



## AGENDA

### COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING MADERA SUBBASIN JOINT GSP SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT (SGMA)

Date: Monday, December 2, 2019  
Time: 4:00 - 5:30 pm  
Location: Madera County Government Center  
Board of Supervisors Chambers  
200 West 4th Street  
Madera, CA

#### In attendance:

Julia Van Horn, Facilitator, California State University, Sacramento  
Malka Koppel, Facilitator, California State University, Sacramento  
Andrea Sandoval, Coordination Committee Secretary  
Bryan Thoreson, Davids Engineering  
Pete Leffler, Luhdorff & Scalmanini  
Stephanie Anagnoson, Madera County

#### GSA Representatives:

Phil Janzen, Madera Water District GSA Representative  
Dave Loquaci, Madera Irrigation District GSA Representative  
Derek Robinson, City of Madera GSA Representative  
Brett Frazier, County of Madera GSA Representative entered at 4:08 p.m.

#### GSA Technical Experts:

Greg Young, Madera County Technical Expert  
Keith Helmuth, City of Madera GSA Technical Expert  
Dina Nolan, Madera Irrigation District GSA Technical Expert  
Eric Abrahamsen, Madera Water District GSA Technical Expert  
For others in attendance, see the sign-in sheet.

---

#### MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Review the comments received on the draft Madera Subbasin Joint GSP
- Vote on recommendation for GSA adoption of Joint GSP

## **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Phil Janzen called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The Madera Subbasin Coordination Committee Representatives and Technical Experts introduced themselves. Staff and the GSP consultants introduced themselves. Ms. Van Horn, Facilitator, with the Consensus and Collaboration Program introduced herself. Chairman Janzen reviewed the agenda.

## **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Janzen opened public comments for items not on the agenda. Stephanie Anagnoson stated a list of sandbag locations and sand is available. On behalf of the Madera County GSA, they are accepting applications until December 13 for GSA Advisory Committee members. Applications are available by the door and applicants must live or work in the County GSA.

## **3. COMMENT SUMMARY, NEXT STEPS, AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

*Technical Experts, Madera Joint GSP*

Madera Irrigation District Technical Expert Dina Nolan reviewed the outline for today's meeting:

- GSP Background
- Comments received
- Response to Public Comments
- Subject Acres with multiple comments
- Next Steps

Ms. Nolan noted the presentation and comments are for the joint GSP prepared by the City of Madera GSA, Madera County GSA, Madera Water District GSP, and Madera Irrigation District GSA.

Keith Helmuth, City of Madera Technical Expert, stated the GSP currently in draft form is a new document required by the state that was developed to demonstrate how groundwater sustainability will be achieved in the Subbasin by 2040. Mr. Helmuth stated the implementation period from 2020-2040 projects and programs will begin.

The GSP was developed with support of a \$500,000 grant for stressed basins and a \$1.5 million grant from Department of Water Resources. The GSP was drafted by local technical experts and a consultant team. Feedback from the public, Coordination Committee, and the GSA Board were incorporated throughout the development of the GSP. Throughout the development of the GSP, there were various public meetings and workshops.

Previous workshops were held:

- Technical Workshop, 05/24/2018
- Technical Workshop, 06/25/2018
- Groundwater Workshop, 08/02/2018
- Technical Workshop, 10/18/2018

- Coordination Committee, 03/21/2019
- Technical Workshop, 04/25/2019
- Technical Workshop, 05/29/2019
- Coordination Committee, 08/07/2019
- Coordination Committee, 10/22/2019

Greg Young, Technical Expert for Madera County GSA, explained there are 7 GSAs in the Madera Subbasin. There are 4 GSAs that have developed the joint GSP. They are City of Madera, County of Madera, Madera Water District, and Madera Irrigation District. The other GSAs are Root Creek Water District GSA, Gravelly Ford Water District GSA, and New Stone Water District GSA, which each prepared their own GSP. The total acres in the Madera Subbasin are 348,000 with 216,000 are irrigated. The County of Madera GSA has a significant number of non-irrigated acres.

Mr. Young reviewed the Simplified Groundwater Condition with Projects graph. Mr. Young stated to reach sustainability a combination of things need to occur, bring more water in and demand reduction. The majority of the demand reduction will occur in the Madera County GSA because of limited water resources. To reach sustainability 105,000 acre feet of reduction will be necessary.

Greg Young reviewed an example graph of the potential near-term groundwater impacts. During the implementation period, there will be demand reduction in incremental increases predominantly in the Madera County GSA and the building recharge projects. It is anticipated there will be continued lowering of groundwater levels. The GSAs need time to transition and complete projects and actions. Greg Young explained without planned projects and the GSP, the modeling estimated that groundwater levels would continue to drop absent the projects and management actions contemplated in the GSP. Without the GSP: groundwater levels would drop another 100 to 150 feet by 2090. Groundwater levels may only temporarily drop between 2020 and 2040, but are expected to stabilize by 2040 and into the future.

Mr. Young stated the GSAs are considering a mitigation program for impacted drinking water wells. There are efforts underway to discuss how this will occur. The Subbasin likely will apply for a \$500,000 grant for a better well inventory. Possible mitigation action may include replace/lower existing well, connect to a community water system, staging and availability of temporary solutions. Mr. Young emphasized the intent with the management actions is to have a better condition than exists today or the most recent low period in the groundwater levels so that we don't anticipate impacts to domestic wells. Possible types of support may include low interest loans and grants. Well owners will need to sign up for the program.

Eric Abrahamson, Technical Expert for Madera Water District, stated the informal comment period began with the release of the draft of the first chapter of the GSP in April 2019. The formal 90-day public comment period began on August 7 and ended on November 9, 2019. Mr. Abrahamson stated there was a Listening Session Coordination Committee meeting held on October 22, 2019 to solicit written comments. There will be an additional 60-day public comment period after the GSP is submitted to DWR.

Bryan Thoreson, GSP consultant, reviewed the list of comments received. Comments were received and reviewed by GSP consultant Team, GSA Technical Experts, GSP Plan Manager, GSA Advisory Committee Members, GSA Elected Representatives, and GSP Grant Management. Comments were put into a spreadsheet and organized by subject areas with multiple comments for efficient response. Mr. Thoreson explained the comments outside of subject areas were responded to in the spreadsheet and responses were developed by the consultant team with input and review by all comment reviewers. The following documentation of response to public comments are included in the GSP as Appendix 2.C.e:

- List of comments received
- Multiple comment subject area responses
- Table summarizing all comments and responses
- Complete text of all comment received

There were 7 subject areas with multiple comments received. Each subject area, comment summary, and response was reviewed.

#### 1. Demand Management Reduction Program

**Comment Summary:** Program lacks detail, should initiate stakeholder process. Mr. Thoreson stated the comments ranged from demand management should happen faster to demand management should occur slower.

**Response:** Stakeholder process is underway with details worked on by Madera County GSA with input from various groups including Madera County GSA meetings, Madera County Advisory Committee for County GSAs, Madera Coordination Committee meetings, discussions with Madera County Farm Bureau, and the Madera Ag Water Association.

#### 2. Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs)

**Comment Summary:** Clarify methods used to identify GDEs, analyze potential impacts to potential GDEs, and consider potential GDES in setting the sustainability goals, measurable objectives (MOs), and minimum thresholds (MTs). Mr. Leffler stated there was one comment that stated appreciation for the comprehensive evaluation of potential GDEs in the Subbasin and the appropriate use of tools and guidance recommended by the Nature Conservancy. Mr. Leffler stated there was significant time spent on analyzing the GDEs.

**Response:** Pete Leffler, GSP consultant, stated the response clarified the methods and analysis and how potential GDEs were considering in setting the sustainability goals, MOs, and MTs. There will be revisions and edits on that topic.

#### 3. Surface water – Groundwater Interactions

**Comment summary:** Insufficient characterization of surface water – groundwater interactions, insufficient description of data gaps and how they will be filled, and disagreement with the conclusion that surface water and groundwater are disconnected in the Madera Subbasin.

**Response:** Mr. Leffler stated there was quite a bit of analysis that is documented in the GSP with the available data. The methods and analysis were clarified. There will be ongoing data collection related to this.

4. Outreach – Including Disadvantaged Communities and Severely Disadvantaged Communities (DACs/SDACs)

**Comment Summary:** Provide more information about beneficial users including disadvantaged communities (DACs) and Severely Disadvantaged Communities (SDACs) and describe how they were engaged.

**Response:** Mr. Leffler stated more text and revisions to Section 2.1.5.3 about how engagement efforts encouraged the active involvement of beneficial users.

5. Subsurface Inflows

**Comment summary:** Concern that subsurface inflows are calculated using an uncalibrated numerical model and concerned for historical and ongoing subsurface inflow from Delta Mendota and Kings Subbasin.

**Response:** Mr. Leffler stated calibration of the numerical groundwater model is described in Appendix 6.D. Subsurface lateral inflows from Delta Mendota and Kings Subbasin will be significantly reduced as a result of implementation of the projects and management actions based on their analysis.

6. Groundwater Quality

**Comment Summary:** There were many comments received related to groundwater quality. Include additional constituents in GSP monitoring, clarify source of water quality MTs, clarify differences in representative monitoring sites (RMS) for water levels and water quality, clarify potential for groundwater contamination to impact domestic wells, and clarify risks for proposed activities to groundwater quality.

**Response:** The responsibility of the GSP relative to groundwater quality mainly falls into the following categories and are discussed in the GSP:

- Altering the movement and spread of known contaminant plumes due to GSP projects and management actions;
- Impacts that are specifically related to declining groundwater levels, for example, arsenic possibly TDs.
- Flushing contaminants from the vadose zone in recharge project areas.

Mr. Leffler stated the oversight of the Subbasin groundwater quality is primary the responsibility of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). There are several programs in place to address water quality in the Madera Subbasin.

7. Groundwater levels related to Domestic Wells

**Comment Summary:** The estimate number of domestic wells potentially impacted by declining groundwater level is too low, input from DACs and potential impacts to domestic

wells was not fully considered, and groundwater level MTs/MOs are too low and do not protect domestic wells.

**Response:** Mr. Leffler stated the GSAs have seriously and meaningfully considered various inputs received from disadvantaged communities and other beneficial users in the Subbasin. Mr. Leffler stated it is important to recognize there are differing opinions on GSP sustainable management criteria. The MTs are designed to work together with the domestic well mitigation program and are not an indication of where the subbasin water levels are projected to be. Any alternatives that may immediately reduce the potential decline in groundwater level have significant and sudden economic impacts to all beneficial users. There will be additional studies on the topic. A grant has been applied for by the County of Madera for a domestic well inventory.

#### 8. Subsidence

**Comment summary:** GSP should set Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) for subsidence, GSP is not in compliance with SGMA related to lack of subsidence SMC being established in the GSP, GSP should discuss subsidence along the Eastside Bypass, and western Madera County adjacent to Delta-Mendota Subbasin should be reducing pumping from the lower aquifer.

**Response:** GSP provides for close monitoring of subsidence with triggers for adaptive management in the future. It is still getting attention in the GSP and implementation period.

Greg Young reviewed the procedural next steps.

There will be a recommendation from the GSA Coordination Committee to adopt the Joint GSP. The GSAs will approve at the following meetings:

- MWD, December 11
- MID, December 17
- County, December 17
- City of Madera, December 18

The GSP will formally be submitted to DWR by the January 31, 2020 deadline. DWR will accept the submission and then an additional 60-day public comment period will begin with comments being submitted directly DWR.

Amanda Monaco, Leadership for Justice and Accountability, acknowledged the hard work and effort that has gone in development of the GSP. She commented the Leadership Council still remain concerned about the amount of domestic wells going dry based on the MTs. Ms. Monaco stated by their estimates 100's of wells could go dry. Ms. Monaco stated she hopes those impacts will be avoided. A mitigation program will be great and they will engaged in helping shape the program. Ms. Monano stated we want to see the agencies avoid critical impacts to drinking water resources. Amanda Monaco agreed with the assessment that the groundwater quality regulation is not the purpose of the GSP. Ms. Monaco stated the request

from Leadership Council was to add additional constituents to the monitoring list to really see the impact.

Paul Provenzo, Madera Ranchos, echoed the comments of the previous commenter. He thanked Stephanie Anagnoson for setting up the meeting he had. Mr. Provenzo questioned if considering the recharge areas are concentrated in certain areas is it the belief of the engineers that the recharge water will reach everyone. Stephanie Anagnoson stated areas chosen because access to water supply through agreements or infrastructure. Mr. Leffler added we do not know where the recharge areas will occur because do not know where all the on-farm recharge projects will happen.

Angelica Yslas, Self Help Enterprises, commented she would like to see more consideration to engage constituents during implementation and asked the Board to consider review their comment letter on what public process they would like to see. Ms. Yslas stated they have collaborated with Madera County for performing workshops. Ms. Yslas stated at the last meeting that was held in Parksdale there were concerns for a more transparent process. She requested materials be uploaded in a day or two. She noted there is a resident of Parksdale that was interested in participating today, but cannot because the materials were not available beforehand. She appreciated the update to the outreach component of the GSP.

Elizabeth (Last Name Not Provided), Self-Help Enterprises commented appreciate all GSAs within Madera develop mitigation of domestic wells and appreciate the framework developed in the Madera Subbasin. Self-Help Enterprises and Leadership Council partnered on a technical analysis and it varies greatly from the GSP analysis. They have seen a big impact to domestic wells on small systems.

#### **4. VOTE ON RECOMMENDATION FOR ADOPTION**

A vote was not required because the Charter specifies a consensus.

There was a consensus from the Coordination Committee to recommend adoption of the joint GSP.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.