



## MEETING NOTES – Merced GSP

SUBJECT: Merced GSP Coordinating Committee Meeting

DATE/TIME: December 17, 2018 at 1:30 PM

LOCATION: Castle Conference Center at Castle Airport, 1900 Airdrome Entry, Atwater, CA 95301

---

### Coordinating Committee Members In Attendance:

	Representative	GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stephanie Dietz	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Justin Vinson	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Chavez	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Elwin (alternate)	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bob Kelley	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nic Marchini	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rodrigo Espinoza	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	George Park (alternate)	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Harris	Turner Island Water District GSA #1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scott Skinner (alternate)	Turner Island Water District GSA #1

### Meeting Notes

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes for November 26, 2018 meeting
  - a. Meeting minutes were approved.
3. Stakeholder Committee update
  - a. Update from December 17 morning meeting was provided. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) provided an update on what was discussed in the morning SC meeting.
4. Presentation by Woodard & Curran on GSP development
  - a. Next Steps in GSP Development presented by Alyson Watson (W&C). The focus of the meeting is on water allocation frameworks.
  - b. Water Allocation Frameworks
    - i. Question: Does a violation have to be determined by the Superior Court? Answer (W&C): No, the GSAs have the authority to determine violations.
    - ii. Alyson Watson (W&C) provided a brief review of the two different type of groundwater rights that will be discussed during the meeting: prescriptive and overlying (correlative) rights.
    - iii. Alyson Watson (W&C) provided a recap of the different allocation methods discussed at the last meeting. The W&C team started from the comments received during the last meetings and worked these into different examples of allocation frameworks.



- iv. The W&C team found and corrected a discrepancy in the sustainable yield analysis, which brings the sustainable total yield for the Subbasin to 530,000 acre feet per year.
- v. Alyson Watson (W&C) explained that Water that is imported and seeps into the basin through unlined conveyance canals and distribution system belongs to the entity that developed the water. W&C team is working with entities in the basin (e.g. MID and others) to develop estimates of canal seepage.
- vi. W&C provided an explanation for the breakdown of different historical use calculations presented over 10-year historical periods.
- vii. The SC recommends using historical use rather than projected use as the basis for allocating sustainable yield.
- viii. Comment: It would be good to have the baseline set on historical use from a city perspective and look at this in terms of per capita use.
- ix. Comment: Cities are going to need to use alternatives, specifically conservation. Cities are also expected to further densify rather than spread, so a per capita use is a better estimation.
- x. Alyson Watson (W&C) provided a brief overview of the input from the SC:
  - 1. There is concern for outside investors coming into water markets
  - 2. It is recommended to base allocations on historical use
  - 3. Will need to decide how to handle non-irrigated lands
  - 4. Several comments voiced a spirit of trying to be inclusive and work out solutions together in a fair way.
- xi. Mojave Adjudication Example:
  - 1. There was a final judgement in 1996, for an area with 5 subbasins. Each year the Watermaster conducts a review and adjustment. This determines the amount that is allocated to each pumper
  - 2. Comment: Request made to look up how the amount pumpers can have is determined.
- xii. A discussion was held on the general allocation approach. Comments and questions are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Question from W&C: Should there be an allocation for non-irrigated lands?
  - 2. Comment: They should have an allocation, although it is unclear what the most appropriate number for the allocation should be.
  - 3. There was a brief discussion on the amounts of irrigated and non-irrigated acres. About a third of the Subbasin's acres could be non-irrigated lands.
  - 4. Question: Why do we not have other appropriators in the prescriptive use estimates? Answer (W&C): It is a matter of time needed in putting together a more detailed example. If we choose to go this route, more information would be needed.
  - 5. Question from W&C: Does the Subbasin want to look at historical or projected or look at a hybrid? And should this consider a percentage reduction in GCPD?
  - 6. Comment: Look at projected use as a baseline.



7. Input from Charles Gardiner (Catalyst): The SC thought numbers for population expansion as stated in the plans (e.g. Urban Water Management Plans) might be too generous to be used for our estimates.
  8. The SC wanted to see what the historical baseline would look like using different ranges of years. Question from W&C: Is there another way to do this? Potentially by using different years?
  9. Comment (W&C): If a historical baseline is used, a range of years will need to be determined.
  10. Comment: The allocation approach has to address overlying water rights.
  11. Comment: A partial allocation could be determined for non-irrigated lands through the use of scenarios to see what that looks like.
  12. Comment: A structure should be created and regulated for transferring allocations. It could be useful to have some examples of permutations to show what this would look like.
- xiii. Alyson Watson (W&C) illustrated a timeline for the implementation of an allocation program from 2020 to 2040, with milestones for every 5-year period.
1. Feedback from CC:
    - a. Comment: This seems to make sense, but there will need to be a lot of education.
    - b. Comment: It is important to avoid having people think there is a lot of lead time and a general concern that the Subbasin will need to keep up momentum.
    - c. Comment: The chosen approach will have to be reasonable and practical. Without metering implementation will be impossible.
  - c. Other Updates: The beta link requested for the Data Management System is still in progress with an estimated completion time in January.
5. Public Outreach update
- a. There were two public workshops held in December, both with good conversational input and good attendance. The next public workshop will be in late February.
6. Coordination with neighboring basins
- a. There is a memorandum of intent with six concepts with Turlock Basin. In December, the West Turlock GSA approved the MOI. This will go to the Merced Subbasin and East Turlock GSA.
7. Public comment
- a. There were no public comments.
8. Next steps and adjourn
- a. Water Budget Technical Memo and Water Allocation Framework development.

**Next Regular Meeting  
January 28, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.**

Merced, CA – Castle Conference Center at Castle Airport (subject to change)  
Information also available online at [mercedsgma.org](http://mercedsgma.org)

**Action may be taken on any item**

*Note: If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact Merced County, Community and Economic Development staff at 209-385-7654 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.*

