



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Board of Directors Meeting

AGENDA

Wednesday, February 13, 2019

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.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/Roll Call
- 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. Roadmap Update and Deliverables
 3. Informational Meeting Recap
 4. Outreach and Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup Update
 5. Pathway Toward GSP Preparation
 6. Financing
 7. Financial Report
 8. Grant Agreement Update (See Attached)
 9. Changes to GSAs
 10. March Agenda Items
 - B. Informational Items (see attached):
 1. November 30, 2018, California Department of Water Resources, “Draft Groundwater Basin Boundary Modifications Announced”
 2. December 14, 2018, Letter from Woodbridge Irrigation District, “Woodbridge Irrigation District Withdrawal of Groundwater Sustainability Agency Status and Membership in the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority”
 3. January 24, 2019, voicesofmontereybay.org, “A Little Fee to Manage a Lot of Water”
 4. February 6, 2019, email from Mary Elizabeth M.S., R.E.H.S., Delta-Sierra Group Conservation Chair, “GDE in ESJ Subbasin”

(Continued on next page)

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Board of Directors Meeting

AGENDA

(Continued)

- III. Public Comment (non-agendized items)
- IV. Directors' Comments
- V. Future Agenda Items
- VI. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting

March 13, 2019 at 11:00 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
Board Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2018

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

The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (GWA) Board meeting was convened by Chair Chuck Winn at 11:01 a.m., on November 14, 2018, at the Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, 2101 E. Earhart Ave. Stockton, CA. Following the Pledge of Allegiance, the required safety information was presented.

In attendance were Chair Chuck Winn, Vice-Chair Mel Panizza, Directors John Freeman, George Biagi, Jr., Stephen Salvatore, Alan Nakanishi, Rich Silverman, Elbert Holman, Russ Thomas, David Fletcher, Mike Henry, Tom Flinn, Eric Thorburn, John Herrick, Dale Kuil, Alternate Directors Charlie Swimley and Doug Heberle, and Secretary Kris Balaji.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion/Action Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of October 10, 2018

Motion:

Director Silverman moved and Director Kuil seconded the approval of the October 10, 2018 minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dennis Mills noted a correction to the October 10, 2018 minutes, that it is the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) which has plots of land. In addition, Ms. Mary Elizabeth (Sierra Club) stated that the last Water Advisory Group/Water Council Meeting was held May 2018.

2. Roadmap Update and Project Schedule

Ms. Alyson Watson gave a summary of project progress.

3. Outreach & Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup Update

Ms. Watson gave an update on outreach efforts and the Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup. She highlighted the public informational outreach meeting that took place on November 7, 2018 in Manteca and that there was good GSA representation there. She also stated there will be a SGMA public meeting today at Cal Water in Stockton. The last item she shared was that based on feedback from the SGMA Workgroup, a SGMA informational flyer has been put together for the pesticide applicator meetings.

4. GSP Action Update: Projects and Management Actions

Ms. Watson provided an overview of projects and management actions, including a review of projects received and the approach to project review.

Director Flinn asked a clarifying question on baseline projects. Ms. Watson responded, noting that the Tracy Lakes project is partially implemented. Secretary Balaji noted that a commitment is needed from GSAs to ensure that the projects that are captured as part of the baseline are committed projects. Director Flinn asked if the second slide was a refinement, or if it was different. Ms. Watson clarified that the slide on project portfolios is looking at packaging projects. Ms. Watson then indicated that each portfolio has a different focus. It was noted that the projects have been submitted by individual GSAs and that one thing not listed is the water balance. Director Flinn asked if the water balance criteria would be applied to projects. Ms. Watson indicated that the current approach is looking at a basin-wide balance, and that each package was designed to meet the shortfall and address GSA-specific challenges. Director Flinn noted that

he feels it is crucial for the water balance to be considered with the packaging of projects. Ms. Watson indicated that the team will work with GSAs to assess projects then will come back with packages. She noted that for project review, there will be scoring and enough information will be provided to compare projects. She indicated that the purpose of the exercise is not to select portfolios but to understand the focus areas and trade-offs, provide information on the trade-offs, and develop hybrid projects where appropriate. Director Flinn indicated that he disagrees with the approach and would like to see scoring to understand how the evaluation was done. He then noted there is a weighting with criteria six (Water Quality Benefit/Impact). Secretary Balaji noted the input is valuable and the Board members should be discussing their feedback with their Advisory Committee representatives.

5. Monitoring Network and TSS Wells

Ms. 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. A motion was proposed to authorize the Basin Coordinator to submit the application with the three proposed wells.

Motion: Director Thomas moved, and Director Silverman seconded the authorization for the Basin Coordinator to submit the TSS application with the three proposed wells, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Paul Wells (Department of Water Resources), indicated that it would be good to get the TSS application submitted as soon as possible and that there is a line. He noted that the draft Basin Boundary Modification results will be released in Winter 2018 with a 30-day comment period and that the City of Lathrop submitted a request. The grant agreement is under review and should be finalized shortly.

6. December Agenda Items

There was a request to move the proposed December agenda items to the January 9, 2019 meeting.

Motion:

Director Silverman moved, and Vice Chair Panizza seconded the motion to move the December agenda items to the January meeting, and the motion was passed unanimously.

B. Informational Items: (No comments were provided.)

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

Ms. Elizabeth gave a summary of the comments she provided to the Advisory Committee. First, she noted that there was one project put forth by North San Joaquin Water Conservation District to study the Mokelumne River, and she is wondering if a similar study is needed for the San Joaquin River and Stanislaus River. Next, she stated that she has requested a list of baseline projects included in the sustainable yield calculation, and indicated that the complete list of projects has not been disclosed (such as the DREAM project). She encouraged more opportunities as was done in the past where more technical information is shared with the governing body. She then stated that the City of Stockton is not regularly participating in public outreach or having regular meetings where SGMA requirements and the GSP progress is disclosed to the governing bodies who are not at these GWA meetings. Ms. Elizabeth additionally requested the methodology for identifying groundwater-dependent ecosystems (GDEs) that are going to be considered for the GSP and noted that she received a request from an NGO and has not been able to reply, because she has not received a reply to her request. She is making that request again at this time. She additionally noted that in regard to postponing the December meetings, more information could be provided and therefore there would be value to holding a December meeting. She recalled the comment from the Advisory Committee on looking at cost per acre-foot to assess project affordability. She stressed the importance of

considering affordability and sustainability. Her next comment had to do with urban populations and the idea that urban customers can be contributing more. She indicated that the group could consider other types of projects not brought forth, like low tech solutions or different kinds of demonstration projects and agricultural practices that enhance recharge potential and flood protection. She then stated that she expects a response of some sort to the requests for information submitted at the Board and at Advisory Committee meetings, based on the bylaws, and continues to request general information and input along the way. She noted that this is clearly stated in SGMA guidance and in regulations that opportunities are available throughout the GSP development process for public input. In closing, she stated that there was a decision made at the Advisory Committee amongst GSA staff that recommended a salinity threshold at 600 mg/L TDS. She indicated that she does not think anyone has received a rationale for how that was established and recommends this body request the basis for that recommendation.

Director Holman noted that this is the last meeting with this GWA Board, and that he will be terming out after 10 years on the City Council of Stockton. He noted that he wishes the group all the best and that three new members to the Stockton City Council and Mayor Tubbs will make an assignment. Chair Chuck Winn acknowledged the commitment and hard work by Director Elbert Holman.

Director Silverman also indicated this is his last meeting for the City of Manteca.

IV. Directors' Comments: (No comments provided)

V. Future Agenda Items: (No comments provided)

VI. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 11:53 am. Director Holman moved, and Director Silverman seconded.

Next Regular Meeting: January 9, 2018 at 11:00 a.m.

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



Joint Exercise of Powers Board of Directors Meeting

MEMBER SIGN-IN SHEET

Location: SJ COUNTY ROBERT J. CABRAL AG CENTER Date: 11/14/18 Time: 11:00 AM

INITIAL	Member's Name	GSA	Phone	Email
	John Freeman	Cal Water Member	209-547-7900	jfreeman@calwater.com
	Steve Cavallini	Cal Water Alternate	209-464-8311	scavallini@calwater.com
	George Biagi, Jr.	Central Delta Water Agency Member	209-481-5201	gbiagi@deltabluegrass.com
	Dante Nomellini	Central Delta Water Agency Alternate	209-465-5883	ngmplcs@pacbell.net
	Grant Thompson	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District Member	209-639-1580	gtom@velociter.net
	Reid Roberts	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District Alternate	209-941-8714	reidwroberts@gmail.com
	Stephen Salvatore	City of Lathrop Member	209-941-7430	ssalvatore@ci.lathrop.ca.us
		City of Lathrop Alternate		
	Alan Nakanishi	City of Lodi Member	209-333-6702	anakanishi@lodi.gov
	Charlie Swimley	City of Lodi Alternate	209-333-6706	cswimley@lodi.gov
	Rich Silverman	City of Manteca Member	209-456-8017	rsilverman@ci.manteca.ca.us
	Mark Houghton	City of Manteca Alternate	209-456-8416	mhoughton@ci.manteca.ca.us
	Elbert Holman	City of Stockton Member	209-937-8244	hoytir63@yahoo.com
	Mel Lytle	City of Stockton Alternate	209-937-5614	mel.lytle@stocktonca.gov

INITIAL	Member's Name	GSA	Phone	Email
RT	Russ Thomas	Eastside San Joaquin GSA Member	209-480-8968	rthomascwd@hotmail.com
	Walter Ward	Eastside San Joaquin GSA Alternate	209-525-6710	wward@envres.org
DF	David Fletcher	Linden County Water District Member	209-887-3202	dqfpe@comcast.net
	Paul Brennan	Linden County Water District Alternate	209-403-1537	ptbrennan@verizon.net
MH	Mike Henry	Lockeford Community Services District Member	209-712-4014	midot@att.net
	Joseph Salzman	Lockeford Community Services District Alternate	209-727-5035	lcsd@softcom.net
ES	Eric Schmid	Lockeford Community Services District Alternate	209-727-5035	lcsd@softcom.net
	Tom Flinn	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District Member	209-663-8760	tomflinn2@me.com
	Joe Valente	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District Alternate	209-334-4786	jcvalente@softcom.net
ET	Eric Thorburn, P.E.	Oakdale Irrigation District Member	209-840-5525	ethorburn@oakdaleirrigation.com
		Oakdale Irrigation District Alternate		
CW	Chuck Winn	San Joaquin County Member	209-953-1160	cwinn@sigov.org
	Kathy Miller	San Joaquin County Alternate	209-953-1161	kmiller@sigov.org
JH	John Herrick, Esq.	South Delta Water Agency Member	209-224-5854	jherrlaw@aol.com
	Jerry Robinson	South Delta Water Agency Alternate	209-471-4025	N/A
DK	Dale Kuil	South San Joaquin GSA Member	209-670-5829	dkuil@ssjid.com
	Robert Holmes	South San Joaquin GSA Alternate	209-484-7678	rholmes@ssjid.com
MP	Melvin Panizza	Stockton East Water District Member	209-948-0333	melpanizza@aol.com
AW	Andrew Watkins	Stockton East Water District Alternate	209-948-0333	watkins.andrew@verizon.net
	Anders Christensen	Woodbridge Irrigation District Member	209-625-8438	widirrigation@gmail.com
DH	Doug Heberle	Woodbridge Irrigation District Alternate	209-625-8438	heberlewid@gmail.com

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Staff & Support

INITIAL	Member's Name	Organization	Phone	Email
KB	Kris Balaji	San Joaquin County	468-3100	kbalani@sigov.org
Present	Fritz Buchman	San Joaquin County	468-3034	fbuchman@sigov.org
Present	Brandon Nakagawa	San Joaquin County	468-3089	bnakagawa@sigov.org
MC	Mike Callahan	San Joaquin County	468-9360	mcallahan@sigov.org
AC	Alicia Connelly	San Joaquin County	468-3531	aconnelly@sigov.org
KV	Kelly Villalpando	San Joaquin County	468-3073	krvillalpando@sigov.org
NT	Nancy Tomlinson	San Joaquin County	468-3089	ntomlinson@sigov.org
AN	Andy Nguyen	San Joaquin County	953-7948	aynguyen@sigov.org
AD	Anthony Diaz	San Joaquin County	468-3060	anthonydiaz@sigov.org
	Rod Attebery	Neumiller & Beardslee / Legal Counsel	948-8200	rattebery@neumiller.com
	Monica Streeter	Neumiller & Beardslee / Legal Counsel	948-8200	mstreeter@neumiller.com

MS



OTHER INTERSTED PARTIES - SIGN-IN SHEET

Location: SJ COUNTY ROBERT J. CABRAL AG CENTER Date: 11/14/18 Time: 11:00 AM

INITIAL	Member's Name	Organization	Phone	Email
<i>[Signature]</i>	Dennis Mills	CALAVASAS County		
RS	Ryan Streeter	F&M Bank		rstreeterefmbonline.com
AW	Alyson Watson	WAC		
ame	Alicia Connelly	SSC		
	Geoff VanderHevel	Milk Producers Council	909-730-1240	geoff@milkproducers.org
<i>[Signature]</i>	Paul Wells	DWR		
HBD	Haydi Danielson	Boetting Treeland Farms	650-222-8308	hdanielson@boettingtreeland.com
	Mary Elizabeth	Sierra Club		
EM	Elba Mijango	City of Manteca		
yp	Yolande Park	Catholic Charities		ypark@ccsolutions.org
	Fritz Buchman	Fritz Buchman SJ County		
EL	Arnon Lewis	EKI		alewis@ekiconsult.com
RS	Rob Schumann	Klein felder		rschumann@kleinfelder.com
<i>[Signature]</i>	Jane Wagner Tyack	Independent consultant		JaneTyack@mac.com

ATTACHMENT II
A.8.



**EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN
GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY**

1810 E. Hazelton Avenue
P. O. Box 1810
Stockton, CA 95201

(209) 468-3089
ESJgroundwater@sjgov.org
esjgroundwater.org

February 6, 2019

Mr. Arthur Hinojosa
Chief, Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Post Office Box 942836
Sacramento, California 94236-0001

Dear Mr. Hinojosa:

I hereby delegate authority to the Project Manager of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (Authority) Agreement No. 4600012686, entitled 2017 Proposition 1 Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant with the State of California, Department of Water Resources. The Project Manager will continue to be Michael Callahan, Senior Engineer of San Joaquin County Public Works, and he will be authorized to sign grant invoices on behalf of the Authority to the Department of Water Resources.

Sincerely,

KRIS BALAJI, PMP, P.E.
Secretary, Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority

KB:KV:me
WR-19B001-ME1

ATTACHMENT II
B.1-4.



[Home](#) [News](#) [News Releases](#)

[Draft Groundwater Basin Boundary Modifications Announced](#)

Draft Groundwater Basin Boundary Modifications Announced

Published: Nov 30, 2018



Groundwater recharge ponds in Stockton, Calif.

SACRAMENTO, Calif. – The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has announced draft decisions for groundwater basin boundary modification requests submitted by local agencies as part of the implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Basins boundaries were previously updated in 2016.



scientific or jurisdictional reasons. Scientific modifications are based on geologic or hydrologic conditions, while jurisdictional modifications change boundaries to promote sustainable groundwater management.

DWR staff reviewed all requests and approved modifications that met the requirements of the [Basin Boundary Regulations](#). In total, DWR approved 33, denied seven and partially approved three modification requests. Denials were based on the criteria identified in regulations and were specific to the unique information presented for each type of modification request. Some requests were partially approved because some portions of the modification requests were adequately supported by the information provided, while other portions were not.

A 30-day public comment period is being held to allow further input by the public and local agencies. A Basin Boundary Modifications Public Meeting to solicit comments will be held at 1 p.m., Tuesday, December 11, 2018, in the California Natural Resources Agency Auditorium, at 1416 9th Street, Sacramento. The meeting will also be [webcast live](#). Comments can be submitted online at any time during the public comment period, which ends January 4, 2019.

DWR will present the draft Basin Boundary Modifications at the [California Water Commission meeting](#) on January 16, 2019, where further public comment can be submitted. All public comments received throughout the process will be reviewed and evaluated before final Basin Boundary Modifications results are announced in February 2019.

For Draft Basin Boundary Modifications results, click [here](#).

To submit public comments, click [here](#).

For more information on SGMA and groundwater, click [here](#).

Contact:

Joyia Emard, Information Officer, Public Affairs, Department of Water Resources
916-651-9258 | joyia.emard@water.ca.gov

Contact:

Tags

Groundwater Basin Bo ...

Sustainable Groundwa ...

Groundwater Manageme ...

2018 Basin Boundary Modifications - Draft Decisions
November 29, 2018 (UPDATED January 14, 2019)

Basin(s)/Subbasin(s)	Requesting Agency	Modification Type	Draft Decision	Basis for Denial	Notes
SANTA ROSA PLAIN WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS	City of Sebastopol	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS PETALUMA VALLEY	City of Petaluma	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WILSON GROVE FORMATION HIGHLANDS SAND POINT AREA	Marin County	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SONOMA VALLEY NAPA-SONOMA LOWLANDS	Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
BOLSA AREA HOLLISTER AREA SAN JUAN BAUTISTA AREA TRES PINOS VALLEY	San Benito County Water District	Jurisdictional Consolidation	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
UPPER VALLEY AQUIFER PASO ROBLES AREA	Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
CARPINTERIA MONTECITO	Montecito Water District	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
BOWMAN ROSEWOOD	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Jurisdictional Consolidation	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
MILLVILLE SOUTH BATTLE CREEK	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Jurisdictional Consolidation	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
TRACY	Brentwood City Of	Jurisdictional Subdivision	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
COLUSA WEST BUTTE	Colusa Groundwater Authority	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
LOS MOLINOS VINA DYE CREEK	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Jurisdictional Consolidation	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WEST BUTTE EAST BUTTE	Reclamation District No. 1004	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WEST BUTTE EAST BUTTE	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation	Jurisdictional Internal Jurisdictional Consolidation	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
EAST BUTTE WYANDOTTE CREEK	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SUTTER NORTH AMERICAN EAST BUTTE	Sutter County	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SOUTH AMERICAN EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN SOLANO	Northern Delta Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Jurisdictional Subdivision	Deny	345.2(d) - Failure to provide all required information.	Agency did not provide the required 3/4 support of local agencies and public water systems in affected basins.
SOUTH AMERICAN COSUMNES	Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District	Jurisdictional Internal	Deny	345.2(a) - May limit opportunity or likelihood of sustainable groundwater management.	Agency did not demonstrate proposed modification would result in improved groundwater management. Opposition to proposal by Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority and City of Sacramento.
SOLANO YOLO	Yolo Subbasin Groundwater Agency	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SOLANO TRACY	Sacramento County Water Resources	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN TRACY	Lathrop City Of	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
CHOWCHILLA	County of Madera	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
CHOWCHILLA DELTA-MENDOTA	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority	Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SHASTA VALLEY	Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
PASO ROBLES AREA	Heritage Ranch Community Services District	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SANTA MARIA	Santa Barbara County Water Agency	Scientific External	Deny	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to support external boundaries match adjudication boundaries and did not consistently follow geologic features.

2018 Basin Boundary Modifications - Draft Decisions
November 29, 2018 (UPDATED January 14, 2019)

Basin(s)/Subbasin(s)	Requesting Agency	Modification Type	Draft Decision	Basis for Denial	Notes
SANTA MARIA	Santa Maria Basin Fringe Areas - County of San Luis Obispo Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Scientific External Scientific Internal	Approve Deny Portion (Ziegler Canyon)	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to demonstrate the referenced fault and geologic contact significantly impede groundwater flow for the Ziegler Canyon area; remaining portions of request were approved.
CARPINTERIA	Carpinteria Valley Water District	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
ARROYO SANTA ROSA VALLEY	Arroyo Santa Rosa Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SIERRA VALLEY	Plumas County	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
KINGS	North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
KERN COUNTY	West Kern Water District	Scientific External	Approve Deny Portion (Little Santa Maria Valley, QP with Anticlines, and QP at Little Santa Maria Valley)	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Request to subdivide and create Little Santa Maria Valley as subbasin is not supported with sufficient scientific information. Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to demonstrate the referenced alluvial units (QP with Anticlines) do not represent aquifer or basin.
OWENS VALLEY	Starlite Community Services District	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WARREN VALLEY	Mojave Water Agency	Scientific Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SAN TIMOTEO	Southwest San Timoteo Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
SAN JACINTO	Eastern Municipal Water District	Scientific External Scientific Internal	Approve Deny Portion (Lake Perris)	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to demonstrate that area 6 (Lake Perris) does not represent basin material; remaining portions of request were approved.
SAN DIEGO RIVER VALLEY	City of San Diego	Scientific External	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
COASTAL PLAIN OF SAN DIEGO	Sweetwater Authority	Scientific External	Deny	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to demonstrate that the referenced area did not represent basin material.
LOS OSOS VALLEY	San Luis Obispo County	Jurisdictional Subdivision Scientific External	Approve Deny Portion (Northern fringe)	345.2(c) - Insufficient scientific evidence to support modification.	Agency did not provide adequate technical studies to demonstrate that the referenced "Minor Fringe Exclusion Area" did not represent basin; remaining portions of request were approved.
OXNARD MOUND SANTA PAULA	Mound Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Scientific External Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
FILLMORE PIRU SANTA PAULA	United Water Conservation District	Scientific External Scientific Internal Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
WYANDOTTE CREEK NORTH AMERICAN SUTTER SOUTH YUBA NORTH YUBA	Yuba County Water Agency	Scientific External Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.
MADERA KINGS	Madera County	Scientific Internal Jurisdictional Internal	Approve	NA	Request met regulatory criteria.

DIRECTORS
WILLIAM STOKES
PRESIDENT
ED LUCCHESI
VICE PRESIDENT
BILL SHINN
KEITH BUSSMAN
HENRY P. VAN EXEL



STAFF
ANDERS CHRISTENSEN
MANAGER
SECRETARY / TREASURER
TODD VERSTEEG
SUPERINTENDENT

WOODBRIDGE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
18750 N. LOWER SACRAMENTO ROAD
P.O. BOX 580
WOODBRIDGE, CALIFORNIA 95258
PHONE: (209) 625-8438
FAX: (209) 625-8663

12/14/18

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority
Attn: Brandon Nakagawa, Water Resources Coordinator
1810 E. Hazelton Avenue
Stockton, CA 95201

RE: Woodbridge Irrigation District withdrawal of Groundwater Sustainability Agency status and membership in the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority

Dear Brandon:

Like many other eligible municipalities and water agencies in our sub-basin, Woodbridge Irrigation District elected to establish itself as a GSA in 2016 as a response to the 2014 SGMA legislation. More recently however, and after much discussion and consideration, the Board of Directors of the Woodbridge Irrigation District (and corresponding GSA) have elected to rescind Woodbridge Irrigation District's status as a GSA under SGMA, and subsequently to withdraw WID's GSA membership in the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority.

As you well know, SGMA and its many implications will have potentially significant impacts for local and regional entities, particularly individual property owners. The Woodbridge Irrigation Board of Directors feels that the best way for this District to support efforts to improve groundwater conditions in our sub-basin is to continue to focus efforts on delivering surface water to its customers and enhance in-lieu groundwater recharge efforts.

Per SGMA guidelines, the WID GSA expects lands within its geographical boundaries to revert to the authority and jurisdiction of the San Joaquin County GSA. WID looks forward to begin dialogue and to assist the County GSA in any way it can to effectively facilitate this transfer and fully execute a seamless transition of jurisdictional authority.

Please accept this letter as WID's formal 90 day notification to unilaterally withdraw from membership in the GWA, per Article 6.4 of the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement, dated February 8, 2017. Thank you for your ongoing commitment in the collective efforts of all GSA partners to effectively and efficiently manage the groundwater in the Eastern San Joaquin sub-basin.

Sincerely,

Anders Christensen,
General Manager



JANUARY 24, 2019

A little fee to manage a lot of water *A new* *agency for the Salinas Valley*



By Ian Evans

Residents of the Salinas Valley will soon see their utility or water bills go up – but only a little. The new fee, which is likely to be passed by July 1, will add about \$2.27 for non-agricultural residents, and \$4.81 per irrigated acre for agricultural users. The fee is needed to fund the valley’s newest water agency — the Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency.

If the new fee schedule passes, residents in areas managed by the new GSA can expect to likely see the fee included in their property tax bill or their water utility bill by the end of the year.

MENU ≡



The agency was created in 2017, as was mandated by California’s Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA – pronounced sig-ma) of 2014. The law is completely rewriting how groundwater is managed in the state, mainly because until now, it was barely managed at all. But many areas of California rely on underground aquifers as their main source of water, referred to as groundwater. This is particularly true for Salinas Valley and the entire Monterey region.

“If you have irrigated crops, or if you have water to your house, you are almost certainly using groundwater,” says Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency General Manager Gary Petersen.

But those underground aquifers are not limitless. Without state restrictions, people are taking water out of many aquifers faster than water can percolate through the soil and refill them. Like a bank account where more money is withdrawn than deposited, these aquifers are defined as “overdrafted.”

In the Salinas Valley, of the six aquifers currently managed by the sustainability agency, five are overdrafted. One, the 180/400 aquifer (the cryptic-sounding name refers to the depths below ground), which sits just underneath the City of Salinas itself, is listed as “critically overdrafted”.

Under SGMA, the state mandated the creation of the Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency. SGMA also states that the new agency must put in place a plan to manage the area’s critically overdrafted groundwater by Jan. 31, 2020 – just over a year away. That deadline is coming up quickly, but before the agency can do anything, it needs money to function.

MENU ≡



Until now, the agency's creation and first few years of operation have been funded by a group of eight local governments and agencies, including the City of Salinas and Monterey One Water. But that agreement comes with a ticking clock as well, says Petersen: "We need to be funded by July 2019 or we will fold up shop and let the state do it."

That is the looming threat of SGMA – if local agencies fail, the state will take over and impose a much steeper fee. While the proposed fee will cost residents a little over \$2 per well connection, the state will likely charge \$300 per well, plus \$40 per acre foot of water that is pumped up.

If you're watering crops, the state's cost could be just as prohibitive. According to calculations put together by Hansford Economic Consulting, a consultant hired by the agency to study how they should implement a fee, agricultural groundwater users would pay up to \$110 per acre of irrigated farm land, compared to just \$4.80 under the local agency – a difference of almost 2,200 percent.

Petersen says that they have been able to keep the fee low because the agency is still young and he is "the closest thing we've got to a full-time employee."

"There's no legacy costs, like major benefit costs or retirement costs to the agency. There is just me," says Petersen. "So, we can point to our budget and show that we're making extremely effective use of the resources."

That money will be used only to fund the agency, says Catherine Hansford, the owner and principle of Hansford Economic Consulting. It will not be used to fund any "capital or infrastructure projects." Because this is a fee, and not a tax, it does not have to be voted on. Instead, Hansford says that she held a series of workshops and brought together people from agriculture and private and public water providers in the area to work out a few different ways that a fee could work.

Then, in October, the sustainability agency board voted to move forward with the plan to charge agricultural users \$4.81 per irrigated acre and non-agricultural users \$2.27 annually. Because agricultural water-user fees are calculated per acre, they will end up paying for about 90 percent of the agency's annual cost. This 90-10 split between ag and non-ag water use reflects how water is used in the valley, says Hansford.

MENU ≡



“There’s flexibility within that fee-setting methodology to allow for a change in that 90-10 split,” says Hansford. “If the board felt, for example, 12 months from now that they wanted to change that to be based on some kind of new well-pumping data, or some other kind of good, published source of data, that they would be able to switch that.”

Although the 11-member board is made up of many different interests — including a group of four who represent agriculture — the proposed fee seems likely to pass, either at the February board meeting or, if substantial changes are needed, in March. That’s well before the state’s July deadline.

Janet Brennan, the board member who represents the environment, says that the real challenges will be in the near future, when the agency tackles issues like seawater intrusion and ecosystem needs. The board also includes several names familiar to Salinas Valley politics, including Lou Calcagno, a dairy farmer from Moss Landing and former Monterey County supervisor, current Monterey County Supervisor Luis Alejo and Salinas Mayor Joe Gunter.

“The board has been operating with a certain amount of congeniality up to this point,” says Brennan. “But we’ll wait and see.”

Editor’s note: The original version of this story has been corrected to reflect that the agency must be funded by July 2019.



Have something to say about this story? Send us a [letter](#).

SUPPORT NONPROFIT JOURNALISM

[DONATE](#)

About Ian Evans

Ian Evans is a freelance environmental journalist who grew up in California and writes about the complex relationships between water, land and policy.

[VIEW ALL POSTS](#)

Villalpando, Kelly

From: Mary Elizabeth <mebeth@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2019 6:57 AM
To: ESJGroundwater; info@esjgroundwater.org; Villalpando, Kelly; Paul.wells@water.ca.gov; Seapy, Briana@Wildlife; Cindy Thomas
Cc: jclary@cleanwater.org; brandon.dawson@sierraclub.org; Sally Liu; Mother Lode Chapter, Delta-Sierra Group ExCom; Sean Wirth
Subject: GDE in ESJ Subbasin
Attachments: GDE 020619 DSG final.pdf

Greetings,

I have attached correspondence prepared to document our efforts to obtain the methodology used to identify groundwater dependent ecosystems in the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin.

Sincerely,

Mary Elizabeth M.S., R.E.H.S.
Delta-Sierra Group Conservation Chair



Delta-Sierra Group
Mother Lode Chapter
P.O. Box 9258, Stockton CA 95208

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority
Board of Directors, Advisory Committee, and Workgroup
P. O. Box 1810
Stockton, CA 95201
via email: esjgroundwater@sjgov.org

3 February 2019

Re: Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

I began asking for information regarding the methodology used for the identification of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) beginning in June 2018 through the latest meeting of the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin Work Group January 2019.

June 11, 2018 Delta Sierra Group correspondence to the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority¹

Can the model be used to perform a vulnerability analysis specifically relating to human and ecological communities that may be affected by management decisions, such as domestic well depths and species habitat, and groundwater-dependent ecosystem locations?

July 2018 Groundwater Authority Advisory Committee²

Additional Steps: Reviewing GDE Groundwater Needs

- Starting with data from The Nature Conservancy and ground-truthing to eliminate obvious non-GDE areas
- Reaching out to Department of Fish and Wildlife to prioritize areas with highest ecological value

Ms. Watson noted that the screening portion would be done prior to next meeting. ³

August 2018 Groundwater Authority Advisory Committee Meeting⁴

Assessing GDEs

- Started with data from The Nature Conservancy and ground-truthing to eliminate obvious non-GDE areas
- Removed drainages, canals
- Applied 300-ft buffer from losing stream midlines

GDE Next Steps

- Review buffer width
- Review shallow GW levels adjacent to remaining potential GDEs
- Coordinate with Department of Fish and Wildlife to prioritize areas with highest ecological value

¹ http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/assets/docs/agendas/2018/GWA_Advisory%20Committee_Agenda_07112018%20with%20attachments_1.pdf

² http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/July11_2018%20Advisory%20Committee%20Slides%20rev5jul18.pdf

³ http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/GWA_Advisory%20Committee_Agenda_08082018%20with%20attachments.pdf

⁴ http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/Aug8_2018%20Advisory%20Committee%20Slides_REVISIED.pdf

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.

I asked more details to describe the mechanism or approach for filtering out GDEs⁵

August 2018 Groundwater Authority Advisory Committee Meeting

I expressed my concerns regarding GDE identification.

Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes November 14, 2018 (distributed by email 1.4.19)

The minutes indicate that I had previously requested information regarding the methodology used to identify the groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDE) to be used in the GSP. She indicated that an NGO asked about this, and she was not able to provide an update.

Additionally, I noted that requests for information in writing had been submitted as comments to the technical advisory group (now Advisory Committee) which had not yielded any additional information nor have been responded to, in written form or by email. I indicated that the group is to have an actively engaged public outreach and noted that this is not occurring.

Work Group Meeting January 9, 2019

After I brought up my request at the January 9, 2018 Workgroup meeting, Paul Wells, DWR subsequently provide me with the Department of Fish and Wildlife SGMA contact information for Briana Seepy. I reached out by telephone to discuss the status of Department of Fish and Wildlife's involvement with the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin and spoke with Briana Seepy. I followed up the telephone conversation with an email to verify my summary:

As of Nov 30, 2018, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) was not aware of ESJ-specific GDE selection methodologies or preliminary GDE maps screened through the Natural Communities Dataset. Christie Kennedy was in attendance at the CDFW Region 2 SGMA Workshop November 30, 2018 meeting when the Yuba Subbasins' draft GDE identification methodology was presented to CDFW staff. There has been no ESJ-specific meeting held between Woodward and Curran representatives and CDFW staff on GDE selection.

Briana further noted:

Woodard and Curran has been intentional about requesting our input on these types of processes.

I subsequently reached out personally to Christie Kennedy by email to understand her perspective and wondering whether or not there was another DFW contact with which the consultants were coordinating with Department of Fish and Wildlife to prioritize areas with highest ecological value. I received the following response:

⁵ http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/GWA_Advisory%20Committee_Agenda_09122018%20with%20attachments.pdf

Our contact at CDFW is Bri Seapy (contact block pasted in below). As you noted we met with them focused on the Yuba basin and shared the methodology to get their preliminary input on assumptions, etc. Each basin will be a little different but some of the basic methodology for conducting the assessment is similar.

Based on my conversations with representatives from the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin consultant Woodward and Curran, there is a perspective difference on the degree of consultation and the completion of “next steps coordinate with Department of Fish and Wildlife to prioritize areas with highest ecological value.”

Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems are specifically defined under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) as “ecological communities or species that depend on groundwater emerging from aquifers or on groundwater occurring near the ground surface.” GDEs may get water only partially from groundwater. If there are other sources of water, such as surface water or supplemental water, that doesn’t disqualify them as a GDE. Second, if irrigation water or surface water (e.g., losing reaches) recharge groundwater, that again doesn’t disqualify the local ecosystem from being a GDE. An evaluation of nearby wells and shallow groundwater levels is necessary to assess whether or not if the potential GDE meets the thresholds for plant roots to access the groundwater.

The co-occurrence of wells, groundwater levels, nearby sources of recharge and potential GDEs is necessary because the County’s Water Well Ordinance⁶ requires:

3.1. All water wells (excluding monitoring wells) shall be located at an adequate horizontal distance from potential sources of contamination and pollution. The following minimum Distances shall be maintained: 50 feet from Stream, Creek, River, Canal.

We look forward to reviewing the methodology that is planned to be used to determine groundwater dependent ecosystems within the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin when evaluating potential adverse effects.

Sincerely,



Mary Elizabeth M.S., R.E.H.S.
Delta-Sierra Group Conservation Chair, Sierra Club
PO Box 4557, Stockton CA 95204

⁶ <https://www.sjgov.org/uploadedfiles/sjc/departments/ehd/forms/well%20standards.pdf>