



MEETING NOTES – Merced GSP

SUBJECT: Merced GSP Coordination Committee Meeting

DATE/TIME: April 26, 2021 at 1:15 – 3:15 PM

LOCATION: Online – Zoom Meeting

Coordination Committee Members In Attendance:

	Representative	GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hicham ElTal	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stephanie Dietz	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Justin Vinson	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Daniel Chavez	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Elwin (alternate)	Merced Irrigation-Urban GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eric Swenson	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mike Gallo	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nic Marchini	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	George Park (alternate)	Merced Subbasin GSA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Harris	Turner Island Water District GSA #1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scott Skinner (alternate)	Turner Island Water District GSA #1

Meeting Notes

1. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

- a. Samantha Salvia (Woodard & Curran) called the meeting to order.

2. ROLL CALL

- a. Coordination Committee members in attendance are shown in table above. The Committee had a quorum.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Meeting notes from previous meeting (February 22, 2021) were approved with one correction to note a missing committee member in the attendance table (Mike Gallo motions, Ken Elwin seconded, none opposed or abstained).

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

- a. Dennis Evans: Dennis shared that he emailed a report to contact@mercedsgma.org from the EPA about green infrastructure to help decision-makers assess the potential value of investment in green infrastructure and encourages committee members to read it. Dennis provided additional follow-up information via chat:
 - i. Please check out two links concerning Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) epa.gov/smartgrowth and Enhancing sustainable communities with green infrastructure

epa.gov/green-infrastructure. The report was prepared by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Sustainable Communities. The report Links and valuation tools will help guide community leaders' decision makers to potential cost saving in Merced.

The examples of how cost savings can be compared in Merced County please See (page 9-Exhibit 6), Supportive Strategies (page 20)



5. REPORTS

- a. Current basin conditions
 - i. Chris Hewes (Woodard & Curran) presented hydrographs for each principal aquifer to highlight new Spring 2021 groundwater measurements.
 - ii. Hicham EITal (MIUGSA) suggests considering in future GSP updates to move to quarterly monitoring instead of monthly monitoring.
- b. Coordination with neighboring basins
 - i. Hicham EITal (MIUGSA) provided updates:
 1. Turlock Subbasin – Coordination is occurring through Merced Irrigation District (MID) and Merced County's involvement as member agencies in the East Turlock GSA during the Turlock Subbasin GSP Development process. Current discussions are focused on interconnected surfaces water and chronic lowering of groundwater levels. This is particularly relevant to flows into and out of the Merced Subbasin. A draft GSP is not expected for public review until a July timeframe.
 2. Chowchilla Subbasin – a meeting was sponsored by DWR for Chowchilla, Merced, Madera, and Delta-Mendota Subbasins to discuss subsidence. An additional meeting is expected (date TBD) to talk about the history of subsidence.
- c. GSA Reports - Updates were provided from each GSA on activities they are undertaking in their own jurisdiction:
 - i. Nic Marchini and Eric Swenson (MSGSA) provided updates:
 1. At the April 8 meeting, the MSGSA Board moved forward with sustainability zones for groundwater management. For now, they are not permanent and may be further refined. It will help MSGSA analyze subareas.
 2. The MSGSA Board also formed a demand reduction committee to explore options for implementing this management action in the GSA.
 3. The MSGSA Board has moved from quarterly to monthly meetings.
 - ii. Hicham EITal (MIUGSA) provided updates:
 1. MIUGSA is still looking to put forward several policies (similar to what was shared in February CC meeting).
 2. DWR has officially awarded the Merced Subbasin \$4,999,800 for two projects under the Proposition 68 implementation grant program (DWR finalized a draft awards list released a couple months ago). MID will move forward with executing a contract with DWR.
 - iii. Larry Harris (TIWD GSA-#1) provided updates:
 1. TIWD GSA-#1 is still focused on a telemetry project for metering and storage projects (permitting, financing, etc.).

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS



- a. Meadowbrook Water System Intertie Feasibility Study
 - i. Mark Reitz (AECOM) provided an overview of the Meadowbrook Water System Intertie Feasibility Study. The feasibility study evaluated possible connections to the City of Atwater and to the City of Merced systems. Details are presented in the separate slide deck.
 - ii. Q: City of Merced has a nominal pressure of 44 psi, plus some various pressure drops, so does the cost estimate include a booster pump? A: Not yet, would need to check some of the observed pressures in the potential connection areas.
- b. Stakeholder Advisory Committee update
 - i. Samantha Salvia (Woodard & Curran) presented a summary of the first meeting of Stakeholder Advisory Committee for GSP Implementation, held on 4/12. Engagement was good (25/30 members in attendance). The meeting provided an overview of GSP commitments and the annual reports, and sought input on priorities for the Data Gaps Plan.
 1. Link to meeting minutes from 4/12:
<https://www.mercedsgma.org/assets/pdf/meeting-materials/2021-04-12-SC-Meeting-Minutes-final.pdf>
- c. Data Gaps Plan (Prop 68 Planning Grant funded work)
 - i. Jim Blanke (W&C) shared the approach and draft results/recommendations from the data gaps plan effort.
 - ii. Comment (Hicham ElTal): it would be nice to have wells near the Merced River stream gauging stations to correlate surface water and groundwater measurements. It would also be nice to have similar wells on the Turlock side of the basin.
 - iii. Comment (Hicham ElTal): East of City of Merced along Bear Creek, MID installed gauging stations and put in two sets of wells (50 and 100 feet deep). It is possible we could add one of these wells to the network, though the gauging stations are not maintained.
 - iv. Q: Numerous folks have offered up monitoring sites sourced from existing production wells. Are these included in the draft results? A: Yes, some have been included where depth information or recent monitoring data were available.
 - v. Comment (Eric Swenson): Hard to review maps without roads or latitude/longitude coordinates.
 1. Woodard & Curran will generate some PDFs with a different basemap where you can zoom in on locations with more detail.
 - vi. Comment (Eric Swenson): The intersection of Baxter and Buchanan Hollow roads is a suggested location for a new well that is a County dirt road.
 - vii. Comment (Eric Swenson): Another tool for subsidence is looking at casing failures for production wells (vertical and lateral shear fractures). Depth at which this is occurring may shed light on compaction depth. If you can identify locations, the next question would be outreach to the landowners.
 - viii. Comment (Hicham ElTal): Have looked at extensometers in the past and confirmed they are very expensive.
 - ix. Comment (Eric Swenson): Thinks there are some consistent cropping areas in the Subbasin that might be good candidates for a new CIMIS station.



- x. Comment (Hicham ElTal): Hoping the data gaps plan can look at topography and wind patterns to suggest a representative location for a new CIMIS station. Not sure if we need to talk to DWR or other weather forecasters. Wind is an important factor to consider.
 - 1. Next steps for additional siting evaluation will be outlined in the data gaps plan.
- xi. Q: Why can't the CIMIS station be installed in an alfalfa field? Does it need to be grass? A: Hicham's understanding is that it could be, but would require some kind of adjustment factor.
- xii. Q: Will the plan look at how many wells needed to look at interconnected surface waters? A: The preferential monitoring layer takes into account distance to stream boundaries and included some suggested well sites along both Merced and San Joaquin Rivers.
- xiii. Woodard & Curran will consider putting out some draft maps for Committee members to provide input before the draft plan is published.
- xiv. Q (Dennis Evans): Is Aquifer recharge monitored? A: It depends on the context of the question – some artificial recharge is measured directly while other measurements (e.g. rainfall, etc.) are used to help model and estimate recharge.

7. Next steps and adjourn

- a. Confirm next meeting date – July 26
- b. Meeting adjourned at 3:13 PM

Next Regular Meeting July 26 at 1:15-3:15 PM

Meeting to be conducted virtually (subject to change)
Information also available online at mercedsgma.org