



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN  
GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

1810 E. Hazelton  
Avenue  
P. O. Box 1810  
Stockton, CA  
95201

(209) 468-3089  
ESJgroundwater@sjgov.org  
esjgroundwater.org

**Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority  
Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup  
September 11, 2018  
4 – 5:30 p.m.  
Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center  
2101 E. Earhart Ave., Stockton, CA, Mokelumne Room**

**Committee Members in Attendance**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
X	Colin Bailey	The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Restore the Delta
X	Gene E. Bigler	PUENTES
	Drew Cheney	Machado Family Farms
X	Robert Dean	Calaveras County Resource Conservation District
X	Mary Elizabeth	Sierra Club
	David Fries	San Joaquin Audubon
X	Joey Giordano	The Wine Group
X	Jack Hamm	Lima Ranch
	Mary Hildebrand	South Delta Water Agency
X	George V. Hartmann	The Hartmann Law Firm
	Michael Machado	Farmer
	Ara Marderosian	Sequoia ForestKeeper
	Ryan Mock	J.R. Simplot Company
X	Yolanda Park	Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Stockton
X	Will Price	University of the Pacific & Vice Chair, SJ County Advisory Water Commission
X	Daryll Quaresma	2Q Farming, Inc.
	Jennifer Shipman	Manufacturers Council of the Central Valley
	Chris Shutes	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
	Michael F. Stieler	CGCS, Spring Creek Golf & Country Club
X	Linda Turkatte	San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department
	Ken Vogel	San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
	Ted Wells	Trinchero Family Estates and Sutter Home Winery

	<b>General Public</b>	
X	Andrew Watkins	Farm Bureau
X	Jane Wagner-Tyack	Communications Consultant
	<b>Staff and Consultants</b>	
X	Brandon Nakagawa	County ESJ GSP Project Representative
X	Michael Callahan	County ESJ
X	Alicia Connelly	County ESJ
X	Alyson Watson	ESJ GSP Project Manager
X	Christy Kennedy	ESJ GSP Deputy Project Manager
	Lucy Eidam Crocker	Stakeholder Engagement & Public Outreach Consultant
X	Cindy Thomas	Stakeholder Engagement & Public Outreach Consultant

## Meeting Notes

### I. Welcome

- a. Alyson Watson welcomed the group at 4:05 pm.
- b. Alyson Watson reviewed the meeting agenda, emphasizing the focus would be on finishing last month's discussion on undesirable results, minimum thresholds, the historical water budget and current conditions baseline.

### II. Comments on Meeting Notes

- a. Jane Wagner-Tyack – asked Robert Dean to describe the public health cost of treatment of water and how that related to sustainability.
- b. Robert Dean – noted elements from the Water Code and asked how to subsidize those that cannot afford monthly rates, noting that the answer may not be with the Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup.
- c. Gene Bigler – noted that he is confused about the discussion of nitrates and sources of contamination. He asked about concerns on the nature of measurement and sources of contamination.
- d. Robert Dean – commented on the issue of nitrates being addressed by CV SALTS and the Irrigated Lands Program. There is an issue with quality of water for recharge and an issue with contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) – who is managing the quality of the recharged water? It is important to consider the potential for mobilization and introduction of contaminants through recharge water.
- e. Gene noted that all sources of contaminates need to be measured to better understand if the recharge efforts are successful.

### III. Update on Background Conditions

- a. Alyson Watson shared slides reviewing background conditions in the basin and addressing questions and comments from the last meeting. She went into detail describing the difference between disadvantaged communities (DACs) and severely disadvantaged communities (SDACs).
- b. Alyson Watson clarified that median domestic well depth is about 5 ft shallower in areas designated as DACs.

- c. Gene Bigler – had a question on the definition of DACs. He noted that the current measurement disregards large populations. Has there been thought to broadening definition, possibly using the Cal Impact map? Woodard & Curran will bring the Cal Impact map to next meeting as an overlay to see how it differs from DACs. Alyson Watson clarified that DACs are not exempt from SGMA.
- d. Daryll Quaresma – questioned if DACs are exempt from groundwater recharge.
- e. Public Trust Doctrine discussion – Will Price did work in this area a few decades ago and has reached out to get more recent information from the legal community. He is waiting for that input. Jack Hamm asked for a definition and Alyson Watson provided a summary. Robert Dean noted that SGMA is a tool to address the issue and does not trump the Public Trust Doctrine, and that this relates to groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) and interconnected surface water. Will Price noted that this has been called “common pool goods,” that the work you do cannot harm others. He emphasized the need to look at how implementing SGMA affects the Public Trust Doctrine. Brandon Nakagawa noted that the Public Trust Doctrine is only to be used when there are no other options available.

#### **IV. Undesirable Results & Minimum Thresholds Continued**

- a. Alyson Watson reminded the group of the 6 sustainability indicators that must be considered under SGMA: Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels, Reduction in Groundwater Storage, Seawater Intrusion, Degraded Water Quality, Land Subsidence and Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water
- b. Alyson Watson gave a review of the Sustainability Indicators discussed in the last meeting.
  - i. Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels
    - i. Andrew Watkins had a question about the age of shallow wells, asking if they may contribute to contamination. Is it better to get rid of old wells so there is not a short circuit issue? Should groundwater be further lowered for a buffer zone with the surface? He noted the potential for a water bank concept.
    - ii. The cost to access water as groundwater elevation drops is an undesirable result as it is prohibitively expensive to tap deep water or access water in storage. Cost factor needs to be part of consideration.
  - ii. Depleted Water Quality
    - i. Asking about water quality at depth, Andrew Watkins noted they have a recent 900 ft well with good water quality. Daryll Quaresma indicated deep water quality in his area is poor.
    - ii. Gene Bigler – asked about “the salt sink” and if they are exacerbated at differing groundwater levels. All water should be considered.
  - iii. Storage
    - i. Consider groundwater below 800 feet as “strategic reserve.”
- c. Members discussed undesirable results for the remaining two sustainability indicators:
  - i. Land Subsidence
    - i. Andrew Watkins and Brandon Nakagawa – indicated there is data that shows there is no land subsidence occurring in the County. There is a small amount of Corcoran Clay in the southwest portion of the subbasin, which is susceptible.

- ii. George V. Hartmann – indicated there is subsidence along the islands where there is oxidation/heat – a different issue.
- iii. Brandon Nakagawa – indicated there is a USGS gauge station that does move up and down, and that could be due to an expansive soils issue. The area where we have Corcoran Clay is a threat area but since it is in a flood plain and next to high groundwater, there is limited potential for subsidence.
- iv. Will Price – asked questions on geology.
- v. Mary Elizabeth – asked what is known about subsidence in the Delta and on oxidation of peat soils. She asked to address that issue in future meetings.
- vi. Infrastructure failures are a concern.
- ii. Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water
  - i. Alyson Watson asked the group what their priorities are in regard to surface water and the potential effects to consider
    1. Groundwater pumping to an extent that impacts surface water rights
    2. Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) will be a part of this sustainability indicator
    3. Consider where major infrastructure is
    4. George V. Hartmann – asked if we eliminate some of the brainstormed concerns by ranking in order of materiality as a value judgement exercise. Mary Elizabeth indicated she is concerned about some of the items
    5. Looking at floodplain issues and the impacts floodplains have, including issues with putting wells in floodplains
    6. Undesirable Results including inability to meet minimum flow requirements, recreation impacts, fisheries impacts/temperature, habitat impacts, impacts to GDEs, impacts to water supply for reservoirs, water rights issues and water quality issues
    7. Note on maps – be able to expand so they can be seen more clearly. Include higher resolution maps on website
    8. Linda Turkatte – for permitting water wells, they have not looked at impacts in the past. They may have wells close to surface water that could potentially have an influence, and indicated she knows of several locations. Doing the permitting discretionary so proper studies can take place is beneficial. Having the regulatory process in place is useful to address this issue, but it is not in place yet
    9. Andrew Watkins – noted there is recharge from rivers to the groundwater basin which is an asset to the community
    10. Consider percolated groundwater through canals

## **V. Historical Water Budget & Current Conditions Baseline**

- a. Alyson Watson presented on the Historical Water Budget.
  - i. Alyson Watson addressed some clarifying questions.
    1. There was a request to put totals on slide 32.
    2. There was a request that a population base be included.
    3. Industrial use is not included directly. Linda Turkatte asked where to get information about these industrial wells that we unaccounted for. She indicated to look at zoning and land use and overlay where wells

are located (wineries with production wells, other industry). Joey Giordano indicated monthly use is reported in the State Portal as part of permitting and that this information is potentially available through the County. Public drinking water systems for production water needs. Andrew Watkins indicated there is a well extraction fee that is charged, so it would be included in agricultural demand. Some areas that have industrial or large pumping wells that may not be captured include Marley Cooly Station, Elkhorn County Club, HOA on March Lane, and the golf course along Hwy 99.

- b. Alyson Watson presented on the Current Conditions Baseline.

## **VI. Recap of Open House**

- a. Members discussed how the Open House event on August 29 went. (*“For those of you who attended, what was your impression of the event?”*)
  - i. Will Price – enjoyed it but did not stay. Expectation was there would be an overview presentation or statement. Thinks we should keep doing them.
- b. Members discussed suggestions for locations for future informational meetings.
  - i. Will Price – would like to do one at the University, to get University people involved.
  - ii. Eastside road (Linden or Lockeford) was suggested, to get farmers involved.

## **VII. Announcements**

## **VIII. Other Topics**

### **Comment by Robert Dean**

In looking over the discussion about where next to hold the outreach meeting, I wonder if we shouldn't look for a location where critical overdraft is occurring. The other thought for a meeting would be to meet with a representative group of DACs. Perhaps at the Ag center. We talk about the DACs but I'm not sure we're not hearing their issues. I don't know if this is the appropriate venue but since it's been the topic of conversation at each meeting it should be examined. It is certainly possible that our work group could be the only entry point to discuss DACs relationship with water availability, ESJ Groundwater Basin and SGMA.

### **Comment by Ara Marderosian**

Slide 31 in the attached slide presentation, scheduled for presentation in today's Eastern SJV meeting, states: Water Demands are based on Urban and Agricultural Water Use Estimates

### **Agricultural water use based**

- Crop type and acreage
- Soil conditions

- Irrigation practices
- Hydrogeology and climate

But the slides don't provide acres of each specific livestock feed crop or give us numbers that can be converted to a useful analysis of the data.

Since Cropscape maps have already created of agricultural acreage and already included them in slide 34, associated CropScape spreadsheet should also be provide that documents the particular acreages by crop within the ESJGW Authority.