



**Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority
Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup
January 9, 2019
4 – 5:30 p.m.
San Joaquin County Public Works Department
1810 E. Hazelton Ave., Stockton – Conference Room A**

Committee Members in Attendance

	Name	Organization
	Colin Bailey	The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Restore the Delta
X	Gene E. Bigler	PUENTES
	Drew Cheney	Machado Family Farms
	Robert Dean	Calaveras County Resource Conservation District
X	Mary Elizabeth	Sierra Club
	David Fries	San Joaquin Audubon
X	Joey Giordano	The Wine Group
	Jack Hamm	Lima Ranch
	Mary Hildebrand	South Delta Water Agency
X	George V. Hartmann	The Hartmann Law Firm
	Michael Machado	Farmer
	Ara Marderosian	Sequoia ForestKeeper
	Ryan Mock	J.R. Simplot Company
X	Yolanda Park	Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Stockton
X	Jonathan Pruitt	Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Stockton
X	Will Price	University of the Pacific & Vice Chair, SJ County Advisory Water Commission
X	Daryll Quaresma	2Q Farming, Inc.
	Jennifer Shipman	Manufacturers Council of the Central Valley
X	Chris Shutes	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
	Michael F. Stieler	CGCS, Spring Creek Golf & Country Club
X	Linda Turkatte	San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department
	Ken Vogel	San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
X	Ted Wells	Trinchero Family Estates and Sutter Home Winery
	General Public	
X	Jane Wagner-Tyack	League of Women Voters of SJ County
X	Paul Wells	Department of Water Resources
	Andrew Watkins	Stockton East Water District
	Staff and Consultants	
X	Brandon Nakagawa	County ESJ GSP Project Representative
	Michael Callahan	County ESJ
	Alicia Connelly	County ESJ

	Alyson Watson	ESJ GSP Project Manager
X	Christy Kennedy	ESJ GSP Deputy Project Manager
X	Lindsay Martien	ESJ GSP Deputy Project Manager
X	Cindy Thomas	Stakeholder Engagement & Public Outreach Consultant

Meeting Notes

I. Welcome

- a. Christy Kennedy welcomed the group at 4:06 p.m.
- b. Christy Kennedy reviewed the meeting agenda, emphasizing the focus would be on the updated roadmap and charter, projects and management actions, and an introduction on approach to project financing.

II. Meeting Objectives

- a. Christy Kennedy reviewed the meeting objectives, which were:
 - i. Review Workgroup roles and meeting structure
 - ii. Identify gaps in project portfolio themes
 - iii. Introduce approach to project financing

(Moving forward, meeting objectives will be clearly identified at the start of each meeting.)

III. Roadmap

- a. Christy Kennedy reviewed the roadmap between January 2019 and May 2019 and how the remainder of the meetings will be laid out. Specifically, she covered the input that will be needed from the group and how it will be distributed in chapters.
 - i. Period
 - ii. Meeting Topics
 - iii. Objectives
 - iv. Deliverables
- b. Mary Elizabeth asked if we will be sticking to a Wednesday meeting or going back to Tuesday. She asked for timing on the deliverables.
- c. Lindsay Martien noted the documents will be distributed to the Workgroup members a week prior to the Board meeting. Workgroup members will have a month to provide comments.
- d. Will Price asked when the next Workgroup meeting will take place.
- e. Christy Kennedy noted that more people are in the room, and we will consider moving the meetings to Wednesdays moving forward.

IV. Charter

- a. Christy Kennedy reviewed the roles and responsibilities identified in the charter as presented in the meeting materials. She noted that this document is intended to provide clarity.

V. Projects and Management Actions

- a. Christy Kennedy gave an overview on projects and management actions and the project portfolios. She reminded the group that they have seen the projects listed before – during the November meeting (supplemental PPT).
- b. Chris Shutes asked for additional information on each of the projects listed. He noted it would be important to know the details around each project, not just the summaries.
- c. Lindsay Martien asked the group to reach out individually for additional information.
- d. Christy Kennedy reviewed the project/portfolio development process and the nine portfolios being considered. She reminded the group that the Advisory Committee developed the criteria for project review.
 - i. Implementability
 - ii. Location/Proximity to Area of Overdraft
 - iii. Cost per Volume Water Savings
 - iv. Environmental Benefit/Impact
 - v. Disadvantaged Community Benefit
 - vi. Water Quality Impact (Positive or Negative)
 - vii. Affordability
- e. Mary Elizabeth suggested considering detriment to DACs. Yolanda Parks noted she had the same comment.
- f. Christy Kennedy reviewed the preliminary project portfolio themes and discussed the grouping process of the portfolios.
- g. George V. Hartmann asked if each portfolio has to hit the 100,000 AF criteria, or if it is the individual projects. Christy Kennedy said it was each portfolio – or grouping of projects.
- h. Christy Kennedy discussed the preliminary portfolio themes:
 - i. Cost-effectiveness
 - ii. Regional Diversity
 - iii. Minimized Infrastructure
 - iv. Environmental Benefit
 - v. DAC Benefit
 - vi. Impact of Cone of Depression
 - vii. Fast Implementation
 - viii. Small-Volume Projects
 - ix. Large-Volume Projects
- i. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 1: Cost Effectiveness
 - i. George V. Hartmann asked if everyone in the room knew where the cone of depression is located.
 - ii. Christy Kennedy showed the group on a map where the largest hole in groundwater is located.
 - iii. George V. Hartmann asked if there was a scale weight to the cost-effectiveness. Christy Kennedy noted there was not.
- j. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 2: Regional Diversity
- k. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 3: Minimized Infrastructure
 - i. Will Price asked if this was based on real projects or conceptual projects. Christy Kennedy explained that they are real planned projected, and that they have worked with GSAs individually to understand each of the projects. They are actual projects and not conceptual.
- l. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 4: Environmental Benefit

- m. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 5: DAC Benefit
- n. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 6: Impact to Cone of Depression
- o. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 7: Fast Implementation
- p. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 8: Large-volume
- q. Christy Kennedy discussed Portfolio 9: Small-volume
 - i. Christy Kennedy compared all of the portfolios against each other and opened the floor for discussion. She noted the intent is to hybridize and optimize the portfolios.
 - ii. Gene E. Bigler asked what the difference is between portfolios and themes. Christy Kennedy said they are interchangeable. They are the same thing.
 - iii. Mary Elizabeth asked for the cost of each of the portfolios. Christy Kennedy noted that information is in the package.
 - iv. George V. Hartmann asked if balancing the cone of depression was the highest ranked priority. Christy Kennedy said no. She noted it is most important to bring the basin into balance and meet thresholds to get to sustainability.
 - v. Will Price asked if the thresholds are met, will the cone of depression be eliminated?
 - vi. Will Price asked if each of the objectives are weighted equally. Christy Kennedy said, "Yes."
 - vii. Daryll Quaresma wanted to know if every GSA is willing to contribute financially. Christy Kennedy said, "They are in discussion about financing right now."
 - viii. Gene E. Bigler noted he thinks we need to discuss the relationships between GSAs that are doing well vs. those that need to be supplemented. He discussed the difference in consumption during the drought.
 - ix. Daryll Quaresma noted a DAC portfolio could work as long as the cone of depression is addressed.
 - x. George V. Hartmann noted that many DACs are located above the cone of depression.
 - xi. Yolanda Park noted that there are a lot of benefits in the DAC spider web diagram compared to the other portfolios. She noted she would like a balanced portfolio.
 - xii. Mary Elizabeth noted that we could eliminate the large and small projects because of the limited benefit to the portfolio.
 - xiii. Christy Kennedy noted that the intent is not to knock out any of the portfolios but to balance the entire group and develop a hybrid. She noted that there are multiple projects that meet all the criteria.
 - xiv. George V. Hartmann asked about the deficit in the cone of depression as opposed to the subbasin as a whole.
 - xv. George V. Hartmann noted that we need to figure out the amount in the cone of depression then allocate the rest. It adds a weight to the evaluation.
 - xvi. Ted Wells said we want to enhance the good behavior we want to see in the future. He asked: How do we put good behavior enhancement in this process?
 - xvii. George V. Hartmann told a story of tomato irrigation during the drought and the trade-offs of drip vs. flood irrigation.

- xxviii. Chris Shutes noted that creating efficiency may have unintended consequences of lowering the groundwater table
- xix. George V. Hartmann noted that there are permanent crops in the cone of depression. There could be an incentive to move to drip irrigate vs. flood.
- xx. Ted Wells wanted to know if the size of project is influenced by behaviors. George V. Hartmann agreed it is important to include that in evaluation.
- xxi. Christy Kennedy noted management actions cover that.
- xxii. Daryll Quaresma noted that in the south county, the water table goes up in the summer due to the flood irrigation.
- xxiii. Chris Shutes noted that there may be deficiency if things change. There needs to be a balance. There is a benefit to maintaining groundwater where there is a lower use of water.
- xxiv. Will Price would like a model that simulates groundwater.
- xxv. Chris Shutes circled back to what is missing. That is why we all need to know the full story of each of the projects. We need to understand how to efficiently use water for irrigation and recharge.
- xxvi. Mary Elizabeth noted the environmental benefit portfolio. She noted some projects were expensive, and the water savings was not significant. She asked: which other portfolios had outliers?
- xxvii. Christy Kennedy noted that recycled water projects were added to the environmental benefit portfolio for balance.
- xxviii. Mary Elizabeth asked to consider removing those very expensive projects.
- xxix. Yolanda Park asked to add a portfolio just focused on recharge.
- xxx. Joey Giordano wanted to know the dollar amount for each of the portfolios.
- xxxi. Jane Wagner-Tyack noted that many of the projects rely on water transfers.
- xxxii. Mary Elizabeth noted that the department is trying to make it easier for getting a beneficial use for surface water/stormwater. It is not tied to SGMA. She noted she thinks it is FloodMAR.
- xxxiii. Christy Kennedy tabled the discussion to move to financing.

VI. Project Financing

- a. Christy Kennedy discussed identifying funding opportunities. She noted the Workgroup will be tasked with identifying potential paths toward financing projects.
 - i. Grant funding
 - ii. Tax
 - iii. Fees – Gene E. Bigler suggested using the word assessment vs. fee
- Chris Shutes asked about a regional pricing vs. at the GSA level.
- Daryll Quaresma noted we need to work as a group but focus on behavior. Someone needs to oversee it all so no one area is taking advantage of another.
- George V. Hartmann asked Paul Wells if one area is out of compliance, does that mean the whole basin out of compliance?
- George V. Hartmann noted that if the State Water Board has to come in the fees imposed are very costly.
- Brandon Nakagawa noted that all of the portfolios meet the criteria set – some better than others. Ne noted we are lucky in this subbasin that we do not need to talk about fallowing. Other subbasins are having that discussion.

- Jane Wagner-Tyack noted that Lodi and other communities that have made infrastructure investments benefit from farming taking place in the cone of depression area, where growers use groundwater because they do not have access to surface water as many users in other parts of the basin, including the south county, do
- Daryll Quaresma reinforced the need for balance.
- Jane Wagner-Tyack noted that 80% of water statewide is used for agriculture. This is an agricultural area and we all benefit from that.
- Mary Elizabeth noted there used to be a lot of canneries in the area so we are only getting a portion of the benefit of the crops grown in our county. We are not realizing all of the worth of the products in our county.
- Daryll Quaresma noted some irrigation districts have excess water capabilities. They sell the water. Maybe there should be a tax if the water is sold out of the county. The tax should go back into our GSP.
- Yolanda Parks said you cannot drink money generated via a tax or fee. We need to focus on recharge, not money.
- Mary Elizabeth said we need to look at conservation vs. water rates.
 - b. Christy Kennedy noted that we will take a deeper dive into financing next month.

VII. Announcements

- a. Christy Kennedy updated the group on the third informational meeting
 - i. Christy Kennedy said we will follow the same style as the last informational meeting.
- b. Christy Kennedy updated the group on the Situation Assessment next steps
- c. The next Workgroup meeting will be held on February 13 at the County Public Works Department. Park in the back – do not park on the street.

VIII. Other Topics

- a. Mary Elizabeth requested the methodology being used for GDEs. She noted she would like the contact at Fish & Wildlife. She requested to have the large maps from deliverables printed and provided.

IX. Public Comment

- a. None

Christy adjourned the meeting at 5:29

Comments by Jane Wagner-Tyack

Under Projects and Management Actions, please note that I asked why the project portfolios themselves were not provided to the Workgroup for the discussion. As I recall, Christy said that the decision was based on the volume of material that doing so would add to the slide deck. There was a general sense among participants that they were being asked to discuss material they didn't actually have in front of them.

Comments by Mary Elizabeth

- The list of deliverables should be included in the minutes. The website link as of 2.5.19 <http://www.esjgroundwater.org/Portals/0/assets/docs/agendas/2019/ESJ-Workgroup-2018-Deliverables.pdf> for the deliverables is the roadmap instead.
- I specifically identified the City of Escalon Wastewater Reuse Project \$30,000,000 for 672 acre feet at \$1,488.98/acre foot as an expensive project that should not have been included. Christie stated that they could do a sensitivity analysis to evaluate the effect of projects on portfolios.
- There were several questions about project descriptions and cost with participants directed to the packet which I assume is the project background information presented November 2018 (missed this meeting) but when checking back to November 2018 meeting materials the background information in that slide was considerable different from the January 2019 TAC information. I used the TAC Jan 2019 meeting information to specifically identify the Escalon Reuse project as extraordinarily expensive. The Workgroup should have access to the most contemporary data and I believe the flow of information was an area that has been identified as an area of improvement.
- The project polling that occurred in October 2018 should have been included with the project descriptions.
- The Charter which was an agenda item is not included on the website for January's 2019 meeting material.
- My comment regarding conservation vs water rates specifically referred to municipal water rates throughout the county and average household consumption. California Water Service metered rates are the highest and had the lowest water consumption.