

Tracy Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Coordination Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 20, 2021

1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Teleconference Meeting Only

Teleconference Link: <https://stantec.zoom.us/j/92863298104>

Phone Number: +1 (669) 900-6833

Meeting ID: 928-632-981-04#

MINUTES

I. Opening of Meeting/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM.

Roll call found the following Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) representatives present via teleconference:

- David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA
- Nick Janes, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA
- Lemar Saffi, City of Tracy GSA
- Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA
- Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA

Other attendees:

- Lea Emmons, City of Tracy GSA
- Ashlee Casey, GEI
- Mike Cornelius, GEI
- Richard Shatz, GEI
- Molly Dimick, J.R. Simplot Company
- George Hartmann, Member of the public
- Jose Coronado, San Joaquin County GSA
- Elizabeth Simon, Stantec
- Kirsten Pringle, Stantec

II. Scheduled Items**A. Approval of April 15 Technical Committee Meetings Minutes****RESULT: APPROVED****MOVER:** Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA**SECONDER:** Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA**AYES:** Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA, City of Lathrop GSA, City of Tracy GSA, San Joaquin County GSA**NOES:** None**ABSENT:** Stewart Tract GSA**ABSTAIN:** None**B. Approval to Release Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan Chapters 7 (Management Areas), 8 (Monitoring Networks), and 9 (Sustainability Management Criteria) for Public Review****RESULT: APPROVED****MOVER:** David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA**SECONDER:** Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA**AYES:** Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA, City of Lathrop GSA, City of Tracy GSA, San Joaquin County GSA**NOES:** None**ABSENT:** Stewart Tract GSA**ABSTAIN:** None

Kirsten Pringle, Stantec, stated that the draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) chapters would be made available for public review and comment on the Tracy Subbasin website.

C. Projected Water Budgets

Ashlee Casey, GEI, provided an overview of the C2VSIM groundwater model, reviewed the historic water budgets, and presented the results of the projected water budget analysis. Projected conditions were simulated for scenarios with and without climate change utilizing historical hydrology, precipitation, and evapotranspiration from 1953-2003. The groundwater model projected an average annual surplus of 4,800 acre-feet per year (AFY) without climate change and a surplus of 1,000 AFY with climate change.

Ms. Casey then presented the results of the projected water budget in the Delta and Non-Delta Management Areas. The groundwater model projected an annual average surplus of 1,700 AFY in the Delta Management Area and average annual deficit of -700 AFY the Non-Delta Management Area. In the Non-Delta Management Area, there is a deficit in the upper aquifer and surplus in the lower aquifer. Richard Shatz, GEI, presented hydrographs to illustrate the decline of groundwater levels at specific monitoring wells.

Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA, asked how the conversion of land use from agricultural to urban land impacts the cumulative change in groundwater storage. Mike Cornelius, GEI, responded that change in land use from agricultural to urban typically results in decreased groundwater demand. Mr. Shatz noted that projected change in demand resulting from the Tracy Hills and River Islands developments were included in the projections.

Mr. Gibson asked whether sea level rise had been incorporated into the models. Ms. Casey stated sea level rise was not included in the models, but recycled water had been incorporated.

Mr. Gibson asked for clarification regarding the projected change in groundwater storage near the community of Manteca and whether well data was available within the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin to verify the modeling results. Mr. Cornelius responded that the GSAs in the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin used a different modeling tool to develop their GSP and that the models will need to be reconciled. He added that he believes the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin GSAs assessed and calibrated their model with measured well data in that area. Mr. Zidar stated he believes the change in groundwater storage in the region appears to be correct.

George Hartman, member of the public, stated that the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin GSAs chose to develop their own model to increase the resolution of the results and asked whether the code for the model used by Eastern San

Joaquin Subbasin is open source. Mr. Zidar responded that the code for both models is the same, but the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin model was further calibrated.

Mr. Hartmann asked whether tidal influences are considered in the groundwater model. Mr. Cornelius responded that daily tidal influence was not evaluated because the C2VSIM model uses a monthly timestep.

D. Project and Management Actions

Mr. Shatz provided an overview of the revised list of projects and management actions (PMA). Molly Dimick, J.R. Simplot Company, asked whether there were additional benefits to the identified PMAs other than groundwater management. Mr. Shatz responded that the PMAs would also benefit surface water flow and groundwater dependent ecosystems.

Ms. Pringle shared that San Joaquin County and consultant staff supporting the Greater San Joaquin County Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Group recommended that the GSAs not consider joining the Group until after the GSP is submitted. Mr. Gibson requested that specific funding opportunities be identified to inform the decision of whether to join the IRWM Group. Ms. Pringle and GEI provided background on potential funding opportunities and indicated that joining IRWM would improve scores on funding applications.

Ms. Pringle provided an overview of the regulatory requirements for GSAs to coordinate with local land use agencies to ensure that land use and groundwater management goals align. Mr. Zidar stated that legal challenges may become more prevalent where development is planned. Mr. Gibson stated that the deadline to update the Urban Water Management Plans are too close to the deadline for GSP revisions.

E. Funding for GSP Implementation

Mr. Shatz provided an overview of the draft GSP implementation budget prepared for the Tracy Subbasin. He stated that the costs in the draft budget are currently allocated by the percentage of the non-Delta management area that is

within each GSA's boundaries. Mr. Gibson requested funding implications be written into the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and requested that the planning team provide a date to when the MOA will be revised and adopted.

F. GSP Adoption Requirements

Ms. Pringle presented an overview on GSP notification requirements. She recommended that each GSA adopt a resolution in July authorizing a Notice of Intent to Adopt GSP. Ms. Pringle noted that she would provide the Committee a template resolution, staff report, presentation slides, and talking points. She clarified that there is no legal requirement for a public hearing for the Notice of Intent to Adopt the GSP.

G. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development Schedule

Mr. Shatz provided an update on the GSP schedule. Mr. Gibson requested that an item be added to GSP Development Schedule on the date that the MOA will be revised and adopted by the GSAs' governing bodies.

H. DWR Status Report

There was no report from California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff.

III. **Public Comment**

There were no comments from members of the public on items not on the agenda.

IV. **Agency Comments**

There were no additional comments from the GSA representatives.

V. **Next Technical Committee Meeting – June 17, 2021**

Ms. Pringle stated the next Technical Committee meeting would be on June 17, 2021.

VI. **Adjournment**

Ms. Pringle adjourned the meeting at 3:13 PM.