



MEETING NOTES – Merced GSP

SUBJECT: Merced GSP Coordinating Committee Meeting

DATE/TIME: August 26, 2019 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 type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Chavez	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Elwin (alternate)	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bob Kelley	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mike Gallo	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nic Marchini	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input 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
 - a. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) called the meeting to order. Committee members introduced themselves.
2. Approval of minutes for July 22, 2019 meeting
 - a. Minutes from July 22nd were approved.
3. Presentation by Woodard & Curran on GSP development
 - a. Update on Public Comments Received on draft GSP
 - i. Alyson (W&C) reviewed the GSP draft timeline.
 - b. Plans for September 18 Joint GSA Boards Meeting
 - i. Discussion will be focused on the Draft GSP comments and how to incorporate.
4. Prop 68 Funding Opportunity
 - a. Alyson (W&C) presented a summary of the Prop 68 Funding Opportunity as well as a summary of the implementation activities that could be included in the funding application.
 - b. Staff recommended assembling a small working group to decide what to include in grant application and requesting authorization from GSA Boards to fund preparation of the application itself.



- c. CC members expressed concern that there may need to be additional meetings beyond September Joint Board Meeting to finish preparation and finalization of the GSP that would require use of the contingency, so it would be wise to request additional funding for the grant application preparation.
 - d. CC voted and unanimously approved that the consultants should start working on the Prop 68 grant application and bill to the contract contingency while the GSAs discuss with their boards to authorize an amendment by September 18.
 - e. Working group volunteers are: Hicham ElTal, Lacey Kiriakou, and Dena Traina (Provost & Pritchard)
5. Water Allocation Framework Discussion
- a. Alyson (W&C) provided a summary of previous discussions and provided some clarification and distinction between several sets of numbers that have been presented previously.
 - b. Q: How do the sustainable yield values compare to what we've seen before? The current overall value doesn't appear to match some of the values presented previously in different regions. A: The number is 90,000 AFY for the entire Basin as a whole. Depending on where you are in the basin, it could be more or less compared to where your pumping is compared to the average.
 - c. Q: Is the 2040 projected conditions the best baseline for comparison? A: It's based on SGMA compliance being needed by 2040, which would be the Projected Conditions. We should focus on the Sustainable Yield which is the same at all years.
 - d. Q: Does 2040 projected conditions include implementation of GSP projects? A: No.
 - e. Q: Is urban water use reduction included in the model of the 2040 projected conditions? A: It includes projected water use in 2040 which includes water use efficiency improvements but also population increases largely based on Urban Water Management Plan projections. Cropping patterns were generally based on current cropping patterns per direction from the GSAs.
 - f. Q: How is the planned significant growth in UC Merced, City of Merced, etc. accounted for in the model? A: It's already included in the projected conditions scenario as part of the City's own projections for its water use.
 - g. Alyson (W&C) summarized inter-GSA coordination efforts agreed on and what next steps are needed. Also shared that an ad-hoc committee is recommended to work in parallel with the GSP to develop.
 - h. Q: What role do you see for the Stakeholder Committee in the ad-hoc allocation committee? A: This ad-hoc committee is intended to be more for GSA staff, but some items need to be put in the GSP vs others are too soon to discuss and won't be part of the GSP.
 - i. CC supported development of an ad-hoc committee for development of an allocation framework, with the following members: Hicham ElTal, Ken Elwin, Mike Gallo, Larry Harris, and Bob Kelley.
6. Public Outreach update
- a. Charles (Catalyst) provided an update on public outreach activities, including community meetings put on by SHE and Leadership Council, the public September 18 Joint Board meeting, and the Adoption Hearings in Fall 2019.
 - b. Comment: SHE and Leadership Council are spread thin and are concerned that the 30-day comment period was too short for full engagement with their communities and thus now encourage GSAs to consider ways to extend time and find ways to fund future additional DAC outreach. Also to consider expanding the Prop 68 working group to include a voice for DAC communities or to quantify benefits to DACs.
7. Coordination with neighboring basins



- a. Hicham EITal (MIUGSA) described a comment letter received from Delta-Mendota Subbasin representatives about subsidence and highlighted need to coordinate on objectives and thresholds between subbasins.
 - b. Comment: If we stopped pumping and everyone still farmed, the ground will still sink (subsidence continues), so setting a goal of 0 does not make sense.
8. Informational Item - Groundwater Tracking with Remote Sensing – Presentation by Dan Howes, ITRC
- a. Dan Howes was invited by the Coordinating Committee to talk about the technology for using remote sensing to measure groundwater use in lieu of metering which is potentially being considered for GSP implementation.
 - b. (see separate PDF with PowerPoint slides)
 - c. General costs of the remote sensing services would be \$40,000/yr service for agencies with surface deliveries. More like \$25,000/yr (due to simpler setup) if surface water deliveries are not used. Cost can vary with level of riparian areas that need more investigation/setup.
9. Public comment
- a. No comments.
10. Next steps and adjourn
- a. Next public meeting is September 18 @ 6PM Joint GSA Board Meeting to review and discuss public comments on draft GSP.

Next Regular Meeting

September 18 @ 6PM

Sam Pipes Meeting Room, Merced, CA (subject to change)

Information also available online at 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.