

AGENDA
County of Madera Groundwater Sustainability Agencies'
Advisory Committee, Special Meeting
June 20, 2019 - 2:30 P.M.
Board Chambers at Madera County Government Center
200 West 4th Street, Madera, California.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call

Bill Diedrich	Ralph Pistoresi	Jared Samarin
Devin Aviles	Jerry Kaczynski	Ben Pitman
Jim Maxwell	Kevin Herman	Greg Rogers
4. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
5. DEMAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATION– Greg Young and Stephanie Anagnoson

Stephanie Anagnoson gave opening remarks, including that under SGMA everyone wants predictability and certainty, but instead gets less predictability and greater uncertainty. The way through the process is with trust, transparency and legitimate stakeholder processes that include all beneficial users. She credited Gary Peterson from Salinas Valley GSA for these thoughts.

The presentation covered three topics: projects, demand reduction, and rates. Some projects that are being reviewed are potential sources of water such as CVP Section 215 water and other water transfers and on-farm recharge as well as large-scale recharge ponds. There are benefits and drawbacks to projects. The benefits are fairly obvious – this is how we supplement supply. The drawbacks are these projects could require significant infrastructure that does not yet exist, the supplies may be intermittent, and the benefits may be limited to certain areas in the GSAs.

Demand reduction was discussed as a necessity for the Madera County GSAs in the Madera Subbasin and Chowchilla Subbasin. Two side by side graphs were shared to show that the 2040 goal that is required for the Madera County GSAs in the Madera Subbasin and Chowchilla Subbasin. Options for demand reduction can be combined and modified as needed. It is not necessary to choose one strategy. The three strategies that were shared, including some from past meetings, were allocations at the parcel level, some version of water markets, and/or some version of easements, including short-term rentals.

The Advisory Committee was also briefed on other options including well moratoriums, land use restrictions, or evaluating lower water use crops. Each option for demand reduction has administrative burdens, regulatory burdens and economic implications.

Stephanie Anagnoson shared that there are two rate studies currently in process:

1. A Rate Study in process to look at the possibility of a 218 proceeding for adequately funding the Flood Control and Water Conservation District county-wide; and
2. A Rate Study to assess an administrative fee to run the GSA; this fee could be used for extensive planning studies, but not for actual project implementation, which would need to follow a 218 proceeding.

Mike Linden, deputy county counsel, reviewed lessons learned from rate cases and legal challenges in San Juan Capistrano and in Ventura County. He emphasized that tiered rates cannot be used primarily to decrease demand. Tiered rates need to have associated costs tied directly to each tier. He also emphasized how tiered rates would need to follow a 218 proceeding.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT – Stephanie Anagnoson
Stephanie Anagnoson recommended an Ad Hoc Committee to support those who have livestock because they have unique concerns. Also, she also suggested that the County could send out a RFQ/RFP to receive proposals on water monitoring.

7. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

There were committee comments.

8. ADJOURNMENT: 4:21 p.m.
Next meeting

Next Regular Meeting Date: July 11, 2019 at 2 p.m.