

GSAG Meeting Notes

August 29, 2016 | Vacaville, CA



OVERVIEW

GSA Advisory Group Participants

Jack Caldwell, Cal Water

John Currey, Dixon Resource Conservation District

Royce Cunningham, City of Vacaville

Misty Kaltreider, Solano County

Cary Keaton, Solano Irrigation District

Joe Leach, City of Dixon

Chris Lee, Solano County Water Agency

Russ Lester, Ag Advisory Committee

Derrick Lum, Solano County Farm Bureau

Ryan Mahoney, Maine Prairie Water District

(alternate for Don Holdner, participated as primary)

Peter Miljanich, Solano County

(alternate for Misty Kaltreider, non-voting)

Erik Ringelberg, Northern Delta GSA

Chris Rose, Solano RCD

**Brooking Gatewood, Ag Innovations, Facilitator*

**Joseph McIntyre, Ag Innovations, Facilitator*

**Tessa Opalach, Ag Innovations, Notes*

**Hong Lin, DWR, Technical Support*

**Barrett Kassa, DWR, Technical Support*

Not in attendance: Jim Allen, Ag Advisory Committee; Jim Christensen, Travis Air Force Base; Darrell Eck, Sacramento County; Mike Hardesty, RD 2068 (sent comments in advance); Don Holdner, Maine Prairie Water District; David Melilli, City of Rio Vista

Meeting Goals

- Prepare Governance and Charter Recommendation draft for elected & public input.
- Discuss & vote on JPA vs MOU format.
- Review Financing the GSA Survey Results and get input for a Finance Working Group.

Featured Resources

1. [August 4, 2016 GSAG Meeting Notes](#)
2. [Summary of GSAG Work to Date](#)
3. [Principles & Cost Estimations Survey Results](#)

Meeting Summary

1. **INTROS & UPDATES.** Members introduced themselves and shared important updates.
2. **JPA VS MOU DISCUSSION & VOTE.** Peter Miljanich briefly presented the benefits and potential drawbacks of MOUs and JPAs. After discussion, the group voted unanimously to move forward with a Joint Powers Authority, which creates a new entity as the GSA.
3. **FINANCING DISCUSSION.** A summary of the group's input on the Financing the GSA Survey was presented, and members posed questions and expectations for the funding group to discuss.
4. **PROPOSED STRAWMAN JPA & PRINCIPLES DISCUSSION.** Members discussed the JPA drafted by SID, and concluded a statement of principles and GSA governance structure need to be clarified prior to drafting the JPA. The JPA will focus on setting up the GSA, whereas the GSP will address detailed functions and processes.
5. **GUIDING PRINCIPLES & DEAL POINTS DISCUSSION.** Members named their primary deal points and core principles for how the GSA should be governed. These will be refined in our next meeting and included in JPA.
6. **GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE DISCUSSION.** Members discussed various GSA board sizes. Opinion varied on what entails a balanced board. A 16-17 member Board was proposed as an option inclusive of all parties who want to participate. A 9-12 member Board is still also under consideration.

Next Steps

1. **Funding working group:** A funding working group, composed of Erik Ringelberg, John Currey, Russ Lester, Joe Leach, and Peter Miljanich will meet in September to come up with a few GSA financing proposals for discussion.
2. **Principles & deal points.** Ag Innovations will provide a synthesized principles document compiling principles and deal points named to date for input before the next meeting.
3. **Learning from other subbasins:** Ag Innovations will draft a memo that reviews governance and voting structures from other draft and final GSA governance documents from around the state.
4. **Next meeting:** We will meet in 2-3 weeks to finalize governance structure and principles aspect of proposal.
5. **Next meeting:** Brooking will send a Doodle Poll to schedule the next two meetings.

DETAILED MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Agenda Review

- Joseph welcomed the group and reviewed the meeting's agenda and goals. He posed the following question to the group: *What do you hope we get out of today? The key agenda points the group raised were as follows:*
 - Clarifying the governance structure, particularly the role of non-agency entities
 - Clarifying guiding principles on water rights
 - Unanswered question: When water supplies are low, how will people's access to limited water determined?
- We are in the Groan Zone: We are trying to solve this issue for the common interest, and this is the most difficult part of the process. There is genuine conflict and anxiety surrounding outcomes. Some recommendations for getting through the Groan Zone include:
 1. Have patience, and be nuanced in our decision-making.
 2. Disclose all relevant information. Not disclosing all information undermines the process.
 3. Don't jump too far out of bounds: **Our goal is to create a GSA that can create a GSP that can be implemented (without steamrolling) and be supported by all stakeholders.** In that GSP there are a bunch of implications for what happens in Solano County. We don't know what those implications are yet. Success is a GSA that has the capacity to write, execute and implement a successful GSP to protect all interests: acceptable, enforceable, meaningful, and one that doesn't get litigated, if possible.

Info Shares

Members introduced themselves and provided updates on their participation or their constituencies' perspectives on our deliberations to date.

- Misty Kaltreider: The Board of Supervisors (BOS) heard an update on GSAG work so far. The BOS is interested in an additional seat on the GSA board, a 3rd seat, to preserve proportional water rights and equality across the subbasin for landowners, agencies, cities, and County seats. County argues that it is uniquely positioned to consider all interests.
- Russ Lester: The Ag Advisory Committee is concerned that ag has adequate representation and a strong voice in the GSA and formation of SMAs and the GSP. Their sentiment echoes what was heard at the Ag Summit.
- Cary Keaton: SID has a grower group that they meet with which consists of 7 of the larger growers in the subbasin, and those 7 growers support the JPA that was drafted by SID.
 - This point raised further discussion: Farm Bureau represents a large swath of farmers and ranchers as well. There is a fear that the common goal might not be the same between Farm Bureau, Ag Advisory Committee and SID regarding ag interests. We must remember in this process also that agriculture isn't monolithic, and we need to support and represent varied agriculture.
- Erik Ringelberg: The Southern American Basin of Sacramento County, including NDGSA, is drafting an MOU/JPA for alternate compliance plan, which will be due January 1, 2016.
 - NDGSA involvement in that process takes the burden of developing a plan off of 6 of those agencies, but will not impact their participation in Solano Subbasin.
 - There is potential for a larger area to be included in this alternative compliance plan, which could potentially impact the Solano Subbasin down the road.

JPA vs MOU Discussion

Overview: Peter Miljanich provided an overview of the benefits and potential drawbacks of MOA/MOU and JPA structures.

- An MOA/MOU is a legal agreement between any number of parties; typically less formal.
- A JPA is a legal agreement that is sanctioned by state law and allows agencies acting together to jointly exercise powers.
 - Advantages of a JPA include insulating member agencies from liability and facilitating bond financing that might not be as attractive for single agencies or a group of agencies acting otherwise.
- Some JPAs create new agencies and some do not. Creating a new agency or not is the big question for SGMA implementation. A JPA that creates a new agency is probably the most effective and durable way to include non-agency members to participate and vote on the governing board.
 - Attempting to provide voting power to non-agency actors without creating a new agency through a JPA would be legally questionable, because it could involve unlawfully delegating agency authority to non-agencies.

Discussion

- A JPA that creates a separate entity:
 - Potential drawbacks include: creates an additional layer of government/bureaucracy that may be wasteful, or many not be necessary.
 - Potential benefits: insulates agencies from being sued as individual agencies and gives agencies flexibility.
- Staff and resources for the JPA
 - A new authority structure requires overhead costs, estimated by one member to be 1.5-2.5 FTE. While some agencies have the capacity to back that administrative need with staff or financial resources, some agencies do not.
 - The original charter for this group indicated that County staff and SCWA staff would provide administrative and technical staff to support to the GSA.
 - SID is part of a JPA with Suisun City, in which each party supplies some staff and the JPA doesn't have any staff itself.
 - Perhaps there will be a want for independent staff due to distrust between stakeholders/parties.
 - JPA will state, "All agencies will provide resources, technology, staff and meeting space to the JPA." Some agencies won't have all of those resources at the same time. RDs aren't using a lot of gw right now and they don't have the resources to contribute.
 - There will need to be a policing authority to enforce metering. Perhaps an agency that already has staff could fill this role.
- A benefit of this approach is that it is familiar. There are other JPAs in the county that are already formed and some of those include agencies that this JPA would include. The county is already comfortable with the JPA model, and the GSA JPA could build on previous experiences with JPAs in Solano County.
- As part of this discussion, we also revisited the idea of having SCWA or Solano County housing the GSA:
 - A single agency will be less costly and more inclusive of interests of farmers who are not represented by an agency.
 - If we fail to form a GSA, the duty falls to the County. From a financial perspective, it could be cheaper to set up a GSA under the County or SCWA.
 - How would you set up a board within SCWA or Solano County that is distinct from their governing boards?
 - Boards can divest authority to advisory committees in theory, though members were not able to think of examples of this approach in practice.
 - It would likely be challenging to arrange a separate governance structure within a single agency. In theory, a series of agreements could be set up but it would take a lot of discretion out of the decisions being made.
 - During SCWA board meetings this idea was discussed at length and they were not able to agree. A number of board members have said they don't want this process to include agencies that are outside the subbasin. Several cities would be uncomfortable with a GSA housed under SCWA.
 - Trying to get the County as the GSA would take a lot of time and could distract from our effort to establish a governance structure and JPA by our deadline.

- The majority of growers farm in areas that aren't overlapped by agencies because 33,000 acres don't sit in a district. The most affected person isn't in the room today. Because these people are groundwater dependent, we're affecting their land value with every decision we make at this table. The needs and concerns of those growers that are not represented by any entity need to be protected.
- One member suggested that a benefit of a single entity GSA would be better representation of those 33,000 acres.
- The underlying interest under this point though is being sure that the needs of those growers get incorporated into the JPA model.
- Recognizing the downsides of this approach, all members agreed on the JPA model, and also voiced that we need to consider how we set up the GSA for success without steamrolling folks without a voice/vote.
- BOS represents every landowner in the County, that's why the BOS wants a 3rd seat on the GSA board.
- One of our principles is to include small farmer interests. No one is being ignored.
- One member also offered the consideration that the GSA will have taxing (e.g. fee assignment) and policing authorities. The tax rate may need to be differential because different areas have different gw conditions.

DECISION: Joseph proposed a vote to move forward with a Joint Power Authority that creates a separate entity and the members voted unanimously in favor.

Survey Results Review & Discussion: Financing the GSA

Brooking reviewed the [survey results](#). The key themes and results from the cost estimation survey can be used to inform governance structure discussion. The highlights from survey results:

- **Funding suggestions:** State, SCWA, agencies, usage fees
- **Data collection suggestions:** County, agencies, landowners and state already have data that can be compiled prior to hiring a consultant to fill data gaps
- **Responsibility suggestions:** Staff and consultants, with farmers playing a large role in Management Area Descriptions
- **In-Kind service suggestions:** Existing information and databases, staff time, voluntary landowner participation

A funding working group, composed of Erik Ringelberg, John Currey, Russ Lester, Joe Leach, and Peter Miljanich will meet in September to come up with a few funding proposals for the larger group to discuss. The funding group posed the following question to the larger group: *What should be included, and how detailed, should the funding proposal be?*

- (1) Compile a cost estimate from the survey results and Chris/Royce/Cary's estimations, which should include an estimation for landowner taxes/fees
- (2) Write a general description of how the agency plans to meet those costs
- (3) Prepare a timeline showing estimates of which expenditures will be expected when.

Discussion

- Yolo County will share their estimations with GSAG members when they become available.
- Other similar agencies around the state have numbers, and we should look to those numbers for ideas.
- We need to sync the data we have, and collect more information from some areas in the basin, to write a GSP. The GSP can lay out different milestones that need to happen to become sustainable by 2042.
- The funding plan should be flexible because we cannot anticipate what DWR will want in the future.
- Lack of water will cause more loss of money than any tax for farmers.
- When state funding becomes available we need to be poised to apply for it, which will require staff time and grant writers.
- Costs
 - Costs can be divided into three buckets: (1) Core admin costs & base level costs, which includes MOUs with adjacent basins; (2) Technical costs associated with collecting and codifying hydrological data in the County and state & writing the plan; (3) Implementation: projects, taxes, wastewater recycling, and other interesting solutions.
 - We will need immediate base level funding, and then there will be maintenance level of ongoing funding in the future.
 - Some agencies are going to have to front some money. \$500,000+ for the start up costs for the GSA.
 - The GSA may also need to consider costs to hire an attorney for potential lawsuits against the GSA.
- Special Management Areas (SMAs)
 - SMAs should come up with solutions to keep costs down. They offer an opportunity for localized creativity and cost effectiveness.

- More SMAs potentially causes more costs.
- SMAs shouldn't be siloed; 2 or more SMAs will have to collaborate in cases when issues arise across SMAs.
- Public outreach
 - We need to be prepared to have an honest conversation with the public about estimated fees, whether its \$1-3 or even \$20.
 - There is funding for another public series of public workshops this year. Presenting a draft financing plan that shows the group that fees are not the #1 consideration might be helpful. These input workshops might also be a good opportunity to get public input about SMAs.
 - If we present an already formed plan to the public, they will not have an opportunity to contribute and be involved with the decision-making, which will cause distrust. We need to show them their input is being directly considered in the actual output, not as an afterthought.

Questions

- How close are we to having a sufficient amount of information in our basin and how much new information do we need? If we are substantially deficient in information, that will require a significant financial investment early on.
 - **Answer:** We have the data we need to write a GSA, and we should work towards accumulating more data over the next decade. This approach lessens the burden on the initial costs and rate pay. We need to establish expectations for how the data collection and accumulation work will be funded moving forward.

Proposed Charter / JPA Strawman Discussion

Joseph introduced SID's 'strawman' (i.e. rough draft) JPA proposal, which serves as a base for this group to work from. Cary reviewed the proposal for the group, and suggested conversation begin with Section 5 (Rights & Principles) which discusses the protection of rights to use groundwater and how those rights interface with surface water and recharge water.

Water Rights & SGMA Discussion:

- Hong Lin of DWR offered some clarification: There is nothing in SGMA that overrides existing water rights, so this discussion might not be necessary for JPA formation
- Some members thought we should think about water rights as property rights; different properties have different rights associated with them due to historical projects and deals, such as the Solano Project.
- We looked at examples from other JPAs:
 - Most JPAs we have seen state a brief position on how the GSA plans to work with water rights.
 - Many acknowledge an intent not to interfere with them.
 - Some acknowledge the GSAs authority to purchase and trade rights as well.
 - Some JPAs have supermajority rule on water rights related issues.
 - None we have seen addressed the level of detail our draft JPA went into.

The core question remains: what kind of board governance structure is needed to affectively address those challenges? Ag Innovations will continue to present examples from other GSA documents from around the state.

Proposal Review (Cary Keaton shares the reasoning behind the draft proposal structure)

- The JPA outlines principles for transferring groundwater within the subbasin. SID has some concerns about transferring groundwater outside of the subbasin, but some other members have suggested transferring groundwater outside of the subbasin.
- The JPA provides for a Technical Advisory Committee and outlines the duties of the Board.
- Some concepts in the JPA came from the North Kings GSA, filtered through an SID vision for local groundwater governance.
- Section 6 (Fees & revenues) is a starting point for a discussion about funding.
- Section 9, which lists all parties as stakeholders, is different from the governance structure the working group agreed to. North Vacaville previously indicated they are content with SID's representation of them. However, if an extra seat is extended to the County, as the BOS has requested, Rural North Vacaville may decide they want a seat. This section describes a process for appointing a public position, and this public position is in lieu of giving the Farm Bureau an at-large seat.

Discussion

- CalWater shared that they would like to have a seat on the GSA Board.

- Issues of mistrust between some members of the community and SID as a leading agency were raised:
 - Two of the five SID Board members are outside the subbasin, and when preserving SID's rights came up in detail early on in the process, there was angst in communities that there is something bigger that SID is pursuing that other players are not seeing.
 - Another member suggested if we can show the aquifer is sustainable, we won't need to change our present actions. Nothing shows SID is harming the aquifer, so we should not be telling them how to manage their business. Telling one another what they can and cannot do isn't a productive method.
 - As a counter point, we also heard a reminder that water usage has increased over time, and is exacerbated by drought. We can transfer water to different constituencies. If ag continues to grow, there will not be enough water, and the GSA needs to plan for that outcome
- The group spent some time discussing the appropriate level of detail to get into in the JPA:
 - As agencies, we have an obligation to plan for what we think the future is going to be. Most of us think there will be stresses and demand put on groundwater and surface water. We have an obligation to do our best to make sure the GSA gives our future generations opportunities for success.
 - Some members expressed concern that in some regions, groundwater doesn't exist. Protocol for those regions needs to be further explained in the JPA proposal, likely via our principles statements.
 - We heard many calls to take a higher-level view: We're trying to resolve the potential issues of what might go on, but we don't know what will occur in the future. The GSP will address the drought, and other potential issues, but the GSA does not need to address those specific issues. The GSP is where we get into the weeds. Let's work through the GSA right now, even determining the management areas can be finalized in the GSP.
 - Some other GSA groups have created a one-pager that accompanies the JPA as an explanation to accompany the legal document. This can help streamline the JPA itself.
 - Protecting our interests and assuming the worst is a default reaction to these tough spots in decision-making. There's an opportunity to manage water in the subbasin to maximize results, and increase water availability through trading and recycling programs. Let's think about what's possible.
- There are other water-related initiatives going on: IRLP and other agencies that are talking about these exact water issues. We don't need to solve all of the water issues in Solano County. Issue at hand is forming a governing body that can deal with sustainable groundwater management in a manner that can be supported by all of the stakeholders.
- The JPA is a one-way document. If an agency signs off, that JPA continues to exist as the management body for the subbasin. Agencies can't get out of the agreement without leaving their rights.
 - Note: subsequent research on this point shows that some JPAs actually have statements that address this concern directly, such as in Kern County.
- June 2017 will be here before we know it. We need to update our boards with both a governance structure and guiding principles.
- In the next round we will spend time on teasing apart what belongs in the GSP and what belongs in the JPA.

Questions

- Does the SID JPA address surface water? How will surface water be handled going forward? Surface water management is a huge concern for border districts and ag. Because surface water keeps the basin stable, pumping it out of the basin causes increased use of groundwater within the basin and puts the area at more risk. We need to be aware of this sticking point moving forward, so we should think about it now.
 - Surface water rights and where surface water comes from are not addressed in the JPA. Surface water as recharge is addressed in length. SID's water balance shows in 2024 users will require surface water and their proportional share of groundwater. Preserving the rights of property owners is of the utmost importance to SID.
 - For now we can notice the interaction between surface water and groundwater exists, and that conjunctive use needs to be addressed in the GSP.

DECISION: Based on this discussion, the group agreed we should keep our JPA and principles at a higher level and leave those details to the GSP process, and that clarifying core principles and GSA governance structure need to be determined prior to writing the JPA. We do not need to include detailed management points in the JPA if we capture the essence of our interests in the principles statements. The JPA will set up the GSA, and the GSP will address detailed functions and processes. Joseph proposed a vote to focus on a simpler document to include guiding principles/deal points to present to boards and the public. The document will eventually inform the JPA, which will be written by a public entity. The members unanimously agreed to move forward by working on a guiding principles/deal points document [Derrick Lum left at 11:45am and did not participate in the vote].

Guiding Principles & Deal Points Discussion

Each member was given an opportunity to offer his or her deal points and principles for the JPA.

Deal points and principles

- Clarity and transparency
- Ability to continue ag as it is today unless “fact-based” data shows need to change
- Solve for “all of us” / public interest
- Share benefits and costs
- Wide horizon: integrated approach to sustainable yield and implementation
- All stakeholders have a voice, and get buy-in / robust public engagement
- GSA recognizes historical differences in groundwater use when making plans
 - What does historical refer to? Use the term “existing” rights to trump potential issues about historical rights
- Do no harm
- Protect social and economic interests of the County, cities, residents and agencies
- If the area is out of balance, first look to new resources (gw recharge), then share the burden within the Management Area when the resource is limited
- Quantified, objective and transparent process
- Apply voluntary best management practices first, then other enumerated powers (depending on authorities of GSA)
- Funding based on weighted risk
- Importance of drought management plan
- If it isn't broken, don't fix it.
- If there is a problem, get the right and effective people to work together to solve the problem collectively and collaboratively.
- Recharge water can be pulled out by agencies/properties that store and contribute to recharge water.
- Each property owner has access to their proportion of the sustainable yield
- Recharge: contributors have right to pull that recharge out
- Recognition of existing property and water rights

Discussion

- Water rights
 - There is a recognition that all properties are not equal and they don't all have the same vested rights. A property that signed up for the Solano Project in Maine Prairie in the 1950s has different access to resources than a property that didn't sign up for the Solano Project. The GSA/GSP has to recognize the differences of some players inside the subbasin.
 - The clause provided by Hong Lin from SGMA legislation can serve as backstop to protect water rights.
- The ultimate goal is for this law's implementation to allow everyone in the community to enjoy full benefits of life as they have been experiencing them.
- DWR will evaluate the basin based on those 6 undesirable results. If those are all fine, that's all good. But if they aren't all fine, the ways of farming may have to change.
- One member proposed that funding should be based on use of weighted risk; there's an idea that fee based structure should be volume based, but state is using weighted risk as one of the 6 factors. It's a depletor based model.
- Drought management plan: Many cities have been dealing with reducing water consumption by state mandate (Dixon reduced water consumption by 30%). Some residents have cut back, but see irrigation taking place as normal and wonder why that is. We could find ourselves in a drought, and should think about what ag will have to do, looking forward, to mitigate the impact of severe drought.
 - Riparian water users also had cutbacks on water usage, in addition to municipal water users.
 - We have an opportunity, due to the drought, to test our principles against the drought and the current deficiency and inadequacy of water.
- Recharge water, recycled water and other water needs to be included for sustainable usage.

Joseph closed the conversation by sharing three principles for success for groups that deal with complex problems:

1. Systems view: cause and effect are not enough to describe what goes on in complex systems dynamics.

2. Innovation: most problems will require some degree of innovation in order to be solved (E.g. in our approach to governance structure or creative reuse options for urban water pathways).
3. Tolerance for uncertainty: the more complex the systems are, the more tolerance for uncertainty needs to be managed by member parties.

Governance

- Royce Cunningham proposed that the group reconsider the full membership Board, diagrammed below. This structure was considered too large several months ago. Rural North Vacaville, Dixon RCD, Fairfield and North Delta withdrew, and CalWater was removed to create a smaller Board. However, Dixon RCD and CalWater are now both interested in a seat, and the BOS wants a third seat. Returning to a full 17 member Board (the original 15, plus the 3rd County seat and a separate Solano RCD seat as requested during the meeting) would be the most inclusive option.
 - Mike Hardesty will be retiring next year, so NDGSA may want their seat back on the GSA Board (they are included in the list below).
 - There are no guidelines for GSA board size.
 - Other boards have 15-16 members (Ex: Sac Water Authority and SCWA) and are productive.

1) City of Dixon	9) Reclamation District 2068
2) City of Rio Vista	10) Northern Delta GSA
3) City of Vacaville	11) SC District 4
4) City of Fairfield	12) SC District 5
5) Cal Water	13) County Supervisor at large seat
6) Solano Irrigation District	14) Public at large 1 (Ag Advisory)
7) Rural North Vacaville Water District	15) Public at large 2 (Farm Bureau)
8) Maine Prairie Water District	16) Dixon RCD
	17) Solano RCD*

Discussion

- We need to determine a decision rule or supermajority rule, regardless of board size.
- The 16-17 Board proposal gives the County, a single agency, 3 votes, while every other agency only has one vote, which seems unfair.
- Does the 3rd BOS seat have to be a BOS member?
 - Yes, the BOS concern was having representation of a broader set of interests. The BOS spent a majority of their meeting time talking about ag interests.
- The 12 member Board proposal shows balance between the different interests: 3 cities, 3 County, 3 water purveyors and 3 public seats.
- Everything short of the 17 member Board will leave someone out.

Questions

- What might balance how the BOS acts? Are there supermajority rules we can impose to help balance the room?
- How does the ag community feel about BOS representation?

Joseph took a straw poll vote on the 16-17 Board member proposal. Results below:

- 3 thumbs down, 4 thumbs sideways and 5 thumbs up. No action taken, and the conversation will reconvene at the next meeting.

*Note that Solano RCD's interest in a seat was quietly mentioned at the end of an over-time meeting, and not all members were aware of this additional seat during the vote. Ag Innovations received confirmation after the meeting from Chris Rose that with this larger structure, Solano RCD would likely request its own seat, but he would have to discuss the matter with his board to be sure.

Joseph closed the meeting: We have decided we will proceed with a JPA model. We are developing a set of principles and deal points to inform the creation of a governance structure that truly matters. We formed a funding group which will come up with a cost estimation, basic plan and timeline for GSA and GSP financing. Within a short period of time we will go into a JPA drafting phase. One subject to talk about in the JPA are the enumerated powers, the chosen subset from the

powers within the law. Chris Lee spoke to the importance of meeting more often to finalize our recommendations and get Board input soon to stay on time for our June 2017 deadline. The group agreed to meet again in 2-3 weeks' time to review governance models and synthesized principles statements.

Further next steps are captured at the top of this document.