



**Center for Collaborative
Policy**
California State University,
Sacramento
815 S Street, First Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

MADERA GROUNDWATER SUBBASIN STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT

Prepared for DWR and Madera Subbasin GSAs
Finalized November 20, 2017

MADERA GROUNDWATER SUBBASIN

Stakeholder Interview Findings and Recommendations

Table of Contents

<u>GENERAL SUMMARY</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>INTERVIEW PROCESS & INTERVIEWEES.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>INTERVIEW FINDINGS.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>MADERA SUBBASIN CONDITIONS.....</u>	<u>4</u>
HYDROGEOLOGIC CONDITIONS	4
POLITICAL CONDITIONS AND STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS	5
GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS	7
VISION FOR THE BASIN	11
STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT	12
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS.....</u>	<u>13</u>
CRITICAL FACTORS INFLUENCING RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
RESOURCES AND STAKEHOLDER DIFFERENCES.....	13
TECHNICAL ADVISORS	13
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT STEPS	14
<u>APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER).....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....</u>	<u>17</u>

General Summary

The County of Madera (County) submitted an application to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) for facilitation assistance in the Madera Subbasin of the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin (Subbasin) for support in the process of developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) was hired by DWR to assist Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) in reaching consensus on potentially contentious water management topics arising from diverse beneficial uses and users of groundwater. An additional goal of facilitation support is to ensure consistent stakeholder outreach and communication messaging by all GSAs within the Subbasin, and develop a Subbasin-wide Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan.

CCP provides impartial mediation services as part of its mission to build capacity of public agencies, stakeholder groups and the public to use collaborative processes to improve policy outcomes. A primary tool is a situation assessment, wherein an independent mediator meets with interested stakeholders to identify parties and issues, analyze potential areas of conflict and agreement, and make recommendations on how to proceed.

CCP conducted an impartial assessment of issues and concerns related to the formation of a Madera Subbasin GSP(s) through individual and group interviews, to learn how stakeholders might want to approach this state-mandated action. CCP staff conducted 14 interviews involving 24 people representing all seven Madera Subbasin GSAs, as well as a representative class of other key Subbasin stakeholders. This document summarizes the findings and recommendations from these assessment interviews.

Interview Process & Interviewees

In September of 2017, CCP met with GSA staff to identify an initial list of individuals to interview, and then relied on interviewees for additional referrals to ensure all perspectives possible were presented. These stakeholders included GSA representatives, local jurisdictions, water districts, mutual water companies, well owners, agricultural interests, and several community organizations. CCP staff conducted interviews with individuals and small groups when appropriate. The interviews were conducted between September 27 and November 13th, 2017, the majority of these interviews were in-person, the remaining conducted through group meetings or by telephone.

A standardized list of 10-15 interview questions focused on gathering insight as to the range of perspectives, issues, and disagreements that must be resolved as the seven GSAs in the Subbasin work toward Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development. The stakeholder assessment served several purposes:

- Identify and analyze stakeholder interests and concerns
- Help to develop plans to further engage stakeholders and encourage

- meaningful involvement in collaborative planning efforts.
- Assist stakeholder groups to identify and develop common planning goals and objectives.
- Improve stakeholder understanding of the requirements for GSP development.
- Help stakeholder groups establish an approach to coordinated decision making in preparation for GSP development and implementation in the Subbasin.

A list of interviewees and interview questions can be found in the appendices. Interview notes are confidential.

Interview Findings

- Results are presented in aggregate, focusing on common themes and unique differences
- Findings are shared without attribution
- Not all participants answered all questions
- Findings may be presented in “qualitative” terms (e.g. “a majority of participants said “X”, “a few participants believe “Y”).

Break out of qualitative terms

Term	Percentage of Respondents Answered
<i>All</i>	95-100%
<i>A majority</i>	80-95%
<i>Most</i>	50-80%
<i>Some</i>	25-50%
<i>A few</i>	10-25%
<i>A minority*</i>	Less than 10%

*Because interviews were conducted with representative stakeholders, minority perspectives are included in findings if those, in our professional view, are representative of a larger group of stakeholders.

Madera Subbasin Conditions

Hydrogeologic Conditions

All interviewees stressed hesitance to make any assumption on hydrologic conditions until GSP data was released and developed. Notwithstanding many shared perspectives and presumptions are based on current known conditions and experience. Those are highlighted below.

[Need for Groundwater Sustainability](#) – Water Managers in the Subbasin are aware the overall water usage is not sustainable and that a plan for sustainability is critical. Wells have gone dry in some residential areas surrounded by agriculture during the drought. The interdependence of the Subbasin is recognized in that when one groundwater user over pumps it has an impact on others in the Subbasin. There is a

generally shared concern that GSAs do not all have the same water resources (i.e. surface water and likely groundwater), and not all GSAs are currently sustainable.

Geo-Political District Boundaries – The majority of the Subbasin GSAs are organized along political boundaries rather than hydrogeologic features, leaving some management areas with limited options for recharge and sustainable groundwater planning. There is currently not sufficient infrastructure to get needed surface water to all GSAs boundaries for users to limit groundwater usage and/or for critical recharge. The current GSA boundaries limit recharge options unless GSAs coordinate efforts through projects and other options.

Groundwater and Surface Water Uses – *Many* interviewed referenced the lack of water treatment facilities (aside from sewage treatment), as the reason to preserve the groundwater supply for drinking and other domestic uses, and a need for agriculture to utilize surface water resources. There is concern with the lack of infrastructure, and the costs to build the needed infrastructure to distribute surface water around the basin. Additionally, some expressed concern that Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requirements will add pressure to the costs of purchasing additional surface water for distribution within the Subbasin.

Political Conditions and Stakeholder Relationships

Agriculture Critical to Local Economy – *Most* stakeholders interviewed assert that agriculture is critical to the economy and success of the region, providing needed jobs, tax base, and economic support for the whole community. *Most* feel that land in the white areas (unincorporated areas covered by the County GSA) will have to be fallowed for the Subbasin to reach sustainability, and *all* interviewees are wary of taking farm land out of production. *All* recognize agriculture as central to the economy.

Tension among Agriculture and Domestic Users – *Many* interviewed state they are aware of plans for increased development and are unsure where the needed water and water infrastructure will come from and how it will be paid for. *Some* interviewees identified this as a threat to stakeholders' water supplies.

- Divergent perceptions regarding groundwater use by domestic versus agricultural water use.
 - *Some* interviewees stated that domestic use accounts for a low percentage (around 2%) of the overall water budget.
 - *Some* interviewees stated that domestic wells use is nearly equal to agricultural water use.

Need For Transparency and Trust in Government Agencies – *Many* interviewees indicate a history of distrust between the Subbasin stakeholders (specifically the agricultural community) and government agencies.

- *Many* indicate there is a general distrust of state government agencies, even a sentiment that the State wants to “get rid of” some agriculture.

Perceptions regarding Madera County – Madera County is historically seen by *many* interviewees as not respecting agricultural interests and *many* are wary that the County is pursuing more residential and commercial development than is feasible. These interviewees expressed concern that domestic development will further stress the water resources of the Subbasin.

- *Many* interviewees referred to a previously disbanded advisory committee as basis to distrust the County’s willingness to approve recommendations from advisory groups or committees.
- *Most* GSAs expressed uncertainty whether the County fully appreciates the role of agriculture to the economy of the region, and they are concerned that many County leaders are not in touch with concerns of the farmers. (However, they also indicated that at least one member on the County Board of Supervisors is a farmer and a one or two more understand agricultural concerns.)
- *Some* express the concern that the County is looking at political factors rather than focusing on the technical expertise needed for the GSP development, however *most* also say the County is improving in its focus on SGMA and the planning and outreach needed to reach compliance.
 - *Many* of the same interviewees referenced improvements in County relationships. These interviewees likewise, identified Supervisor Brett Frazier as fair and well versed in representing or understanding stakeholder concerns. Likewise, they referenced new staffing on groundwater management in the County as an improvement in stakeholder relationships
 - *Some* of these same interviewees referenced a need for additional staffing support for the County to engage in SGMA, specifically referencing the need for technical support to the County.
- *Many* consider it the responsibility of the County and the County Board of Supervisors to acknowledge and plan for the needed water to support both the farmers in white areas and planned development, and to plan for the costs and infrastructure to move surface water around the Subbasin.
- *Most* referenced the County as having the greatest “lift” in terms of communicating and engaging a larger variety and number of stakeholder concerns and varied beneficial users in GSP development.

Need For Collaboration and Trust among GSAs – *All* interviewees indicate that until now, the GSAs have not had to work together to make hard decisions (i.e. water balance, financing, etc.). Each GSA management area is making plans for their own sustainability, however GSAs have not yet had to make hard decisions together about Subbasin planning and sustainability.

- *Many* potential management areas are currently developing internal plans for sustainability and shouldering those costs. There is general consensus that GSAs do not want to share responsibility of costs to develop other management areas internal plans or implementation of those plans. *Most* agree to contribute to costs of overall GSP development.

- There is no mutual agreement on how to allocate costs (when accrued for GSP development).
- *All* understand that data sharing and reporting is necessary at the Subbasin level.
- *Some* are unsure if they can trust their neighboring GSAs to implement the final GSP.
- *Many* are concerned about enforcement by Subbasin GSAs of other Subbasin GSAs who may contribute to non-compliance of the Subbasin.
- There is uneasiness regarding the interaction and relationships between those GSAs who have surface water supplies and infrastructure and those who do not.
 - *Many* feel that previous investments in water infrastructure and water sources should be honored.
 - *Some* are unsure how SGMA implementation will impact future options to manage water supplies (surface and groundwater). Those with limited surface water or infrastructure expressed a concern with limited power in GSP decision-making.
 - *All* identify Madera Irrigation District (MID) as a key player in decision making, due to their existing surface water resources and infrastructure.
- There are *shared concerns* over inflows, outflows, and recharge.

Non-GSA Beneficial User Concerns – There are *some* interviewees who feel as if they have no say in decisions that directly impact them. They are concerned that mutual water companies, disadvantaged communities (DACs), those with private wells (including farmers, residents, schools, and hospitals), and other beneficial users who will be impacted do not have a voice and vote in the current governance structure. *Many* are unsure who to go to within the GSA decision-making structure to impact decisions and express their opinions on decisions that will impact them. They are unclear how their wishes and needs will be incorporated in the GSP development.

- *A few* interviewees are working towards SGMA compliance, but do not yet trust that their interests will be represented as they feel outnumbered by other water users with more political and economic power.
- *A few* interviewees point out that a primary concern for many who live in disadvantaged community areas is water quality and quantity. Some have contamination issues, and some are dependent on wells that have gone dry or are about to go dry. They shared that leaders in these communities expressed concern with safe, affordable access to water.

Governance Structure and Operations

Technical Points of Concern

Science, Transparency and Reliable Data Sharing – *A majority* of those interviewed referred to the need for accurate, valid science and data from a neutral third party to provide the foundation for the GSP planning process.

- *Some* are concerned with the lack of available engineering consultants and technical experts in the region and within each of the GSAs. *Some* GSAs have already hired consultants.
- *All* want consistent, accurate data that can be trusted. In a *few* interviews, this data included well monitoring and drilling logs to be accessible by all.

Water Credits and Transfers – *Some* are concerned with the ability to transfer water credits among management areas. There is also concern over who will be allowed to decide on and enforce water transfers for overall Subbasin SGMA compliance.

- *A few* interviewees want to keep their water supply rights and determine how much they can charge for their resources, however others are concerned about how a just compensation structure will be developed to “share” water supplies when needed.
- *Some* are concerned about how a just compensation structure will be developed to “share” water supplies across management districts when needed to stay in compliance.
- *Some* interviewees are worried they will be burdened with requirements they cannot afford.
- *Some* shared concern that surface water will be sold and transferred outside of the Subbasin if there is a buyer who can pay more than some water providers in the Subbasin can afford, putting them out of compliance. *Some* also note that Madera County has already passed an ordinance that does not allow for transfer of water outside of the Subbasin.

Recharge, Inflows and Outflows – *Many* interviewed, express concerns with how inflows, outflows, and especially recharge will be calculated. *Some* mentioned litigation may be needed to settle these questions.

- *Many* management areas are concerned with their water rights to inflow and outflow, and see that each GSA needs to account for the inflow and outflow within their areas for the GSP.
- *Some* express concern with receiving equal benefit to the recharge water they put back into the ground. They are wary of not getting credit for recharge water, or having to help others with recharge, but seeing no benefit in their own areas. They are equally concerned with having others pump recharge water before they can utilize it to benefit their users.
- *A few* feel they do not benefit from their past efforts to manage groundwater.
- *Some* suggest a collaborative approach to recharge, but are concerned that consultants and data from individual management areas may not be in agreement with the water accounting processes.
- *A few* expressed the desire to reclaim waste water for recharge.
- *A few* point out that there are limited areas for recharge in the Subbasin, and want GSAs to take a proactive stance in locating recharge areas and water sources for recharge.
- *A minority* are concerned that recharge water is going to agricultural users with deeper wells. Emphasizing domestic users’ reliance on groundwater.

Meters – *A few* expressed the concern that all private wells need meters, not estimations of use, and that there is insufficient resources allocated to tracking meter installation and water use.

- *A few* discussed the introduction of more meters for domestic users, covering the costs with grants, to regulate usage and encourage conservation.
- *Many* expressed concern that there is unsustainable water use in the white areas.
- *A few* expressed concerns regarding implementation consistent monitoring across the Subbasin, and the ramifications monitoring will produce.

Governance Points of Concern

Need For Centralized Committee or Group to review and analyze technical information – *All* interviewed state the need for reliable, shared technical data to form the foundation for a GSP. *All GSAs* want research and data before they make any assumptions for how to develop the GSP. *All* mentioned the need for a centralized committee or group (i.e. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)) to analyze technical information at the Subbasin level.

- There is a need for clarity on the intent of the TAC, whether it will be an information sharing group, or an advisory workgroup.

Need For A GSP Coordination Committee – *Many* would like to see a formal GSP Coordination Committee formed to make recommendations to the GSAs. Clarity is needed as to how this group will work, who will sit on the Committee, and how recommendations will be implemented.

- *Some* are leery of committing resources to a GSP Coordination Committee due to lack of staff, as well as having seen past recommendations ignored by agencies.
- *A few* who do not have GSA authority want the opportunity to engage and provide feedback on GSP decisions and planning. These include farmers with private wells, Disadvantaged Community (DAC) representatives, mutual water companies, and private well residents. *These few* interviewees do not want left out of the planning discussions, and want to make sure they have the opportunity to have their perspectives represented in the GSP.

GSP Development Preferences and Concerns – *All* interviewees acknowledge the eminent need for interagency collaboration, however *some* want to develop separate management plans, then share information and coordinate for a joint GSP. They offered the following perspectives on how this might work:

- *A few* proposed that each GSA develops their own “chapter” of the GSP for a corresponding management area, then share the draft plan with the other GSAs to respond to and coordinate with.
- *Some* discussed concerns around staff resources to do GSP planning and outreach in general. As such, *some* want to review developed options to provide feedback on instead of embarking on planning processes solo.

- *Some* are worried about having to share resources and/or being out of compliance. *All* want clarity on how the State will address and handle non-compliance in implementation of the final GSP by any given GSA.
- *Some* are concerned that problems in other GSAs will manifest as issues they will need to spend time to address. Litigation to secure water resources against other water districts is seen as an option to resolve issues.

GSA Decision Making – GSAs are anticipating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) structure as they move forward to develop one GSP together. (Six of seven GSAs plan to coordinate for one GSP, with one GSA working on their own GSP.) The *majority* of interviewees want a role in groundwater management decisions and would prefer not to relinquish control to any agency or to adjudication. This presents challenges to the Subbasin as GSAs move forward into the GSP process.

Decision-making structure suggestions from interviewees include:

- A Subbasin GSA Board consisting of one member per GSA. It was noted that more than one seat per GSA could be a problem for smaller GSAs that only have part-time staff who are already at maximum capacity.
- Advisory Committees to the GSA Board to help with information gathering and decision-making. *All* indicated a desire for a Technical Advisory Committee that all trust is a need. *Some* think a Coordination Committee to advance the GSP planning process is needed.
- Decision making authority should be equal to the impact that the decisions have on users.
- Clarity is needed for how voting can be made “fair.”
 - *Some* say acreage does not make sense.
 - *Some* say by usage/supply/resource does not make sense.
 - *Some* say it does not make sense to give votes per money or payments going in.
 - *Some* say by percentage or weighted voting that is equitable, but are unsure how to do this.
 - *Some* say one member, one vote, but wonder how large GSAs will feel with small GSAs having equal say. It was suggested that a super-majority vote be required for certain decisions.

Fee Structure and Cost Sharing – *All* interviewees are unsure how cost-sharing will be delegated for SGMA implementation and enforcement. Many ideas were given, however there is no consensus on what kind of cost-sharing would be fair to all. Up to this point each district is paying for their own consultants and planning, and have not had to talk about sharing costs.

GSP Development Phase Costs:

- The Subbasin is applying for and counting on grant money to help pay for GSP development and the early stages of implementation.
- It was pointed out that potential funding from the State for GSP development needs to be allocated to GSA management areas through a fair process

(possibly voting) since some will not need the same allocations for their individual chapters.

GSP Ongoing Compliance Costs:

- *All* interviewees are unsure of a fair way to cost share, however *many* say it should mirror the decision-making structure – if paying by acreage, should vote by acreage; if paying based on use, weighted voting should be implemented; if paying based on equal share, voting should reflect this.

Enforcement Authority Questions – *All* interviewees expressed concerns regarding how GSAs will impact each other if they cannot meet SGMA compliance.

- Interviewees are unclear regarding what tools and methods of enforcement are intended to be used to keep GSA management areas, as well as other beneficial users, in SGMA compliance.
- Interviewees are unclear regarding how each GSA management area will be seen by the State and how “good” and “bad” actors will be treated if the Subbasin is out of compliance but individual management areas are managing for sustainability.
- *A few* say that third party mediation may be required when management areas are out of compliance and not in agreement with how to reach sustainability.

Future Move Toward One GSA – *Some* interviewees indicated that the GSA workgroup has the potential of becoming one GSA in the future. For now individual GSA management areas are working toward sustainability, and there will likely be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to guide collaborative planning for one Subbasin GSP. Once the GSP is in place, *some* interviewees felt that one governing GSA will make more sense in the long-run.

Vision for the Basin

A successful vision for the future of the Madera Subbasin offered by those interviewed includes a coordinated solution where all are pitching in to ensure groundwater sustainability.

- Collaboration: Partnerships are intact, strengthened and improved, and a mutual, collaborative approach to meeting SGMA sustainability requirements is in process.
- Sustainability: There are less significant drops in the water table, wells do not run dry, and if they do there are methods in place to address and mitigate the problem.
- Access: All residents have safe and affordable drinking water and farmers have enough surface water to grow their crops.
- Usage: Meters are installed for all users and recharge stations are distributed throughout the basin. Public water systems are consolidated and extended.

Stakeholder Communications and Engagement

- *All* interviewees indicated there exists a general lack of communication about SGMA requirements in the Madera Subbasin, and *some* point out this is due to lack of resources in terms of staff time and costs. Not all who will be impacted are engaged, or even understand SGMA.
- *A few* interviewees shared concerns that GSAs are keeping their information close and that some stakeholders who are tremendously impacted, are being left out of the conversation.
- *Some* interviewees recommended establishing or utilizing routine communication channels between GSAs, as well as with the broader public. Stakeholders and beneficial users who are not GSAs need communication to flow both ways, with information going out, and to have opportunities to give input and have questions answered.
- *All* interviewees expressed the need for a centralized communication strategy to engage stakeholders across the Subbasin, however they note that it is equally important that outreach and engagement take place at a very local level.

Centralized Communication Strategy Ideas

SGMA is complicated, and messaging needs to be simplified, relatable and repetitive so that people understand, especially those who will be greatly impacted.

- *Many* say the County website has been helpful, and that it should be the main hub of Subbasin SGMA information, supported with resources to keep it updated.
- *A few* recommended:
 - Utilizing email listserves and newsletters of all interested parties, including the Farm Bureau, utilities, water districts, mutual water companies, and local non-profits such as Self-Help Enterprises and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability to distribute SGMA information.
 - Generating media releases for SGMA updates – TV news, radio (KNJ), and newspapers. (*Many* reported that local news outlets are not trusted and information is best coming through trusted local entities.)
 - Developing a SGMA 101 workshop that can be given throughout the Subbasin.
 - Leveraging existing 70 engaged neighborhood groups to distribute information.
 - Translating information from English to Spanish.

Localized Outreach and Engagement Ideas

Many point out that private pumpers and those in agriculture are not currently a part of the SGMA conversation and need to be informed and engaged. There is currently misinformation and fear about SGMA impacts. The importance of public meetings is emphasized so that specific groups cannot drive the conversation by only sharing discussion points they choose to share.

- There is a need to find a trusted liaison for outreach to private pumpers. Local agencies with standing meetings, such as the Farm Bureau, mutual

water companies, and some DAC representatives are trusted entities in their communities that can help with SGMA outreach.

- Trusted associations and groups to help with outreach include growers associations, wine industry, dairy industry, resource conservation, and groups like Self Help Enterprises.
- *Some* suggest leveraging local, trusted resources for community meetings, such as schools, churches, and community centers.
- *Some* suggested that public meetings should be about concrete impacts. For example, there will be a need for public meetings once the fee structure is announced to help people understand how to interpret the impacts on them.

Recommendations

The primary purpose of this assessment was to establish foundational background to develop recommendations on how GSAs might best engage each other, as well as their stakeholders as they move forward with the GSP planning process. GSAs still need to establish routines for consulting one another, create platforms for sharing data, and define protocols for making decisions, sharing costs, and resolving conflicts. These recommendations seek to address the desire for Subbasin-wide communication and to improve local relationships, while balancing the need to acknowledge the unique differences within the Subbasin with the need for overall coordination for GSP development and implementation.

Critical Factors Influencing Recommendations

In making recommendations, there are challenging factors the Subbasin GSAs will need to coordinate on. It is the authority of the GSAs to make mutually beneficial decisions that will generate the best outcomes for the Subbasin as they work together to meet SGMA requirements.

Resources and Stakeholder Differences

There are distinct and in some cases severe differences in the resources, stakeholders, and capacity of each GSA and their management areas. These differences greatly impact how much time and money each GSA can and should contribute to a GSP planning and implementation processes. They also greatly impact which GSAs will need to work to engage their stakeholders, as well as reach sustainability in their management areas.

These differences create tensions between management areas that are now interdependent under SGMA. Those GSAs who have planned for water sustainability prior to SGMA requirements do not want to make sacrifices for those they feel have planned appropriately.

Technical Advisors

Technical advisors are needed at the Subbasin level, to help all GSAs understand shared, reliable data from which to make decisions. Technical advisors are also

needed at the individual GSA level to help GSA boards understand data and make decisions. Not all GSAs have the staff and/or financial resources to maintain their own technical advisors.

Recommendations for Next Steps

1. Secure trusted technical consultants for the Subbasin who GSAs can trust to work for the best of all, facilitating the understanding of data that will provide the foundation for collaborating on the GSP.
2. Establish a Technical Workgroup or review process (Tech Group) to advise at the GSA level, but coordinate among the other GSAs on a Subbasin level.
 - a. All GSAs work towards agreement on a process and a charter for establishing the Tech Group, including who will be on the group, how technical discussions will be handled, how decisions will be made based on technical data, and what technical data will be used.
3. Establish a GSP Coordination Committee, can advise at the Subbasin level, with a charter that includes roles, responsibilities, and timelines to advise the GSAs during the GSP planning process. Coordination is needed for messaging and outreach, consideration of stakeholder impacts, weighing in of various perspectives for proposed project decisions and impacts, and overall planning recommendations to provide to the GSA decision-makers.
 - a. It is recommended that each GSA have an opportunity to have 1-2 representatives sit on a Coordination Committee. Each GSA shall have discretion to identify their representative. 1 Board representative and 1 technical/SGMA expert (i.e. staff) is recommended.
 - b. Provide avenues for beneficial users who will be highly impacted by SGMA requirements to have a seat on, or robust official avenues to be able to engage the Coordination Committee.
 - c. Confirm Coordination Committee Charter. Including Roles and Responsibilities, confirmed decision-making structure and affirm coordination among GSAs and Subbasin stakeholders.
 - d. Confirm Coordination Work Plan and decision-making milestones. These may include specific discussions including: cost sharing, key messages, etc.
4. Include Stakeholder Engagement Process in Coordination Committee Development. The Coordination Committee should describe the methods that stakeholders engage in Coordination Committee discussions, or by creating a process that includes stakeholder input. Options may include:
 - a. Open meetings of the Coordination Committee with opportunities for discussion with public attendees.
 - b. Community roundtable discussions incorporated into Coordination Committee Work Plan.
 - c. Designated Stakeholder seats on Coordination Committee (e.g. members at large from DAC, Agriculture, and Private Development interests).

5. Schedule a set of SGMA workshops and or roundtable discussions around the Subbasin to go over technical components of SGMA, as well as GSA governance strategies. Consistent messaging is strongly recommended to be coherently coordinated at the Subbasin level, while outreach should be coordinated at the management area level through existing channels.
 - a. As a follow up to this report, CCP is contracted to assist the Subbasin in development of a Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan to help establish outreach protocols, activities and timelines.

APPENDIX A: List of Interviewees (in alphabetical order)

1. Christina Beckstead – Madera Farm Bureau
2. Julia Berry – Madera County, Water and Natural Resources Department
3. Nick Bruno – Root Creek Water District
4. Juan Cana – Self Help Enterprises
5. William Chaltraw – Valley Children’s Hospital
6. Michael Claiborne – Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
7. Richard “Rick” Cosyns – Madera Irrigation District
8. Brett Frazier – Madera County Board of Supervisors
9. John Gies – Madera Water District
10. Thomas Greci – Madera Irrigation District
11. Maria Herrera – Self Help Enterprises
12. Jesse Hudgins – Valley Children’s Hospital
13. Carl Janzen – Madera Irrigation District
14. Lauren Layne – Baker Manock & Jensen
15. David “Dave” Loquaci – Madera Irrigation District
16. Leslie Martinez – Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
17. David Merchen – City of Madera, Community Development Director
18. Dina Nolan – Madera Irrigation District
19. Don Roberts – Gravelly Ford Water District
20. Greg Rodgers – Madera Valley Water Company
21. Brad Samuelson – Provost & Pritchard
22. Andrea Sandoval – Madera Irrigation District
23. Sean Smith – Madera Irrigation District
24. Roger Skinner – New Stone Water District
25. Abigail Solis – Self Help Enterprises
26. David Tooley – City of Madera, City Administrator
27. Joe Vivid – Madera Irrigation District Stakeholder
28. Tim DaSilva – Madera Irrigation District Stakeholder

APPENDIX B: Interview Questions

Madera Groundwater Subbasin –GSA Coordination for GSP Development Effort Interview Questions

BACKGROUND/HYDROLOGIC CONDITIONS

1. Tell us about you/your agency's/organization's role and location in the Madera Subbasin (Subbasin). What is your relationship like with some of the water management partners and GSAs in the Basin?
2. What are the main factors in reaching ground water sustainability for this basin (political/hydrological, i.e. quality, source, breadth and depth of the ground water table, etc.)?
 - a. What suggestions do you have for addressing any of these issues?
 - b. What concerns, if any, do you have about *future* groundwater management in the basin?

GSA COORDINATION

3. In your perspective, what are the roles and responsibilities of the individual GSAs in context of developing a single GSP?
4. Do you anticipate any challenges in coordinating GSP components among the GSAs developing the GSPs?
 - a. Are there other potential challenges?
5. How would you like GSAs to make decisions together during the development and management of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan/Plans GSP(s)? What do you see as the best decision making process for developing the GSP(s)?
 - a. How do you think beneficial users can/will be engaged in that process?
6. How do you see a Madera Subbasin Coordination Committee organized (seats, representation, etc.)?
7. What is a fair way to distribute costs for development, implementation, and management of the GSP?
8. What issues need to be discussed during the development of GSP(s)?
 - a. What challenges, if any, do you anticipate?
 - b. What suggestions do you have for addressing those challenges?

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

9. What is the level of understanding (or lack thereof) by your stakeholders and constituents about SGMA, the different GSAs and their roles for water management in the Subbasin, and GSP development?

10. What are the essential organizations, groups, agencies, Tribes, governing bodies, or individual stakeholders to include in the development of the GSP? Are there groups that are often left out or do not attend meetings? How should they be brought into GSP development discussions? (Stakeholder Advisory Committee, governing board, etc.)?
11. What kinds of outreach activities and information do you recommend during the GSA Coordination discussion and for the GSP development in the Subbasin?
 - a. What works, what does not work? Please specify (venues, times, frequency, etc.)

WRAP-UP

12. If you imagine the Subbasin two, five, ten years down the line, and you feel positive about how this has all transpired, what would this success look like?
13. Is there anything else you think I should know that I haven't asked about? ☐
14. Is there anyone else you would suggest I interview? ☐
15. Is there anything you've told me that you'd like me to keep confidential? ☐

Filename: Final_Madera Stakeholder Assessment Report (11.27.17).docx
Directory: C:\Users\slucero\Dropbox (CCP
Teams)\private\Business\CCP\SGMA\Madera\Stakeholder Assessment Report
Template: C:\Users\slucero\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\N
ormal.dotm
Title:
Subject:
Author: Jen Mair
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 11/21/2017 4:51:00 PM
Change Number: 4
Last Saved On: 11/27/2017 3:39:00 PM
Last Saved By: Lucero, Stephanie
Total Editing Time: 227 Minutes
Last Printed On: 11/27/2017 3:39:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 18
Number of Words: 5,717 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 32,590 (approx.)