

Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 19, 2021
1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Teleconference Meeting Only

Teleconference Link: <https://stantec.zoom.us/j/93541056999>

Phone Number: 1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 935 4105 6999

MINUTES

I. Opening of Meeting/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 PM.

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

- David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA
- Greg Young, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA
- Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA
- Lea Emmons, City of Tracy GSA
- Lemar Saffi, City of Tracy GSA
- Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA
- Ryan Alameda, Stewart Tract GSA
- Susan Dell'Osso, Stewart Tract GSA

Other attendees:

- Jackson Cook, California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
- Richard Shatz, GEI
- Carlos Rincon, Member of public
- Kirsten Pringle, Stantec
- Elizabeth Simon, Stantec

II. Scheduled Items

- A. Approval of July 15 GSP Coordination Committee Meeting Minutes

Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA, requested that the notes reflect that the next Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Coordination Committee meeting was to be held on August 19, rather than August 20.

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: None

ABSTAIN: Susan Dell'Osso, Stewart Tract GSA

B. Public Outreach Update

Kirsten Pringle, Stantec, provided a summary of the format, discussion, and participant questions from the August 10 public workshop. Ms. Pringle stated that David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA, had requested an informational flyer be created explaining the public comment process for the draft GSP. The flyer will be provided to all GSAs. She noted that the Notice of Intent to Adopt the GSP had been distributed to cities and counties in the plan area on behalf of all GSAs. The draft GSP can be adopted no sooner than 90-days from receipt of the notice. Ms. Pringle also stated template materials will be developed to support GSA staff with GSP adoption.

C. Summary of GSA Comments to Draft GSP

Richard Shatz, GEI, provided a summary of revisions made to the draft GSP to address comments from the GSA representatives and the GSP status. He noted that language in the Executive Summary and Chapter 2 "Agency Information" had been revised to allow for flexibility in the GSAs' cost allocation methodology for GSP implementation costs. He also noted that Chapter 10 "Projects and Management Actions" had been revised to address comments from Mr. Gibson regarding how the project benefits were quantified. A separate subsection was added to Chapter 10 for supplemental projects to address this concern. Mr.

Shatz stated that a complete draft of the GSP was made publicly available on August 9th for a 30-day public comment period.

D. Amendment to the Memorandum of Agreement and Cost Allocation for GSP Implementation

Ms. Pringle summarized the outcomes of discussions on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and cost allocation method from previous GSP Coordination Committee meetings. She stated that the GSAs previously agreed that individual GSAs will be responsible for costs associated with projects and management actions and any costs for groundwater monitoring that they are already conducting. The remaining costs will be shared by the six GSAs. Ms. Pringle added that the GSP Coordination Committee had previously discussed splitting costs based on the percentage of land each GSA has within the Non-Delta Management Area; however, some of the GSAs have raised concerns about this approach.

The Committee discussed the draft annual budget for GSP implementation. Susan Dell'Oso, Stewart Tract GSA, requested that the latest copy of the budget be circulated to the Committee members. Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA, noted that the percentage of the shared costs funded by Groundwater Investigation Zone No. 2 funds was incorrect. Greg Young, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA, stated that estimated amount to update the groundwater model appeared high and encouraged the GSAs to consider a cost minimization strategy. Mr. Zidar stated his support for reviewing the annual budget to minimize costs.

The Committee then discussed potential methods to split the shared GSP implementation costs. Mr. Young stated that he did not agree with a cost allocation method based only on acreage because agencies like Byron-Bethany Irrigation District that don't use groundwater would pay a significant amount. He requested that the planning team evaluate a 'hybrid' approach that splits costs by acreage, population, and/or groundwater extraction within the Non-Delta Management Area. Mr. Shatz responded that the costs currently attributed to Byron-Bethany Irrigation District are not limited to domestic well pumping; they include high capacity well and irrigation pumping. Mr. Young indicated that he would check this information. Mr. Young also requested a clause be written into

the MOA amendment to allow for flexibility in changing the cost splitting method at a future date, if desired.

Mr. Gibson stated that the City of Lathrop is not in favor of splitting costs by groundwater pumping due to the challenges with quantifying it. He noted concerns about the uncertainty and potential inaccuracies with estimating groundwater extraction. Mr. Zidar agreed that lack of pumping information is a data gap. He noted that there are other methods of quantifying groundwater pumping. Mr. Gibson stated his support for a hybrid approach of splitting costs by acreage and population.

David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA, stated his support for a hybrid approach to splitting costs.

Lea Emmons, City of Tracy GSA, stated support for a hybrid split based on acreage, population, and groundwater pumping.

Ms. Dell'Oso stated they she could not make a decision on the cost allocation model without understanding the total anticipated costs. She noted that Stewart Tract GSA anticipates future population growth.

As a next step, Mr. Shatz will revise the annual budget and circulate it for review; and provide estimates of acreage, population, and groundwater pumping in the Non-Delta Management Area for each GSA. The GSAs agreed to continue the discussion at the next Coordination Committee meeting using the new information.

E. GSP Adoption Schedule

Mr. Shatz provided an overview of the GSP adoption schedule, specifically noting the planned GSP adoption date in late November. He indicated he would change the MOA amendment schedule for October, rather than August.

F. DWR Status Report

Jackson Cook, DWR, indicated that DWR's drought response team is granting up to \$500 million for drought related needs. He noted that DWR's Financial Assistance Branch has distributed an electronic survey to collect input on drought response needs and that the survey results will inform guidelines for future drought response grants.

III. Public Comments

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

IV. Agency Comments

There were no additional comments from the GSA representatives.

V. Next GSP Coordination Committee Meeting – September 16, 2021

The next GSP Coordination Committee meeting will be held on September 16, 2021.

VI. Adjournment

Ms. Pringle adjourned the meeting at 2:31 PM.