EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 9, 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 November 14, 2018 (See Attached)
2. Projects and Management Actions
    i. Project Review Summary
    ii. Project Portfolios
3. Values Discussion Around Funding
4. Monitoring Network and Technical Support Services (TSS) Update
    i. Update from DWR
5. Situation Assessment Findings Overview
6. Third Informational Meeting Location
7. February Agenda Items

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items)

IV. Future Agenda Items

V. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting
February 13, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.
San Joaquin County - Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center
2101 E. Earhart Ave., Assembly Rm. #1, Stockton, California

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

Sign-In Sheet

November 14, 2018

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
MBH	California Water Service Company	Hurley, Michael
CB	Central Delta Water Agency	Biagi, George
RR	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	Roberts, Reid
	City of Lathrop	--
LR	City of Lodi	Roberts, Lance
EM	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
	City of Stockton	Lytle, Mel
WW	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Ward, Walter
DF	Linden County Water District	Fletcher, Dave
Present/MH	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike
DdG	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
ES	Oakdale Irrigation District	Sheldon, Emily
Present/KB	San Joaquin County	Balaji, Kris
PMK	South San Joaquin GSA	Rietkerk, Peter
	Stockton East Water District	Moody, Scot
	Woodbridge Irrigation District GSA	Heberle, Doug

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Dennis Mills	Calaveras County	
Paul Wells	DWR	
Mary Elizabeth	Sierra Club	
Grace Su	EBMUD	
Travis Kehrs	City of Lodi	

Continued on next page....

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Noel Lieu	City of Lodi	
John Kramer	EASTSIDE/CONDOR	jkramer@condorearth.com
Michael Callahan	SJCPW	
Yolanda Park	Catholic Charities	ypark@ccstockton.org

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2018

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 of Woodard & Curran at 9:05 a.m., on November 14, 2018, 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, Walter Ward, David Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Emily Sheldon, Kris Balaji, Peter Rietkerk, Scot Moody, and Doug Heberle.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of October 10, 2018

Public comment: Ms. Mary Elizabeth (Sierra Club) noted that it is not the first time she requested that water budgets be provided by GSA. She noted that she would like that request placed in the minutes and noted it was a repeated request.

Mr. Doug Heberle moved, and Mr. Mike Henry seconded the approval of the October 10 minutes.

2. Projects and Management Actions

a. Workshop Results and Follow Through

Ms. Alyson Watson gave an overview of new projects.

- Project 10 (Increase Nick DeGroot Water Treatment Plant Surface Water Deliveries): Ms. Mary Elizabeth noted that this project includes City of Tracy and asked if City of Tracy would participate. Mr. Peter Rietkerk answered that the project is for increasing in-basin capacity, with a focus on cities of Escalon and Ripon.

- Project 23 (Cal Fed Groundwater Recharge Project): A question was asked regarding where the water will come from. Mr. Daniel de Graaf answered that it comes from storage in Camanche Reservoir using NSJWCD's water right. A representative from Stockton East Water District asked about a right for diverting stormwater flows. Mr. Mike Henry asked if the water would be in addition to allocation in certain years.

- Project 24 (Mokelumne River Loss Study): A clarification question was asked if EBMUD has already performed this characterization work. Mr. Daniel de Graaf and Ms. Alyson Watson answered, indicating the study would be to enhance the accuracy of groundwater model assumptions. There is potential to partner with EBMUD and Woodbridge Irrigation District on this project.

- Project 25 (North System Modernization): Mr. Daniel de Graaf added clarification to both North and South Modernization System projects.

- Project 26 (PDA Banking): This project would be an expansion of the DREAM project with EBMUD. A Protest Dismissal Agreement (PDA) settlement calls out this block of water. It was noted that there is potential to put the water in the ground with a similar approach as the DREAM project.

- Project 27 (South System Modernization): Mr. Daniel de Graaf clarified this is an expansion of the current project.

- Project 28 (Tracy Lakes Groundwater Recharge): Ms. Mary Elizabeth asked that recharge projects indicate the volume to be percolated.

- Project 29 (Winery Recycled Water): No questions.

- Project 30 (Advanced Metering Infrastructure): A clarification question was asked on the meter reading program. It was noted that the City of Stockton is looking to do a fixed advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) network, and there are currently eight staff reading meters.

- Project 31 (Mobilizing Recharge Opportunities): No questions.

Ms. Mary Elizabeth asked questions on projects. She referred to Project 24 (Mokelumne River Study) that is intended to validate and inform modeling decisions and asked if similar type of study would be needed for the San Joaquin and Stanislaus Rivers. On Project 26 (PDA Banking), she was wondering if the 1,000 AF DREAM project is included in the baseline. She stated that she has requested on previous occasions a list of those projects that are used for recharge, specifically in a couple of forums. She then asked if there is opportunity to partner with Cal Water and with City of Stockton on recharge. She further asked if some projects would include areas occupied by homeless populations.

Mr. Mike Henry asked when the group will start talking about financing projects. Ms. Alyson Watson answered that the discussion is still at a high level, and that we will get to the financing piece in January or February. It was asked when projects will be selected. Ms. Alyson Watson noted that the next month will be used to refine projects and meet with GSAs, and that costs and financing will be discussed with the Advisory Committee in January and February 2019. Mr. George Biagi asked a water rights modifications question and noted that there was a comment included that SGMA does not affect water rights. He asked if the Advisory Committee wanted water rights to be looked at as a project, as it relates to reservoir operations.

b. Project Review

Ms. Alyson Watson presented an overview of the approach to the project review process.

Mr. Daniel de Graaf asked for clarification on weighting and assessment of institutional complexity. Dr. Mel Lytle asked a question on assessment of project location, indicating that low groundwater levels in places where the depression is greatest could be due to pumping and also due to limitations on percolation. He indicated the need to look at geology since the lenses below the surface stretch to different locations. He then noted that just because a groundwater recharge project is located on top of the depression does not mean that the water will go there. It may be more advantageous to take advantage of geology. Ms. Alyson Watson indicated that the criteria would be revised to show direct benefit to the area of the cone of depression. Mr. Scot Moody echoed Dr. Mel Lytle's thoughts, indicating that he suspects groundwater does not recharge well in the NSJWCD and SEWD areas. Mr. Kris Balaji noted that with the interconnectivity of aquifers, a project that is not at the cone of depression may also provide benefits. Mr. Michael Hurley asked what tools are available for assessment. Ms. Alyson Watson answered that the model is a tool for assessment in this area. She further noted that she would rather see thresholds that facilitate projects not dictate projects. Dr. Mel Lytle noted that it is important that the group not box itself in, and to keep the whole basin's ability to recharge as the highest goal.

Regarding the cost assessment, Dr. Mel Lytle noted that the cost per acre-foot is different for urban and agricultural areas, and the >$500/AF classification is not unreasonable for urban areas. He noted that there is a need to understand the beneficial use of water and that this does not get to affordability. Ms. Alyson Watson noted the assessment criteria would be refined. Mr. Kris Balaji asked a clarifying question. Mr. Daniel de Graaf asked if funding sources will be looked at. Ms. Mary Elizabeth noted that by the nature of conservation, she agrees that it is important to have an objective cost scoring per acre-foot. She indicated the original question in relation to how study-type projects pan out where there is not direct benefit to water value.

Mr. Scot Moody stated that the disadvantaged community (DAC) benefits criteria will discriminate against agricultural communities. Ms. Alyson Watson noted that that is a good point and that this is a tool to compare projects and may be useful for funding sources. Dr. Mel Lytle indicated that there are small community water systems that overlay with DACs. Mr. Brandon Nakagawa noted that the IRWM program has a DAC coordination nexus with SGMA.

c. Project Portfolios

Ms. Alyson Watson presented an overview of project portfolios, noting the projects will be bundled by themes to meet the needs of the basin.

Mr. Walt Ward asked for clarification on bundling to get to 100,000 AFY. Mr. Kris Balaji asked if there is something that measures the long-term sustainability of projects. For example, will projects be expected to yield volume yearly, and will reliably and sustainability continue? Ms. Alyson Watson noted that there is not, but it could be added if the group thinks it is important. Mr. Brandon Nakagawa suggested thinking about long-term outcomes through operations and maintenance and funding sources. He asked if there are innovative solutions to be looked at. He asked the group if the basin should consider out-of-the-box solutions and if there are additional projects related to technology and innovation that could be adaptively managed. Mr. Doug Heberle asked if projects could first be ranked by individual GSAs to find out if GSAs have certain preferred projects.

3. Water Quality Thresholds and Monitoring Network

Ms. Alyson Watson presented an overview of the meeting held with GSAs impacted by water quality issues to develop an initial approach to establishing thresholds for salinity. She indicated that the Advisory Committee will discuss the outcomes of this meeting and make a recommendation to the Board.

4. Monitoring Network and Technical Support Services (TSS) Wells

Ms. Alyson Watson gave an overview of the TSS well analysis, indicating the three locations identified as priorities for TSS wells, which are Dry Creek, Calaveras/Highway 88, and Duck Creek/Stanislaus County.

It was asked if the three wells were intended to fill data gaps or if they were critical for monitoring. Ms. Alyson Watson indicated that they would fill data gaps. Mr. Mike Henry asked for clarification on the subsequent 10 wells. Dr. Mel Lytle asked if well logs, geology, and soils information would be provided. Ms. Elba Mijango asked who would be responsible for the operations of the wells. It was indicated that there are a number of items including access permission that have been worked through in the past with USGS, and that this can be worked out. It was noted that the GWA does not have the monitoring equipment to do the water quality testing, and the group will need to figure out as a region who will pay for the equipment and do the work.

Mr. Mike Henry moved, and Mr. David Fletcher seconded that a recommendation go to the GWA Board to approve the wells for use in the TSS application.

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

Ms. Mary Elizabeth (Sierra Club) indicated she would like to see a refined a list of baseline projects and would like that information to be disclosed. She has also previously requested a sustainable yield value and commented on reaching out to GSAs. She indicated that the public is not able to participate in the process and that outreach materials are not available either through GSA governing bodies or water advisory group meetings. She stated she has previously requested methodology used to identify the groundwater-dependent ecosystems (GDE) process to be used in the GSP. She indicated that an NGO asked about this, and she was not able to provide an update. She then commented on process, indicating that in the bylaws it is referenced that in addition to the end of meeting comments allowed by the public, written comments may be submitted to the technical advisory committee. She stated that comments have been submitted to the technical advisory group, but have not been responded to, in written form or by email. She indicated that the group is to have an actively engaged public outreach and noted that this is not occurring.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

December agenda items will be addressed at the January Advisory Committee meeting, per discussion on proposal of Advisory Committee not holding meeting in December.

V. Adjournment:

There was a motion to adjourn. Mr. Doug Heberle moved, and Dr. Mel Lytle seconded the meeting adjournment. The meeting was closed at 10:38 am.

Next Regular Meeting: January 9, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.
San Joaquin County - Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, 2101 E. Earhart Ave., Assembly Rm. #1, Stockton, CA.