



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, November 14, 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 October 10, 2018 (See Attached)
 2. Projects and Management Actions
 - i. Workshop Results and Follow Through
 - ii. Project Review
 - iii. Project Portfolios
 3. Water Quality Thresholds and Monitoring Network
 4. Recommendation to Submit Technical Support Services (TSS) Well Drilling Application
 5. December Agenda Items
- III. **Public Comment (non-agendized items)**
- IV. **Future Agenda Items**
- V. **Adjournment**

Next Regular Meeting

December 12, 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
October 10, 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 at 9:04 a.m., on October 10, 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, Dante Nomellini, Reid Roberts, Greg Gibson, Lance Roberts, Elba Mijango, Danny Trejo, Peter Martin, David Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Kris Balaji, Peter Rietkerk, Scot Moody, and Doug Heberle.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of September 12, 2018.

Mr. Scot Moody moved, and Mr. Peter Martin seconded the approval of the September meeting minutes. No changes were posed.

2. Announcement: Second Informational Meeting

The second informational meeting is scheduled for November 7th, 6:30-8 p.m. at the Manteca Transit Center. It will be held in a larger room than last time to minimize noise. The meeting will include an orientation session and will follow an open house style format with a repeating introductory presentation throughout the meeting. Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) are strongly encouraged to attend with representatives. Outreach materials are available on the website and will be sent directly to GSAs.

3. Projects and Management Actions

Ms. Watson gave an overview of the projects list and indicated that the list may be incomplete. She emphasized that the intention of the meeting is not to come away with a list of projects and ranking, but rather to gather criteria and evaluate projects to create a package of projects in the future.

Mr. Dante Nomellini asked why there is a need for a decrease in groundwater pumping if water is imported and indicated that decreased pumping should not be a goal. There is a need to balance the water budget rather than decreasing groundwater pumping, and this should be recharacterized appropriately moving forward. Mr. Mike Henry asked how to measure the 12-15% pumping reduction, asking if that would require meters or measurement on each individual pumping site. Ms. Watson answered that there is a requirement to report on the basin scale and there are multiple technologies to do so, including metering and remote sensing. To some extent, there will be a need for monitoring and reporting measures and the scale depends on the solutions. Mr. Greg Gibson reiterated his comment from last meeting that it is hard to evaluate the projects without identifying where each agency falls within the water budget. Ms. Watson noted that information can be provided for each GSA; however, the State is looking at the basin scale.

a. Project Descriptions

Mr. Daniel de Graaf noted that their projects were submitted that morning. These are mainly ongoing recharge projects. Mr. Kris Balaji asked for an explanation of the difference between a baseline and a

management action. Ms. Alyson Watson responded that for projects included in the baseline, it is assumed it is part of base and it is critical that those projects go forward. She noted that if projects will not definitely be carried out and are currently included in the baseline, they should be removed so there is a more accurate sustainable yield estimate. Mr. Gibson stated if agencies are doing the projects to operate sustainably, they should get credit for projects underway. Ms. Watson responded that cost allocation is not a topic for today's meeting – the meeting is geared towards looking at the most cost-effective options at the basin scale.

Mr. Nomellini asked if the water budget breaks down the quantity of water for individual projects in the baseline. That information can be derived to the extent that estimated yield is known. For some projects, supply and demand needs to be analyzed to determine the quantity of water. Mr. Nomellini then asked if there is a specific list of the baseline projects. Ms. Watson responded that there is a list in some cases and that for supply and demand, Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) projections are used. Mr. Peter Rietkerk indicated they have a water treatment plant that should not be included in the baseline assumptions because the water treatment plant serves a number of cities and not all cities have bought into the plan. These projects are included in the baseline but are not currently operating and have no funding. He noted that projects on the fence for the baseline should have equal weight with other projects for sustainability. Mr. de Graaf noted North San Joaquin Water Conservation District has a 10,000 AF pilot project with EBMUD and that the project proposal was submitted this morning.

Project 1: Farmington Dam Repurpose Project

Mr. Moody noted that a new long-term water project should be considered at some point. Mr. Henry echoed Mr. Moody's comments and indicated that a big project could go a long way in increasing supply. Mr. Nomellini indicated that the Farmington Dam project was comprehensively studied years ago, and that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) did a feasibility study that deemed it a leaky dam that offers a good percolation opportunity.

Project 2: Lake Grupe In-Lieu

Mr. Moody noted an estimated surface water use of about 18,000 AFY. Currently 6,000 acres are on groundwater, and it depends on how successful they are at meeting the program. The largest negative impact in the basin is south of the groundwater "hole". Mr. Rietkerk asked if there is an existing water right. Mr. Moody responded there is a diversion structure that needs to be redone, but the diversion right is under Stockton East Water District.

Project 4: SW Implementation Expansion

Mr. Moody noted 20,000 AF is a conservative effort, and this includes Calaveras River and Mormon Slough, but does not include New Melones, which could be twice as much (up to 40,000 AFY). Mr. Moody noted that this project has high cost-efficiency as some landowners already have diversion points, but these are not being used. Mr. Nomellini asked if there is a facility to get New Melones water into this area (the 6,000 acres). Mr. Moody responded no, that there would need to be an incentive to make it attractive, and that there is no existing facility. He called for coordination between Stockton East Water District and Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District to convey water within districts.

Project 5: Expansion of SW Treatment Facility and Delivery Pipeline

The projected cost is \$4M for the equipment and supplies. This projected cost excludes the annual operation and maintenance cost of \$710,000. Mr. Moody asked clarification questions, and Mr. Lance Roberts noted demand is projected to grow in the future.

Project 6: White Slough WPCF

Mr. Lance Roberts indicated that the project will be done by the end of 2018. If the project is completed by December 2018, it may be included into the baseline. Mr. Nomellini asked if there are loans and/or funding available for wastewater projects that are not available for stormwater projects and if wastewater projects easier to fund. Mr. Lance Roberts noted a grant was received for the project.

Project 7: City of Manteca Recycled Water Transfer to Agriculture

There was further clarification that treatment level is tertiary. Ms. Elba Mijango noted this project goes northeast, and the City might have a potential project going southwest.

Project 9: Water Transfers to SEWD and CSJWCD

Oakdale Irrigation District and South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) have entertained the water transfer program for 10 years that will require new facilities. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) could be done and ready in one year.

Project 11: Escalon Wastewater Reuse

Capacity maxes out in the summer months during canning. There is an opportunity based on the geographic location and capacity issues. Mr. Balaji asked what the planning horizon of 2028 means, and Mr. Rietkerk responded that it is a best guess for when the project would be fully online and clarified the term "planning horizon."

Project 12: SSJ Stormwater Reuse

The cities of Escalon, Ripon, and potentially Manteca need to better understand the quantity of stormwater discharge. There is a peak event at 200 cfs, and there may be opportunity for stormwater capture and recharge. Mr. Nomellini asked if ponds, biofilters, or a reservoir would be used. Mr. Rietkerk responded that this is a conceptual project at this point.

Project 13: Pressurization of SSJID Facilities

This is a well-known project (Division 9 Project) implemented in 2012 that could be further expanded. It is currently not cost-effective to expand, but it does provide benefits to the program. The high-efficiency system allows for more on-demand and could reduce pumping and conserve water.

Project 14: BNSF Intermodal Facility Recharge Pond

Mr. Reid Roberts noted this has been a conceptual plan for Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District (CSJWCD) for a long time. The project is located close to where lower Littlejohns Creek crosses the railroad. The estimated recharge is unknown, but the project would provide a salt water intrusion barrier and raise groundwater levels.

Project 15: CSJWCD Capital Improvement Program

Mr. Reid Roberts indicated this is an in-lieu recharge project, but the reliability of water supply is a problem.

Project 17: LAS-3 Percolation Basin (Lathrop)

Mr. Greg Gibson noted there is the potential to add other percolation basins, but the City wants to maximize the beneficial uses of recycled water and does not want to commit all of recycled water for SGMA purposes. Mr. Gibson noted that recycled water is prioritized for urban landscaping. Mr. Nomellini asked about the treatment level of the recycled water, and Mr. Gibson confirmed it is treated to the tertiary level.

Project 22: City of Ripon SW Supply Project

There were no questions.

b. Develop Assessment Criteria

Mr. Nomellini indicated that some of the projects will have self-funding capability, and that it will be important to identify financing. He noted a need to clarify the cost criteria.

Mr. Rietkerk called for stormwater and recycled water meeting permitting compliance and questioned whether multi-benefits should be separated or built into the cost. There are other important drivers that will determine whether projects may move forward. Potential criteria include costs related to the SGMA program and if other benefits are funded outside of the program. Mr. Gibson noted a distinction in who receives the benefits – whether it is a local agency or the entire basin. Mr. Walt Ward recognized that the basin is in a deficit and that each project could minimize groundwater overdraft. Mr. Ward further stated he would like to understand project location and where it is relative to the cone of depression. Projects that are integrated into the project list should be ranked first by unit cost (dollars/AF), then by beneficiaries, and then by funding. Projects should be initially screened by understanding the benefits and overdraft as well as by spatial distribution.

Ms. Mary Elizabeth noted regulatory compliance and indicated her support for those ideas. Ms. Elizabeth noted that it is critically important to look at areas in the cone of depression, and that DACs are more likely to be impacted. Mr. Moody responded to Mr. Ward’s comment and questioned if it is important that a project is in the cone of depression area. Mr. Moody further asked if implementing a project in the City of Stockton could help the basin long-term. Ms. Watson clarified that there are two objectives: halting overdraft at the basin scale and looking at local thresholds.

Mr. Henry noted a need for collaborating on local benefits as everyone will benefit from any project that is approved, adopted and implemented. Mr. Nomellini recounted a prior assessment that determined there is a general benefit to the entire community, but the specifics focused on addressing the 1992 levels.

Mr. Balaji suggested a criteria for the ability for a project to be implemented in SGMA timeline. Mr. Balaji questioned whether it is realistic and beneficial to assess the weight based on project complexity. Mr. Balaji further questioned if projects should be low-hanging fruit or more challenging. A potential solution is to identify yield versus realistic reliability of coming online.

Criteria ideas include:

- Ease of implementation/implementability
- Project location (near cone of depression)
- Cost per AF
- Environmental Benefit/Impact (Projects must comply with CEQA)
- DAC Benefits (Will help with financing and grants)
- Water Quality

Ms. Cathy Lee asked about wastewater reuse projects decreasing water in streams and how this relates to the baseline. Ms. Watson clarified that projects in the implementation plan need to be developed enough to be integrated in the plan; this can include adaptive management. The 2020 plan must include conceptualized projects to meet the initial deadline. There will be potential to further develop projects that are better suited in the future.

Mr. Nomellini noted that projects do not need to be implemented by 2020, but they are needed to meet the goal by 2040. Mr. Martin indicated confusion about conceptual projects and does not know if the District is intent on moving forward.

Polling results indicated that Criteria 1 (Implementability) and Criteria 3 (Cost) polled the highest (the most important). Criteria 4 (Environmental Benefit/Impact) polled as the next highest, followed by Criteria 2 (Location), Criteria 5 (DAC Benefit) and Criteria 6 (Water Quality).

4. Schedule Recap

B. Informational Items:

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

Ms. Elizabeth requested the sustainable yield number and requested that water budgets be provided by GSAs, with a discussion of cost allocation.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

November agenda items will include projects and management actions, and data gaps.

V. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 10:49 am. Mr. David Fletcher moved to close the meeting, Mr. de Graaf seconded.

Next Regular Meeting: November 14, 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

October 10, 2018

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
MS	California Water Service Company	Bolzowski, Michael
PK	Central Delta Water Agency	Biagi, George
ML	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	- -
CS	City of Lathrop	Gibson, Greg
LR	City of Lodi	Roberts, Lance
E.M.	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
D.T.	City of Stockton	Trejo, Danny
DM	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Martin, Peter
DB	Linden County Water District	Fletcher, Dave
HA	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike
DU	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
	Oakdale Irrigation District	Sheldon, Emily
WJ	San Joaquin County	Balaji, Kris
PM	South San Joaquin GSA	Rietkerk, Peter
JM	Stockton East Water District	Moody, Scot
DA	Woodbridge Irrigation District GSA	Heberle, Doug

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
Anthony Diaz	SJC PW	
ANDY NGUYEN	SJC PW	
Noelkin	City of Lodi	nkin@lodi.gov
Grace Su	EBMOD	
Linda Dorn	Sacramento County	dorn@esaccounty.net

Continued on next page....

