

Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 17, 2022
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

NOTICE: CORONAVIRUS COVID-19

Assembly Bill 361 amends Section 54953 of the Government Code to allow the legislative body of a local agency to meet remotely without complying with the normal teleconference rules for agenda posting, physical location access, or quorum rules. To do so, one of three scenarios must exist, all of which require that the Governor has proclaimed a State of Emergency pursuant to Government Code section 8625:

- A. State or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing;
- B. The agency is holding a meeting for the purpose of determining whether meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees; or
- C. The agency is holding a meeting and has determined that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

Assuming the State of Emergency remains in effect and an agency wishes to continue meeting under the modified rules, it must adopt an initial resolution within 30 days of the first teleconference meeting (which applies retroactively to that first meeting), and then must adopt an extension resolution at least every 30 days thereafter. (Id. at subd. (e)(3).)

California Governor Gavin Newsom declared a state of emergency on March 4, 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The state of emergency declaration remains in place. Pursuant to the requirements of Section 54953 of the Government Code, the Tracy Subbasin Sustainability Agencies have adopted a resolution determining that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees. This resolution allows the GSP Coordination Committee to continue to hold meetings remotely for a period of at least 30-days.

The following options are available to members of the public to listen to these meetings and provide comments to the Committee Members before and during the meeting:

CALL-IN

Member of the public are encouraged to use the call-in number, which will allow them to fully participate in the meeting without having to be present in person. ***Once connected, we request you kindly mute your phone.***

PUBLIC COMMENT

If you wish to make a comment on a specific agenda item, please submit your comment via email by 5:00 p.m. on the Wednesday prior to the meeting. Please submit your comment via email to Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County, at mzidar@sjgov.org. Your comment will be shared with the Tracy Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agencies members and placed into the record at the meeting. Every effort will be made to read comments received during the meeting into the record but some comments may not be read due to time limitations. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting.

DISABILITY-RELATED MODIFICATIONS

If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please call 1 (209) 468-3089 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA

- I. **Opening of Meeting/Roll Call**
- II. **Scheduled Items**
 - A. Approval to Extend Resolution Proclaiming a Local Emergency, Ratifying the COVID-19 State of Emergency, and Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings of the Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act – *Action Item*
 - B. Approval of January 20 GSP Coordination Committee Meeting Minutes – *Action Item*
 - C. Update on Annual Report – *Discussion Item*
 - D. Propose new date for March Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Meeting - March 24, 2022, 1-3 PM – *Discussion Item*
 - E. MOA Update – *Discussion Item*
 - F. DWR Status Report – *Discussion Item*
- III. **Public Comments**
- IV. **Agency Comments**
- V. **Next GSP Coordination Committee Meeting – March 17, 2022 (pending proposed re-schedule for March 24, 2022)**
- VI. **Adjournment**

2021 Annual Report Water Use Summary Tables
February 17, 2022

Purpose:

Provide an accumulation of the water supply and use for review by the GSAs to make sure that the summary data provided thus far has been characterized properly and are in the correct classifications. Obtain any additional information to complete the tables.

Background:

Water supply information was provided by each GSA to GEI. The information provided was used to populate the attached tables.

Evapotranspiration data from IRTC is to be delivered on February 15, so the estimated groundwater pumping for agricultural is not complete at this time.

The Annual Report is for only the Non-Delta Management Area

Attachments:

Four tables (Part A through D) that are to be electronically submitted to DWR as part of the Annual Report submittal.

Four tables (Groundwater metered, Groundwater estimated, Surface water metered and Surface water Estimated), which have been placed behind each of the Part A through D tables to provide supplementary and supportive information to populate Part A through D tables. Yellow highlighted areas are information to be acquired.

Next Steps:

Process IRTC data, by GSA area. For agricultural areas, Evapotranspiration – surface water deliveries = estimated groundwater extractions.

Table 1. PART A: Groundwater Extractions, Water Year 2021

Basin Number	Water Year	Total Groundwater Extractions (AF)	Water Use Sector Urban (AF)	Water Use Sector Industrial (AF)	Water Use Sector Agricultural (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Wetlands (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Recharge (AF)	Water Use Sector Native Recharge (AF)	Water Use Sector Other (AF)	Water Use Sector Other Description
3-004.11	2021	xxx	7,087	0	966	0	377	0		

pull template from DWR

Table 2. PART B: Groundwater Extraction Methods, Water Year 2021

Basin Number	Water Year	Meters Volume (AF)	Meters Description	Meters Type	Meters Accuracy (%)	Meters Accuracy Description	Electrical Records Volume (AF)	Electrical Records Description	Electrical Records Type	Electrical Records Accuracy (%)
3-004.11	2021	7,087	Monthly readings	Direct	100%	metered/(metered + land use)	0			

Electrical Records Accuracy Description	Land Use Volume (AF)	Land Use Description	Land Use Type	Land Use Accuracy (%)	Land Use Accuracy Description	Groundwater Model Volume (AF)	Groundwater Model Description	Groundwater Model Type	Groundwater Model Accuracy (%)	Groundwater Model Accuracy Description
	0	For Ag lands, if Etc - SW diversions or recycled water by each GSA area was >0, value reported	Estimated	0%	Land Use Volume/(metered + land use)	0				

Other Method(s) Volume (AF)	Other Method(s) Description	Other Method(s) Type	Other Method(s) Accuracy (%)	Other Method(s) Accuracy Description
0	Estimated from previous water year	Estimated		Reported values from previous water year

Metered Groundwater Extraction Reported for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	WY Total
Agricultural													
BBID	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	52	131	73	0	66	377
BCID ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	166	191	156	43	589
SJ County	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Stewart Tract	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Subtotal Agricultural Extractions													966
Urban/Municipal/Rural													
Lathrop	233	120	200	191	162	224	308	350	366	360	316	259	3,089
WELL 5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WELL 6	59.24	33.08	44.43	65.67	36.85	52.00	62.83	161.69	149.19	98.18	112.43	74.15	
WELL 7	63.24	27.14	32.07	37.62	53.49	69.92	122.72	160.68	115.59	131.99	126.45	72.84	
WELL 8	50.34	11.83	49.08	65.35	26.76	49.83	64.36	27.27	56.70	54.77	64.94	71.61	
WELL 9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
WELL 10	60.35	47.72	74.90	22.72	45.18	52.40	57.64	0.00	44.56	75.05	11.87	40.64	
Tracy	43.26	102.78	23.94	0.21	145.77	475.32	533.29	468.72	463.98	249.56	178.03	347.27	3,032
LINCOLN	0.00	4.91	2.46	0.00	43.11	109.70	171.14	100.07	12.65	1.69	0.00	0.00	
WELL 1	11.50	19.96	3.08	0.00	16.92	34.01	69.68	41.85	47.18	43.76	31.36	0.30	
WELL 2	14.50	9.25	0.82	0.17	14.00	21.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	134.21	
WELL 3	13.15	23.99	3.69	0.00	15.01	40.81	16.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	52.24	182.54	
WELL 4	4.09	20.40	1.10	0.00	21.80	76.82	82.90	33.98	58.70	0.00	61.19	30.19	
WELL 5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
WELL 6	0.01	5.31	6.33	0.03	16.00	119.93	90.09	148.05	175.88	104.24	14.41	0.02	
WELL 7	0.00	18.96	6.48	0.00	18.93	72.95	102.70	144.77	88.49	99.87	18.83	0.01	
WELL 8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	81.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Corral Hollow Public Water System													0
Morehead Park													0
Maurland Manor Water System													0
CSA 16 Par County Estates													0
CSA 35													0
CSA 44													0
CSA 50 Patterson Irrigation Park													0
San Joaquin River Club													0
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depot													0
Domestic Well Owners	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Subtotal Urban Extractions													6,121

Metered Groundwater Extraction Reported for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	WY Total
Industrial													
Deuel Vocational Institution	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Sharpe Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Subtotal Industrial Extractions													0
Managed Wetlands													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Wetlands Extractions													0
Managed Recharge ²													
Tracy (Well 8)	0	0	139.79	162.30	75.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	377
Subtotal Recharge Extractions													377
Native Vegetation													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Native Vegetation Extractions													0
Other Water Use Sector - Groundwater Remediation													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Occidental													
Sharpe Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)													
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)													
Deuel Vocational Institution													
Subtotal Remediation Extractions													0
Total Metered Groundwater Extractions													7,087

Notes:

--- Information not available

Metered accuracy to be plus or minus 10%

¹ Groundwater pumping exported to the North and Central Delta-Mendota subbasin

² Managed Recharge not included in Total Metered Extractions

Estimated Groundwater Extractions for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									WY Total	
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
Agricultural ¹														
BBID Area														0
BCID Area														0
SJ County Area														0
Subtotal Agricultural Extractions													0	
Urban/Municipal/Rural														
Lathrop	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tracy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corral Hollow Public Water System														0
Morehead Park														0
Maurland Manor Water System														0
CSA 16 Par County Estates														0
CSA 35														0
CSA 44														0
CSA 50 Patterson Irrigation Park														0
San Joaquin River Club														0
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depot														0
Domestic Well Owners	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Subtotal Urban Extractions													0	
Industrial														
Deuel Vocational Institution														0
Sharpe Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)														0
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depots (U.S Army)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Subtotal Industrial Extractions													0	
Managed Wetlands														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Wetlands Extractions													0	
Managed Recharge														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Recharge Extractions													0	
Native Vegetation														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Native Vegetation Extractions													0	

Estimated Groundwater Extractions for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									WY Total
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	
Other Water Use Sector - Groundwater Remediation													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Occidental													0
Sharpe Army Defense Distribution Depot													
Tracy Army Defense Distribution Depot													
Deuel Vocational Institution													
Subtotal Remediation Extractions												0	
Total Estimated Groundwater Extractions												0	

Notes:

¹ Estimated Groundwater Pumping for Agriculture based on Estimated Evapotranspiration minus Actual Surface Water Deliveries less fallowed and native lands

--- Information not available

Estimated accuracy to be plus or minus 30%

Table 3. PART C: Surface Water Supply, Water Year 2021

Basin Number	Water Year	Methods Used To Determine	Water Source Type Central Valley Project (AF)	Water Source Type State Water Project (AF)	Water Source Type Colorado River Project (AF)
3-004.11	2021	metered, estimated	10,030	0	0

Water Source Type Local Supplies (AF)	Water Source Type Local Imported Supplies (AF)	Water Source Type Recycled Water (AF)	Water Source Type Desalination (AF)	Water Source Type Other (AF)	Water Source Type Other Description
60,306	22,840	0	0	0	0

Metered Surface Water Diversions Reported for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	WY Total
Agricultural Use - CVP													
BBID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BCID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Agricultural Diversions Reported													0
Agricultural Use - Local - San Joaquin River													
BBID Area	808	131	27	36	82	1,119	1,600	1,566	1,733	1,982	1,340	1,585	12,009
BBID - Bethany	808	131	27	36	82	1,119	1,600	1,566	1,733	1,982	1,340	1,585	
BCID Area	2,522	1,347	712	9	79	2,054	5,989	7,851	8,591	9,182	5,784	4,177	48,297
Delivered to Agriculture Inside District	2,157	1,288	584	4	71	1,685	4,911	6,459	7,139	7,583	4,738	3,472	
Delivered to Agriculture Kasson	365	59	128	5	8	369	1,078	1,392	1,452	1,599	1,046	705	
SJ County Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Local Agricultural Diversions Reported													60,306
Urban/Municipal - CVP													
Mountain House (CVP)	455	329	255	229	221	341	404	550	611	624	615	531	5,165
Tracy (CVP)	991	143	0	0	0	0	199	440	533	643	923	993	4,865
Subtotal Urban CVP Diversions Reported													10,030
Urban/Municipal - Imported													
Lathrop (SSJID)	264	261	121	1,189	846	801	1,044	1,139	1,217	1,364	1,179	672	10,097
Tracy (SSJID)	786	1,202	1,305	1,189	846	801	1,044	1,139	1,217	1,364	1,179	672	12,743
Subtotal Urban Imported Reported													22,840
Total Diversions Reported													93,176

Notes:

--- Information not available

Metered accuracy to be plus or minus 30%

Estimated Surface Water Diversions for Water Year 2021 (acre-feet)

Water Use Sector/Agency	2020			2021									
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	WY Total
Agricultural Use													
BBID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BCID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJ County Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stewart Tract Area													0
Subtotal Agricultural Diversions													0
Agricultural Use Riparian Water Rights ¹ - Local													
BBID Area													0
BCID Area													0
SJ County Area													0
Stewart Tract Area													0
Subtotal Riparian Agricultural Diversions													0
Urban/Municipal/Rural													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Urban Diversions													0
Managed Wetlands													
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Wetlands													0
Managed Recharge													
BBID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BCID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJ County Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Fallowed Land													0
Native Vegetation													
BBID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BCID Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SJ County Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Native Vegetation													0
Total Estimated Diversions													0

Notes:

¹ Estimated based on land parcels immediately adjacent to rivers or waterways

--- Information not available

Estimated accuracy to be plus or minus 50%

Table 4. PART D: Total Water Use, Water Year 2021

Basin Number	Water Year	Total Water Use (AF)	Methods Used To Determine	Water Source Type Groundwater (AF)	Water Source Type Surface Water (AF)
		0		0	0

Water Source Type Recycled Water (AF)	Water Source Type Reused Water (AF)	Water Source Type Other (AF)	Water Source Type Other Description	Water Use Sector Urban (AF)	Water Use Sector Industrial (AF)
0	0	0		0	0

Water Use Sector Agricultural (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Wetlands (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Recharge (AF)	Water Use Sector Native Vegetation (AF)	Water Use Sector Other (AF)	Water Use Sector Other Description
0	0	0	0	0	

Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Special Meeting

Thursday, January 20, 2022
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

DRAFT MINUTES

I. Opening of Meeting/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:07 PM.

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

- Lea Emmons, City of Tracy GSA
- Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County
- Ryan Alameda, Stewart Tract
- Greg Young, BBID
- Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA

Other attendees:

- Richard Shatz, GEI
- Glenn Prasad, San Joaquin County
- Jackson Cook, California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
- Emily Finnegan, Stantec
- Khandriale Clark, Stantec
- Kirsten Pringle, Stantec
- Nader Shareghi, Mountain House Community Services District

II. Scheduled Items

- A. Approval to Extend Resolution Proclaiming a Local Emergency, Ratifying the COVID-19 State of Emergency, and Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings of the Tracy Subbasin GSP Coordination Committee Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act – *Action Item*

RESULT: APPROVED

MOVER: Lea Emmons

SECONDER: Matt Zidar

AYES: ALL

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

- B. Approval of December 16 GSP Coordination Committee Meeting Minutes – *Action Item*

RESULT: APPROVED

MOVER: Matt Zidar

SECONDER: Ryan Alameda

AYES: ALL

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Greg Young

- C. Outreach Update – *Discussion Item*

Kirsten Pringle, Stantec, provided an overview of the SGMA-related outreach and engagement conducted in the Tracy Subbasin. The Tracy Subbasin GSAs have been contacting adjacent basins as a part of their interbasin coordination efforts. A meeting was held with the San Luis-Delta Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) from the Northern Central GSP region of the Delta Mendota subbasin on January 7, 2022.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss interbasin flows and general data sharing and coordination. Both the Tracy and Delta-Mendota subbasins are planning to use DWR's technical support services to aid with the installation of

monitoring wells at the basin's shared boundary to help address data gaps. No formal agreement between the groups will be constructed, and all meetings going forward will be conducted on an as-needed basis. The next step in these coordination efforts is for Richard Shatz, GEI, to receive subsidence data and coordinate with the SLDMWA on the locations of the proposed monitoring wells.

D. Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Budgeting Process and Schedule – *Discussion Item*

The Tracy Subbasin GSAs have created a new annual budgeting process and schedule. It was previously suggested that the GSAs adopt a five-year budget schedule; however, an annual schedule is now proposed. In this plan, the fiscal year begins in July and new budgets will be adopted each June for the following fiscal year. While this year's budgeting schedule and process has been compressed to accommodate current needs, moving forward the GSAs will have from November to June each year to develop, review, and finalize the following year's budget.

For the current year, it is anticipated that the schedule will proceed as follows: March 1, estimated date for release of annual report for review by the Tracy GSAs; March 24, date for adoption of annual report at a regularly scheduled Coordination Committee meeting; April 1, deadline to submit the annual report to DWR; and June 23, date for adoption of the Fiscal Year 22 budget at a regularly scheduled GSA meeting.

Greg Gibson, City of Lathrop GSA, and Lea Emmons, City of Tracy GSA, noted the processes for budget adoptions at their respective cities. Both mentioned the need for documentation to help explain the GSA's budgeting process and schedule to their city councils at their own budget meetings.

Mr. Gibson asked if the five-year budgets had costs smoothed out or average over the five-year period. Mr. Shatz confirmed that the five-year budget included averaged costs.

Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County, asked if the annual costs are different from the reserve costs. Mr. Shatz responded that the five-years costs are averaged. Mr. Zidar suggested including reserve funding in the budget for unexpected costs.

Mr. Gibson asked if DWR had comments on the GSP that required revisions, whether the budget includes funding to update the GSP. Mr. Shatz responded

that funding to respond to DWR comments was included in the five-year averaged budget. Mr. Gibson requested an estimate of costs to update the GSP according to DWR comments. Mr. Gibson also suggested including a reserve fund in the budget for unforeseen costs.

E. Approval of Scope and Budget for GSP Implementation Technical Support –
Action Item

Mr. Shatz provided an overview of modifications to the scope and budget from the previous version. The scope and budget now includes procurement of data regarding the estimation of groundwater extraction, as needed, for the annual report; Airborne Electromagnetic (AEM) coordination and support; and a breakdown of costs by GSA.

Mr. Zidar asked whether the cost by GSA is based on the cost allocation methodology, and Mr. Shatz confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Gibson asked what DWR was doing with the AEM data and whether the data would be used to update the C2VSIM Model. Mr. Shatz responded that the data could be used in the five-year GSP update. Jackson Cook, DWR, stated that he would follow-up with DWR staff regarding whether AEM data would be used to update the Model.

Mr. Gibson asked whether the ET data is from satellite data, and Mr. Shatz confirmed that was correct.

RESULT: APPROVED

MOVER: Lea Emmons

SECONDER: Greg Young

AYES: ALL

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Greg Young

F. Greater San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Group –
Discussion Item

Glenn Prasad, San Joaquin County, provided an overview of the Greater San Joaquin County Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), their ongoing and completed work, and a potential expansion to cover the Tracy Subbasin. He noted that the IRWM Group used to be run by the Groundwater Banking Authority, which included the City of Lathrop along with a number of other agencies. A new Committee was formed, but the footprint of the old IRWM Group was grandfathered in.

Mr. Gibson asked if members of the Tracy Subbasin would also be paying for Zone 2 funding, if the portion of Zone 2 funding going towards the IRWM would only be paid by individuals in the IRWM area, and if the Zone 2 costs would rise if Tracy Subbasin GSAs decided to join the IRWM region. Mr. Prasad responded that, no, costs would not rise. Costs would be funded by Zone 2 and not limited to parcels only within the IRWM areas; the previous IRWM Plan was funded through Zone 2; and the group always planned to expand its operations, including into the Tracy subbasin region.

Mr. Gibson asked if the Paradise Cut project would be included or funded through in the IRWM Plan. Mr. Prasad responded that Paradise Cut was not included in IRWMP funding and that it was mostly funded with RCD and grant funding.

Mr. Gibson asked about the status of the City of Lathrop's involvement with the IRWM. Mr. Prasad stated that the City of Lathrop is not in the IRWM Group at this time.

Mr. Gibson asked what the next steps would be for the Tracy Subbasin GSAs to join the Greater San Joaquin IRWM Group. Mr. Prasad noted that he would initiate contact with DWR, seek a proposal to identify the best path forward, and proceed in coordination with all parties to keep the integration into the IRWM as seamless as possible. He noted that membership was open, optional, and that not all of the Tracy Subbasin GSAs needed to join if they didn't feel it was a good fit for them.

III. Public Comments

No additional comments were provided.

IV. Agency Comments

Mr. Zidar stated the Memorandum of Understanding would be going to the San Joaquin County board in February.

Mr. Shatz requested that the GSAs forward him the notification that went out to the public saying that each GSA intended to adopt the GSP.

V. Next GSP Coordination Committee Meeting – January 20, 2021

The next GSP Coordination Committee Meeting will be held on February 17, 2023.

VI. Adjournment

Ms. Pringle adjourned the meeting at 2:59 pm.

Inter-Basin Coordination Meeting Between the Delta-Mendota and Tracy Subbasins

Location: Zoom

Date: Friday, January 7, 2022, 9:00 – 10:30 AM

Meeting Goals:

- Discuss goals and desired outcomes for inter-basin coordination.
- Discuss comments provided in letter dated September 9, 2021 from Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Group to the Tracy Subbasin GSAs (see copy of letter attached to this agenda).
- Identify a list of technical documentation or information required to further discuss or resolve comments identified in letter and timeline to share follow-up information.
- Discuss process for data and information sharing, including frequency, contacts, and best practices.

Participants:

Delta-Mendota Subbasin	<p>Aaron Barcellos, Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Group, Northern Management Committee</p> <p>Claire Howard, San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority</p> <p>John Brodie, San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority</p>
Tracy Subbasin	<p>David Weisenberger, Banta-Carbona Irrigation District GSA</p> <p>Greg Young, Tully and Young on behalf of Byron-Bethany Irrigation District GSA</p> <p>Matt Zidar, San Joaquin County GSA</p> <p>Richard Shatz, GEI</p>
Facilitator	<p>Kirsten Pringle, Stantec</p>

Summary:

1. Agenda Overview/Introductions

Ms. Pringle provided an overview of the meeting agenda and goals. Each of the meeting participants introduced themselves.

2. Inter-Basin Coordination Goals and Desired Outcomes

Mr. Zidar and Mr. Weisenberger stated that they would like to continue informal coordination (i.e. coordination without seeking development of a formal coordination agreement) with the GSAs in the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Region. Mr. Brodie stated that the GSAs in the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota Region would like to cooperate with the GSAs in the Tracy Subbasin and agreed to informal coordination. The participants decided to meet on a quarterly basis or as-needed as issues arise. Mr. Weisenberger expressed support for a focus on GSA-to-GSA coordination.

3. Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Group Comment Letter

Mr. Brodie provided an overview of the comment letter from the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Region to the Tracy Subbasin GSAs dated September 9, 2020. He stated that the Northern & Central Delta Mendota GSP Region GSAs would like to cooperate and work with the Tracy Subbasin GSAs to fill data gaps.

The participants discussed inter-basin flows between the Delta-Mendota and Tracy Subbasins and subsidence in the Tracy Subbasin. Mr. Shatz stated the groundwater contours developed for the Tracy Subbasin GSP show groundwater flowing from the Delta-Mendota Subbasin to the Tracy Subbasin, while the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota Region GSP shows the groundwater flowing from the Tracy Subbasin to the Delta-Mendota Subbasin. During preparation of the draft Tracy Subbasin GSP, Mr. Shatz's team noted a steep change in groundwater contours for the lower aquifer along the Tracy and Delta-Mendota Subbasins boundaries. Mr. Shatz has proposed that the Tracy Subbasin GSAs construct four new groundwater monitoring wells in the lower aquifer in the Tracy Subbasin to better understand the flows between the Tracy and Delta-Mendota Subbasins. He noted that the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are applying for funding through the DWR's Technical Support Services Program (TSS Program) to construct the wells. Mr. Shatz also stated that Banta Carbona Irrigation District will be expanding its service area to include an area that is currently dependent on groundwater. The expansion is anticipated to reduce groundwater pumping by 1,000 acre-feet per year. On the topic of subsidence, Mr. Shatz stated that the Tracy Subbasin GSP used DWR InSAR data to evaluate subsidence and this data did not show a great amount of subsidence occurring the Tracy Subbasin.

Ms. Howard asked whether the four new proposed wells in the Tracy Subbasin all in the upper aquifer. Mr. Shatz clarified that the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are applying for TSS Program support to construct six new wells, two of which are in the upper aquifer. Ms. Howard stated that the GSAs in the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Region have also applied for TSS Program support to install new monitoring wells, but construction of the wells has been delayed until later this year (anticipated).

Mr. Barcellos asked if the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are conducting any monitoring for subsidence along the Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC). Mr. Shatz responded that the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are using DWR InSAR data and data from a plate boundary station within the basin to evaluate subsidence and are not planning on conducting any additional subsidence monitoring at this time.

Mr. Shatz asked whether the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Region GSAs are conducting annual benchmark surveys along the DMC. Mr. Brodie responded that the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (Authority) is performing some surveys along the DMC and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) conducts annual surveys.

Mr. Barcellos suggested that the GSAs in the two subbasins coordinate the locations of the proposed new monitoring wells. Mr. Shatz and Mr. Zidar agreed with this approach.

Mr. Weisenberger noted he has been coordinating with Anthea Hansen—General Manager for Del Puerto Water District—in preparation of the annual report. Ms. Howard asked with the expansion of Banta Carbona Irrigation District's service area will affect Del Puerto Water District. Mr. Weisenberger responded that that expansion will only be within the Tracy Subbasin.

4. Inter-Basin Data and Information Sharing

The participants discussed sharing subsidence data from the USBR's and Authority's subsidence surveys. Mr. Brodie stated the USBR's survey data is made publicly available and offered to connect Mr. Shatz with the contact at the USBR to get the data. Mr. Brodie stated that most the Authority's subsidence survey is not publicly available and that the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSP Region GSAs will discuss internally whether and what level to share the

subsidence data. Mr. Shatz stated that the USBR data is sufficient. Mr. Zidar agreed with Mr. Shatz and stated that he would like to know when and if there is a trigger or red flag in the data that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Brodie asked whether the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are coordinating with the local Irrigated Lands Program regarding water quality data. Mr. Zidar responded that the Tracy Subbasin GSAs are still working on it. Mr. Shatz added that there are only two Irrigated Lands Program wells in the Tracy Subbasin and both are in the upper aquifer.

5. Next Steps and Action Items

Mr. Shatz to share proposed locations of new monitoring wells, once developed, with the Northern & Central Delta-Mendota GSAs for coordination.

Mr. Brodie to send Mr. Shatz information regarding USBR subsidence data.