



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, September 11, 2019

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

San Joaquin County – Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center
2101 E. Earhart Avenue – Assembly Room #1, Stockton, California

- I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance & Safety Announcement/Introductions
- II. **SCHEDULED ITEMS** – *Presentation materials to be posted on ESJGroundwater.org and emailed prior to the meeting. Copies of presentation materials will be available at the meeting.*
 - A. Discussion /Action Items:
 1. Approval of Minutes of August 14, 2019 (See Attached)
 2. Ad-Hoc Committee – Obtain Input
 3. Draft GSP Public Comment Incorporation Process
 4. GSP Adoption Timeline and NOI
 5. October Agenda Items
- III. Public Comment (non-agendized items)
- IV. Future Agenda Items
- V. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting

October 9, 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
August 14, 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 9:03 a.m., on August 14, 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 Jeremiah Mecham, Dante Nomellini, Reid Roberts, Travis Kahrs, Elba Mijango, Mel Lytle, Peter Martin, Mike Henry, Daniel de Graaf, Eric Thorburn, Kris Balaji, Brandon Nakagawa, and Scot Moody.

II. SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion/Action Items:

1. Approval of Minutes of July 10, 2019

Motion

Mr. Scot Moody moved, and Mr. Kris Balaji seconded the approval of the July 10 meeting minutes. The motion was approved. Ms. Elba Mijango abstained.

2. Outreach Update

Ms. Alyson Watson provided an overview of outreach activities, and GSA representatives shared outreach updates with the group. Dr. Mel Lytle indicated that the City of Stockton has placed hard copies of the Draft GSP in several libraries. He stated he would provide the list of libraries to be put on the Groundwater Authority (GWA) website. Mr. Glenn Prasad indicated that two SGMA outreach meetings were held by San Joaquin County Public Works Department. Ms. Elba Mijango indicated that the City of Manteca website was updated to include more information on being a GSA and that it linked to the GWA website. Mr. Eric Thorburn stated that he will be presenting on SGMA status at the Oakdale Irrigation District Board meeting next Tuesday. Mr. Kris Balaji noted there have been regular updates to the Farm Bureau Water Committee. Mr. Dante Nomellini provided an update on Central Delta Water Agency outreach efforts, noting that they have a SGMA update on the agenda for every meeting. Ms. Mijango noted she will provide an update to the Manteca City Council at their August 20 meeting and is posting a request for public comment on the City Council's bulletin board. Mr. Balaji questioned if any of agencies need County support, and he stated that County representatives could be available at meetings to help answer questions. Additionally, Mr. Balaji noted that Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID) has resumed its status as a GSA. Mr. Balaji recognized Mr. Prasad for identifying a technicality in DWR's GSA withdrawal process, and will expeditiously reinstate WID into its prior GSA status.

Mr. Scot Moody presented a comment letter provided by Ms. Mary Elizabeth received by Stockton East Water District. No formal action by the Board was requested, but the comments were reviewed and considered. Mr. Peter Martin indicated that a map tool would be useful at a parcel level. He questioned if hard copies of the Draft GSP were placed at offices and public libraries, noting he has had one member of the public come to their office and review the Plan. It was noted that North San Joaquin Water Conservation District has placed a hard copy of the Draft GSP at their office and at the City of Lodi Public Library. Mr. Dante Nomellini questioned how useful the mapping tool would be and noted that a link could be put on the website clarifying the process for requesting parcel-level data.

3. Ad-Hoc Committee Recommendation and Input

Ms. Alyson Watson introduced the Ad-Hoc Committee recommendation. Following clarification questions on the Mokelumne River Loss Study, Ms. Watson described why the study applies to the whole basin.

Mr. Nomellini indicated the need for a financing mechanism. He questioned the need to shift to the GWA for annual reporting given that the County is already conducting groundwater level and quality monitoring and providing an annual report (Spring and Fall). Mr. Nomellini stated the focus should be on implementation, not more studies. Mr. Balaji responded with agreement to the first comment and clarified the second comment. He noted that the "X" on the table in the slides indicates that the GWA will package and assemble the information, not duplicate the work. Mr. Nomellini stated that the group has information on what needs to be done for implementation: there is a need to complete projects, not to do more studies. Ms. Watson clarified that the Mokelumne River Loss Study is a field project. Dr. Lytle noted that the study could provide value but that he has concerns around timing. It was noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee felt it was a valuable study but the timing was not quite right, given that the GWA has five years to update the model. Thus, other projects or environmental work may provide a greater benefit. Mr. de Graaf noted that the study is intended to refine the model, and that there is a focus in North San Joaquin Water Conservation District on projects. He noted he still sees it as a basin-wide action that would provide helpful information in the long term.

Ms. Alyson Watson noted there are three pathways for the Mokelumne River Loss study: 1) Keep the project characterized as is, 2) Consider as a GSA-level project, 3) Take the project out of the Plan. Mr. Mike Henry stated that the Ad-Hoc Committee will go back and discuss the issue prior to presenting to the Board in September.

Mr. Moody indicated he is not advocating for or against study and that he understands Mr. Nomellini's perspective. Mr. de Graaf indicated the study should be included as part of model refinement, not as its own study. Mr. Martin stated, with regards to monitoring well networks, Zone 2 monies cannot pay for Stanislaus County. He noted that a number of GSAs have CASGEM networks and monitoring, but there are uncertainties around the future direction of the CASGEM program. Mr. de Graaf indicated that the chart seems duplicate monitoring efforts and requested that it be revised for clarity. Mr. Nomellini stated that if a GSA wants to do elements individually, they should do them. He stated concern about how to fund dollars in first column. Mr. Henry noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee shares concerns regarding funding.

Mr. Thorburn noted that a number of things on the list are required, and that the Mokelumne River Loss Study is not required, and neither is the addition of additional wells (items B1 & B3). Dr. Lytle clarified that the Ad-Hoc Committee started out with the question of whether or not the JPA should continue to exist after the Plan is adopted, and the exercise is intended to take the temperature of what responsibilities the GSAs would cover independently. Dr. Lytle clarified that the Ad-Hoc Committee is supporting the concept that the JPA should continue to exist. Once we understand the breakdown of how duties will be split, he continued, we can understand financing.

Following discussion by the Advisory Committee members, the topic was opened for public comments. Ms. Valerie Kincaid (SSJID/OID counsel) indicated that the Mokelumne River Loss Study might save time and money in determining how many projects need to come online. She noted it may also refine the locations for recharge and avoid recharged water being carried away. Mr. Nomellini responded that it is already known where the deficit is. Mr. Andrew Watkins questioned if an adjusted number would reduce the need for projects. He stated that monitoring levels will show if projects are working or not, and when there is a need to stop.

4. Proposition 68 Grant Application

Ms. Alyson Watson provided an overview of the Proposition 68 Grant Round 3 funding opportunities and application process. A clarifying question was asked on whether implementation projects would be included in the application. Ms. Watson responded yes.

Ms. Watson asked the group if there was input for projects to include in the grant. Mr. Nomellini indicated a need to clarify monitoring procedures, a need for additional monitoring, and a need to concentrate on implementation. He noted the group could build on the EBMUD implementation project. Mr. Thorburn indicated there will be costs moving forward regardless of the approach taken and stated his support for the Ad-Hoc Committee recommendation. Dr. Lytle indicated that this could be part of the implementation effort and the group could consider a Programmatic CEQA document that tiers off for individual projects in future. Mr. Watkins noted that Mr. Brandon Nakagawa had indicated there is physical equipment available to do groundwater monitoring.

5. Draft GSP Comment Incorporation process

Ms. Watson reviewed the recommended the approach for comment incorporation process. Mr. Nomellini noted his concern that comments may come back stating that the numbers in the Plan are incorrect. He stated there is a need to make clear that the numbers will be refined. He additionally indicated that the group will not have much latitude in making changes to plan, and he noted no issues with process. Mr. Balaji indicated support for suggestion #2.

Motion

Mr. Thorburn moved, and Ms. Mijango seconded a motion to recommend to the Board the approach for public comment review as presented.

There were no public comments on this item.

6. GSP Adoption Procedures

Ms. Watson summarized the approach for GSP adoption procedures and next steps for issuing the notice of intent (NOI) to adopt the plan. Mr. Nomellini requested clarification on who needs to sign the NOI. Ms. Watson clarified. Mr. Balaji questioned what the NOI needs to contain. Mr. Martin stated his desire to make sure the public understands the approach, and indicated that for the Eastside GSA, four agencies need to adopt. Mr. Nakagawa noted that South San Joaquin Irrigation District has developed a draft letter for an NOI, and that each GSA will need to publish notices of public hearing.

There was further discussion around whether to send the NOI as one letter, or for each GSA to send NOIs individually. Mr. de Graaf noted that North San Joaquin Water Conservation District needs to take the issue to their Board on who can sign. A single letter approach was supported.

Motion

Ms. Mijango moved, and Dr. Lytle seconded the recommendation that the NOI be published as a single letter on behalf of the GSAs.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid provided comments, stating that the word “accept” might not be the right word. Ms. Watson noted that legal counsel for the GWA has recommended the word “accept” and the word “implement”. Mr. Balaji noted his support for the language with the least risk. Mr. Martin noted he would like to see the language for the resolution to confirm consistency. Ms. Watson noted the counsel to the

GWA could develop the language for the resolution. Mr. Nomellini noted that GSAs can adopt a Plan but, in the resolution, say they only have the authority to administer parts of Plan.

Mr. Paul Wells noted that it is locally-determined what adoption process is acceptable. However, if only parts of the Plan are adopted, coordination agreements would be needed. Dr. Lytle indicated that his chief concern is if one GSA fails to adopt the Plan. Would that mean that the Plan is not approved? Further, he asked: if GSAs only adopt within their jurisdiction, is there still a remaining connection between jurisdictions? Ms. Watson provided clarification, noting that there is a provision that DWR will not review the Plan unless it covers the entire basin. Dr. Lytle restated his concern about validity of the Plan if a GSA fails to adopt. There was a consensus that the consulting team would send out a single NOI letter for signatures.

There were no public comments on this item.

7. Staff Administration for GWA for Implementation

Ms. Watson walked through the option that San Joaquin County continue to administer staff support for the GWA into implementation. Mr. Nakagawa stated it would be good to define what that role is for “administrator” and indicated that it could be addressed with the Ad-Hoc Committee.

8. Interbasin Coordination Summary

Ms. Watson gave an update on interbasin coordination meetings with neighboring basins. There were no public comments on this item.

9. September Agenda Items

Ms. Watson presented the September agenda items. There were no comments on this item.

B. Informational Items:

III. Public Comment (non-agendized items):

None.

IV. Future Agenda Items:

None.

V. Adjournment:

The meeting was closed at 10:55 a.m.

Next Regular Meeting: September 11, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.
Robert J. Cabral Agricultural Center, 2101 E. Earhart Ave. Stockton, CA

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sign-In Sheet

August 14, 2019

INITIAL	AGENCY	MEMBER
Jm	California Water Service Company	Mecham, Jeremiah**
[Signature]	Central Delta Water Agency	Nomellini, Dante**
[Signature]	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District	Roberts, Reid**
[Signature]	City of Lodi	Kahrs, Travis
EM	City of Manteca	Mijango, Elba
[Signature]	City of Stockton	Lytle, Mel
Late PM	Eastside San Joaquin GSA	Martin, Peter
	Linden County Water District	N/A
[Signature]	Lockeford Community Services District	Henry, Mike**
[Signature]	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	de Graaf, Daniel
[Signature]	Oakdale Irrigation District	Thorburn, Eric**
Present	San Joaquin County	Balaji, Kris
Present	South San Joaquin GSA	Nakagawa, Brandon**
[Signature]	Stockton East Water District	Moody, Scot

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
NAME	AGENCY	EMAIL
ANDY NGUYEN	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	
CHRISTY KENNEDY	WOODARD & WELAN	ckennedy@woodard.com
BROWNLS MILLS	CALAVERAS COUNTY	
GREEN PRASAD	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	
Larry Meyers	STL	

Continued on next page....

