



MEETING MINUTES – Merced GSP

SUBJECT: Merced GSP Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

DATE/TIME: July 23, 2018 at 9:30 AM

LOCATION: Castle Conference Center, 1900 Airdrome Entry, Atwater, CA

Stakeholder Committee Members In Attendance:

	Representative	Community Aspect Representation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alex McCabe	City of Livingston
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arlan Thomas	MIDAC, growers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ben Migliazzo	Live Oak Farms, growers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Spriggs	City of Merced, Merced Irrigation District
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bob Salles	Leap Carpenter Kemps Insurance, insurance industry and natural resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brad Robson	Buchanan Hollow Nut Co. Le Grand-Athlone Water District, growers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Breanne Ramos	Merced County Farm Bureau
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Carter	D&S Farms, growers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carol Bonin	Winton M.A.C.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Machado	Machado Backhoe Inc., construction industry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Darren Olguin	McSwain MAC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frenchy Meissonnier	Rice Farmer, rice growers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Galen Miyamoto	Miyamoto Farms
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gino Pedretti III	Sandy Mush Mutual Water Company
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greg Olzack	City of Atwater resident
<input type="checkbox"/>	James (Jim) Marshall	City of Merced
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joe Scoto	Scoto Bros Farms / McSwain Union School District
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ladi Asgill	East Merced Resource Conservation District / Sustainable Conservation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Maria Herrera	Self-Help Enterprises
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Maxwell	University of California, Merced
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Maxwell Norton	Retired agricultural researcher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Parry Klassen	East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition, growers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rick Drayer	Drayer Ranch, Merced cattlemen
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Simon Vander Woude	Sandy Mush Mutual Water Company, dairies

Meeting Minutes



1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review
 - a. Introduction and overview of agenda items given by Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran)
 - b. There were no comments for the past meeting minutes. Comments and questions from past meeting minutes and further input can be sent via email to Woodard & Curran
 - c. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) provided an explanation on GSP Development addressing what we are trying to do, what we are trying to avoid, and how to establish our management objectives
2. Merced Subbasin Water Resources Model and Water Budget
 - o Baseline overview
 - Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) presented the most recent work on the groundwater modeling tool and talked about the model's progress. Input on clarifications and questions were given by Jim Blanke (Woodard & Curran) and Dominick Amador (Woodard & Curran)
 - The following points and questions were addressed:
 - How we intend to use the model: the model will help us talk about stream/aquifer interaction, water quality, subsidence, GW levels, etc. and how to quantify this
 - A clarification was given regarding that we are discussing the Merced Subbasin, which is part of the larger San Joaquin Basin
 - Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) explained the grid criteria for the model and that there are models the state has developed. However, we are developing a smaller scale model which is needed for the projects we would like to talk about implementing
 - Question: how many wells are we using? Answer: there are over 200 wells operated by various agencies.
 - Question: if we are light on the data in the Eastern part of the subbasin, could there be inaccuracies in the model? Answer: where we have more data, we are more confident that the data is simulating more accurately. Where we don't have data, we do the best we can
 - Question: what kind of wells were utilized for this? Answer: there are 200 calibration wells, and over 200,000 were taken into consideration including urban and agricultural wells
3. Undesirable Results
 - a. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) provided a review of SGMA requirements and guidelines, including that we have to use 50 years of hydrology and must consider three important baselines
 - b. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) clarified we used 2013 as a pre-drought starting point with good land use data
 - c. Merced Subbasin conditions were explained by Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) with input by Jim Blanke (Woodard & Curran) and Dominick Amador (Woodard & Curran). Contents included an explanation of historic use and groundwater budget in the Merced Subbasin
 - d. Several questions were asked and clarifications given as follows:
 - i. Question: does the model show change in GW levels? Answer: where the change occurs varies from area to area and is very site specific. The model has capacity to show this change including the rate of decline across the basin
 - ii. Comment from Stakeholder Committee member: nothing is going to look as bad as 2014 and 2015. Response: we are going to look at both historical and current conditions and are also looking at urban water use, land use, and river flows. From 2015-2060, we are simulating up to 2060 using the historical data



- iii. Question: how do the three (2015-2018) years of actual data compare with what we are using? Answer: we are using the historical data in covering these years
- iv. Comment: we should recharge in wet years, use our surface water, and rest the deep wells
- v. Question: are updates made every 5 years? Answer: Per SGMA updates are every 5 years
- vi. Question: are we going to account for population change? Answer: yes, this will be part of the projected budget
- vii. Question: how are we checking the data? Answer: data is checked with each of the GSAs
- viii. Question: is there a 600 AFY overdraft? (referring to slide) Answer: this is still a best estimate with the assumption that everything stays the same except hydrology. Eventually we will get to the projects we might want to implement and how these impact overdraft
- ix. Comment: cities will (and have) projected higher population growth than actual growth, and this will make a huge difference on our water budget. Response: we are working with the GSAs to establish what they think will happen with land use change, population growth, etc.
- x. Question: do we have a map with the projected changes throughout the basin? Answer: yes, we do have this can present next time
- xi. Question: do we have a map with the 200 wells? Answer: this can be provided next meeting
- xii. Question what well information do you need? Answer: Any well that has data, we can use
- xiii. Question are you looking for more wells? Answer: Yes, especially in gap areas
- xiv. Question: can you use data that the growers are keeping track of? Answer: we would take that information into consideration, although it might not go into the model
- xv. Question: can we list what kind of well data we need on the website? Answer: yes
- xvi. Comment: is a well with no historical data useful? Answer: we currently need historical data, but other data will be helpful going forward
- xvii. Question: the Mariposa Basin is not included in the model? Answer: no, the other 3 directions have more complexity. However, at other boundaries we want to look at boundary interactions with the other basins
- xviii. Question: when would we have a number for overdraft to plan with? Answer: there are many assumptions built into this number. However, using the projected baseline will be our best measure for future planning
- xix. Question: does the Coordinating Committee make the decisions on this? Answer: the Coordinating Committee makes recommendations to the GSAs, who make decisions.
- xx. Question: are we going to include the SED (Substitute Environmental Document) into the baseline? Answer: that will be a policy decision, and our recommendation is to not build it into the baseline until it is adopted
- e. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) explains for storage the challenge is in getting to the groundwater. The subbasin does not have a substantial issue in terms of total volume (storage)
- f. Alyson Watson (Woodard & Curran) described what are significant and unreasonable undesirable results (types of negative impacts we want to avoid), minimum thresholds (what we are going to measure), and measurable objectives
- g. Discussion was held focusing on undesirable results for the different sustainability indicators, addressing what members and attendees have seen, what is critical and most important based on their experience in the basin. Results of that discussion were put on a whiteboard as follows:
 - i. Subsidence
 - 1. Loss of storage
 - 2. Infrastructure impacts
 - 3. Irreversible system impacts
 - 4. Flood flow impacts
 - 5. Planned projects impacts
 - ii. Interconnected Surface Water
 - 1. SED impacts
 - 2. Environmental quality + habitat



- iii. Degraded water quality
 - 1. Human consumption
 - 2. Reduced crop yields
 - 3. Soil impacts
 - 4. Public health + sanitation
- iv. Groundwater Elevation
 - 1. Cost of pumping water
 - 2. Harder to recharge (with decline in levels)
 - 3. Energy requirements increasing
 - 4. Shallow wells going dry
 - 5. Well replacement costs
 - 6. Decline in yields
- h. Economic impacts from groundwater issues impact everyone and span across all issues because everyone in the Subbasin is connected financially. This includes property value impacts and public health impacts
- 4. Stakeholder Outreach and Engagement Strategy
 - a. The First Public Meeting will be August 2, 6:00pm to 8:30pm. Woodard & Curran will send out a notice. There will be Spanish translation provided. Committee members and attendees are encouraged to help get the word out about this event
- 5. Interbasin Coordination Update
 - a. Hicham EITal (MIUGSA) gave an update. We have met with Turlock and have an interbasin agreement with Chowchilla which is going to the GSAs for approval and signing. This is for agreeing to work together on the subsidence area and to share information and to agree on how we manage this area. There is a meeting with the technical staff in August to coordinate that information sharing. We are also setting up coordination the Delta-Mendota
 - b. Question asked whether this means that one basin will adversely affecting another. Answer: There are different ways to develop goals and thresholds. We are going to coordinate now to avoid a position where one basin negatively affects another in the future
- 6. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda
 - a. Question was asked about what is the “SED”. Answer: the “Substitute Environmental Document”. This looks at in stream flow requirements for the Delta but has not been adopted yet
- 7. Next Steps and Next Meeting (will be Aug. 27th)
 - a. Historical Water Budget
 - b. Undesirable Results Continued (working toward sustainable thresholds)

**Next Regular Meeting
August 27, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.**

Castle Conference Center, 1900 Airdrome Entry, Atwater, CA
Information also available online at mercedsgma.org

Note: If you need disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Merced County, Community and Economic Development staff at 209-385-7654 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.