THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF STOCKTON EAST WATER DISTRICT WAS HELD AT THE DISTRICT OFFICE
6767 EAST MAIN STREET, STOCKTON, CA
ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2026, AT 12:30 P.M.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

President McGurk called the regular meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. Manager Hopkins led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present at roll call at the District were Directors Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti and Watkins. Also present were Manager Hopkins, Assistant Manager Vega, District Engineer Evensen, Water Operations Manager Brothers, Maintenance & Construction Manager Higares, Administrative Assistant Rodriguez, Legal Counsel Zolezzi and Consultant Barkett.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT (NONE)

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes 08/04/26 Regular Board Meeting

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the Consent Calendar, as presented.
Roll Call:
Ayes: Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti, Watkins
Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

D. SCHEDULED PRESENTATIONS AND AGENDA ITEM

1. Stockton East Water District – Consider Approval of Plan for Water Treatment Plant Filter Project

Manager Hopkins introduced Chris Cleveland along with Patrick Carlson and Taylor Romenesko, all from Carollo Engineers (Carollo). Mr. Cleveland explained that the presentation would provide an overview of the current project design, along with alternatives requested by several Board members at a previous meeting. The current design includes four new filters, a new blower and electrical building, rehabilitation of the existing filters, air scour, updated underdrains, larger and deeper modern filter media, new actuators, and improved flow controls. Mr. Cleveland reviewed the existing filter configuration, noting that the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) currently has eight filters, with the original 1974 filters located on east side and the four filters added in 1990 located on the west side. The proposed four new filters would continue the existing arrangement in the westerly direction. Mr. Cleveland explained that the current design follows recommendations from the WTP Master Plan, which was prepared by Stantec.

Mr. Carlson presented the alternatives analysis to the Board. Mr Carlson reported the current design includes air scour, larger and deeper modern filter media, rehabilitation of both the 1974 and 1990 filters, four new filters, updated underdrains, new actuators, and improved flow controls. Based on current assumptions, this design is expected to eliminate the need for major filter modifications for at least 30 years and provides the best compatibility with potential future ozone treatment or other advanced treatment processes.
Alternative 1 would eliminate air scour and continue using the existing surface wash process, including extending the surface wash system to the four new filters. The existing surface wash pumps would have to be rehabilitated due to their age and condition. Both the 1974 and 1990 filters would be rehabilitated, and four new filters would be added using media like the existing filters.

This alternative would improve the condition and extend the useful life of the existing filters for approximately 30 years. However, if ozone or another advanced treatment process is pursued in the future, significant additional upgrades would be required, including installation of air scour and larger, deeper filter media.

Mr. Carlson reported Alternative 2 is like Alternative 1 but would initially rehabilitate only the older 1974 filters and leave the 1990 filters without rehabilitation. The 1990 filters could continue operating for a longer period; however, Carollo estimates they would likely require rehabilitation within approximately 10 years. As with Alternative 1, future ozone or another advanced treatment process would require additional upgrades to the filtration system.

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2 but would not initially rehabilitate either the 1974 or 1990 filters. While this option would reduce the initial project scope, it would leave the existing filters in their current condition, increasing the risk of failures and the potential need for future emergency rehabilitation projects. Carollo estimates that filter rehabilitation would likely be necessary within approximately 10 years.

Mr. Romenesko presented the Cost Analysis, Timeline and Risk Comparison of Current Design and Alternatives. Mr. Romenesko reported the current design includes air scour, rehabilitation of all eight existing filters, and construction of four new filters. The estimated construction cost is $53.8 million, with no additional filter projects anticipated for approximately 30 years. The total estimated cost remains $53.8 million whether or not ozone treatment is added in the future. This option has a low failure risk and low process risk. Mr. Romenesko noted that no significant filter retrofits, upgrades, or repairs are expected to be necessary for the next 30 years. Alternative 1 would use surface wash on all 12 filters and rehabilitate all eight existing filters. The estimated construction cost is $50.8 million, providing an initial savings of approximately $3 million compared with the current design. Without ozone, the total estimated cost would remain $50.8 million; however, if ozone is added in the future, the total cost is estimated at $69.2 million due to the additional air scour and media modifications that would be required. The failure risk is low, while the process risk is slightly higher because of the smaller, shallower media and potential future underdrain considerations. Alternative 2 would use surface wash and initially rehabilitate only the 1974 filters, leaving the 1990 filters without rehabilitation. The estimated construction cost is $42.7 million. Because the 1990 filters are approximately 36 years old and nearing the end of their useful life, an estimated $10.9 million rehabilitation project would likely be needed within 10 years. This results in an estimated total cost of $53.6 million without ozone, only $200,000 less than the current Ddesign. Mr. Romenesko reported with future ozone treatment, the total estimated cost would increase to $72 million. The failure risk would be moderate during the first 10 years and low after the 1990 filters are rehabilitated, while the process risk would be similar to Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would use surface wash but would not initially rehabilitate any of the eight existing filters. The estimated construction cost is $34.8 million, but approximately $21.9 million in future rehabilitation costs would likely be required within 10 years. This results in an estimated total cost of $56.7 million without ozone, which is approximately $2.9 million more than the Current Design. If ozone treatment is added, the estimated total cost would increase to $75.1 million, or approximately $21.3 million more than the current design. Mr. Romenesko noted that while the project would add four new filters, the eight existing filters are at or beyond their expected useful life. As a result, Alternative 3 carries an elevated near-term failure risk, while its process risk would remain similar to Alternatives 1 and 2 until future upgrades are completed.

Water Operations Manager Brothers provided the Board with Operations and Maintenance Considerations. Water Operations Manager Brothers reported the proposed filter improvements would provide better filter performance monitoring and more consistent operations. Past taste and odor (T&O) events highlighted limitations in identifying performance issues with individual filters. Installing individual flow monitoring and establishing consistent sampling points would allow operators to evaluate each filter separately and identify uneven flow, short circuiting, and declining granular activated carbon (GAC) performance earlier. Improved performance trends would also support better decisions regarding backwashing, maintenance, and carbon replacement, potentially reducing long-term operating costs. The addition of air scour would provide more effective cleaning and agitation of the entire media bed compared with surface wash, which primarily cleans the upper portion of the media. Air scour would provide operators with an automated, consistent, and repeatable backwash process across all 12 filters while helping prevent media compaction, mudballs, channeling, and uneven filter performance. It could also reduce treated-water use and backwash water requirements, resulting in long-term operational savings

Director Atkins inquired what the big difference between air scour and surface washing as far as cleaning goes. Mr. Romenesko replied surface wash uses water jets that only clean the top six inches of the media, whereas air scour bubbles air through the entire filter bed, allowing particles to scrub against each other and cleaning the entire depth of the bed.

Director Nakaue inquired if the current design being presented uses air scour, including the retrofit design for the existing units. Mr. Romenesko replied yes, the current design includes air scour for the new filters and retrofitting the old ones to be air-scour capable.

Director Nakaue inquired on the existing filters, if we don't switch them to the new design with flow regulators, how would the system operate, and is there a reason we wouldn't need to make that change. Mr. Romenesko replied it would be a discussion with the regulators, but typically they allow grandfathering. However, from an operational standpoint, it is difficult because you cannot easily identify which filter is having issues without individual flow meters

Director McGurk inquired is the material accumulating on top because the water is introduced from the top or is it primarily because the material is lighter than water and therefore floats to the surface. Mr. Romenesko replied primarily because the top of the media encounters the dirtiest water first, and neutrally buoyant particles like algae often catch on the top.

Director Atkins inquired if the air scouring needs to be used more often because media is bigger than the media it has now. Mr. Carlson replied no, it is the opposite; larger media creates larger pore space, allowing more solids to build before backwashing is required, leading to performance increases and less backwashing.

Director Hansen inquired how much does ozone cost to add at a future date if necessary. District Engineer Evensen replied Ozone itself was around $50M several years ago.

Director Watkins inquired about the concrete conditions underneath these tanks. Mr. Carlson replied the concrete basins themselves seem to be in good shape, but the underdrain system including gravel layers and feed ports is the component at risk of failure.

Director Watkins inquired whether the filters could be isolated and, if one filter fails, whether the issue could spread to the other filters. Mr. Romanesco replied if a filter begins losing significant

amounts of media, the media could enter the effluent and potentially be carried into another filter during backwashing, allowing the issue to spread.

Director Watkins inquired whether the water treatment plant is currently configured to allow ozone to be added to the existing treatment process without requiring significant modifications or relocation of equipment, and whether there is sufficient space available for the installation of an ozone system. District Engineer Evensen replied there is sufficent space to accommodate ozone. The proposed location would be north of the Low Lift Pump Station area, where preliminary plans for the ozone facilities were previously developed and presented to the Board.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the current design, as presented.
Roll Call:
Ayes: Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti, Watkins
Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

2. Stockton East Water District – Staff Report – Adopt Revised Resolution No. 26-27-04 – General District Election
   a. Revised Resolution No. 26-27-04 – Declaring An Election Be Held In Its Jurisdiction; Requesting The Board of Supervisors To Consolidate This Election With Any Other Election Conducted On Said Date; And Requesting Election Services By The Registrar of Voters
   Manager Hopkins presented the Board with Revised Resolution No. 26-27-04. Manager Hopkins reviewed the staff report and staff provided responses to questions.

A motion was moved and seconded to adopt Revised Resolution No. 26-27-04 Declaring An Election Be Held In Its Jurisdiction; Requesting The Board of Supervisors To Consolidate This Election With Any Other Election Conducted On Said Date; And Requesting Election Services By The Registrar of Voters, as presented.
Roll Call:
Ayes: Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti, Watkins
Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

3. Stockton East Water District – Staff Report – Consider Approval of the Second Agreement with Lepton Solar, LLC (A White Pines Renewables Entity)
   Manager Hopkins provided the Board with a staff report to Consider Approval of the Second Agreement with Lepton Solar, LLC. Assistant General Manager Vega reviewed the staff report and staff provided responses to questions.

Director Nakaue asked for clarification regarding the provisions for public agency termination, non-appropriation, and sovereign immunity. Legal Counsel Zolezzi replied no current board can obligate a future board to debt-like obligations for real assets unless specific stipulations are in the contract; this clause gives the District an out if a future board does not want to pursue it.

Director Sanguinetti inquired what a 1.9% annual rate increase would look like over 30 years. Assistant Manager Vega replied the rate is tied to usage, and while it increases, it is expected to remain competitive with PG&E, which is projected to have higher rates by the time the contract ends.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the second amendment to the Solar Power & Services Agreement with Lepton Sola LLC, in sustainability the form presented and, authorize the General Manager to execute the Second Amendment and the associated Memorandum of Agreement subject (1) final review and approval as to form by District Counsel, and (2) insertion of the final legal description, Array License Exhibit, and recorded Memorandum of Agreement, as presented.
Roll Call:
Ayes: Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti, Watkins
Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

4. Stockton East Water District – Staff Report – Consideration of Casting Stockton East Water District's Vote In The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies 2026 Board of Directors Election
Manager Hopkins presented the Board with a staff report to Consider Casting Stockton East Water District's Vote In The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies 2026 Board of Directors Election. Manager Hopkins reviewed the staff report and staff provided responses to questions.

A motion was moved and seconded to authorized submission of the District's ballot for the proposed slate, as presented.
Roll Call:
Ayes: Atkins, Hansen, McGurk, Nakaue, Panizza, Sanguinetti, Watkins
Nayes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

E. COMMITTEE REPORTS (NONE)

F. REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

1. Water Supply Report as of 08/04/26
Manager Hopkins provided a handout of the Water Supply Report for information only that included storage, release, and production data collected from various sources as of midnight August 11.

2. Information Items: None

3. Report on General Manager Activities
   a. Stockton East Water District's Activities Update
   Manager Hopkins reported he had a meeting with the City of Lathrop Manager regarding a possible pilot project to send water to Lathrop. Manager Hopkins reported City of Lathrop may not need the water for approximately ten years, so discussions related to such will cease until reinitiated by Lathrop.

   Manager Hopkins reported former City of Stockton Municipal Utilities Department (MUD) Director Lytle has retired, and Jeff Marasovich has been appointed as the Interim Director of MUD.

   Manager Hopkins reported follow-up on the employee satisfaction survey and has been meeting individually with employees to discuss feedback and confirm their intended meaning.

Manager Hopkins provided the Board with the equipment use for the week of 08/03/26.

4. Stockton East Water District Engineering & Maintenance Update
   District Engineer Evensen presented the Board with an Engineering update. District Engineer Evensen reported major capital projects continue to progress. The Filter and Sedimentation Basin, Clements Pipeline and Reservoirs Design, LLPS Electrical Design Build, Mormon Slough RR Bridge Fish Passage and SWEEP and SWEG Grants are ongoing. District Engineer Evensen also reported on Project and Construction Management. Manager Evensen reported on the Bellota Weir Modifications Project, George Watkins Low-Water Crossing, HWY 4 Trash Rack and Powerline, White Pine Solar Project and WTP Utility Water Booster Pump Station.

   Maintenance & Construction Manager Higares presented the Board with a Maintenance & Construction update. Manager Higares reported District crews continue to make progress on several operational projects, including the WTP Utility Water Booster Pump Station excavation and preventive and corrective maintenance. Manager Higares also reported on the 4,000 Pump Potter Creek Pump Station issue, P-26 VFD Installation, Highway 4 trash rack electrical and George Watkins Low-Water Crossing construction bypass intake & mobilization.

G. DIRECTOR REPORTS (NONE)

H. COMMUNICATIONS (NONE)

I. AGENDA PLANNING/UPCOMING EVENTS

1. Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Board Meeting, 10:30 a.m., 08/12/26

2. San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation Monthly Water Committee Meeting, 4:30 p.m., 08/12/26

K. REPORT OF THE COUNSEL

1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION Potential exposure to litigation – Government Code Section 54956.9 – one case

President McGurk adjourned the meeting to closed session at 2:09 p.m. The regular meeting reconvened at 2:14 p.m., with no reportable action.

K. ADJOURNMENT

President McGurk adjourned the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin M. Hopkins
General Manager

br

Board Meeting – 08/11/26
~~Draft~~Approved