



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 10, 2019

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

San Joaquin County – Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center
2101 E. Earhart Avenue – Assembly Room #1, Stockton, California

- I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance & Safety Announcement/Introductions
- II. **SCHEDULED ITEMS** – *Presentation materials to be posted on ESJGroundwater.org and emailed prior to the meeting. Copies of presentation materials will be available at the meeting.*
 - A. Discussion /Action Items:
 1. Approval of Minutes of March 13, 2019 (See Attached)
 2. Schedule Overview
 3. Management Actions
 4. Water Budget Planning Estimates
 5. Sustainable Management Criteria Definitions
 6. Six Sustainability Indicators
 - a. Undesirable Results, Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, Interim Milestones, Definition of Violation
 7. Monitoring Network
 8. Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems Approach
 9. Inter-basin Coordination
 10. Next Steps and Key Decisions for the GWA
 11. May Agenda Items
- III. **Public Comment (non-agendized items)**
- IV. **Future Agenda Items**
- V. **Adjournment**

**The date of the May meeting is being rescheduled
per request of the JPA members.**

Action may be taken on any item

Agendas and Minutes may also be found at <http://www.ESJGroundwater.org>

Note: If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact San Joaquin County Public Works Water Resources Staff at (209) 468-3089 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2019

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance & Safety Announcement/Roll Call

The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (GWA) Advisory Committee meeting was convened by Alyson Watson at 9:06 a.m., on March 13, 2019, at the Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, 2101 E. Earhart Ave. Stockton, CA. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, a representative of the San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services provided the required safety information.

In attendance were Michael Hurley, George Biagi, Reid Roberts, Lance Roberts, Elba Mijango, Mel Lytle, Peter Martin, David Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Emily Sheldon, Kris Balaji, Peter Rietkerk, Andrew Watkins, and Doug Heberle. Others in attendance are on the sign in sheet.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of February 13, 2019

The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Summary of Approach for Water Budget and Plan Finalization

Members of the Advisory Committee made a request to propose an alternate date for May meeting because of conflict with ACWA conference. It was suggested to send out a Doodle poll to gather preferences for an alternate date.

Ms. Alyson Watson gave an update on the status of sharing GSA-level water budgets. She indicated that GSA-level water budgets will be provided as a tool and that the results from this analysis are in draft form. She noted that the details and assumptions of GSA scale water budgets will need to be worked through following GSP adoption. She reminded the group that DWR is looking for compliance with SGMA at the basin scale.

Ms. Alyson Watson indicated that a list of projects from GSAs is being confirmed. The proposed approach is to develop a recommended list of projects that GSAs want to implement and show this as a menu of options that demonstrates that we have sufficient projects to address the need. A plan for determining which projects will be implemented and when, will be developed. This plan will include how projects will be financed. This approach recognizes that there is a lot of work needed to verify and validate assumptions in first five years of GSP implementation.

3. Water Budget Planning Estimates

Long-Term Average Imbalance

Ms. Alyson Watson gave an overview of the staff workshop on February 28th, noting that the workshop was held in response to Board direction, and the intent was to discuss the work that has been done and identify policy decisions to be brought back to the Advisory Committee and Board. An additional goal of this workshop was to revise the GSP review schedule.

Mr. Ali Taghavi presented an overview of the water budget planning estimates for the basin scale. He indicated what the projected conditions will look like at build out and what the sustainable yield calculation is showing.

Mr. Mike Henry asked a clarifying question about projected recharge: does it include managed recharge? Mr. Ali Taghavi answered that the projected level of recharge is from projected conveyance and diversions. Mr. Ali Taghavi then discussed sustainable yield modeling and indicated which undesirable results are the focus of current work. Mr. Mike Henry asked a question about optimized urban conservation and the use of the word "additional." It was noted the word "additional" would be removed from the slide. Mr. Michael Hurley clarified that adjacent subbasin flows is reflected in subsurface flows.

Mr. Kris Balaji reiterated what Ms. Alyson Watson said that this work is for the sensitivity analysis. He noted that on Slide 9, the net deficit is 34,000 AF for urban and agriculture reduction. He asked why the difference in pumping is much larger than the reduction in pumping. Mr. Ali Taghavi answered that there we can consider the difference is a "hole" of about 34TAF in the long term. He explained that as the hole is filled and the groundwater level rises, dynamic of flows between neighboring basins, delta, and river courses will change. As a result, we will experience less flows from rivers and the Delta. To make up for this, we need to reduce groundwater pumping by more than that. Mr. Mike Henry asked why they cannot just deliver 35,000 AF directly to the hole to minimize the impact to boundary flows and streams.

Mr. Michael Hurley clarified that this is the annualized look at the conditions. He asked what SGMA allows with regard to variance from this in years of drought. He next asked if there is a percent deviation from these annual averages. Mr. Ali Taghavi responded that short term imbalances need to be offset and there is a 20-year implementation period. Mr. Andrew Watkins questioned what it would start out as. Ms. Alyson Watson responded that it depends on what the group decides for the implementation plan. These are the long-term sustainable conditions. Mr. Andrew Watkins clarified 78,000 AF is the 2040 number and that there may be reductions during the implementation period before then. Mr. Mike Henry clarified that this will be in the 5-year plan updates, and the group might find out that if it needs to be less or more. There is room for validation and changes to assumptions with a flexible implementation plan. Therefore, starting with an estimate that is adaptable is preferred.

Dr. Mel Lytle stated that 78,000 AF by 2040 is the average amount of water needed to balance the basin. The recharge is not a one-to-one comparison. He noted that the basin would not get 78,000 AF/year recharged and that that number will change based on year type and how effective recharge is. Mr. Peter Rietkerk requested clarification on the 78,000 AF number. He asked if it is an average or ultimate number total needed after implementation. Mr. Ali Taghavi responded that it is a long-term average over the next 50 years. The basin has 20 years to get there.

Mr. Peter Martin brought up coordination between basins, as north and south subbasins are on different timelines. He asked if there is sufficient pressure to ensure that neighboring basins do not harm inflows. He asked for a reminder on SGMA guidance on interbasin coordination. He asked if there will be pushback on the assumption that subbasins will keep up with the ESJ Subbasin, given they may be on a different timeline. Ms. Alyson Watson stated that the regulations do require coordination with neighboring basins. The approach is to be open and share information, make assumptions clear, make a plan to move forward, and address inconsistencies as necessary.

Mr. Mike Henry indicated that at the GSA level, the coordinated effort leads to not harming one another, but no "hammer" is explicitly laid out. Ms. Valerie Kincaid added that there is a "do no harm" requirement. No one basin can interfere with another basin's ability to get to sustainability. She stated that we do not

want a neighboring basin to comment on the plan saying no coordination has been done. That is the "hammer," of sorts, available - via a stakeholder comment letter.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid asked how to deal with margins of error. Mr. Ali Taghavi responded that there is 5-20% uncertainty for different data items and there is a range that reflects that uncertainty. We are recommending the low-end estimate on that margin of error. Ms. Alyson Watson added that we will develop an implementation plan and take those 5 years to dig in deeper to areas where the model is particularly sensitive. Mr. Mike Henry asked for clarification on the 15% reduction in certain parts of the basin. Ms. Alyson Watson suggested to look at how sensitive the sustainable yield calculation is in relation to specific areas that the reduction is applied.

Ms. Mary Elizabeth questioned what distance from rivers is used when looking at targeted areas, concerned with potential decreases in subsurface flows. Wells as close as 50 feet to a stream may be drawing water from the stream. Mr. Ali Taghavi responded that they are optimizing using a mile or so from the river. Mr. Mike Henry asked with the same scenario and same approach, if the 10% urban conservation be applied basin-wide. Mr. Ali Taghavi responded that 10% will be applied evenly on urban area.

Mr. Andrew Watkins asked if it is premature to adopt numbers since not all GSA water budget meetings have been held yet. Ms. Alyson Watson indicated that the numbers on GSA scale would not change the basin scale number and that the meetings are focused on GSA-level budgets. Those are not going into the plan. Mr. Brandon Nakagawa indicated that water budgets specific to each GSA may affect how much of the 78,000 AF is the responsibility of the GSAs. Mr. Peter Martin wanted to clarify that there are no attorneys attached to the body and requested caution when characterizing this group in the future.

Dr. Mel Lytle asked if the number includes the agriculture/urban split or are whether it is considered as one block. Mr. Ali Taghavi answered that it is considered as one block. Ms. Alyson Watson added that the way this number was developed is not a proposed solution. Ms. Emily Sheldon added that she thinks it is a fair estimate to start with. Mr. Daniel de Graaf had the same concern that GSAs do not have time to bring this back to their Boards. He noted that he wanted time to brief his Board members before deciding next month. Ms. Alyson Watson clarified that they are asking only for a recommendation. Next month the Board will make a decision, leaving one month for communication.

Mr. Reid Roberts said he is not ready to make a recommendation and that he needed more information before agreeing with a recommendation. Ms. Alyson Watson indicated that if a recommendation is not received, it will affect the schedule. The schedule has the water budget delivered to staff on April 15, leaving no direction until May if a recommendation is not received. Ms. Valerie Kincaid noted that from a process perspective, Ms. Alyson Watson made a good point. She noted that the job of everyone on this Advisory Committee is to bring information back to the Board. She said that the group can keep the agenda item for the Board as an action item and that a recommendation is not necessarily needed at this meeting.

Mr. Kris Balaji added that it would help the group to clarify what is being asked. He asked if the group would be more comfortable focusing on the methodology rather than the number. He reminded the group that this is the best available science and the role of the Advisory Committee is to provide the technical expertise to evaluate and comment on the methodology. He asked if anyone felt something was missing. Mr. Reid Roberts stated that he is not going to change his decision. He noted that he will comment that the methodology is appropriate and that this may be a reasonable number. Mr. Michael Hurley asked what consideration had been given with regards to surface water supplies and the negative impacts of those. Dr. Mel Lytle indicated the original studies by Brown & Caldwell in 1985 showed about 85,000 AF reduction was

needed. For ease of incorporation, he noted he would be open to rounding the number to 78,000 or 80,000 AF.

Mr. Lance Roberts indicated that there was a lot of work put into this and noted his concern that the group is having concerns now that they are asked for agreement with a number. He noted that the GSAs still do not know whose portion is what and noted his concern about postponing this discussion.

Mr. Brandon Nakagawa suggested that everyone take this methodology approach back to Boards. We can bring this topic to the Advisory Committee next month again, and the Board will be agenzized to take up this discussion based on that morning's recommendation. It will still be on the Board agenda.

Motion

Mr. Daniel de Graaf motioned to bring this topic up again at the meeting next month, another member seconded, and there was unanimous agreement amongst the committee members.

Mr. Mike Henry indicated that his board meets tomorrow and they are not agenzized for this action so they would not have a chance to get direction before the next meeting.

4. Sustainability Indicators

Ms. Alyson Watson gave an overview of sustainability indicators and the consultant recommendation on which ones to address fully in the GSP, and the justification that would be given for doing so.

Dr. Mel Lytle noted that he is not familiar with how seawater intrusion is defined in SGMA. He indicated that we want to make sure DWR is not going to come back to us and say seawater intrusion is due to the Delta. Mr. Paul Wells explained that how you develop your plan is based on interpretation of the requirements.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid commented that she has talked to a DWR representative and they made a distinction between impacts that are not currently happening, and impacts that could never happen. She noted that the representative could not think of a basin where groundwater storage was not a sustainability indicator that could be evaluated. Groundwater levels could be used as a proxy in this case, but it would not be acceptable to table it. Her recommendation is to state in the plan that there are no existing issues with those indicators and that the basin is prepared to evaluate and set thresholds if they become an issue in the future. Mr. Kris Balaji stated he thinks we still need a way to monitor these other indicators and should set triggers rather than thresholds. Ms. Alyson Watson responded that we can look at groundwater level thresholds and see if those are protective of the other undesirable results.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid noted that DWR indicated that DWR does use the word trigger but suggested setting a minimum threshold if it ever becomes an issue. She further noted that DWR came out with the Sacramento Valley Subsidence report, and that the San Joaquin study is coming out soon. She asked that it be confirmed that the data indicates there is no issue with subsidence in the subbasin.

Motion

Mr. Peter Rietkerk made a motion to recommend to the Board to follow a hybrid action plan approach with technical data to justify why these sustainability indicators are not a concern for the basin. Mr. Peter Martin and Dr. Mel Lytle seconded, and there was unanimous agreement amongst the committee members.

5. Monitoring, Measuring, and Model Refinements

Motion

Dr. Mel Lytle motioned, and Mr. Michael Hurley seconded the recommendation to the GWA Board that monitoring, measuring, and model reporting be conducted at the basin scale. There was unanimous agreement amongst the committee members.

6. Project Implementation

Mr. Kris Balaji asked why this is a critical decision now. Ms. Alyson Watson responded that it was identified as a policy decision for the Board to take up and that clarification is needed on what default approach will be for projects.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid added that the JPA allows for groups to do special activity agreements, and for smaller groups to get together and create programs such as a grant fund, but that each GSA that submits a project is in charge of that project. She stated that this JPA does not have the authority to force a GSA to get a project online.

Dr. Mel Lytle questioned what would happen if a GSA refuses to do the project approved in the implementation plan. Ms. Valerie Kincaid responded that the JPA does not have common authority to force a GSA to take on that project or to take the project on themselves.

Motion

Mr. Dave Fletcher moved to make a recommendation to the Board for project implementation to be consistent with the JPA bylaws. Mr. Peter Rietkerk seconded, and there was unanimous agreement amongst the committee members.

The remaining items on the agenda are tabled to next meeting.

7. Management Actions

This agenda item will be discussed at the April 10 Advisory Committee meeting.

8. Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems

This agenda item will be discussed at the April 10 Advisory Committee meeting.

9. April Agenda Items

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

There was no public comment.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

V. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 10:59 am.

Next Regular Meeting: April 10 2019 at 9:00 a.m.

San Joaquin County - Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, 2101 E. Earhart Ave., Assembly Rm. #1, Stockton, CA

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sign-In Sheet

March 13, 2019

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
MBH	California Water Service Company	Hurley, Michael
GB	Central Delta Water Agency	Biagi, George
TK	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	Thompson, Grant
LR	City of Lodi	Roberts, Lance
EM.	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
AW	City of Stockton	Lytle, Mel
PM	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Martin, Peter
DFT	Linden County Water District	Fletcher, Dave
MS	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike
DD	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
ES	Oakdale Irrigation District	Sheldon, Emily
WJ	San Joaquin County	Balaji, Kris
PM	South San Joaquin GSA	Rietkerk, Peter
AW	Stockton East Water District	Watkins, Andrew
DA	Woodbridge Irrigation District GSA	Heberle, Doug

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Alexis Wells	CHANDLER COUNTY	
Alicia Connolly	SSC	
Paul Wells	DWR	
Bill Braucher	DWR	
Sara Miller	Woodbridge and others	
<i>Continued on next page....</i>		
OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		

NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Michael Callahan	SJC PW	
Janice P. Magdich	City of Lodi	jmagdich@lodi.gov
Travis Pains	City of Lodi	
Nollan	City of Lodi	
Danny Trejo	City of Stockton	
Garry Schump	ERMMIS	
Ali Tashari	W&C	
Grace Su	EBMUD	
M. Elizabeth M	Sierra Club	
Victoria Drake	ENGEO	
C. Swinley	Lodi	same
Keely Vellelapano	SJC PW	