<u>Meeting date/time</u>: April 25th, 2018 I 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. <u>Location</u>: Dorris City Hall, 307 S. Main St., Dorris <u>Key contacts</u>:

-Matt Parker, County Natural Resources Specialist I <u>mparker@co.siskiyou.ca.us</u> I 530.842.8019 -Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University Senior Facilitator I <u>r.wilson@csus.edu</u> I 415.515.2317 -Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead I <u>lfoglia@ucdavis.edu</u> I 530.219.5692

MEETING RECAP

- Action Item Update and Approval of Past Meeting Summary. CCP facilitator Rich Wilson provided status update from the January Advisory Committee (committee) meeting action items. The committee approved its January meeting summary, for which there were no outstanding comments or questions.
- **Public Comment.** At the outset the Executive Director of the Shasta Valley RCD offered technical support, and a mechanism for applying for grants, to residents of Butte Valley during the GSP development process. A representative from Belkorp PrecisionAg described technology that can help farmers with data management, machine management and water management. A member of the local community inquired about ways to collaborate on project grants in the Butte Valley groundwater basins. During the meeting various members of the public commented on the GSP development process and the Technical Team's role in SGMA implementation.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker provided updates on a range of issues, including outputs from a recent "Introduction to SGMA" public workshop; DWR's basin prioritization process; various grant proposals and funding opportunities; and draft well agreement and data access forms that are being presented to the GSA Board in May.
- Technical Team Updates and Next Steps. The SGMA Technical Team provided background information on SGMA, an overview of DWR's requirements for developing Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs), and a timeline of the Technical Team's upcoming work. Committee members asked questions and offered a number of suggestions for how the Technical Team can improve its outreach efforts as it establishes the voluntary well monitoring network across Butte Valley.
- Charter Discussion and Provisional Adoption. The facilitator introduced the latest iteration of the draft charter and reminded the group that, following the January meeting, county counsel and staff closely reviewed the committee's provisionally adopted charter. District staffer Matt Parker explained edits to the charter's goals, member terms, and updated membership composition. In response to a few questions, he reminded the group that they are advisory in nature, and that at this stage the District is not requiring committee members to sign Form 700 (conflict of interest). Following a brief discussion, the committee again provisionally adopted its charter by the GSA Board at its May 21st meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Next meeting: Thursday, May 30th, 3:00 – 5:30 p.m., Dorris City Hall, 307 S. Main St., Dorris

View <u>Siskiyou County's groundwater website</u> for posted meeting materials

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda Review, Action Item Update and Approval of Past Meeting Summary

CCP Facilitator Rich Wilson opened the meeting, welcomed all committee members and the public, and briefly reviewed the agenda. He introduced ground rules and reminded the group to honor the queue during open group discussion in order to guide civil, inclusive and productive dialogue. No member offered any questions or comments on the agenda. The facilitator provided a status update on all action items from the January meeting. The facilitator then inquired and secured committee approval of the past meeting summary.

Public Comment Period

Time periods for receiving public comment are regularly built into advisory committee meeting agendas. At the outset, members may address the committee on matters not on the consent agenda. Ed Stanton, Executive Director of the Shasta Valley RCD, offered technical support to residents of Butte Valley to apply for grants that would support development of specific projects in the valley. Dr. Thomas Harter introduced his colleague Giuliano Galdi, who is the new UC Davis Cooperative Extension Farm Advisor in Siskiyou County, and will be another available resource. Tim Stokes, of Belkorp PrecisionAg shared a resource called "Operation Center," which can help farmers with data management, machine management and water management. Finally, one member of the local community inquired about ways to collaborate on project grants in the Butte Valley groundwater basins. Throughout the course of the meeting various members of the public commented on the GSP development process and the Technical Team's role in SGMA implementation.

District Staff and Other Updates

Matt Parker provided updates on a range of issues, including:

- Advisory Committee Membership. The committee's tribal seat has been filled. Sami Jo Difuntorum of the Shasta Nation now holds this seat. GSA staff has yet to successfully recruit an individual or organization to fill the environmental seat.
- SGMA Public Workshop. A workshop, focused on introducing the public to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), was held in Yreka in early March, and was well attended. One member of the public commented that he felt Butte Valley is behind the Scott and Shasta basins, and may have missed funding requests.
- **DWR Technical Support Services.** Siskiyou County put in application to drill a monitoring well on county land in Butte Valley, and is waiting to hear if DWR will approve. This well will monitor groundwater elevation and will also have a data logger, so continuous data will be available online. One committee member suggested the well could be put in near the airport. Another suggested it should be put in near irrigated lands.
- **Bureau of Reclamation Grant Opportunity.** Matt and Laura prepared and submitted a grant application to the Bureau of Reclamation to WaterSMART Program, asking for equipment for continuous well monitoring and for soil moisture sensors. The idea is to approach land owners to gauge interest in voluntary monitoring. Placing a soil moisture sensor on their land to assess efficiency of water use may serve as a positive incentive

for landowner participation. If successful, the grant will provide 27-30 sets of equipment that can be used across the three basins (Scott, Shasta, and Butte).

- Well Agreement Forms. The county is drafting two agreement forms to provide a level of protection for collected data, including 1) a well access agreement form and 2) a data release form. The documents will enable a level of privacy and confidentiality of data collected as part of the SGMA voluntary well monitoring program. Any committee members who know of individuals who may be interested to participate in the program should inform Matt. The Technical Team prepared an outreach survey that interested parties should complete. (https://www.getfeedback.com/r/JFf2RLBm/)
- Additional Grant Funds. Matt Parker provided background information on Proposition 68 and available funding opportunities for medium and high priority SGMA groundwater basins around the state. The draft Project Solicitation Package (PSP) is expected to come out in May. This presents an opportunity to secure additional funds for GSP development across the county. Matt and Laura are already discussing necessary needs for the proposal.

SGMA Technical Team Updates

Dr. Thomas Harter provided a presentation describing key requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). He emphasized how SGMA is structured to enable locally-based management. He also described the six undesirable groundwater conditions that medium and high priority groundwater basins around the state must avoid. A Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP), he noted, is the key management tool that will help basins maintain or achieve sustainability. The six undesirable results include the following:

- Chronic lowering of groundwater levels indicating a significant and unreasonable depletion of supply if continued over the planning and implementation horizon. Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods
- Significant and unreasonable reduction of groundwater storage
- Significant and unreasonable seawater intrusion
- Significant and unreasonable degraded water quality, including the migration of contaminant plumes that impair water supplies
- Significant and unreasonable land subsidence that substantially interferes with surface land uses
- Depletions of interconnected surface water that have significant and unreasonable adverse impacts on beneficial uses of the surface water

Bill Rice, a member of the UC Davis SGMA Technical Team, gave a presentation to orient the committee to the work that the team will be conducting as the Butte Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development process unfolds. He described DWR's GSP content requirements, discussed early chapters that the team will soon begin developing (e.g. Plan Area

and Basin Setting), and noted how climate change scenarios will need to be explored. He then reviewed some currently available data sources and gaps in the Butte Valley region.

A number of questions and comments interspersed the presentation. Responses were generally provided by members of the Technical Team. At times, District staffer Matt Parker provided responses and clarifying remarks.

- <u>Question</u>: What's being used as the basis for valley's groundwater levels. <u>Response</u>: Groundwater levels are not perfectly flat across the valley. Depends on where wells are located. The flat valley floor can help provide a benchmark. We can also consider well depth below the surface.
- <u>Question/comment</u>: Are you viewing Butte Valley as a single basin or are there three sub-basins or layers within the aquifer? The team explained that the aquifer has been described in different literature as one unified aquifer or seven. It's different based on which document you read. We have to determine what's right. You may wish to talk to the Natural Resource Conservation Service and look at their work. <u>Response</u>: The survey is important for offering data but also sharing local knowledge.
- <u>Question</u>: Anything in your calculation as to how much water is in a well? Some wells pull down more than others. Any of these kinds of calculations used? <u>Response</u>: These calculations will be used in the long-run, and will be useful for the Hydrogeological Conceptual Model. There might be differences in well screening; could be different geological features not yet good answers but this is an important issue to resolve.
- <u>Question</u>: What's the next step from here? <u>Response</u>: The Technical Team are currently reviewing the geology of the area, looking at public records, and also asking for additional monitoring locations.
- <u>Question</u>: Are you using USGS data? Response: The California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program (CASGEM) set has water elevation from quite a few agencies. DWR is repository. <u>Additional member comment</u>: Maybe people don't know how much water they are using but the well driller reports could provide useful information. <u>Response</u>: Driller reports don't always accurately identify water elevation. <u>Additional comment</u>: If this information was included it might tell you how water levels have changed. You might also consider soil types in the area.
- <u>Question</u>: What areas do you need to look at? <u>Response</u>: Ideally data will need to be distributed in the entire basin. For water elevation data we expect that you all know better than us which areas the Technical Team should consider. We would also like well data in areas where we don't have data. Water elevation data, soil evapotranspiration data, any data is good data.
- <u>Comment</u>: It's still not clear what you are asking for from the public. The school board and local chamber of commerce are the two best access points for outreach. But the Technical Team still needs to better explain what we are trying to do, what well owners are agreeing to, and what information is being sought. <u>Response</u>: Our original goal was to get your contacts and to have you help us identify who might be easy to engage.

- <u>Comment</u>: You have to define what you want. I'm trying to get right of entry so we can do monitoring on Fish and Game sites. <u>Response</u>: We're not asking for pumping data. Do you have elevation data you want to share, soil moisture data, or if you have knowledge of geology.
- <u>Comment</u>: We asked these same questions at the last committee meeting. There is a big social event this week and you're missing a good outreach opportunity. And strawberry farmers are going to be too busy in a month.
- <u>Question/Comment</u>: What percentage of landowners in this valley have provided information to you at this point in time? We need to quantify benefits and what they will receive for participating. We need to explain why this is important to them personally, and how it will be a disadvantage if they don't participate.
- <u>Comment/Question</u>: We need to know where, geographically, you don't have data. Can you put this on a map and show areas where we need data? <u>Response</u>: We need data from agricultural areas and fish and game areas.
- <u>Comment</u>: If you just looked at crops being raised, and amount being watered, this will give you a real, definable number. <u>Response</u>: Yes, this kind of work is an upcoming step for the Technical Team. <u>Additional comment</u>: Maybe bring a map of crop use next time and committee members can help validate information.

After several questions, comments and back-an-forth discussion about the Technical Team should conduct outreach, the facilitator provided a summary of discussion outputs, including:

- It is helpful to have more data to inform the Technical Team's groundwater model
- Well agreements are being developed which will help address privacy concerns
- The Technical has developed an online survey for interested parties and will send the survey link around shortly after the meeting
- Ideally, the county will be awarded the Bureau of Reclamation grant, which will provide equipment and help incentivize participation in the voluntary well monitoring program
- Regarding outreach, committee members can communicate to interested well owners that the SGMA Technical Team is looking to collect the following information:
 - Groundwater elevation (not pumping information)
 - o Geology
 - o Soil moisture

Committee members, the facilitator noted, requested additional information, including:

- Maps showing the location of data gaps
- Explanation of the benefits of participating in the voluntary well monitoring program and the negatives of not participating in the program
- The kind of wells and geographic areas the Technical Team is interested in

Following the facilitator's summary one committee member suggested that the Technical Team develop simple talking points about the program. Another inquired about which data is legal or not to share. A member of the public suggested that the Technical Team have face-to-face

contact with 60 members of the community. Members of the Technical Team concluded the discussion by thanking the group for their candid input, noting that they would use this input to prepare additional materials and come back in May to re-visit the topic with the committee.

Charter Discussion and Provisional Adoption.

The facilitator introduced the latest iteration of the draft charter and reminded the group that, following the January meeting, county counsel and staff closely reviewed the committee's provisionally adopted charter. District staffer Matt Parker explained edits to the charter's goals, member terms, and updated membership composition. A few committee members still had questions about the GSA's decision-making process. Matt reminded them that the group is advisory in nature, and that the District at this stage is not requiring members to sign the Form 700 (conflict of interest). Following this brief discussion, the committee again provisionally adopted its charter by consensus. The next step is for District staff to present and seek approval of the charter by the GSA Board at its May 21st meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

Richard Nelson (Chair), Private pumper Don Bowen (Vice Chair), Residential Carol Mckay, City of Dorris (Municipal/City) Don Crawford, Private pumper Greg Herman, Private pumper Patrick Graham, CDFW Butte Valley Wildlife Refuge Steve Lutz, Butte Valley Irrigation District Steve Albaugh, Private pumper

Absent Committee Members

Sami Jo Difuntorum, Shasta Nation (Tribal representative)

District Staff

Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

Technical Team

Dr. Laura Foglia, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Dr. Thomas Harter, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Claire Kouba, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Dr. Laura Foglia, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Dr. Thomas Harter, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Claire Kouba, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Bill Rice, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

¹ Three members of the public and a Shasta Valley RCD affiliate attended the meeting.

Gaby Castrellon, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Cab Esposito, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Brad Gooch, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program