

Madera Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Date: August 30, 2017

10:30am - Noon

Location: Madera County Offices, 3rd Floor Chamber (and via conference call)

A. Welcome and Introductions (Aja)

Aja confirmed list of attendees.

Name	Affiliation	Email	Attendance			
			Kick-off Meeting 8/7/17	TAC Meeting #2 8/30//17	TAC Meeting #3	TAC Meeting #4
Abigail Solis	Self Help Enterprises	abigail@selfhelpenterprises.org		X		
Eddie Ocampo	Self Help Enterprises	eddie@selfhelpenterprises.org	X			
Maria Herrera	Self Help Enterprises	mariah@selfhelpenterprises.org				
Jason Rogers	City of Chowchilla, Public Works	jrogers@cityofchowchilla.org	X	X		
Doug Welch	Chowchilla Water District	dwelch@cwdwater.com	X	X		
Keith Helmuth	City of Madera	khelmuth@cityofmadera.com	X	X		
Mark Angelo	SWRCB	markangelo@hotmail.com				
Jay Lowe	NorthStar Engineering	jlowe@northstareng.com	X	X		
Zaira Lopez	Central Valley RQWCB	Zaira.Lopez@Waterboards.ca.gov	X	X		
Sean Smith	Madera Irrigation District	ssmith@madera-id.org				
Harish Bagha	SWRCB	Harish.Bagha@Waterboards.ca.gov	X	X		
Jeannie Habben	Environmental Consultant for the San Joaquin Valley Region of RCDs	efwatershed@gmail.com	X			
Gretchen Heisdorf	Root Creek Water District (Provost and Pritchard)	gheisdorf@ppeng.com		X		
Igal Treibatch	Liberty Groves/SEMUCU	igal@earthlink.net		X		
Lead Agency Preparing SWRP - Madera County						
Ahmad Alkhayyat	Madera County	ahmad@madera-county.com				
Dario Dominguez	Madera County	dario.dominguez@co.madera.ca.gov	X	X		
Julia Berry	Madera County	Julia.Berry@co.madera.ca.gov	X			
Consultant Team						
Gary Conley	2NDNature	gary@2ndnaturellc.com	X	X		
Nicole Beck	2NDNature	nicole@2ndnaturellc.com				
Regina Hirsch	Sierra Watershed Progressive	regina@sierrawatershedprogressive.com	X	X		
Aja Bulla-Richards	Sierra Watershed Progressive	aja@sierrawatershedprogressive.com	X	X		
Robyn Cooper	Fall Creek Engineering	rcooper@fallcreekengineering.com		X		
Emily Corwin	Fall Creek Engineering	emily@wateristas.com	X	X		

B. Review on Methodology and Project Ranking Criteria (Gary)

Review Slides

Two components: Spatial Opportunities Analysis and Project Specific Benefits Assessment

Focus on Spatial Opportunities Analysis

Criteria and Metrics Review – looking for feedback

Comment: Igal – Projects that combine water supply/infiltration and flooding. Do those have higher priority? Gave Root Creek example – string of pearls. Has both infiltration and flooding benefits.

Response: Gary and Aja responded that, yes, these projects will likely end up with a higher priority because they are benefiting more than one criteria/metric

Right now, looking for areas where highest benefit to each metric

Weighting for importance from the stakeholder meeting

Possible of 100 points. For Spatial Points 73% are allocated to water supply. This is a heavy weighting. Is this the priority of TAC/local community? Water quality 17% and flood control 10%.

Comment: Igal – Are these numbers set or are they flexible?

Response: Gary – No we are asking for feedback

Comments: Harish – Flood management by reducing runoff rates and volumes?

Response: Gary – yes, those items are in the calculations. Example of infiltration basin located in an area with flooding would have a double benefit.

Response: Gary – there will be a survey for feedback for after meeting

Comment: Igal – Recharge and Flooding – Where do we get the water? Cheapest is floodwater in the winter. If water needs to be purchased then it would be very expensive and winter water is cheaper therefor has a better benefit and should allow for doubling of benefits somewhere in the criteria/metrics analysis. Combine additional points.

Response: Gary and Aja – I think I'm understanding. Areas where groundwater reduction, subsidence and cone of depression is greatest are also where the problem is greatest.

Comment: Igal – Why are you only assigning from last five years?

Response Gary - Great question. Longer data, but we didn't have coverage over whole county if we go 10 years back, so we focused on 5 years of reductions.

Comment: Igal - Can you do an average?

Response Gary - Could be a way to deal with it, but the result would be unfair to areas where data exists for only half the time. We can send out the data we used, and see what people think of data, and look at maps we used. We can

make sure on maps the data corresponds to where you all think the greatest need is.

Draft Spatial Outputs – Regional Scale Metrics. Dark orange areas have greatest priority relative to other areas.

Comment: Igal – Can't identify locations on maps

Response: Gary – Should add highways and cities to the map.

C. Initial Projects Prioritization (Gary)

Review slides

Mendota Pool Bypass and Reach Improvements (MPB)

Root Creek Water Conservation (RCWCP)

Root Creek Avenue 10 Recharge Project (RCA10R)

Root Creek Recharge is scoring higher based on weighting. Ranking of project is as important as getting the project in the plan. Requirement is simple to be included in the plan and integrated into the plan structure.

Comment: Doug – Who is proposing MPB Project? So Federal project taking money over local project?

Response: Emily- San Joaquin Bureau of Reclamation.

Requirement for funding is not solely based on priority. It is based on the

Comment: Doug – Who is doing ranking?

Response: Emily – Second Nature is doing Prioritization and Team will do preliminary Review. They TAC stakeholders and public will have an opportunity to comment. Previous comment follow-up – not considering who the project proponent.

Comment: Harish – Apply for grants, projects will be considered the same and will be graded on application.

Response: Aja – reminder that this is the TAC and not stakeholder meeting. We cannot decide during this meeting whose projects will be prioritized. Possible conflict of interest.

Comment: Igal and Doug - This project does not show any signs of subsidence or potential for GW Recharge

Comment: Gary – Project will score low on benefits that it will provide, as seen in the ranking.

Comment: Gretchen – Will TAC be able to review applications. Mendota Project site on perched groundwater. Questioning 3.4 out of 5 when recharge potential is limited.

Response: Emily - One thing to keep in mind is that this is based on the spatial element. Let's go into project benefits.

D. Review on Weighting Criteria (Emily)

Review slides.

Stakeholder Criteria Ranking

Input from Stakeholder Meeting #1 Results

Comment: Igal – So in south Madera, if you apply for a grant based on zip code, there is a difference. So, we could apply on DAC we fit, but based on (couldn't hear) we don't fit. With one hand tied behind our back, how do we function?

Response: Emily – We recommend using the DWR DAC Mapping tool

Comment: Igal – One is zip code and one is in tract.

Response: Emily – If you are in either one, we would qualify you.

Comment: Gretchen – What is the difference between Residential project water supply vs water supply?

Response: Emily – One stakeholder wanted to see infiltration benefits to go to residential communities' vs benefitting greater community.

Example Project: Root Creek Avenue 10 (Emily)

Comment: Igal – Water supply, any benefit into it from stormwater runoff. Part of supply that is not included?

Emily - Conjunctive use. Project could be in multiple categories.

Comment: Igal – Golden valley school district plan to add agricultural node to school. Donate 100k to water education that will be included in project. Water demonstration into project. Is there any place for it within this Grant?

Response: Emily – Does it provide a WQ, Supply, Environmental, or other listed benefit? If so it could be added and considered.

Please complete survey, any comments? (Emily/Aja)

Please fill it out now if possible. Here you can rank them.

Aja: All percentages should be adding up to 100%.

E. Approach for Soliciting and Developing New Projects

Review Slides

Review of Project Solicitation

Comment: Gretchen – Have you contacted the US Forrest Service? Will email to Emily a contact.

Comment: Gretchen – Consider Fresno Bee – will hit folks in Madera

Comment: Igal – Clearing or Arundo – Flood Control Project be considered?

Comment: Emily - Our consultant team is developing more projects today and tomorrow, as well as September 19th.

Comment Keith – Can hang out after call to review project locations.

Comment Jason – Can hang out after call to review project locations.

Comment: Gretchen – Are you visiting sites that already have application? In development and may be difficult to access.

Response: Emily – No.

F. Schedule (Aja)

Review Slide with dates for process.

Comment: Doug - September 15th absolute deadline for submitting a project?

Response: Aja – Yes.

Comment/Clarification: Aja - Week of October 16th will work?

(Chowchilla WD can do Wednesdays, City of Madera mornings are good)

(Gretchen: MS4 will require paperwork due on October 16th)

Comment: Aja – Anyone have a conflict on Wednesday October 18th. (no response)

Comment: Emily to Gary – All of the 2N modeling could help with MS4 deadline that is approaching.

Response: Gary – Will send information and make available. Send shapefiles. Send table. Send output.

Comment Aja: Review of next meeting scope, and input/actions needed prior to next meeting. Please complete the survey and if other questions, please contact us.

Comment: Igal - When with the Draft SWRP be on the website?

Response: Emily - It will be on website in mid-October

Comment – By when should the surveys be completed?

Response: Aja - By end of the week, so we can get information to wrap into the data/spatial analysis. We will make sure it is available and distributed more widely.