



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 8, 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 April 24, 2019 (See Attached)
 - 2. Schedule for Meetings
 - 3. Bundle 1 – Draft Chapter Overview
 - 4. Additional GSP Elements (Reg. § 354.8 g)
 - 5. County Coordination Process/Plan Coordinator
 - 6. June Agenda Items
- III. Public Comment (non-agendized items)
- IV. Future Agenda Items
- V. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting

June 12, 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 Meeting Minutes
April 24, 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 Christy Kennedy at 9:08 a.m., on April 24, 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 Elaheh Esfahanian, George Biagi, Reid Roberts, Travis Kahrs, Danny Trejo, Peter Martin, Dave Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Emily Sheldon, Brandon Nakagawa, Peter Rietkerk, Scot Moody.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of April 10, 2019

Mr. Scot Moody moved, and Mr. Mike Henry seconded the approval of the April 10 meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Sustainability Indicators

a. Land Subsidence

Ms. Christy Kennedy walked through an overview of the proposed land subsidence sustainable management criteria, noting that land subsidence has not been historically observed in the Subbasin. She discussed the causes of subsidence, which results from dewatering of compressible clays. Ms. Kennedy indicated the consultant recommendation is to use groundwater levels as a proxy metric for land subsidence and provided justification based on the correlation between groundwater levels and land subsidence. Further detail on the justification was provided, including that historical lowering of the groundwater levels did not result in subsidence, and it is anticipated that additional dewatering would occur within similar materials and would cause a similar result.

Mr. Scot Moody stated there has not historically been land subsidence and noted the connection of subsidence with dewatering of the aquifer. Mr. Moody indicated his support for the approach presented and moved that the group accept the recommendation.

Mr. Kris Balaji asked if a violation of the minimum threshold for groundwater levels would result in a double violation if a proxy is used for this sustainability indicator. Mr. Jim Blanke (Woodard & Curran) responded no and clarified that a single violation results in non-compliance. Mr. Mike Henry questioned if a greater number of wells might cause the Subbasin to be out of compliance. Mr. Blanke noted that undesirable results would be the same as for the groundwater levels sustainability indicator, with undesirable results defined as an exceedance of the minimum thresholds at 25 percent of wells for 2 consecutive non-dry years.

Motion

Mr. Scot Moody moved, and Mr. Peter Martin seconded to recommend to the GWA Board to approve the use of groundwater levels as a proxy for the land subsidence sustainability indicator.

b. Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water

Ms. Kennedy walked through an overview of the proposed depletion of interconnected surface water sustainable management criteria, noting the two options that have been explored. She provided background

on depletions of interconnected surface waters, including the difference between losses and depletions, with depletions being caused by groundwater pumping.

Mr. Balaji indicated he is trying to understand the interconnection and how to control that. Mr. Blanke provided context for the sustainability indicator and the conditions we are trying to avoid. Ms. Kennedy walked through Approach 2, starting with the details on what a proxy is.

Mr. Moody noted he had questions on the modeling and that Approach 1 has too many uncertainties and Approach 2 is more understandable. Mr. Martin agreed with Mr. Moody and noted the correlation with hydrology and the need to look at the correlation to see if groundwater pumping is significant or not. He stated the second approach is the better one at addressing that point. He questioned how undesirable results would be determined. Mr. Blanke explained the process using groundwater levels as a proxy. Mr. Biagi stated his desire for additional details. Mr. Martin noted the limited details on losses and depletions and stated Approach 2 is better as there are a lot of uncertainties in Approach 1. Mr. Biagi stated he is still looking for more details. Ms. Kennedy discussed the challenges with DWR guidance and approval process

Mr. Fletcher indicated that most of the wells are not near the areas of interest and asked if this would be addressed in implementation. Ms. Kennedy responded yes and indicated that the groundwater level network is away from streams. Mr. Henry asked if there a distance identified for selection of wells for this purpose. Ms. Kennedy noted that new wells near streams will be monitored, but that they will not be made representative wells with thresholds right away. Mr. Henry asked if these wells would be newly drilled and installed. Ms. Kennedy answered yes, that two would be installed as part of the Technical Support Services (TSS) program, and remainder would be from the GSP.

Mr. Travis Kahrs commented that he is concerned about using a proxy again. Mr. Nakagawa questioned how to tie in beneficial uses downstream to show the minimum thresholds are protective. Mr. Blanke noted the group needs to decide if 70,000 AF is significant and unreasonable. Mr. Moody indicated that most rivers and streams are managed, and flows vary based on hydrology. Mr. de Graaf suggested tying into minimum fish flow requirements. He stated support for Approach 2.

Ms. Stacy Ansel commented on concerns for using groundwater levels as a proxy for too many sustainability indicators, noting that this is one of the sustainability indicators where DWR says groundwater levels is likely the best proxy.

Mr. Nakagawa noted if there is a way to match up instream flows and monitoring or spring measurements, that may be most appropriate. Mr. Rietkerk noted there is not enough data to tie to flow requirements. He stated we do not know what future in-stream flow requirements we will be targeting, especially with the Stanislaus River. He voiced support for Approach 2 as the more pragmatic.

Motion

Mr. Martin moved, and Mr. Rietkerk seconded to recommend that the GWA Board approve Approach 2, using groundwater levels as a proxy for the depletion of interconnected surface water sustainability indicator. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sustainability Goal

Ms. Kennedy described what a sustainability goal is and walked through the proposed sustainability goal. Mr. Henry indicated concern with including the word “unforeseen”. Ms. Kennedy noted that the change could be made.

3. Monitoring Network

Ms. Kennedy walked through an overview of the proposed monitoring network. Mr. Moody questioned if the group should consider adding monitoring wells over the cone of depression area. Ms. Kennedy recommended an overlay map because there are monitoring wells proposed for that area. Ms. Kennedy continued with a discussion of monitoring well density and the network density requirements, as well as a discussion of proposed monitoring frequency.

Mr. Rietkerk questioned what factors were involved to limit the number of representative monitoring wells to 19. Ms. Kennedy responded that we worked with GSAs to propose 0 to 3 wells and are looking for one or more wells per GSA. She noted the intent is to have coverage and leverage the CASGEM network. Mr. Rietkerk asked if projected modeling showed a violation. Mr. Blanke indicated yes for the projected condition without SGMA projects and management actions, and no for the projected sustainable condition.

Mr. Balaji asked how quarterly monitoring was determined. Mr. Blanke discussed DWR guidance, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and cost implications. Mr. Daniel de Graaf noted the need for consistency with prior monitoring efforts to match historical data. Mr. Nakagawa suggested March/April and September/October to capture the highs and lows.

Mr. Henry asked for clarification on the regulation for monitoring frequency for the 19 representative monitoring wells. Mr. Blanke and Ms. Kennedy clarified that this direction comes from the BMPs, which provides a recommendation, not a requirement. Mr. Henry noted that some of the wells are already monitored more frequently. Mr. Henry further asked who would monitor the wells. Mr. Nakagawa indicated that the County measures 250 wells two times per year. He indicated potential logistical issues for monitoring for water quality, but noted that there are fewer wells to monitor, could help limit the financial impacts.

Motion

Mr. Fletcher moved, and Mr. Moody seconded to recommend that the GWA Board approve the monitoring network as recommended. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems Approach

Ms. Kennedy described groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) and the process for GDE identification. She noted that the approach started with the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset. Areas without shallow groundwater, areas with access to supplemental water, were removed. Mr. Rietkerk asked if DWR provides guidance on the buffers. Mr. Blanke noted that this has been discussed with DWR without comment.

Mr. Nakagawa asked what other basins are using for the groundwater level cutoff. Ms. Kennedy indicated that 20 feet and 30 feet were looked at. Mr. Blanke noted The Nature Conservancy (TNC) direction looks into a Ground Surface Elevation (GSE) – Groundwater Elevation (GWE) method rather than a depth to water method. Mr. de Graaf requested detail.

5. Inter-basin Coordination

Ms. Kennedy provided a summary of neighboring subbasins.

6. Next Steps and Key Decisions for the GWA

Ms. Kennedy indicated that the Advisory Committee recommendations will be discussed at the Board meeting on May 8 and that we are finalizing coordination on minimum thresholds.

7. May Agenda Items

The May agenda will focus on draft GSP development.

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

There was no public comment.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

V. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 10:26 am.

Next Regular Meeting: May 8, 2019

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

April 24, 2019

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
EF	California Water Service Company	Esfahanian, Elaheh
GB	Central Delta Water Agency	Biagi, George**
	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	Roberts, Reid **
TR	City of Lodi	Kahrs, Travis
	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
D.T.	City of Stockton	Trejo, Danny
PM	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Martin, Peter
DBT	Linden County Water District	Fletcher, Dave**
mtb	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike**
OH	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
ES	Oakdale Irrigation District	Sheldon, Emily
BN	San Joaquin County	Balaji, Kris Nakagawa, Brandon
PMK	South San Joaquin GSA	Rietkerk, Peter
SM	Stockton East Water District	Lee, Cathy Scot Moody from

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Christy Kennedy	Woodard & Curran	cskennedy@woodardcurran.com
Jim Blanke	Woodard & Curran	jblanko@woodardcurran.com
DENNIS MILLS	STANISLAUS COUNTY	
STACIE ANN SILVA	NCNL	ssilva@NEWCURRENTWATER.COM
Andrew Watkins	SEWD	
Cathy Lee	:-	
Jane Wagner Tyack	Consultant/LWVSC	
Continued on next page....		

[illegible]

ST Canty

Lodi

Kn's Balaji

83 Co.

Mike Callahan

SJCPZ