



# EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### AGENDA

Wednesday, July 10, 2019

**9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

**Manteca Transit Center**

**220 Moffat Blvd. – Community Room #2, Manteca, CA**

- 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 June 12, 2019 (See Attached)
    2. Draft GSP Public Review Period and Process for Adopting
    3. Implementation Phase and Funding Next Steps
    4. Update on Inter-basin Coordination
    5. Fourth Informational Meeting – July 18, 5-8 PM, Ag. Center
- III. **Public Comment (non-agendized items)**
- IV. **Future Agenda Items**
- V. **Adjournment**

### **Next Regular Meeting**

**August 14, 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**  
**June 12, 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 Alyson Watson at 9:05 a.m., on June 12, 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 Michael Hurley, George Biagi, Reid Roberts, Travis Kahrs, Elba Mijango, Mel Lytle, Walt Ward, Dave Fletcher, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Emily Sheldon, Kris Balaji, Brandon Nakagawa, and Scot Moody.

**II. SCHEDULED ITEMS**

**A. Discussion/Action Items:**

**1. Approval of Minutes of May 8, 2019**

**Motion**

Mr. Scot Moody moved, and Mr. Mike Henry seconded the approval of the May 8 meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

**2. Bundle Review & GSP Draft Release Process**

Ms. Alyson Watson reviewed the bundle chapter release and reviewed adoption schedule.

Ms. Elba Mijango questioned when the GSP is going to be finalized. Ms. Watson answered November 5, 2019. Ms. Watson clarified that the Notice of Intent (NOI) needs to be published 90 days prior to when the GSAs intend to adopt the plan. Mr. Walt Ward asked a clarifying question regarding the NOI. Ms. Watson indicated that each individual GSA needs to adopt the plan. Mr. Ward questioned if a Notice of Exemption (NOE) was needed.

Ms. Watson walked through the two options for NOI publication. Mr. Brandon Nakagawa suggested keeping a spreadsheet to make sure everyone knows where everyone is in the process. Mr. Moody indicated that he liked option 1, filing a joint NOI that lists the adoption dates for each GSA. Mr. Mike Callahan indicated that CEQA does not apply to GSP preparation and no NOE is required. Mr. Mike Henry asked if GSAs can provide additional comments on the Draft GSP. Ms. Watson answered absolutely and noted that there will be changes and revisions based on what has been incorporated. Mr. Henry asked if there be could be changes to the November 5 Final Draft. Ms. Watson responded that there could be. She indicated that the hope is to close the comment period and work closely with the group to get clear direction so there are no surprises on November 5 version.

Mr. Ward stated that newspapers for publishing NOIs have different lead times. Mr. Ward indicated that he liked the idea of option 1 but wanted flexibility. Mr. Kris Balaji stated that 90 days is the minimum and that option 1 would streamline the process. Mr. Balaji questioned if there are plans for outreach during the public comment period. Ms. Watson responded yes, the next informational meeting is July 18. Ms. Watson summarized a consensus on option 1, for a single NOI that lists all GSA adoption dates. She noted that the adoption meetings will need to be between November 5, 2019 and January 1, 2020 and that we will follow up on meeting dates.

Next, Ms. Alyson Watson walked through comments received on the draft GSP chapters.

### **Minimum Value for Groundwater Level Thresholds**

Ms. Watson summarized a comment that recommended setting a minimum value for groundwater level minimum thresholds based on mean sea level (msl). She noted that the consultant recommendation would be to set a minimum value tied to depth-to-water (DTW) rather than msl. Mr. Nakagawa provided elaboration on the comment. He noted that the area near the representative monitoring well located in SSI GSA is an area of historically high groundwater levels, but projections are showing it could be in violation. Mr. Ward indicated that for Stanislaus County, the minimum seal depth is 50 feet. Ms. Watson indicated that that could be a permutation. Mr. Nakagawa clarified that this particular monitoring well's historical low is high. Dr. Lytle asked if this value had to be tied to well seal depth or if it could be 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) everywhere. Ms. Emily Sheldon asked a clarifying question. Ms. Watson responded that GSAs would not pick the minimum threshold, but the threshold would be set at 100 if certain criteria were met. Mr. de Graaf noted that he could see a well next to water body or river that would have significant impacts if it got down to 100 feet bgs.

Ms. Mary Elizabeth (Sierra Club) questioned what the extent of the basin is that this description entails, and indicated that the 100 feet requirement in San Joaquin County is for new wells, not for existing wells. Mr. Ward noted he does not like the idea that everything is tied to a numerical value and asked if the group can account for historical conditions to provide more flexibility. Mr. Travis Kahrs questioned if other wells would be affected by the change in language. Ms. Watson indicated she believed there would be other wells affected. Mr. Ward indicated the change was not necessary. Ms. Mijango agreed. Mr. Kahrs indicated he thinks the minimum thresholds are protective enough for the basin as a whole. Dr. Lytle asked Mr. Nakagawa if it is one well or multiple. Mr. Nakagawa responded it is one well in the western part of the service area. Dr. Lytle asked if there is another well in the area that is representative. Mr. Moody indicated his view that the first 5 years of GSP implementation will be a learning curve.

### **Motion**

Mr. Moody moved, and Mr. Fletcher seconded the motion to recommend to the Board to not approve the change in minimum threshold definition to include a minimum value depth to water. Mr. Nakagawa abstained, and the motion carried.

### **Use of Municipal Wells as a Criteria for Minimum Threshold Definition in Municipalities**

Ms. Watson provided a summary of the comment received, noting that, in some parts of the basin, there are local ordinances that require users to connect to city supplies. The comment was that the use of domestic well depth is not appropriate for those areas where there is a requirement to connect to municipal domestic supplies. Dr. Lytle provided clarification. He noted that there are some domestic wells used for agricultural uses but not typically for drinking water. Mr. Kahrs indicated that the threshold for the well in Lodi is tied to historical lows. He stated there are domestic wells within the buffer, but there is no way to address issues with domestic wells. Ms. Mijango indicated she believe Manteca residents need to connect to Manteca's potable water system. Mr. Balaji questioned whose call is it to use which criteria. Ms. Watson responded the group would need to define that based on where domestic wells are not permitted due to local ordinances. Mr. Henry indicated there are a few local wells not required to connect to the system in Lockeford.

Ms. Elizabeth indicated the City of Stockton has areas resisting annexation. She indicated that if someone has a well they were permitted to install, they have a right to operate that well. Ms. Watson clarified that this discussion is not about revoking rights, but for setting thresholds. Mr. de Graaf indicated that if a well is on the outside edge of city limits, wells outside the city limits may be impacted. Dr. Lytle noted that it would be difficult for his council to adopt a plan based on domestic wells because it is counter to the municipal code.

### **Motion**

Dr. Mel Lytle moved, and Mr. Moody seconded a recommendation to the Board to approve the use of the municipal well criteria in municipalities with an ordinance that requires the use of City water. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **Use of 500 mg/L Isocontour for Seawater Intrusion Measurable Objective**

Ms. Watson walked through the proposed change to the measurable objective definition for seawater intrusion. Dr. Lytle asked a clarifying question. Ms. Watson indicated the isocontour line would measure a front. Mr. Ward asked a clarifying question on the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (SMCL) and noted that it makes sense to tie the objective to an existing standard.

### **Motion**

Dr. Lytle moved, and Mr. Ward seconded a recommendation to the Board the approval of the use of a 500 mg/L isocontour line for the seawater intrusion measurable objective. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Balaji questioned if these comments were from member agency staff and if there is a process to address comments that directly impact the JPA Board and thresholds. He indicated that this is the last meeting before the public draft is released.

Ms. Watson indicated that we may want to post an addendum based on Board direction, but lacking that Board direction, we will not change the text in the public draft. She noted there will be a file share setup so Advisory Committee members can see comments as they come in. Ms. Mary Elizabeth asked if the shared folder will be made available to members of the public. Ms. Watson indicated the Advisory Committee will provide input.

### **3. Implementation Phase**

Ms. Watson asked the group for their thoughts on what the role of the JPA will be in implementation. Ms. Emily Sheldon indicated Oakdale Irrigation District (OID) likes the agreement as is and noted the possibility of an amendment. She stated she likes the idea of each GSA implementing their own projects and management actions, however an amendment could include a backstop if a GSA is not compliant. The agreement could include a function for the JPA to be able to step in if needed to take measures to ensure compliance, or enforcement actions or to levy fees. Mr. Glenn Prasad indicated the group should also consider the 5-year update. Mr. Ward added that this is the most difficult part of implementing SGMA and that the degree of coordination will be tremendous. He noted he thinks the JPA has to exist, and that the agreement likely needs to be amended. Ms. Mijango stated the City of Manteca is also interested in continuing a group similar to this. Mr. Henry noted monthly meetings may not be needed, but some group oversight will be.

Mr. Moody stated two different discussions are needed: what oversight will be from the JPA Board, and the management portion. Dr. Lytle stated the JPA organization is a good representation of the basin, which is beneficial. He asked about the potential for including associated members (like the Farm Bureau). He noted the need to think about what other players need to be involved. Mr. Nakagawa stated the need to examine the balance between autonomy and accountability. Mr. Henry questioned if Board Chair Winn could appoint a subcommittee to look at that in detail.

Ms. Janice Magdich (City of Lodi) indicated that the JPA agreement does anticipate going forward by its language and that it is unnecessary to do an entirely new agreement. Dr. Lytle stated that if the JPA is to

oversee compliance, amendments clarifying specifics will be critical. Ms. Elizabeth noted there is a delicate balance between autonomy and accountability for many of the implementing requirements for GSAs. She stated if the GSAs are not implementing those requirements, they can put the basin at risk of noncompliance. In the event of noncompliance, GSA members of the JPA could be removed by vote but clarification is needed on what would warrant that. She noted the existing agreement has opportunities to be used for implementation as is.

### **Monitoring Networks**

Ms. Watson noted that the Advisory Committee will be asked to make a recommendation on if to stay with a quarterly monitoring frequency for groundwater level representative monitoring wells, or to change to a semi-annual frequency based on staff comments.

Mr. Ward asked what more the group would learn from additional monitoring. Mr. Paul Wells (DWR) indicated the goal is to meet sustainability by 2020. Mr. Nakagawa indicated semi-annual monitoring seems prudent, and that there is an option to escalate to 4 times per year with successive months if thresholds are violated. Mr. de Graaf stated this would be a good way to make sure it links to what has been monitored historically. Mr. George Biagi recommend semi-annual monitoring, and if there are dramatic changes, going back to quarterly. Mr. Moody concurred.

### **Motion**

Mr. Henry moved, and Mr. Balaji seconded a recommendation to the Board to approve a semi-annual monitoring frequency (with one month in the Spring and Fall), and to increase frequency if violations are expected. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Watson walked through preliminary estimates for the range of costs for implementation and discussed elements that go into the range of options. Mr. Henry added that this is important information for the planning group appointed by the Chair.

### **4. Funding Sources**

Ms. Watson walked through funding sources. She asked the group if they want to recommend that the JPA Board pursue funding through Proposition 68 funding. She indicated that \$2 million is available in total, so up to \$500,000 is available to the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin. Mr. Wells indicated that in this round, there is \$5 million available statewide, and it will be highly competitive. Ms. Cathy Lee questioned if there is a cost share. Mr. Wells responded yes. Mr. Wells indicated that most basins will be eligible. Mr. Balaji noted that it takes 10% of the grant money to put the application together and requested DWR look at reducing the cost and complexity of the grant application. Mr. Wells noted that the comment period closes June 17 and the final proposal solicitation package (PSP) and guidelines are expected mid-summer, with applications due shortly after that.

Dr. Lytle indicated he thinks this is doing business and noted the option to spread costs between agencies. He noted it seems logical to take advantage of the grant opportunity.

### **Motion**

Dr. Lytle moved, and Mr. Balaji seconded a recommendation to the Board to pursue funding under Proposition 68. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Jennifer Spaletta (representing North San Joaquin Water Conservation District) indicated that the Proposition 68 grant can cover expenses since June 2018. If the Board approves going forward with this expenditure, there should be solid discussion of what project will go into the grant application. She noted it

can cover many things, but it can be something you need to do anyway. This would allow the application to be more competitive. She stated that discussion should happen sooner than later to have a competitive application.

#### **5. Inter-basin Coordination**

Ms. Watson gave an update on inter-basin coordination meetings with neighboring basins.

#### **6. Fourth Informational Meeting – July 18, 5-8 PM (Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, Stockton)**

Ms. Watson indicated that the fourth informational meeting will be held on July 18 at the Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center in Assembly Room 1. The focus of the meeting will be on the Public Draft GSP and comment period.

#### **7. County Coordination Process/Plan Coordinator**

Ms. Watson reviewed the Plan Manager role: “A delegated contact who has been delegated authority for submitting the GSP and who has been identified as a DWR point of contact in the basin.” Mr. Balaji indicated he would like to have an agency responsible. Mr. Nakagawa stated he is willing to help keep continuity or we can pick someone else.

#### **Motion**

Mr. Ward moved, and Mr. Lytle seconded a recommendation to the Board that the position run with San Joaquin County. It was noted that the role has been well served and that the County has the ability to facilitate and congregate. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **8. July Agenda Items and Meeting Location Change**

Ms. Watson indicated the July Board and Advisory Committee meetings would be at the Manteca Transit Center (220 Moffat Blvd., Manteca, CA). Agenda items will include the Draft GSP public review period and implementation phase and funding next steps.

#### **B. Informational Items:**

#### **III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):**

None.

#### **IV. Future Agenda Items:**

None.

#### **V. Adjournment:**

The meeting was closed at 11:03 a.m.

**Next Regular Meeting: July 10, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.  
Manteca Transit Center – 220 Moffat Blvd., Manteca, CA 95336**

# Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sign-In Sheet

June 12, 2019

| INITIAL | AGENCY  | MEMBER              |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| MBH     | California Water Service Company                | Hurley, Michael     |
| GB      | Central Delta Water Agency                      | Biagi Jr., George ✓ |
| M       | Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District | Roberts, Reid** ✓   |
| TC      | City of Lodi                                    | Kahrs, Travis       |
| E.M.M.  | City of Manteca                                 | Mijango, Elba       |
| A       | City of Stockton                                | Trejo, Danny D.T.   |
| WAW     | Eastside San Joaquin GSA                        | Ward, Walt** ✓      |
| CDW     | Linden County Water District                    | Fletcher, Dave** ✓  |
| MLB     | Lockeford Community Services District           | Henry, Mike** ✓     |
| DS      | North San Joaquin Water Conservation District   | de Graaf, Daniel    |
| ES      | Oakdale Irrigation District                     | Sheldon, Emily      |
| Present | San Joaquin County                              | Balaji, Kris        |
| Present | South San Joaquin GSA                           | Nakagawa, Brandon   |
| SM      | Stockton East Water District                    | Moody, Scot         |

| OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES   |                  |                            |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| NAME                       | AGENCY           | EMAIL                      |
| STACIE ANN SILVA           | NCWL             | ssilva@NEWCURRENTWATER.com |
| Robert Emmens              | EKI Envi + Water | remmens@ekiconsult.com     |
| Janice Magdich             | Lodi             | jmagdich@lodi.gov ✓        |
| Bob Holmes                 | SSB SA           | RHolmes@SSJID.com          |
| Rob Schumann               | Kleinfelder      | rschumann@kleinfelder.com  |
| Continued on next page.... |                  |                            |

