



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, September 12, 2018

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 August 8, 2018 (See Attached)
 2. Open House Recap
 3. Thresholds Status
 4. Projected Water Budget
 5. Sustainable Yield
 6. Projects and Management Actions
 7. October Agenda Items
- III. **Public Comment (non-agendized items)**
- IV. **Future Agenda Items**
- V. **Adjournment**

Next Regular Meeting

October 10, 2018 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
August 8, 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 Ms. Alyson Watson (Woodward & Curran) at 9:02 a.m., on August 8, 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 Bolzowski, Grant Thompson, Greg Gibson, Lance Roberts, Elba Mijango, Mel Lytle, Walter Ward, David Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Emily Sheldon, Fritz Buchman, Peter Rietkerk, Scot Moody, and Doug Heberle.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of July 11, 2018

Mr. Henry moved, and Dr. Lytle seconded the approval of the July 11 minutes. The motion passed (Ms. Mijango abstained).

2. Minimum Thresholds

Ms. Watson gave a presentation on the analysis behind setting draft Minimum Thresholds. Referring to Ms. Watson's slides, Mr. Ward asked to what datum they are corrected. Mr. Brandon Nakagawa answered that he believes it is the NAVD 1988 dataset. The consultants will confirm the datum source and that everything is corrected to the same datum. Dr. Lytle asked for the definition of domestic wells. Ms. Watson indicated that the definition is from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) domestic well database. Mr. Henry stated that his GSA met conservation goals of 25% and is still using less water than in prior years but is seeing groundwater levels dropping nearby despite these efforts to conserve. He indicated that the situation in Lockeford points out the need to collectively get more water into the basin.

Next, Ms. Watson presented on and facilitated a discussion around groundwater-dependent ecosystems (GDEs). Mr. Ward asked if mapping vegetation type will help in screening for GDEs (for example, mapping phreatophytes, with field verification to rule areas in and out). Ms. Watson noted this is part of the next steps, and what is presented in this meeting is the coarse first filter, done by removing areas that are screened out in desktop analysis. Following this first step, we will work with a biologist to refine and prioritize significant areas.

Ms. Watson then defined losing streams as streams that lose water to the groundwater system. She defined GDEs as wetland areas not adjacent to or fed by surface water but that are dependent on groundwater for root zones.

Ms. Watson then presented on groundwater quality. Mr. Gibson indicated that Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) could be caused by the Simplot plume, by unsustainable irrigation, or in areas of recycled water application, and that it may not be just related to groundwater pumping. Dr. Lytle indicated that he agreed it is important to understand the specific area.

Dr. Lytle then indicated that United States Geological Survey (USGS) wells would be helpful to look at because of the nested feature, and that there are USGS wells in Calaveras County. Ms. Watson indicated

that a workgroup would be convened for salinity, including Cal Water, City of Lodi, City of Manteca, City of Stockton, and City of Lathrop.

Ms. Watson then presented on interconnected surface water. Dr. Lytle asked if there is there a reason Bear Creek was not considered a losing stream. Ms. Watson answered that it may be shown as a mixed stream in the model, and Mr. Nakagawa indicated that the older models show Bear Creek with hardpan with ponded water.

Dr. Lytle commented that it is hard to understand the impact of groundwater-surface water issues. He indicated that these issues are difficult to identify precisely, and we should take into consideration that the information out there to date is the best available. Mr. Ward asked to revisit slide 20, which gives an overview of minimum thresholds. Mr. Ward asked about managing a surface over an area and indicated it would be challenging to monitor at specific points. He noted he would like to see an approach of managing a surface over a geographic area, averaging the surface across points rather than at each point. Ms. Watson commented that what is proposed does not exclude that, and that Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) may have additional monitoring locations.

Ms. Mary Elizabeth (Sierra Club) had eight comments.

1. She asked that information provided to the GSAs for review be made public
2. Methodology definitions should be provided
3. It would be helpful to have the ID system used for well names to be provided so stakeholders can identify wells on DWR's website
4. Each time groundwater elevation is referred to, provide datum so you can compare datasets
5. Disclose how contours on slides are developed
6. Provide the mechanism or approach for filtering out GDEs
7. For TDS and connate water, eastern peak wells are eliminated when averaging, so look at peaks to include eastern wells. Also, five years is short.
8. On the slide regarding contaminates information, the mixed constituents should be disclosed; additionally, other and synthetic are shown with same symbol

Mr. Henry asked for caution on identifying well location and to be aware of private property.

3. Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model Discussion (HCM)

Ms. Watson presented on and facilitated a discussion on the proposed HCM cross-section locations.

Mr. Gibson noted that the C-C' cross-section from the example does not match what was proposed.

Ms. Watson clarified that it would be extended to match as proposed. Mr. Ward asked what value a North-South cross-section would provide. Ms. Watson indicated that the North-South cross-section was proposed due to the number of wells and indicated that they cross the groundwater depression and go along Jack Tone Road.

Mr. Gibson indicated that the C-C' wells on the east side do not go down to bedrock and the wells on the west side are not deep enough. He suggested considering wells for a cross-section in areas where deeper well information is needed to support HCM development.

Ms. Elizabeth indicated that in HCM development, the groundwater storage is based on depth of aquifer and that information has not been provided. She then indicated that many of the wells proposed to include for DWR funding were highlighted in yellow, including some on the eastern side, and that if wells do go in there, there should be a cross-section of that area.

Mr. Ward noted that he did not see anything in the presented HCM that links age thickness relationships in stratigraphic column and indicated the need to understand water bearing formations and how they are related. He indicated that in the Modesto Basin to the south, there are formations that have different aquifer characteristics. Defining that relationship is important, and it is important to understand the regional picture.

Mr. John Fio (EKI) indicated that on Slide 41, the basin boundary should be Dry Creek, not Cosumnes River. Dr. Lytle indicated he attended fluvial geomorphology lecture and incised Valley fill was the geologic formation due to snowmelt river watersheds that contributed significantly to recharge. He indicated he is not certain the extent it impacts the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin and is not certain what we have here as far as snowmelt recharge. Mr. Pat Dunn (NV5) indicated that the Mehrten is recharged to the east. The HCM will coordinate with groundwater to see how it is depicted.

Ms. Elizabeth asked that a microphone is used for all comments and responses.

4. Projected Water Budget

Ms. Watson presented an update on the projected water budget. Mr. Gibson commented on slide 59, indicating that the projected simulation has a flat line and asked why it does not keep growing. Ms. Watson indicated that the assumptions for the projected baseline includes plans out through 2040. The budget assumes that buildout happens through 2040 and then is held constant. Changes past 2040 indicate changing hydrology.

Mr. Ward asked a question on slide 62, asking if the decline from separation is due to land use conversion. Ms. Watson indicated that the water demand for agriculture, as far as duty factors, stays the same and applies. Urban water use is a projection of GPCD, which is increased based on urban plans.

Mr. Rietkerk asked if consultants would be reaching back to GSAs to confirm water budget numbers. Ms. Elizabeth indicated that on maps where historical and future water budget is listed, dates end at 2018. For Council of Governments, the dates are not identified. In map slides, no slides had 2040 time scale.

5. Projects and Management Actions

Mr. Gibson requested to look at funding when looking at projects.

6. Schedule Recap

B. Informational Items:

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

Ms. Elizabeth indicated the information was not on the website about the public meeting.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

V. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 10:53 am.

Next Regular Meeting: September 12, 2018 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

August 8, 2018

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
<i>MM</i>	California Water Service Company	Bolzowski, Michael
	Central Delta Water Agency	Biagi, George
<i>present</i>	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	Thompson, Grant
<i>JS</i>	City of Lathrop	Gibson, Greg
<i>LR</i>	City of Lodi	Roberts, Lance
<i>EMM.</i>	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
<i>on</i>	City of Stockton	Lytle, Mel
<i>pm</i>	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Martin, Peter
<i>DQT</i>	Linden County Water District	Fletcher, Dave
<i>mk</i>	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike
<i>DG</i>	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
<i>ES</i>	Oakdale Irrigation District	Sheldon, Emily
<i>present</i>	San Joaquin County	Buchman, Fritz
<i>PMTC</i>	South San Joaquin GSA	Rietkerk, Peter
<i>SM</i>	Stockton East Water District	Moody, Scot
<i>DJA</i>	Woodbridge Irrigation District GSA	Heberle, Doug

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
<i>Darwin Barney</i>	<i>SJC WK</i>	
<i>Christy Kennedy</i>	<i>Woodard & Curran</i>	<i>ckennedy@woodardcurran.com</i>
<i>Paul Wells</i>	<i>DWR</i>	<i>paul.wells@water.ca.gov</i>
<i>DREWIS MILLS</i>	<i>CALAVERAS County</i>	
<i>Fritz Buchman</i>	<i>SJC PAX</i>	
<i>Continued on next page....</i>		

