

MINUTES

MADERA SUBBASIN COORDINATION MEETING

Date: Thursday March 22, 2018
Time: 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
Location: Madera Irrigation District Board
Room, 12152 Road 28 ¼, Madera,
CA 93637

In attendance:

GSA	Committee Member	Technical Expert
City of Madera	Derek Robinson	Dave Merchen
Gravelly Ford Water District	Diane Kirk	Ken Bonester
Madera County	Brett Frazier	Greg Young
Madera Irrigation District	Dave Loquaci	Dina Nolan
Madera Water District	Phil Janzen	
Root Creek Water District	Julia Berry entered at 1:45 p.m.	

Stephanie Lucero, Facilitator
Bryan Thoreson, David Engineering (GSP consultant)
Peter Leffler, Luhdorff & Scalmanini (GSP consultant)
For others in attendance, see sign in sheet

-
1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS – Meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.**
Goal – Roll call of coordination committee members and overview of agenda goals.

Stephanie Lucero, Center for Collaborative Policy introduced herself and reviewed the agenda. Ms. Lucero is the facilitator provided by a grant from the Department of Water Resources (DWR). Self-introductions were made by the Committee Members. Ms. Lucero provided the ground rules for the meetings.

2. **DISCUSS AND AFFIRM COORDINATION COMMITTEE CHARTER.**

Goal – Share updates on GSA affirmation of coordination committee charter. Discuss and issues or revisions, clarifications required. Coordination Committee members shall review overall discussion and decision-making process consistent with charter and shared understanding of members. Coordination Committee shall also discuss development of the Subbasin Coordination Agreement and any interim agreements required through GSP Development.

The charter was reviewed, and it was noted all GSAs have approved the charter. Dave Merchen noted the City of Madera has not officially approved, but has reviewed and does not have any comments or concerns. Ms. Lucero noted the charter is the foundational document for the GSA Coordination Committee. The coordination committee is not the decision-making body, but will have discussions and will provide recommendations to the GSAs. Ms. Lucero noted the intent is that if a recommendation is not likely to be approved by the GSAs it will be known in the discussions. If there are too many recommendations that are not approved by the GSAs, the committee will run the risk of not making the deadlines established by SGMA.

The term of the Committee will be through the development of the GSP. The coordination committee will need to determine if it works and if not present new ideas on how moving forward. Ms. Lucero stressed the importance of all committee members, technical experts, and alternates attending the meetings. The GSP consultants David Engineering, Luhdorff & Scalmanini and Ms. Lucero represent the entire Madera Subbasin and are neutral. Ms. Lucero stated eventually the consultants will be gone and the coordination committee will need to continue to work together.

There may be ad hoc workgroups formed as needed. Ms. Lucero recommended the chair and vice chair be determined at the next board meeting. The role of the secretary was discussed. Andrea Sandoval, Madera Irrigation District will provide minutes only for the group. The recommendations will be affirmed and reviewed by Ms. Lucero before they go out to the GSAs. All other items, such as Brown Act requirements and conflict of interest will be completed by Ms. Lucero. Ms. Lucero will provide handouts for the committee members only, unless members of the public let her know they need copies.

The technical experts will meet with the GSP consultants. The coordination committee is made up of the GSAs that are preparing one GSP. The roundtable meetings will begin in April one hour before the coordination committee meeting. The roundtable meetings are smaller meetings with members of the public. At minimum one committee member needs to attend the roundtable meetings. The roundtable meetings will be noticed as a Brown Act Meeting. The roundtable meetings are solely for the GSA Coordination Committee. It may change based on the communication plan.

If someone does not agree “thumbs down” the recommendation will be moved forward to the GSAs. Decisions made at a previous meeting will not be revisited. There is no time to revisit things if someone missed a meeting. The charter can be amended at any time.

Recommendation of the coordination committee that each of the GSAs approve the coordination committee charter as reviewed and outlined during the meeting on March 22, 2018

3. REVIEW AND DISCUSS GSP DEVELOPMENT WORK PLAN.

Goal- Review and discuss proposed work plan for GSP development activities. This includes proposed GSA Coordination Committee meetings times, decision-points, and plan development milestones

Ms. Lucero stated the work plan includes the meetings times and plan development milestones. Ms. Lucero suggested each GSA review the sequence and figure out when individual GSAs need to review to make sure the work plan sequence works for everyone.

Dina Nolan questioned where the ad hoc meetings fall on the work plan. Ms. Lucero replied they are not intended to be public meetings.

Mr. Thoreson stated the work plan is a part of the grant application with the detailed tasks. They have tried to give extra time where needed. The work plan includes outline of meetings that fit with the tasks. Mr. Thoreson would like to schedule the meetings on a monthly basis and then update the work plan.

The standing coordination committee will be scheduled for the 3rd Thursday of the month beginning in May. The meeting in April will be based on the Doodle poll results. The preferred time was 1-5pm.

Technical workshops will be the same day and it will be either the technical workshop or coordination committee meeting.

Action Item: David Engineering and Cal State University, Sacramento is going to review plan with standing meeting and put dates that correlate with the 3rd Thursday of every month and make sure we

make the milestones and have dates when decisions need to be made.

Madera County will be the location for the standing committee meetings based strictly on capacity. The remodeling has been completed at Madera County.

Dave Merchen stated having the dates inserted will assist in understanding the work plan to truly grasp it. GSAs were asked to let Stephanie know if a different layout for the work plan would be more user friendly. GSA meetings are not included in the work plan.

4. UPDATE ITEM: POTENTIAL BASIN BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS

Goal -- Discuss deadline and potential for two Basin Boundary Modifications (deadline for submittal is June 30): 1) include Madera Lake in the Madera Subbasin and 2) change the southern subbasin boundary from the San Joaquin River to the county line.

Mr. Leffler reported on the Madera Subbasin basin boundary modification issue. He noted Madera Lake was omitted from the basin boundary and DWR is not sure why or how it happened. Madera Lake should be in the Madera Subbasin. The official boundary is offset from the Madera Lake. The Madera Lake is mostly in Madera Irrigation District lands. Madera Lake is 380 acres. The boundary can likely be addressed with letter from MID on MID letterhead. Dina Nolan stated several years ago MID had conversation with DWR regarding this issue. MID submitted for the MID GSA and included the Madera Lake. The MID GSA was approved by DWR as submitted. MID's stance has been there is not an issue since the MID GSA boundary was approved as submitted. Dina Nolan stated if the letter needs to be submitted MID is okay to do. Mr. Leffler stated DWR and consultants would like for the issue to be resolved.

The Madera Subbasin southern boundary is defined by San Joaquin River. Technically, there is part of Fresno County in the Madera Subbasin. The approximate acreage is 323 acres in Fresno County and approximately 120 Root Creek WD in Kings Subbasin. The basin boundary modification needs to be completed by June 30, 2018 and will require formal basin boundary modification request to address. Julia Berry stated the Madera County GSA was the last GSA to file and requested the boundary from DWR to use as the boundary. The boundary follows the Cal Fire boundary, but is not the County boundary.

DWR stated it only dealing with Madera Lake it requires only a letter. If the southern boundary issue is resolved, it will need a formal boundary modification and will need to include Madera Lake.

GSP Consultant Action Item: Follow up with DWR on what the bare minimum is we can do instead of formal basin boundary modification request to address the issue.

Dave Loquaci stated his recommendation is to have the boundary correct and make the necessary actions to make it correct. Phil Janzen stated this is something we will have to live with for many years to come and it should be correct.

Dina Nolan stated she has talked with DWR many times on this issue. MID's stance is the MID GSA boundary was approved and accepted prior to the basin boundaries being modified by DWR. Madera County is the agency that should make the request. Mr. Leffler clarified that DWR will require a formal process. Dina Nolan noted the GSP has to include all areas of the subbasin. The formal boundary modification process requires a resolution, public outreach, and technical reports.

David Rogers questioned if the timeline will need to be extend if there is another jurisdiction included. Mr. Leffler stated a decision cannot wait until the next meeting. Brett Frazier questioned if this only needs to go before the County GSA and MID GSA.

Phil Janzen questioned if these are the only areas of issue. Mr. Leffler stated these are the only areas he know of at this time

Christina Beckstead, Madera County Farm Bureau, stated there are issues on the eastern side of Madera County with small portions of lands being in and out of the basin. There are individual parcels split on the eastern boundary. Mr. Leffler stated there are various other minor misalignments apparent in comparison of GIS datasets. David Rogers stated he does not believe it is a big issue since it will be included in the GSP. Dina Nolan stated it will become an issue with LAFco and the State Board of Equalization. Greg Young stated he will work with Mr. Leffler on the boundary basin modification issues in the most cost effective manner.

Action Item: Determine the parcel bisection on the eastern boundary and verify if it is an issue for resolution by the Madera Subbasin or the coordination committee.

Dina Nolan stated the coordination committee does not have the jurisdiction to modify the boundaries or the County will be able to include in the timeframe for basin modifications requests. David Rogers questioned why worry about it. Greg Young stated if there are assessments later down the road it will become an issue. Julia Berry stated when she worked at the County, DWR told her they would not accept a boundary modification on the eastern boundary because hydrologically they believe it is the same.

Action Item: The GSP consultant and Madera County consultant will clarify if the eastern boundary needs to be resolved and by which means.

Action Item: Coordination committee recommends that the GSP consultant work with Madera County's consultant (Tully & Young) in the most cost effective way to look at the basin boundary modification. If there is a cost share, it will come back to the coordination committee for discussion and decision. MID's technical expert will assist to resolve the Madera Lake issue.

Mr. Leffler clarified that if a formal request is done, the Madera Lake modification will need to be included. Dina Nolan stated the MID technical expert will assist.

1st Recommendation to GSA / Action Item: The GSP consultant will determine cost for subbasin boundary modification with Madera County technical expert (Greg Young) and MID technical expert.

If there is a cost, it will come back to coordination committee.

2nd Recommendation: The GSP consultant and Madera County consultant will reach out to the Fresno County to determine how to reach out to Fresno County on behalf of the Madera Subbasin.

Madera County Action Item: The Board of Supervisors approve the costs for the Madera Subbasin modification on the southern boundary.

The item will be added to the April coordination committee agenda.

5. DISCUSS AND AFFIRM MADERA COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Goal- Discuss Subbasin level coordination and engagement actions as recorded in Communication and Engagement Plan. Members shall discuss any additional considerations to ensure engagement with stakeholders consistent with the proposed work plan.

Ms. Lucero stated each GSA will need to continue to their own outreach. This is in addition to the

outreach done by the coordination committee. Ms. Lucero noted this is not the final Communication and Engagement Plan (Plan). The Plan is a requirement of the GSP and SGMA. New Stone will complete their own outreach. Each GSA is maintaining their own interested parties list. The GSP consultant will create a constant contact with all GSAs interested parties list. The GSP consultant will work with Madera County on updating the www.maderacountywater.com website to include the coordination committee information.

Roundtable sessions will be scheduled prior to coordination committee meetings. There will also be targeted stakeholder meetings because not everyone will be able to attend roundtable meetings. There will be many different outreach strategies used. Primary ways of engaging stakeholders will be roundtable meetings, open coordination committee meetings, and public technical workshops. Emails and listserves will be utilized. There was discussion regarding newspaper and radio ads. Social media will also be used to promote the meetings and activities of the coordination committee.

Sal Alhomedí of Self Help Enterprises announced they are hosting a workshop on SGMA and the development of GSP. The workshop is scheduled for April 21, 2018 from 9am -2pm at Gracie Elementary in Merced. Mr. Alhomedí will provide the flyer to Ms. Lucero for distribution.

Ms. Lucero stated the April coordination committee will likely be held on April 26, 2018. This will allow stakeholders to attend the Self-Help Workshop.

Ms. Lucero questioned if GSAs have English/Spanish translation services that can be cost shared or in-kind.

Action Item: GSA determine if able to provide English / Spanish translation cost share or in-kind services for flyers, etc.

Action Item: Ms. Lucero updated the Plan to include KMJ instead of KNJ – COMPLETED 3/22/2018

Action Item: Ms. Lucero will provide cost estimate for translation services and reach out to local organizations regarding possible resources.

Action Item: David Rogers provide contact information for KMJ radio and Univision Spanish radio - COMPLETED 3/22/2018

Christina Beckstead stated the Chowchilla RCD did receive a grant to provide SGMA outreach.

Action Item: Ms. Lucero and Christina Beckstead will discuss Chowchilla RCD and Ms. Beckstead will provide contact information.

The best way to meet the SGMA goal is for GSA members to meet with smaller groups of people. There will need to be targeted SGMA outreach. Some people may not have internet capabilities or be engaged.

Action Item: Agencies that have not submitted their logos will do so in the next two weeks for the flyer / press release. Agencies without webpages will provide an email for hyperlink.

Julia Berry circulated the draft press release to announce the coordination committee and upcoming meetings. There was a case study included at the end of the press release. A Root Creek Water District case study was included on the press release. Ms. Lucero questioned if each GSA would like to provide a case study. Julia Berry volunteered to write the case studies for other GSAs. Dina Nolan stated it should be either all GSAs provide a case study for inclusion or do not include any case studies. Dave Merchen

stated the actions that we want to celebrate are with the home agencies and not the coordination committee. Julia Berry asked for suggestions for the press release to be more interesting and informative.

Action Item: Each GSA will review and provide input for the press release in the next two weeks. Coordination committee members will provide edits in one week to Ms. Lucero and one week to send out for final approval.

The Madera County website and date of the next meeting will be added to the press release.

6. IDENTIFY AND AGREE ON NEXT STEPS

Goal – Review action items from meeting and affirm agenda for next meeting.

The following items will be added to the next agenda: items included in the work plan, basin modifications request, and communication plan.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting will likely be held on April 19 or April 26.