<u>Meeting date/time</u>: January 24th, 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. District staffer Matt Parker provided a status update on action items from the December Advisory Committee (committee) meeting. Facilitator Rich Wilson (Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program or CCP) inquired if members had any outstanding questions or comments on the December meeting summary. None were received and therefore the final meeting summary was approved.
- **Public Comment.** No comments were received during the initial public comment period. A few comments were received at various stages of the meeting, most especially following the presentation describing DWR's recent basin reprioritization process.
- **DWR Basin Reprioritization Process.** DWR staffer Shane Edmunds provided an overview presentation about its basin reprioritization process. He fielded a range of questions about the methodology and tools used to conduct the evaluation. He also provided links to the DWR site where interested parties can review the process and results for Butte Valley.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker provided brief updates on future Brown Act training, Form 700 and the status of the voluntary well survey.
- Technical Team Updates and Science Coordination Opportunities. Dr. Laura Foglia, SGMA Technical Team Lead, provided the committee an overview of the law that is driving this process, the 2014 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. She also described how her team is building a data management plan and seeking local landowner support to build out a groundwater monitoring network. She and her team will come back to the April committee meeting with refined ideas about data management, confidentiality, and outreach to well owners, and will seek the committee's input on its work at this time.
- **Charter Discussion.** The facilitator introduced the latest iteration of the draft charter and inquired if committee members had any outstanding questions, comments or suggested edits. Committee members suggest a number of minor edits to the document. County Counsel will review the draft document once these edits are incorporated. Any edits they provide will be shared with the committee at its next meeting.
- Membership, Committee Schedule and Next Steps. Matt Parker provided a status update on membership, which seats still need to be filled, and the forthcoming application process that will help complete the process. He also reviewed the emerging committee schedule, described SGMA outreach efforts to date and noted that a public workshop may soon occur. The facilitator briefly described SGMA requirements that necessitate development of a communication and engagement strategy for the Butte Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plain (GSP). He will bring draft material for committee feedback at its next meeting.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeframe/Deadline
Provide Matt with ideas on when and where	Committee members	February 15 th
the District should host a public SGMA		
workshop, and who to invite.		
Let Dr. Laura Foglia (<u>Ifoglia@ucdavis.edu</u>)	Committee members	ASAP
know of folks that may wish to share data		
with the SGMA Technical Team as they work		
to build out the local monitoring network.		
Provide navigation steps that enable	Shane Edmunds	DONE
committee members and other interested	(DWR); Matt Parker	
parties to explore DWR's basin prioritization		
program materials, including information on		
how Butte Valley was assessed and rated as a		
medium priority groundwater basin.		
Work on an iterative GSP development	Laura Foglia and	April meeting
process and data management program, and	Technical Team	
bring a suggested approach for each back for		
group consideration at the April meeting.		
Also, work out a calendar of activities to be		
included in the committee workplan.		
Share Laura's SGMA overview presentation	Matt Parker	DONE
with committee members.		
Begin work on a draft communication and	Rich Wilson	Next meeting
engagement strategy and bring materials for		
discussion at the next committee meeting.		
Keep committee informed of when a Brown	Matt Parker	TBD
Act training opportunity will be provided for		
all three basins—Scott Valley, Shasta Valley		
and Butte Valley.		
Let the committee know by February 8 th if	Matt Parker	DONE
there will be a February meeting.		
Inform the GSA Board about the request for	Matt Parker	February 6 th
alternates made by some in Butte Valley and		
Butte Valley. Pending the Board's response,		
the committee can discuss the issue further.		

Next meeting: Fourth week of April, 2019. Specific date TBD.

Website for meeting material posting:

https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/naturalresources/page/sustainable-groundwater-managementact-sgma

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 use of a queue during open group discussion in order to guide civil, inclusive and productive conversation. No committee member offered any questions or comments on the agenda. Matt Parker provided a status update on all action items from the December meeting. The facilitator then inquired and secured committee approval of the past meeting summary. Dr. Laura Foglia, local SGMA Technical Team Lead, briefly introduced her science team to the group.

Public Comment

Time for receiving public comment will always be built into committee meeting agendas. At the outset, members may address the committee on matters not on the consent agenda. During the course of the meeting, time permitting, the public may also comment on any agenda items. No comments were received during the initial public comment period. At times during the meeting some individuals commented on the DWR groundwater basin reprioritization process and perceived or known lines that divide Butte Valley from Red Rock Valley.

District Staff and Other Updates

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

- **Brown Act.** County Counsel will provide Brown Act Training to committee members, centrally located for all three SGMA basins and possibly linked to a public workshop. Committee members do not currently have to fill out Form 700 (Statements of Economic Interest) but may have to later as the committee's work progresses.
- Voluntary well survey. Many comments were received on the draft survey. District staff and the Technical Team have chosen for now to figure how to address data management and confidentiality issues prior to reaching out to the public.

Basin Reprioritization

DWR staffer Shane Edmunds attended, described DWR's eight component process for evaluating and prioritizing California's 517 groundwater basins. He then reviewed how the Butte Valley groundwater basin was scored and determined to be a medium priority basin, which therefore must comply with SGMA. He showed the committee and a few members of the public how they can navigate DWR's site and view the results for Butte Valley. A few questions from both committee members and the public interspersed the conversation, with Shane responding at various times throughout.

- <u>Question</u>: So all groundwater wells are considered, are surface water wells also considered? <u>Response</u>: Also looked at production wells that had at least a 4 inch casing and were 22 feet deep.
- <u>Question</u>: Is the level of decline prioritized? <u>Response</u>: Critical overdraft is the most severe condition. <u>Additional comment</u>: The level of decline seems like an important issue.

- <u>Question</u>: If data shows to DWR that we do not have declining groundwater, can our medium priority basin status be lowered? <u>Response</u>: At this time there is no appeals process.
- <u>Question</u>: Is hydrograph data based on specific times of year? Summer would show decline but January would not. <u>Response</u>: DWR is assessing groundwater levels in March and October and looking at long term trends. At times there is a lack of data.
- <u>Question</u>: What is the range of scores that falls under "medium" priority? <u>Response</u>: 14

 21 points during the evaluation. Scott Valley and Shasta Valley ranked a little higher than Butte Valley.
- <u>Public question</u>: Where did the overdraft or water level decline information come from? <u>Response</u>: Hydrographs come from the publicly available CASGEM and DWR volunteer well monitoring grid. The data and graphs can be observed online through the CASGEM website.
- <u>Public comment</u>: The components that relied on hydrographs, it seems the evaluation is not based on hard data. <u>Response</u>: Open data is available for viewing on the site that shows what data was considered for the reprioritization.
- <u>Question to DWR from Technical Team</u>: Can you share the parameters you used with the local SGMA Technical Team? <u>Response</u>: Yes, we can make these available.

SGMA Overview and Technical Team Updates

Laura provided an overview of the law which is driving this groundwater management planning process, the 2014 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). She also provided updates on her team's work. The SGMA Technical Team is building a database and seeking landowner assistance to build out a local groundwater monitoring network, and if anyone is interested in participating, she emphasized they should contact either Matt or someone from the team. The monitoring program will focus on collecting groundwater elevation and water quality data, not pumping data. A database is being created on an Amazon server. She also mentioned that USGS in either 2004 or 2006 developed the beginning of a model for Butte Valley. Her team has requested the data, however, because of the Federal government shutdown they have not received the information yet. The committee will play a key role in helping identify and fill data gaps. Committee members can also help the Technical Team figure out how to conduct outreach to landowners. Laura and her team will likely come back to the April meeting with refined ideas about data management, confidentiality, and outreach to well owners, and will seek the committee's input on its work at this time.

A range of questions and comments were put forward and, when appropriate, addressed by Laura and at times Matt Parker. This included the following:

- <u>Question</u>: When do you want to install monitoring devices? <u>Response</u>: As soon as possible; good to install before the irrigation season starts.
- <u>Comment (DWR staffer)</u>: Suggest you explore funds available through DWR's Technical Support Services grant program, or through Proposition 68. It will be good to get data loggers in place.

- <u>Question</u>: What is the cost of a data logger? <u>Response</u>: A couple thousand dollars.
- <u>Question</u>: How old is the data on crops that was discussed during the basin reprioritization presentation? <u>Response</u>: The Technical Team wants to find out.
- <u>Question</u>: How soon will you be able to supply data? <u>Response</u>: Immediately. We will come back with a data management plan in April. Your data will help.
- <u>Question</u>: What are your options for frequency of monitoring? <u>Response</u>: Monthly would be useful. Also, when you are irrigating versus not irrigating.
- <u>Question</u>: Will you use isotopes to map aquifers? <u>Response</u>: That would be interesting. Maybe we can take samples from here and send them to Lawrence Livermore Laboratory for evaluation. This could help map the basin.
- <u>Public comment</u>: Is the designation of Butte Valley as a groundwater basin premised on the idea that all groundwater is coming from inside the basin? <u>Response</u>: There is a need to determine the line that separates Butte Valley from Red Rock Valley. <u>Additional</u> <u>comment</u>: I think there are many basins. This skews the prioritization that DWR put forward. <u>Additional response</u>: Building a monitoring network with continuous data will help us better understand the underground system.

Charter Discussion

Facilitator Rich Wilson introduced the next iteration of the draft charter (governance structure) to the group. The facilitator inquired if any committee members had additional comments, questions or suggested edits to the charter. One member requested technical support to enable the evaluation of the economic impact of SGMA. Laura noted that an economic analysis is not a required component of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan that is due by January 31st, 2022. Matt acknowledged this interest and noted that it could be shared with the GSA Board.

Members put forward minor suggestions to help define labels and terms in the charter, slightly improve the goals, and ensure member responsibilities are based more on collaboration than individual self-interests. Matt briefly clarified the description of member terms in the charter before the discussion wrapped up. He also noted that he will bring the interest in alternates to the GSA Board for consideration. The facilitator will incorporate suggested and agreed upon comments put forward during the meeting. County Counsel will review the charter next. Any edits they provide will be shared with the committee at its next meeting.

Membership, Committee Schedule and Next Steps

Matt Parker followed by providing a status update on membership, which seats still need to be filled, and the forthcoming application process that will help complete the process. He noted any individual or group that fills the open environmental or tribal seats will need to at least have some local ties to Butte valley. He then briefly reviewed the emerging committee schedule, described SGMA outreach efforts to date and noted that a public workshop may soon occur. The facilitator briefly pointed to SGMA requirements that necessitate development of a SGMA communication and engagement strategy for the Shasta Valley GSP. CCP will bring draft

material for consideration and interactive discussion at the next 2-3 Advisory Committee meetings.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

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

Absent

Steve Albaugh, Private pumper

District Staff Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

DWR Staff Pat Vellines Shane Edmunds

Technical Team

Dr. Laura Foglia, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

¹ Three members of the public attended the meeting.