



Delta-Mendota Subbasin Coordination Committee

Wednesday September 13, 2017, 10:00 AM  
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractor's Office  
842 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Banos

Meeting Minutes

Representatives from various GSAs and GSP interests convened at approximately 10:30 p.m. at 842 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Banos, California.

**Voluntary Coordination Committee Representatives in Attendance**

Anthea Hansen (Del Puerto WD) via telephone  
Jarrett Martin (Central California Irrigation District)  
Palmer McCoy (San Luis Canal Company)  
Ben Fenters (San Luis WD)  
Larry Harris (Turner Island WD)  
Valerie Kincaid (Oro Loma WD)  
Lacey Kiriakou (Merced County)  
Christina Guzman (Fresno County)  
Glenn Allen (Fresno County)  
Ric Ortega (Grasslands WD)  
Ken Swanson (Grasslands WD)  
Ellen Wehr (Grasslands WD)  
Jim Stillwell (Farmers WD)  
Joe Hopkins (Provost & Pritchard / Aliso WD)  
Rick Iger (Provost & Pritchard / Grasslands WD and Aliso WD)

**Authority Representatives Present**

Andrew Garcia

**Others in Attendance**

Lisa Beutler- Executive Facilitator – Stantec  
Linda Mendez – UC Davis  
Amanda Peisch-Derby – Department of Water Resources  
Chris Olvera – Department of Water Resources

**I. Introductions**

The voluntary Coordination Committee meeting was called to order by Lisa Beutler at

approximately 10:05 AM.

## 2. DWR Work Plan Introduction

Lisa Beutler noted that, through DWR's Facilitation Support Services, Stantec will provide services both intrabasin and interbasin coordination, as well as stakeholder identification and outreach efforts, including a stakeholder workshop.

Amanda Peisch-Derby described the facilitation and coordination tasks as outlined in the facilitation contract, reinforced that these services are for the entirety of the subbasin GSAs including all interested parties and beneficial users, and last described the Guidance Document for GSP Stakeholder and Communication Plan. Amanda then reminded everyone that the DWR SGMA Workshop in Clovis is close to full at nearly 200 attendants, and to RSVP.

## 3. Technical Subcommittee Update

Andrew Garcia briefly provided a discussion on the topics discussed at the previous subcommittee meeting. Minutes of that meeting are kept separately. Topics covered included existing data management systems, grant funding and grant participants while accounting for EDAs and DACs. It was noted that a draft application package will be available for all parties to review prior to submittal to DWR.

## 4. Draft Coordination Agreement Document Walk-through

Andrew provided a bit of background as to the comments received and the changes that were incorporated from the previous draft of the document. Lisa Beutler walked thru the document with the Committee in sequential sections, with the exception of Sections 6 – 10, 12 and 13. Those sections were deferred to the following meeting date or to the technical subcommittee. Following the first Technical Subcommittee meeting, it was determined that the agreement should explicitly list Coordinated Plan Expenses and a Section 5 was added to the Draft Agreement for this purpose. Andrew Garcia noted that he will prepare draft language for discussion at the subcommittee level and approval at the Committee level.

In the 'Definitions' Section of the Agreement, definitions were added based on the proposed governance of the Committee, SGMA specific definitions were moved to an appendix in the Agreement document, and some definitions are to be finalized following discussion with DWR in October. In addition, a discussion was held regarding reference to Management Areas and other definitions that are SGMA specific and may be adding confusion to this document. This term was replaced in the document or removed completely.

Section 4, Governance of the Coordination Committee, is where a lengthy discussion was held. The group ultimately proposed that the Committee will consist of one to two GSP representatives from each GSP Group with one vote allocated to each GSP group. The voting decisions and individual GSP discussion would happen separately from the Coordination Committee and each voting member would come to a Committee meeting having previously discussed positions at the GSA/GSP level. The Agreement also includes language to describe open public meetings in the spirit of SGMA and

transparency.

Voting was also discussed at length. Specifically, the draft language regarding agreeing to move forward but not providing support as well as a member being responsible to provide a constructive alternative when a specific action is opposed. The level of support language may be revised because some individuals believe the language describes organic functions of a Committee and should not be as prescriptive to prevent confusion. Finally, all agree that for an action to be taken a unanimous must be required. The reasoning behind this decision was that the purpose of the Coordination Agreement is to coordinate between all GSPs, and if there is not a unanimous vote then there is not subbasin coordination.

A dispute resolution concern was brought up, regarding non participation or performance. The review did not reach this section, but the Committee will discuss this particular language at the follow up meeting.

Lisa Beutler continued to remind the group that this Agreement is specifically to coordinate multiple GSPs and agreeing during development and implementation.

## 5. Next Steps/Schedule

Next regular meeting is scheduled for October 11<sup>th</sup> 2017.