



EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER
AUTHORITY

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

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

**Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority
Groundwater Sustainability Workgroup
May 8, 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
	Gene E. Bigler	PUENTES
	Drew Cheney	Machado Family Farms
	Robert Dean	Calaveras County Resource Conservation District
X	Mary Elizabeth	Sierra Club
X	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
	Yolanda Park	Coop
X	Jonathan Pruitt	Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Stockton
X	Will Price	University of the Pacific & Vice Chair, SJ County Advisory Water Commission
	Daryll Quaresma	2Q Farming, Inc.
	Jennifer Shipman	Manufacturers Council of the Central Valley
	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
	Ted Wells	Trincherro 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
	Bryan Pilkington	Private citizen

	Staff and Consultants	
X	Brandon Nakagawa	County ESJ GSP Project Representative
X	Michael Callahan	County ESJ
	Alicia Connelly	County ESJ
X	Alyson Watson	ESJ GSP Project Manager
	Christy Kennedy	ESJ GSP Deputy Project Manager
	Lindsay Martien	ESJ GSP Deputy Project Manager
X	Cindy Thomas	Stakeholder Engagement & Public Outreach Consultant

Meeting Notes

I. Welcome

- a. Alyson Watson welcomed the group at 4:05 p.m.
- b. Brandon Nakagawa announced that he is leaving the county. His last day will be on May 10.
- c. Alyson Watson reviewed the meeting agenda, emphasizing the focus would be on the Bundle 1 draft GSP chapters and the elements needed for GSP implementation.

II. Meeting Objectives

- a. Alyson Watson discussed the meeting objectives:
 - i. Discuss draft chapter and review HCM requirements
 - ii. Identify elements needed in GSP implementation plan
 - iii. Announcements

III. Bundle 1 – Draft Chapter Overview

- a. Alyson Watson discussed the distribution process of the chapters and noted that Bundle 1 can be found on the website.
- b. Jane Wagner-Tyack asked about the length of the other bundles.
- c. Alyson Watson noted they will all be as long as the first and maybe longer.
Alyson Watson discussed what is included in the bundle and highlighted each of the sections. She then touched on the hydrogeologic conceptual model and the requirements.

IV. Review: Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model Requirements

- a. Alyson Watson touched on the hydrogeologic conceptual model and the requirements.
 - i. She noted it is more of a summary vs. a model that's similar to what they are using in other simulations.
- a. Alyson Watson explained the B-B cross-section process.
- b. George Hartmann asked how we know what a cross-section actually looks like if it is just a simulation. Geologic data is used to generate cross-sections.
- c. Linda Turkatte noted that the State Water Board is using data from the well completion reports and the data is much more extensive.
- d. Brandon Nakagawa said the most detailed cross-section work is published by the USGS.
- e. Linda Turkatte said the people performing the studies for their needs and assessments are using a lot of different technology. She mentioned the technology is probably available for use as part of this process.

V. Implementation Plan

- a. Alyson Watson asked for input from the group on:
 - i. Implementation governance
 - ii. Stakeholder involvement
 - iii. Next steps
- b. George Hartmann asked for clarification. He asked if we are trying to determine who is in charge of implementation and mentioned that in the past it has been the County.
- c. Brandon Nakagawa said the County has always had a role but has not been ultimately responsible.
- d. Alyson Watson said the Board believes some of the functions should be handled at a regional level.
- e. George Hartmann said the structure is determined by the money and all the tests must be paid for.
- f. Jane Wagner-Tyack noted that a representative from a firm in Fresno informed her that there is monitoring via a Water Master Plan. There has been one on the King's River and it has worked well.
- g. Alyson Watson explained the need for a centralized organization to collect all the data from preexisting monitoring networks. She did not feel there is a need to create a completely new organization.
- h. George Hartmann asked if this should be driven at the GSAs-level or by an overarching governing body.
- i. Alyson Watson said the Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA), the precursor to the Groundwater Authority (GWA), still exists as an entity and asked if the GWA should we shift back over to the GBA.
- j. Brandon Nakagawa said for all intents and purposes, the GBA will be gone.
- k. Mary Elizabeth asked to elaborate on the North Valley Consortium and expanding that advisory group. The project basin falls between multiple groups so there would need to be coordination. She thinks there needs to be fewer layers of bureaucracy.
- l. George Hartmann noted that all GSAs are not equal and not all can contribute the same resources. He also asked what the Board is saying about this issues.
- m. Alyson Watson said the discussion just began. There are two varying views based on the size of the GSA.
- n. Brandon Nakagawa said we are developing a work plan with zero-based budgeting and will determine the cost, who is going to pay for it and who is going to be accountable.
- o. George Hartmann noted that if one GSA fails, we all fail. That is how SGMA was set up.
- p. Mary Elizabeth said there were four different funding options for the plan. The most affordable was selected. If the next phase is more expensive, there should be consideration based on size and ability to pay and all factors should be considered and agreeable to everyone. She does not feel it is sustainable for everyone to pay the same.
- q. George Hartmann said Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID) is no longer a GSA. It is assumed the County will take it over and the State will recognize the change. One of the risks of a process that is not successful is having more GSAs leaving. He noted there is a lot of risk.

- r. Brandon Nakagawa said his recommendation is that the County to take over the WID GSA.
- s. George Hartmann said he can anticipate a few other GSAs experiencing the same situation as WID.
- t. Alyson Watson said that across the state, GSAs formed because water agencies wanted to retain control and authority. She anticipates more GSAs will leave due to the responsibility.
- u. Will Price said the State would then take over the GSAs. He does not see the advantage of getting out of a GSA.
- v. Linda Turkatte said the County would lend itself to a more regional approach if GSAs drop out.
- w. Will Price asked if there are DAC considerations.
- x. Alyson Watson said right now there is not a cost sharing strategy. It could be a recommendation moving forward.
- y. Brandon Nakagawa noted that the County's policy is to not use general funds for these types of activities. The supervisors said they want to respect the autonomy of the GSAs.
- z. George Hartmann said the only problem with the County position is that they have no right to the groundwater and it belongs to the State.
- aa. Linda Turkatte said she would rather see a usage fee than a sales tax.
- bb. Mary Elizabeth said it would be interesting to look at takeover costs when determining the solution.
- cc. Alyson Watson said the entire basin is charged a fee if one GSA is out of compliance.
- dd. George V. Hartmann asked if anyone disagrees with a user based fee vs. general tax.
- ee. Will Price noted there are models that fall in between the two.
- ff. Linda Turkatte things it should be a little of both.
- gg. The group discussed ideas and strategies for funding and financing GSP
- hh. George Hartmann noted that SGMA totally ignores water rights.
- ii. Will Price would like more discussion around groundwater recharge.
- jj. George Hartmann asked about the group who represents DACs.
- kk. Mary Elizabeth noted that many GSAs do not have any capacity or ability to provide public outreach.
- ll. Alyson Watson added that this group may need to meet less often and consider expanding membership to get more participation.
- mm. Joey Giordano noted that the participation occurs at GSA meetings.
- nn. Alyson Watson noted that the group should consider moving to a broad membership model, meeting less often and during the end of the business day.

VI. Announcements

- a. Alyson Watson discussed the contents of Bundle 2 and the chapter release date. The anticipated release is June 5.

VII. Other Topics

- a. The next meeting will take place on June 12.
- b. Will Price requested a Workgroup meeting focused on groundwater recharge.
- c. Mary Elizabeth requested a meeting focused on understanding the materials and giving feedback.

VIII. Additional Comments

- a. Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystem (GDE) Comments
 - i. Caution against removing areas only because an alternate non-groundwater supply is available, as it may still depend on groundwater
 - ii. Agricultural or other wells adjacent to potential GDEs may have impacted them so they are not being captured
 - iii. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has a guide on SGMA
 - iv. Other Comments

IX. Public Comment

- a. None

Alyson Watson adjourned the meeting at 5:32