambers)
   vi. GSA Workshop re: Draft PE & PA – Sept 2 (Time, Location TBD)

g. Topics for Upcoming Board Meetings
   i. Well & Septic Ordinance - https://www.buttecounty.net/2273/Well-Septic-Ordinance-Updates
   ii. TWD Water Transfer Policy

10. Board Member Announcements, Reports and/or Requests for Future Agenda Topics

CLOSED SESSION

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL (Govt. Code Section 54956.9)

Anticipated Litigation: Govt Code, Section 54956.9(d)(2): One matter

ADJOURNMENT

NOTES

In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, if you need disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in this meeting, please email info@tuscanwaterdistrict.org by Noon the day prior to this meeting.

Written material distributed during a public meeting will be available for public inspection at the meeting, if prepared by the district or a member of its legislative body, or after the meeting if prepared by some other person. Any materials related to an item on this Agenda are available for public inspection online at https://www.tuscanwaterdistrict.org/.

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
Board Meeting Minutes – June 17, 2026

DATE:	Wednesday, June 17, 2026
TIME:	9:00 a.m.
LOCATION:	BCAG Board Room, 326 Huss Drive, Chico, California 95928
Directors Present:	President Rich McGowan, Vice President Steve Koehnen, Secretary Rayme Antonowich, Treasurer Andrew Mendonca, Director Bill Chance, Director Craig Knight, Director Brian Mori, Director Jim Paiva, Director Todd Turley.
Directors Absent:	None.
Staff Present:	Tovey Giezentanner, General Manager; Joe Hughes, General Counsel (participating remotely).
Others Present:	Joe Turner (Geosyntec), Christina Buck (Butte County Water and Resource Conservation), and various members of the public were in attendance.

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

President McGowan called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Audience introductions followed.

2. Public Comment

No public comment was received at the opening of the meeting.

3. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

President McGowan presented the May 14, 2026 minutes, noting the draft had been corrected to identify Director Koehnen as Vice President. Director Mendonca requested an update on the SWEEP grant conflict-of-interest review raised at the prior meeting; the GM responded that he will address it if the application advances past the concept phase.

> **Action:** Director Mori moved to approve the May 14, 2026 minutes; seconded by Director Antonowich. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Finances and Payment of Bills

One invoice was presented: the General Manager's monthly invoice. No Board or public comment was received.

> **Action:** Director Antonowich moved to approve payment of the invoice as presented; Director Paiva seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

6. County Election Process Update (Taken Out of Order)

The Board heard this item ahead of Item 5 to accommodate the morning's schedule. President McGowan noted the election timing had been misstated previously, and General Counsel Hughes clarified the schedule: the sitting directors were elected to four-year terms (December 2023) that run through 2027, so no district election is required in 2026. All nine divisions will stand for election in November 2027, when the staggering of terms will be completed — consistent with prior Board discussion, odd-numbered divisions would receive four-year terms and even-numbered divisions two-year terms in that first cycle, with all terms four years thereafter so that elections occur every two years. Informational only; no action was taken.

5. Geosyntec Groundwater Recharge Feasibility Study — Final Results

Joe Turner, principal hydrogeologist with Geosyntec and project manager for the groundwater recharge feasibility study funded through the Vina GSA's SGMA implementation grant, presented final results. A public workshop was held June 15, and the display boards were available at the meeting. The final report is due June 30.

Scope and Methods. The team inventoried candidate sites with cooperating landowners, conducted site visits, performed field investigations at eight sites, and ran pilot studies. Methods included tTEM geophysics (a ground-based counterpart to DWR's airborne AEM survey, covering roughly 400 acres per day on 10–15-foot line spacing), cone penetration testing, soil borings with permeability testing, monitoring and stilling wells, and water quality sampling. A separate condition assessment of the Durham Mutual Water Company irrigation main is appended to the report.

Key Findings. Perched groundwater systems — shallow water at roughly 4–10 feet held up on clay layers, with regional groundwater near 50 feet — were identified at several sites and shaped site screening; recharge remains feasible in the subbasin where hydrogeology allows. A 140-foot reverse tile drain set at 12 feet in an orchard along Comanche Creek infiltrated approximately 0.3 acre-feet per day (10–14 feet per day), performing equally well with clean water and floodwater; a surface basin at the same site infiltrated 2–3 feet per day, well above the one-foot-per-day SAGBI "excellent" benchmark. Pilot floodwater diversions were conducted under Water Code section 1242.1 without a water right permit, giving the project team direct experience with its notification and reporting requirements. Sediment management will be necessary for creek diversions; groundwater mounding was monitored and dissipated as expected.

Proposed Projects. (1) Three gravity-flow basin complexes along Keefer Slough and Rock Creek, with sediment forebays and returns to the creeks, pairing recharge with flood attenuation near the Highway 99 corridor; (2) a pumped recharge complex at the Comanche Creek pilot site (an aging walnut orchard that may not be replanted), requiring a 10,000–15,000 GPM pump, rehabilitation of an existing diversion, and enhanced monitoring given a VOC plume in the vicinity (recharge water sits near 25 feet, well above the plume near 100 feet); and (3) repairs to the Durham Mutual pipeline, which video assessment found largely serviceable with localized repairs — restoring surface water deliveries, reducing groundwater pumping, and potentially conveying winter water to future recharge sites under Durham Mutual's winter rights (siphons under Butte Creek could not be inspected). Land acquisition is the largest cost driver; projects can be phased, and ecological features such as pollinator and bird habitat would strengthen grant competitiveness.

Discussion. Directors' questions addressed seasonal infiltration and winter testing, test durations (24-hour and two-day floodwater events at roughly 1,000 GPM), and the limits of flood-only diversion compared with temporary 180-day or five-year permits, which entail CEQA. Christina Buck confirmed M&T Ranch and Llano Seco were aware of the concepts and noted this study completes the feasibility work funded under the GSA's SGMA implementation grant. Director Antonowich provided history on the Durham Mutual system, noting its winter water rights could support recharge in that area. In response to public questions, Mr. Turner discussed adding ecological enhancements to lower-yield basins. No formal action was taken.

7. Vina GSA Periodic Evaluation Update

GM Giezentanner reviewed recent Vina GSA plan evaluation actions, presenting GSA staff materials.

- **Domestic Well Mitigation.** As approved by the GSA Board in May, the plan evaluation will state that program development begins in 2027 supported by an approximately $50,000 GSA budget set-aside.
- **Land Subsidence.** On June 10, 2026, the GSA Board adopted the SHAC-recommended draft amendment language. The County has tracked subsidence since the late 1990s using groundwater levels as a proxy; InSAR data for 2020–2025 — a period including historic-low groundwater levels — show no subsidence and some uplift. The amendment moves toward InSAR as the primary measure while retaining groundwater levels as an additional line of evidence, with causation language tied to physical impacts on infrastructure. AGUBC provided detailed comments through the public process and supports the outcome. Director Mori asked how InSAR distinguishes elastic from inelastic subsidence; the question was referred to County technical staff.
- **Interconnected Surface Water.** Analyses over the past five years — comparing LiDAR-derived stream elevations with groundwater levels from the monitoring network — show the Sacramento River is primarily connected, other streams are seasonally connected, and some are ephemeral. Because DWR has not issued guidance on the central remaining question of depletion volumes, the SHAC recommended and the GSA Board adopted a "show progress, proceed carefully" approach: document the work completed, await guidance, and make no premature changes to minimum thresholds or the monitoring network. AGUBC supported the outcome. Responding to Director Turley on timing, Christina Buck noted the Sacramento River is a regional feature; the draft regional work plan contemplates roughly five years of data collection, monitoring, and modeling, with sustainable management criteria addressed in the back half of that period.
- **Groundwater Levels — Next Topic.** A staff memorandum and "straw man" on groundwater levels, including the monitoring network and minimum thresholds, was expected within days, for initial discussion at the June 24 SHAC meeting and the July 8 GSA Board meeting, with the minimum-threshold discussion continuing at the July and August SHAC meetings. Water quality and projects/management actions follow later in the process.
- **Plan Evaluation Ad Hoc Committee.** The Board expanded the plan evaluation ad hoc committee: Directors Turley, Antonowich, Mendonca, and President McGowan, with

Director Mori also volunteering. The ad hoc meets the following week, ahead of the SHAC meeting.

8. General Manager Updates

8A. Well and Septic Ordinance Updates

Butte County Environmental Health will hold a public meeting on July 22, and stakeholder surveys are due August 21; the GM will return in July with a recommended approach to the survey, and Environmental Health will be the featured presentation at an upcoming Board meeting. Through President McGowan's and Vice President Koehnen's efforts, agricultural representation is being added to the County's Water Well Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Committee; the GM will serve on the TAC on behalf of the District.

- **SWEEP Grant.** The concept proposal was submitted to CDFA on May 15; no feedback has been received. An update is expected by the July meeting.
- **Thriving Farmland Summit.** Chico State's Center for Regenerative Agriculture and Resilient Systems (director Cynthia Daley) will host a farmland summit at the University Farm on July 1, with keynotes by the California Secretary for Natural Resources and the Secretary of Food and Agriculture.
- **Upcoming Meetings.** Butte County Water Commission (later that day); Vina GSA SHAC, June 24 at 9:00 a.m.; Vina GSA Board, July 8. Both GSA meetings will take up groundwater levels.
- **Upcoming Topics.** The Environmental Health ordinance presentation; a full assessment status review requested by President McGowan (December and April assessments — prepayments, collections, and outstanding balances); budget review; continued office space pursuit (Director Chance); and a South Vina extension progress update. Also ahead: continued Caltrans discussions on Highway 99/Keefer Slough drainage; a Joel Kimmelshue demand reduction presentation; and the water transfer facilitation policy, deferred pending the general counsel transition.

Board Member Announcements

Director Mendonca noted the Vina GSA has announced an opening for the alternate domestic well representative and encouraged referrals of qualified candidates.

Closed Session and Adjournment

The Board met in closed session. There was no reportable action.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:35 a.m.

Item 4

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

FY 2025-26 Assessment Levy and Collections Report

July 15, 2026

What we projected. For Fiscal Year 2025-26 — the District's first year of assessment collections — the Board levied the Proposition 218 land-based assessment at $6.45 per assessable acre, just under the $6.4598 maximum authorized by the January 15, 2025 property-owner election, with an approved budget of $619,400 (March 19, 2025). Of the District's 96,071 assessable acres, landowners representing 29,527 acres pre-paid the assessment directly to the District; 65,041 acres were enrolled on the Butte County secured tax roll; and 1,503 acres of public-agency and other exempt parcels were removed by the Auditor-Controller and not assessed. The removal of those exempt acres accounts for the difference between the approved budget and the $609,964 actually assessed.

Assessment Levied	Acres	Rate/Acre	Amount
Maximum authorized — Proposition 218 election (Jan 15, 2025)	96,071	$6.4598	$620,600
Approved budget (Mar 19, 2025)	96,071	—	$619,400
Pre-paid directly to District (June 2025)	29,527	$6.45	$190,449
Enrolled on County secured tax roll	65,041	$6.45	$419,515
Removed by Auditor — public-agency and other exempt parcels	1,503	—	not assessed
Total assessed, FY 2025-26	**94,568**	**$6.45**	**$609,964**

Assessed acreage (94,568) plus removed acreage (1,503) equals the District's 96,071 assessable acres.

What we received — and what remains. The District has received $587,358 to date: $190,449 in direct pre-payments and $396,909 in the County's December and April apportionments. That is 96.3 percent of the total assessed. One payment remains: the County's final apportionment of $22,580, expected in July 2026, which brings projected total receipts to $609,937 — within $27 (less than 0.005 percent) of the full amount assessed.[1]

Receipts	Date	Amount
Pre-payments received by District	June 2025	$190,449
County apportionment — December	Dec 18, 2025	$233,202
County apportionment — April	Apr 17, 2026	$163,707
Received to date		**$587,358**
Final County apportionment (expected)	July 2026	$22,580
Projected total receipts		**$609,937**
Variance to total assessed		*$(27)*

[1] **Collection risk — the Teeter Plan.** Butte County operates under the "Teeter Plan" (Revenue & Taxation Code §4701 et seq.), the alternative method of tax apportionment the County adopted in 1993, and the Auditor-Controller's Property Tax Division has confirmed that the District's assessment is included in it. Under the plan, the County apportions 100 percent of the enrolled levy to the District on a fixed schedule — approximately 55 percent in December, 40 percent in April, and 5 percent in July — regardless of whether individual taxpayers have paid. The County advances any delinquent amounts, assumes the full risk of collection, and keeps the delinquency penalties and redemption interest when late taxpayers ultimately pay. Taxpayer non-payment therefore does not reduce the District's assessment receipts: the District will receive 100 percent of the amount enrolled on the roll.

Item 4

TWD Finances

FY 2025-26	2025-26 APPROVED BUDGET *(attached)*	JUL 2025 Approved	AUG 2025 Approved	SEPT 2025 Approved	OCT 2025 Approved	NOV 2025 Approved	DEC 2025 Approved	JAN 2026 Approved	FEB 2026 Approved	MAR 2026 Approved	APR 2026 For Approval	MAY 2026	JUN 2026	Billed to Date	Approved Budget Remaining
TWD BUDGET CATEGORY															
Personnel	**$ 266,400**	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 7,500	$ 14,583	$ 14,583	$ 14,583	$ 14,583	$ 118,333	$ 148,067
Office	**$ 81,000**	$ 7,304	$ 1,005	$ 165	$ 1,320	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 12,200	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 21,994	$ 59,006
External Support	**$ 97,000**	$ 2,175	$ 635	$ 1,580	$ 953	$ -	$ 3,041	$ 158	$ 2,908	$ 1,658	$ 978	$ -	$ 213	$ 14,297	$ 82,704
Litigation	**$ 75,000**	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 75,000
Technical Support	**$ 50,000**	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,206	$ 3,998	$ 4,795	$ -	$ 1,652	$ 11,651	$ 38,349
Lobbying & Funding	**$ -**	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Reserves	**$ 50,000**	$ 17,399	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 17,399	$ 32,601
TOTALS	**$ 619,400**	**$ 34,378**	**$ 9,140**	**$ 9,245**	**$ 9,773**	**$ 7,500**	**$ 10,541**	**$ 7,658**	**$ 11,614**	**$ 32,439**	**$ 20,356**	**$ 14,583**	**$ 16,448**	**$ 183,674**	**$ 435,726**

Itemized Bills

Category	**Description**	**Amount**
Personnel	Giezentanner & Associates - General Manager	$14,583.33
Office		$ -
External Support	Klein DeNatale Goldner - General Counsel	$ 212.50
Technical Support	Water & Land Solutions, LLC	$ 1,652.21
	Total	**$16,448.04**

INVOICE

Giezentanner & Associates
30 Independence Circle, Suite 300
Chico, California 95973
United States

BILL TO
Tuscan Water District
30 Independence Circle
Chico, California 95973
United States

Invoice Number:	20201302
Invoice Date:	June 30, 2026
Payment Due:	July 30, 2026
Amount Due (USD):	**$14,583.33**

Items	Amount
Service Tuscan Water District General Manager Services June 2026 See attached Statement of Services.	$14,583.33

Total:	$14,583.33
Amount Due (USD):	**$14,583.33**

Areas of Activity for June 2026 – General Manager Services

Board Governance & Administrative Support (Financial, Budget, Operations)

- June 17, 2026 – Regular Board Meeting. Material prep, coordination, and follow-up
- District Responsibilities: July Meeting Prep; County Assessor Process; Maintenance of official District records
- Legal Counsel interviews and related activities
- Potential office space

SGMA Compliance, Regulatory Coordination & Stakeholder Engagement

- June 1 – Meetings re: Plan Evaluation and related topics
- June 2 – RCRD Meeting re: Plan Evaluation and related topics
- June 10 – Vina GSA Board Meeting
- June 11 – Meeting re: FERC Relicensing
- June 15 – Vina GSA - Recharge Workshop (prep)
- June 16 – Vina GSA - Interbasin Coordination
- June 17 – Water Commission Meeting
- June 24 – Vina GSA SHAC Meeting
- June 25 – SR99 / Keefer-Slough (Caltrans) Meeting
- Ongoing: Issue Management – Technical Review re: GWL, GDE, ISW, Land Subsidence, Storage, Sustainable Yield, Monitoring Network, etc.
- Ongoing: Develop Internal Dashboards to Analyze SGMA Issues & Basin Conditions
- Continued Evaluation: GSP Plan Evaluation (and potential Amendments)

Project Development & Implementation

- Ongoing: Rock Creek / Keefer Slough Flood-MAR Concept development
- Ongoing: Water Supply Feasibility Analysis (South Vina Extension)
- Ongoing: Caltrans Hwy 99 Project – project dashboard development
- Ongoing: Demand Reduction Strategies

Grant Pursuit and External Funding

- SWEEP:
    - Waiting to hear from CDFA

Klein · DeNatale · Goldner
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

10000 STOCKDALE HWY, SUITE 200
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93311

(661) 395-1000
FAX (661) 326-0418
E-MAIL accounting@kleinlaw.com

June 30, 2026

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
*****E-MAIL INVOICES*****

Invoice No.	1268112
Client No.	24618
Matter No.	001
Billing Attorney:	JDH

INVOICE SUMMARY

For Professional Services Rendered for the Period Ending: June 19, 2026.

RE: TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
GENERAL BUSINESS

Professional Services	$ 212.50
Costs Advanced	$ .00
TOTAL THIS INVOICE	**$ 212.50**

Invoice No. 1268112 June 30, 2026

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Date	Init	Description	Hours	Amount
6/17/26	JDH	ATTENDED REGULAR BOARD MEETING.	.50	212.50

TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES **$ 212.50**

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Name	Init	Rate	Hours	Total
HUGHES, JOSEPH	JDH	425.00	.50	212.50
Total			**.50**	**$ 212.50**

TOTAL THIS INVOICE **$ 212.50**

Klein · DeNatale · Goldner
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

10000 STOCKDALE HWY, SUITE 200
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93311

(661) 395-1000
FAX (661) 326-0418
E-MAIL accounting@kleinlaw.com

June 30, 2026

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
*****E-MAIL INVOICES*****

Invoice No.	1268112
Client No.	24618
Matter No.	001
Billing Attorney:	JDH

REMITTANCE

RE: TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
GENERAL BUSINESS

BALANCE DUE THIS INVOICE	**$ 212.50**

All checks should be made payable to:
(Please return this advice with payment.)

Klein DeNatale Goldner
10000 Stockdale Hwy, Suite 200
Bakersfield, CA 93311

For payment by ACH in USD:
(Please reference:
Client-Matter No. 24618-001,
Invoice No. 1268112)

J.P. Morgan Chase
Account No. 825707620
ABA No. 322271627

To pay by ACH, click here --->: Pay Now or call Accounting at (661) 395-1000.

DUE UPON RECEIPT

FEDERAL I.D. No. 95-2298220

Thank you! Your business is greatly appreciated.

Water & Land Solutions, LLC
P.O. Box 2657
Los Banos, CA 93635

INVOICE #	5285
DATE	5/31/2026
DUE DATE	6/30/2026
TERMS	Net 30
ACCOUNT #	26-214

A/R Contact:
jbunch@waterandlandsolutions.com

BILL TO

Tuscan Water District
30 Independence Circle, No. 300
Chico, CA 95973

Client email:

DATE	TITLE	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES	HOURS	RATE	AMOUNT
		TASK 1: ADMIN			
		Munson, Maddie			
05/20/26	SWS	Prep and call with Tovey to discuss scoping.	1.00	225.00	225.00
05/22/26	SWS	Finalizing CSA.	0.50	225.00	112.50
05/29/26	SWS	Review P&P agreement, schedule kickoff, prep kick off agenda.	0.50	225.00	112.50
		Subtotal			**450.00**
		TASK 2: STRATEGIC SCOPING			
		Munson, Maddie			
05/21/26	SWS	Call with WCWD staff and emails with P&P to schedule site visit and initial meeting.	0.50	225.00	112.50
05/27/26	SWS	Site visit with WCWD to assess engineering and permitting alternatives.	4.50	225.00	1,012.50
05/27/26	MI	1121 Cedar Drive Wheatland, CA to 2003 Nelson Rd, Nelson, CA 95958.	106.50	0.725	77.21
		Subtotal			**1,202.21**

BALANCE DUE **$ 1,652.21**

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
Staff Memorandum

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Tovey Giezentanner, General Manager
DATE: July 15, 2026
RE: Item 6 — Approve Legal Services Agreement with Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, LLP, and Appoint David Cameron as General Counsel

---

Action Requested. Approve the attached legal services agreement with Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, LLP ("AALRR"); appoint David Cameron as General Counsel of the District, effective upon approval; authorize the Board President to execute the agreement; and acknowledge the conclusion of the District's legal services agreement with Klein DeNatale Goldner.

Background. Following Mr. Joe Hughes' announced retirement from the practice of law, the Board's Legal Ad Hoc Committee (Directors McGowan, Mendonca, and Mori) conducted the recruitment of successor counsel. Mr. Hughes identified four candidates for the Board's consideration; the ad hoc committee interviewed three candidates in advance of the May 14 special meeting; and the Board has taken up the transition in closed session at its regular meetings since December 2025. That process concluded with the selection of David Cameron of AALRR.

Summary / Analysis.

Terms of the agreement. See attached. The agreement takes effect upon approval and execution.

Transition. Upon approval, Mr. Cameron assumes the duties of General Counsel, including for the remainder of today's meeting. Mr. Hughes remains available to support the handoff of open matters, and staff will complete the routine onboarding items.

Attachment: Proposed Legal Services Agreement with Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, LLP

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION AGREEMENT

I. PARTIES

This Attorney Representation Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by and between the law firm of ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO, a professional corporation, hereinafter referred to as "Attorney" or the "Law Firm" and TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT, hereinafter referred to as "Client" or "District."

II. PURPOSE

Client desires to retain and engage Law Firm to serve as General Counsel to the District. Law Firm accepts this engagement on the terms and conditions contained in this Agreement.

III. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

A. Designated Attorneys

Law Firm commits that David E. Cameron will be the primary attorney who will be responsible for providing the services to Client, with other attorney(s) who possess appropriate experience to serve the Client as needed. Law Firm shall immediately notify and seek approval from Client if a change in the primary attorney is proposed.

B. Responsiveness

Law Firm will strive to promptly respond to Client inquiries and will handle emergency and high priority inquiries to the best of its ability under the particular circumstances.

C. Fees for Services

1. Hourly Rate Services

Client agrees to pay Law Firm at the following hourly rates:

Partners/Senior Counsel/Of Counsel – $425

Senior Associates – $395

Junior Associates – $355

Paralegals – $255

Effective July 1 of each subsequent year of this Agreement, the hourly billing rates set forth in this agreement shall increase by three percent (3.0%) over the hourly rates in effect during the immediately preceding twelve-month period.

2. Costs and Expenses

A three percent (3%) administrative fee will be applied to each bill in lieu of charging for telephone costs, incoming and outgoing faxes, photocopies, mailing fees, messenger services, computer databases (e.g., Westlaw), word processing, automobile mileage, parking costs, and airfare.

Costs relating to fees charged by third parties retained to perform services ancillary to the Law Firm's representation of Client are not included and are charged separately. These include, but are not limited to, deposition and court reporter fees, transcript costs, witness fees (including expert witnesses), process server fees, and other similar third party fees. The Law Firm shall not be obligated to advance costs on behalf of Client; however, for purposes of convenience and in order to expedite matters, the Law Firm reserves the right to advance costs on behalf of Client with Client's prior approval in the event a particular cost item exceeds $2,000.00 in amount, and without the prior approval of Client in the event a particular cost item totals $2,000.00 or less.

D. Billing Practices

1. A detailed description of the work performed and the costs and expenses advanced by the Law Firm will be prepared on a monthly basis as of the last day of the month and will be mailed to Client on or about the 15th of the following month, unless other arrangements are made. Each statement shall include for each billing entry the date on which services were provided, the attorney or paralegal who provided the services, a description of the services provided, the amount of time, billing rate, and total charges. Payment of the full amount due, as reflected on the monthly statement, will be due to the Law Firm from Client by the 10th of the month following delivery of the statement, unless other arrangements are made. In the event that there are funds of Client in the Law Firm's Trust Account at the time a monthly billing statement is prepared, funds will be transferred from the Law Firm's Trust Account to the Law Firm's General Account to the extent of the balance due on the monthly statement and a credit will be reflected on the monthly statement. Any balance of fees or costs advanced remaining unpaid for a period of 30 days will be subject to a 1% per month service charge.

2. Hourly rate services shall be charged to Client at a minimum increment of one-tenth hour. Travel time for attorney travel from Northern California shall be billed as if travelling from Law Firm’s Sacramento office. When time spent by Attorney on a particular service exceeds one-tenth hour, the charge will be rounded up to the next one-tenth hour increment.

3. Client agrees to review the Law Firm’s monthly statements promptly upon receipt and to notify the Law Firm, in writing, with respect to any disagreement with the monthly statement.

E. Termination of Representation

Client has the right, at any time, and either with or without good cause, to discharge the Law Firm as its attorneys. In the event of such a discharge of the Law Firm by Client, however, any and all unpaid attorneys' fees and costs owing to the Firm by Client shall be immediately due and payable.

The Law Firm reserves the right to discontinue the performance of legal services on behalf of Client on a particular matter upon the occurrence of any one or more of the following events:

1. Upon order of a court of law requiring the Law Firm to discontinue the performance of legal services;

2. Upon a determination by the Law Firm in the exercise of its reasonable and sole discretion, that state or federal legal ethical principles require it to discontinue the performance of legal services;

3. Upon a failure of Client to perform any of Client's obligations with respect to the payment of the Law Firm's fees, costs or expenses as reflected on the monthly bill; or,

4. Upon failure to cooperate with Law Firm as described in paragraph G.

In the event that the Law Firm ceases to perform legal services for Client, Client agrees that it will promptly pay to the Law Firm any and all unpaid fees and costs advanced for the particular matter(s) for which it is discontinuing the performance of legal services. Further, the Client agrees that, with respect to any litigation where the Law Firm has made an appearance in a court of law on its behalf, Client will promptly execute an appropriate Substitution of Attorney form. Any termination of Law Firm's representation on such a matter may be subject to approval by the applicable court of law.

F. Possible Third Party Conflicts

The Law Firm has a number of attorneys. The Law Firm may currently or in the future represent one or more other clients in matters involving Client. The Law Firm undertakes this engagement on the condition that the Law Firm may represent another client in a matter in which the Law Firm does not represent Client, even if the interests of the other client are adverse to those of Client (including appearance on behalf of another client adverse to Client in litigation or arbitration), provided the other matter is not substantially related to the Law Firm's representation of Client and in the course of representing Client attorneys of the Law Firm have not obtained confidential information of Client material to the representation of the other client ("Permitted Adverse Representation"). Client's consent to this arrangement is required because of its possible adverse effects on performance of the Law Firm's duties as attorneys to remain loyal and available to those other clients and to render legal services with vigor and competence. Also, if an attorney does not continue an engagement or must withdraw therefrom, the Client may incur delay, prejudice or additional cost such as acquainting new counsel for the matter. Client agrees not to seek to disqualify the Law Firm from representing such other client in any Permitted Adverse Representation.

G. Client Cooperation

Client understands and agrees that, in order for the Law Firm to represent Client effectively, it is necessary for Client to assist and cooperate with the Law Firm during this engagement. Client agrees to: (1) make its employees and officials available to discuss issues as they arise; (2) attend and participate in meetings, preparation sessions and court proceedings, review drafts of documents, and perform other activities in connection with the representation; and (3) provide complete and accurate information and documents to us on a timely basis. Noncooperation will be grounds for the Law Firm's withdrawal from representing Client on a particular matter. It is essential that Client and the Law Firm maintain open communications.

H. Arbitration: Waiver of Jury Trial

Negotiation. Law Firm and the Client agree that they will attempt in good faith to resolve through negotiation any dispute, arising out of or relating to this Agreement. Either Law Firm or the Client may initiate negotiations by providing written notice in letter form to the other side, setting forth the subject of the dispute and the relief requested. The recipient of such notice will respond in writing within five (5) days with a detailed statement of its position on, and recommended solution to, the dispute. If the dispute is not resolved by this exchange of correspondence, then representatives of each side with full settlement authority will meet at a mutually agreeable time and place, within ten (10) days of the date of the initial notice, in order to exchange relevant information and perspectives and to attempt to resolve the dispute. If Law Firm and the Client are unable to resolve the dispute at the meeting by negotiations, either side may then initiate arbitration as set forth below.

Arbitration. Law Firm and the Client agree that any dispute or claim in law or equity arising out of this Agreement or any resulting transaction, including without limitation claims of malpractice or professional negligence, that is not settled through mediation, shall be decided by neutral, binding arbitration and not by court action. The arbitration shall be conducted by a retired judge or justice selected by the Client and Law Firm jointly, unless both parties agree to a different arbitrator. The arbitrator shall render an award in accordance with substantive California law. In all other respects, the arbitration shall be conducted in accordance with Part III, Title 9 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction. The Client and Law Firm each shall have the right to discovery in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 1283.05. Small claims matters are exempt from arbitration. Fees of the arbitrator shall be taxed as costs.

MFAA. Under Section 6201 of the California Business and Professions Code (the Mandatory Fee Arbitration Act, or "MFAA"), the Client has the right to resolve disputes regarding the Law Firm's fees and costs through nonbinding arbitration or through court action. Law Firm is required to give the Client written notice of this right to nonbinding arbitration before Law Firm initiates any proceeding seeking payment of fees. If the Client declines to elect nonbinding MFAA arbitration within thirty days of receiving the notice, the binding arbitration provisions set forth above will apply.

I. Protection of Client Confidences - High Tech Communication Devices

The Law Firm is aware of its important obligation to preserve the secrets and confidences of its clients which it holds in precious trust for them. To that end it is important that Client and the Law Firm agree from the outset what kinds of communications technology the Law Firm should employ in the course of representing Client. For example, the exchange of documents and other information using email or other types of electronic communications involves some risk that information will be retrieved by third parties with no right to see it. Even the use of facsimile machines can cause problems if documents are sent to numbers where the documents sit in open view.

Therefore, Client should only provide the Law Firm with cellular numbers, facsimile numbers and email addresses which are acceptable to Client for receiving confidential communications from the Law Firm. Client agrees that the Law Firm may use any of the cellular numbers, facsimile numbers and email addresses other than those which you specify in writing that the Law Firm should not use.

J. Document Retention and Destruction

After a file on a matter is closed, Client has a right to request the Law Firm to return the file to Client. Absent such a request, the Law Firm shall retain the file on Client's behalf for a period of five (5) years. Following this period of time, the Law Firm will destroy such files.

K. Miscellaneous

1. Law Firm and Client agree that the Law Firm, while engaged in carrying out and complying with any of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, is an independent contractor and is not an employee of Client.

2. The Law Firm maintains errors and omissions insurance coverage applicable to the services to be rendered.

L. Entire Agreement

This Agreement represents the entire agreement between Client and the Law Firm unless a particular matter is covered by a separate written agreement. This Agreement supersedes and replaces any other agreement between Client and the Law Firm. By execution of this Agreement, Client certifies that it has carefully reviewed and understands the contents of this Agreement and agrees to be bound by all of its terms and conditions. Furthermore, Client acknowledges that the Law Firm has made no representations or guarantees regarding the outcome, or the time necessary to complete or resolve a particular matter. No change or waiver of any of the provisions of this Agreement will be binding on either Client or the Law Firm unless the change is in writing and signed by both Client and the Law Firm.

IV. DURATION

This Agreement shall commence on the date executed below by Client. The attorney-client relationship between the Firm and Client will cease at the conclusion of the matter(s) specified above. If the Firm is not asked by Client to provide advice for a period of one (1) year from the last date the Firm provided such advice, both Client and the Firm agree that the attorney-client relationship terminated on the last date the Firm provided advice without further action or notice by either party.

"Law Firm"

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

Dated: June 23, 2026 By:____________________
David E. Cameron
Partner

"Client"

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

Dated:____________________ By:____________________
Rich McGowan
President

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
Staff Memorandum

TO: TWD Board of Directors

FROM: Tovey Giezentanner, General Manager

DATE: July 15, 2026

RE: **Item 7: Adoption of Resolution 26-____ — Certification of the FY 2026-27 Assessment for Enrollment on the County Secured Property Tax Roll**

Action Requested. Adopt Resolution 26-____, certifying the District's FY 2026-27 parcel listing and authorizing the General Manager to execute and submit the documents required by the Butte County Auditor-Controller to place the District's land-based assessment on the FY 2026-27 secured property tax roll; and confirm the individuals to be named on the County's Property Tax Data Form as authorized to approve assessment corrections.

Background. On April 15, 2026, the Board adopted the FY 2026-27 budget of $472,069 at an assessment rate of $4.91 per assessable acre and directed staff to initiate the annual enrollment process with Butte County. On May 11, 2026, the Auditor-Controller's Property Tax Division transmitted its annual instruction packet for taxing agencies, and staff presented an informational overview of the enrollment process and timeline at the May meeting. The annual certifying resolution is now before the Board; adoption on July 15 keeps the District comfortably ahead of the August 10 statutory submission deadline (Government Code section 26911).

Summary / Analysis.

What the Resolution Does. Resolution 26-____ makes the certifications the County requires each year before it will place an agency's charge on the secured roll: that the assessment complies with all laws pertaining to the levy, including Proposition 218; that it is levied without regard to property valuation; that it is levied for its stated purpose under the cited State Code authority (Water Code section 37200, et seq.); and that the District will hold the County harmless from taxpayer claims. The resolution certifies the parcel listing as correct and authorizes the General Manager to execute and submit the four County documents — the Proposition 218 or Compliance Certification and Hold Harmless Statement, the Property Tax Bill Data Form, the Governing Authorization Certification Form, and the parcel listing. Adoption of the resolution is the only Board action the County's process requires; the remaining items are executed by staff under its authority. The District's Water Code section 37203 election (Resolution 25-04), its collection agreement with the County, and Tax Code 67675 all carry forward without further action.

Parcel Listing and Reconciliation. The listing submitted to the County will levy $4.91 per assessable acre on roughly 3,100 parcels comprising roughly 96,071 assessable acres, for a gross levy of approximately $472,069. Consistent with prior practice, the submission will exclude parcels owned by public agencies, which the County will not activate and which the District bills directly; per-parcel amounts are rounded to amounts divisible by two, as the County's two-installment billing requires. The resulting net roll submission of approximately $472,069 reconciles to the assessment revenue assumed in the adopted budget. The County publishes its post-rollover edit list in mid-July identifying parcels that have split or combined; staff will conform the final listing to the edit list before submission. For this reason, the resolution certifies the parcel listing on file with the District rather than attaching it as an exhibit.

Possible Revisions Before Adoption. Staff is completing a final review of the resolution and County forms with the Auditor-Controller's Property Tax Division during the week of July 13. Any resulting revisions are expected to be technical and conforming. If revisions are made after packet publication, a revised resolution will be distributed at the meeting and made available to the public, and the motion to adopt should reference the resolution as revised and distributed at the meeting.

Authorized Correction Signers. The County's Property Tax Data Form names up to three individuals authorized to approve post-enrollment corrections or removals (for example, removal of a charge a taxpayer has paid directly to the District). Staff recommends naming the General Manager, the Board President, and the Board Treasurer, subject to the Board's preference.

Schedule. Following adoption, staff will submit the complete enrollment packet to the Auditor-Controller no later than August 10, review the County's rejected-parcel report, if any, immediately upon receipt, and return the signed final Certification of Property Tax Bill Levy by September 1. The secured roll extends to the Tax Collector in mid-September, after which any change requires a County correction form and fee.

Additional Context. County administrative costs are unchanged: $0.30 per parcel for enrollment, collected as an offset to the December and April disbursements, and $10 per item for post-extension corrections. These costs are provided for in the Assessment Collection line of the adopted budget. The $4.91 per acre rate is a reduction from the $6.45 levied in FY 2025-26 and is below the $7.14 maximum authorized for the year by the assessment's Engineer's Report.

Attachment: Resolution 26-____.

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 26-____

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT CERTIFYING TO THE COUNTY OF BUTTE THE VALIDITY OF THE LEGAL PROCESS USED TO PLACE THE DISTRICT'S LAND-BASED ASSESSMENT ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2026–2027 SECURED PROPERTY TAX ROLL

WHEREAS, the Tuscan Water District (District) is a California Water District approved by its voters on December 5, 2023 and formed by the Butte Local Agency Formation Commission on February 1, 2024 in accordance with Government Code section 56000, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the notices and property-owner election required by Article XIII D, section 4 of the California Constitution (Proposition 218) for the District's land-based assessment, levied for the purpose of funding the District's administration, operations, and programs, were completed on January 15, 2025, and the assessment was approved by a vote of 34,222,913 (87.61%) in favor and 4,839,853 (12.39%) opposed; and

WHEREAS, Water Code section 37200, et seq. establishes an alternative method for the levy, collection, and enforcement of the District's assessments by the county within which the District is located, and by Resolution 25-04, adopted August 5, 2025, the District elected pursuant to Water Code section 37203 to proceed under that alternative method; and

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2026, the District's Board of Directors (Board) authorized the levy of an assessment of $4.91 per assessable acre for Fiscal Year 2026–2027, a rate below the $7.14 per acre maximum authorized for that year by the assessment's Engineer's Report; and

WHEREAS, the District is placing the assessment on the Butte County secured property tax roll for collection, and the charge will be as follows:

District Land-Based Assessment (Tax Code 67675) — $4.91 per assessable acre

WHEREAS, the District has complied with all laws pertaining to the levy of the assessment, including Proposition 218, to be collected pursuant to Water Code section 37200, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the assessment is being levied without regard to the property valuation of the properties involved; and

WHEREAS, the District agrees that it shall be solely liable and responsible, and will defend and hold the County of Butte harmless from any liability as a result of claims or claims for refunds and related interest due filed by taxpayers against any assessments, fees, charges, or taxes placed on the roll for the District by the County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Tuscan Water District as follows:

1. The parcel listing to be submitted to the Butte County Auditor-Controller for Fiscal Year 2026–2027, setting forth the parcel numbers and the assessment amounts to be levied, is hereby certified as being correct.

2. The General Manager is hereby authorized to sign any documents required, and is directed to deliver the parcel listing to the Butte County Auditor-Controller on behalf of the District, for placement of the assessment on the Fiscal Year 2026–2027 secured property tax roll for collection, including:

(a) Proposition 218 or Compliance Certification and Hold Harmless Statement;

(b) Property Tax Bill Data Form;

(c) Governing Authorization Certification Form (Authority to Approve Direct Assessment Charges); and

(d) Parcel Listing.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Tuscan Water District at its regular meeting on July 15, 2026, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

____
Rich McGowan, President
Board of Directors, Tuscan Water District

ATTEST:

____
Rayme Antonowich, Secretary
Board of Directors, Tuscan Water District

Item 9a

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT

Staff Memorandum

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Tovey Giezentanner, General Manager
DATE: July 15, 2026
RE: Item 9a — Projects: Updates & Status

Action Requested. Receive the monthly status update on the District's surface water supply and recharge projects and provide direction to staff as appropriate; no formal action is required this month.

Background. At President McGowan's request, staff will provide a standing monthly update on the District's project work, beginning with this meeting. The update is anchored by a one-page Project Status Report (Attachment A) showing each active project and workstream, its current stage, recent progress, and next steps. Staff will refresh the report each month; beginning in August, changes from the prior month will appear in bold so the Board can track movement at a glance. The stage framework also gives the Board and the public a shared, accurate vocabulary for where each project stands.

The item begins at a natural transition point. With Geosyntec's recharge feasibility results received in June, the grant-funded feasibility phase of the basin's project development work is substantially complete. That body of work — including the Vina Subbasin Surface Water Supply Feasibility Analysis presented in March — was funded with SGM Implementation grant dollars administered through AGUBC and others as subrecipients of the Vina GSA, at no direct cost to the District.

The work now shifts to TWD: converting feasibility findings into defined, permittable projects the District can fund, build, and operate. The portfolio tracks the Vina GSP's three project pillars — surface water supply, recharge, and demand reduction — with the District leading implementation of the first two and AGUBC leading analysis of the third at this time.

Summary / Analysis.

Surface water: the South Vina Extension is the near-term driver. The feasibility analysis confirmed the technical viability of delivering Western Canal surface water to South Vina lands now wholly dependent on groundwater — an in-lieu groundwater offset on the order of up to 7,000 acre-feet per year — while identifying cost competitiveness and federal permitting at the Cottonwood Creek crossing as the key implementation barriers. To address those barriers, the District engaged Water & Land Solutions, with Provost & Pritchard as engineering subconsultant, for a Phase 1 scoping and acceleration effort (not to exceed $19,950). Phase 1 carries four deliverables, all due July 31: a strategic scoping memo covering cost re-engineering and funding strategy; a recommended permitting path, including Section 408 considerations; a refined project description suitable for the Vina GSA consistency determination; and a draft Phase 2 scope of work. The consistency process under LAFCO Condition 18 is now in motion — staff anticipates project description submission for review by the Vina GSA SHAC this month, with SHAC and GSA board consideration anticipated late August or September.

Two companion efforts round out the surface water program: a pilot water transfer with PID (approximately 1,500 acre-feet via Butte Creek), for which a draft term sheet is in development, and the water transfer facilitation policy staff is drafting per the Board's February direction, which will define the District's role in facilitating member transfers. Staff will work with legal counsel and return to the board with a more defined plan for next steps in an upcoming meeting.

Recharge: five candidate projects, prioritization next. Geosyntec's June feasibility memorandum — the last of the grant-funded studies — synthesizes an extensive field program (tTEM geophysics, CPT investigations, sonic borings, permeability testing, and pilot ponding tests) into project concepts developed expressly to support consistency determinations and Proposition 4 construction funding: three flood-MAR basins along the Keefer Slough/Rock Creek corridor, a pumped recharge basin at Comanche Creek, and restoration of Durham Mutual's conveyance system. With Provost & Pritchard's April flood-MAR engineering memo and the Rock Creek East tTEM survey also complete, the technical record is in place. Staff expects to return to the Board in August or September with a more detailed strategy for next steps.

Demand reduction: analysis complete, tools published. Land IQ, with ERA Economics, completed the demand-reduction analysis — an AGUBC-led workstream and the third pillar of the GSP's project strategy. The findings are now publicly accessible through a story map, with a companion dashboard published by AGUBC. The analytical core is Land IQ's eleven-site orchard study, which estimated fallowing water savings of roughly 0.9–2.6 acre-feet per acre per year, and ERA's voluntary incentive-payment framework. This is not a District project, but it completes the demand-side picture that the District's supply and recharge projects are designed to complement. Staff is coordinating a Board presentation on the findings and will be working with Land IQ to schedule a presentation to the board later this year.

Funding: the Proposition 4 window is approaching. DWR's Prop 4 SGMA-implementation solicitation — part of a bond that includes $386 million for groundwater management — has not yet opened; an April workshop was held and guidelines are pending. That makes this precisely the window to finish project descriptions, permitting strategy, and Phase 2 scoping so the District's projects are competitive when applications open. WLS's Prop 4 positioning work and Provost & Pritchard's solicitation tracking are aimed at exactly that alignment.

Reading the status report. Each project on Attachment A is shown at one of five stages: Concept → Feasibility → Project Definition → Approvals & Permitting → Design & Construction. The portfolio today is concentrated at the transition from Feasibility to Project Definition; the acceleration work is aimed at moving the priority projects across that line and into position for Proposition 4.

Attachment: A — Project Status Report (July 2026)

ATTACHMENT A

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT — PROJECT STATUS REPORT

July 15, 2026 · Prepared by the General Manager · Updated monthly

Project / Workstream	Stage	Funding	Status & Recent Progress	Next Steps
SURFACE WATER SUPPLY				
South Vina Extension Water Supply Project — Western Canal supply to South Vina lands; in-lieu groundwater offset up to 7,000 AF/yr	Project Definition (feasibility complete Mar 2026)	Feasibility: SGM Impl. grant (via AGUBC) · Phase 1: TWD, NTE $19,950	WLS/P&P Phase 1 underway: cost re-engineering & funding strategy; permitting path (incl. Section 408 at Cottonwood Creek); refined project description; draft Phase 2 scope. Deliverables due Jul 31.	Project description to Vina GSA (SHAC and GSA board consideration anticipated in late August or September; Phase 1 results & Phase 2 recommendation to Board in August.
PID Pilot Water Transfer — ~1,500 AF via Butte Creek	Agreement development	—	Draft term sheet in development.	Finalize term sheet; bring proposed terms to the Board later this year.
Water Transfer Facilitation Policy	Policy drafting	TWD (staff)	Draft in progress per February 2026 Board direction.	Draft policy to Board for review and adoption later this year.
RECHARGE				
Keefer Slough / Rock Creek Flood-MAR Basins (3 sites)	Feasibility complete → Project Definition	SGM Impl. grant (via AGUBC / Vina GSA)	Geosyntec recharge feasibility memo received Jun 2026 (last of the grant-funded studies) — built on tTEM geophysics, CPT investigations, borings, permeability & pilot ponding tests; P&P flood-MAR engineering memo (Apr 2026) complete.	Site prioritization with Recharge Ad Hoc Committee; landowner engagement; project descriptions for consistency review; Prop 4 alignment. Staff will provide more detail in Aug or Sept.
Comanche Creek Pumped Recharge Basin	Feasibility — candidate identified	SGM Impl. grant (via AGUBC / Vina GSA)	Proposed as pumped-basin concept in Geosyntec memo (Jun 2026).	Evaluate & prioritize with Recharge Ad Hoc Committee alongside Keefer/Rock Creek sites.
Durham Mutual Conveyance Restoration	Feasibility — cost analysis complete	SGM Impl. grant (via AGUBC / Vina GSA)	Irrigation main condition assessment & repair cost analysis included in Geosyntec memo (Jun 2026).	Coordinate with Durham Mutual on scope & cost-share; identify funding path.

Project / Workstream	Stage	Funding	Status & Recent Progress	Next Steps
DEMAND REDUCTION (AGUBC-LED BASIN WORKSTREAM — CONTEXT)				
Demand Reduction Strategies — Story Map & Dashboard	Analysis complete — published	AGUBC (Land IQ / ERA Economics)	Land IQ story map complete; AGUBC companion dashboard live. Eleven-site orchard study (fallowing saves ~0.9–2.6 AF/acre/yr) & ERA incentive-payment framework underpin the tools.	Board presentation on findings in coordination; links available through the District and AGUBC.
REGULATORY & FUNDING				
Vina GSA Consistency & CEQA (LAFCO Condition 18)	In process — South Vina first	—	Refined South Vina project description in preparation (WLS Task 3); SHAC review Jul 22; GSA board consideration anticipated Aug 12. Recharge projects to follow as prioritized.	Submit project description & supporting materials; staff support at SHAC and GSA board meetings; CEQA scoping in Phase 2.
Proposition 4 Funding Readiness	Pre-solicitation	—	DWR SGMA-implementation round not yet open (April 2026 workshop held; guidelines pending). WLS preparing positioning strategy; P&P tracking the solicitation.	Align project descriptions & Phase 2 scope with guidelines upon release; identify target applications.

Stages: Concept → Feasibility → Project Definition → Approvals & Permitting → Design & Construction. *Beginning with the August 2026 report, bold text marks changes from the prior month.*

TUSCAN WATER DISTRICT
Staff Memorandum

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Tovey Giezentanner
DATE: July 10, 2026
RE: **Item 9b: 2026 SWEEP Block Grant — Invitation to Submit Full Proposal**

Action Requested. This memorandum is informational; no Board action is requested at this time.

Background. In May 2026, the District submitted a Concept Proposal to the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Office of Agricultural Resilience and Sustainability (OARS) as Lead Applicant for a $4,000,000 State Water Efficiency and Enhancement Program (SWEEP) Block Grant. The proposed program would fund competitive on-farm irrigation efficiency projects across Butte, Yuba, and Sutter counties — reducing groundwater use and greenhouse gas emissions — with the Butte County Farm Bureau (BCFB), the Agricultural Groundwater Users of Butte County (AGUBC), and the Sutter County Resource Conservation District (Sutter RCD) as technical assistant provider subrecipients.

On July 7, 2026, CDFA notified the District that it has been invited to submit a Full Proposal.

Summary / Analysis.

Advancement and reviewer feedback. Concept Proposals were scored by a technical review committee, and OARS invites top-scoring applicants totaling roughly 150 to 200 percent of available funding into the Full Proposal round. Advancement is therefore a meaningful screen but not an award — the Full Proposal remains competitive. **Reviewers called the concept "insightful and great"** and observed that the project "shows clear need for SWEEP funding," crediting its focus on disadvantaged and severely disadvantaged communities and vulnerable populations. **Their single stated concern is that "the lead applicant's independent experience and capacity remain unclear."**

Near-term process steps. Staff will book the District's 30-minute CDFA consultation, offered July 13 through 31, and will work with the subrecipient partners to complete the workplan, budget, and required documentation. Staff intends to submit ahead of the August 18 deadline and will update the Board before submission.

Vina Subbasin GSP Periodic Evaluation — Key Issues and Positions Summary

Vina GSA and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA · 2027 GSP Periodic Evaluation · Prepared July 10, 2026

Date	Issue	SHAC Position	Staff Position	GSA Board Position
Memo: May 6, 2026 SHAC: April 22, 2026	**01 — Domestic Well Mitigation Program.** Timing and scope of developing a well mitigation program and how it is described in the Periodic Evaluation (PE); supports response to DWR Recommended Corrective Action (RCA) 3.	Unanimous recommendation: (1) the PE state that the GSAs will develop a Well Mitigation Program that fits subbasin needs during the next implementation period (2027–2032); and (2) the Board dedicate FY 2026–27 budget funding to initiate program development in early 2027, after SGM grant projects are complete, so staff capacity is not overloaded.	Recommended Board action consistent with the SHAC: include the PE statement and FY 2026–27 budget funding to begin development in early 2027. Staff anticipate a program could be developed within 12–14 months once funding and consultant support are identified.	Adopted the SHAC position (same as SHAC recommendation).
Memo: June 4, 2026 SHAC: May 27, 2026	**02 — Land Subsidence SMC (DWR RCA 5).** Whether to amend the GSP to replace the groundwater-level proxy with direct measurement of land surface change.	Unanimous recommendation to adopt the proposed GSP amendments: InSAR-based direct monitoring (DWR-provided at no cost), a Minimum Threshold of 0.5 ft cumulative subsidence over 5 years caused by declining groundwater levels, a Measurable Objective of 0.0 ft/yr, and a land subsidence RMS network consistent with the groundwater level monitoring network.	Incorporate the Land Subsidence SMC amendments (GSP Sections 3.7, 4.5, and new 4.9.3) into the GSP as plan amendments and document the response to DWR's RCA in the PE consistent with that approach.	Adopted the SHAC position (same as SHAC recommendation).
Memo: June 4, 2026 SHAC: May 27, 2026	**03 — Interconnected Surface Water (ISW) Approach (DWR RCA 6).** Whether to establish ISW-specific SMC now or defer while monitoring data, DWR guidance, and regional coordination develop.	Majority recommendation (all members but one): combined "Show Progress / Proceed Carefully" path — define a broad ISW monitoring network using established wells, document progress characterizing ISW location and timing, improve visuals and explanations, continue shallow groundwater and stream gage data collection, and defer ISW-specific SMC, MTs, MOs, and RMS designation until DWR guidance, additional data, and regional coordination are available. The dissenting member opposed any commitments before DWR guidance is issued.	Proposed approach consistent with the SHAC recommendation, refining the Broad Network to established monitoring wells and newly installed SGM grant-funded wells only, with other wells described as potential future additions. No GSP amendment for ISW.	Adopted the SHAC position (same as SHAC recommendation).
Memo: July 8, 2026	**04 — North Sacramento River Corridor (NSRC) Interbasin Coordination.** IBC Framework 5-Year Implementation Update and proposed regional ISW work plan (regional data collection, refined regional modeling, local policy support).	Accepted the direction of staff.	Receive the report and provide feedback on the Framework 5-Year Implementation Update and the proposed regional ISW approach; feedback carried back to the NSRC IBC group; incorporate IBC commitments and ISW status into the PE. Funding not yet secured; Proposition 4 identified as a potential source.	Accepted the direction of staff.
Memo & Strawman released June 18, 2026	**05 — Groundwater Level RMS Network and SMC (DWR RCA 3).** Two key choices: whether to revise the RMS monitoring network, and whether to change the SMC (MTs).	Reviewed the strawman proposal and supporting information at June/July meetings; the SHAC will reconsider the item on **July 22, 2026**.	Strawman "Targeted Refinement" proposal: expand the RMS network from 17 to 29 wells (retain 11, remove 6, add 18); carry forward 2022 SMC for retained wells and assign comparable MT/MO/IM values to new wells using the 2022 GSP methodology; quantify domestic well sensitivity at MT levels; and establish non-regulatory Local Management Levels 10–20 ft below the MO at five shallow RMS wells in GDE-sensitive areas. No change to the 2022 MT framework.	Reviewed the information at June/July meetings; the GSA Board will make its decision on **August 12, 2026**.