Meeting date/time: May 28th, 2019 I 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. <u>Location</u>: Ft. Jones Community Hall, 11960 East, Ft. Jones

Key contacts:

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

MEETING RECAP

- Action Item Update and Approval of Past Meeting Summary. CCP facilitator Rich Wilson recommended a new process for committee members to review and approve meeting summaries upon distribution of the draft document. The committee agreed to the new approach, which will open up more time in future agendas for substantive groundwater discussions. The committee then approved its April meeting summary, for which there were no outstanding comments or questions.
- Public Comment. One member of the public made various comments throughout the
 meeting, encouraging the committee to address the need to meet adjudicated flow rights,
 especially in late summer and fall (e.g. USFS flow right), and at one point suggested a
 research paper about upslope management.
- District Staff and Other Updates. Matt Parker provided updates on a range of issues, including GSA Board approval of data collection and well access agreement forms and the committee's charter; and a Tribal Advisory Committee concept being considered by the Board.
- Water Budget, Outreach and Anticipated Next Steps. The SGMA Technical Team provided a presentation which reviewed the GSP development process and looked at how the Scott Valley groundwater model will inform the water budget. Committee members made comments and asked a number of questions throughout the presentation. Based on these queries, the Technical Team will refine how information from the model will be presented and discussed at future meetings. The Technical Team emphasized how the committee will continue to play an important role in helping validate information that comes from the model and is considered as the GSP is developed.
- **Proposition 68 Grant Opportunity.** Matt Parker and Laura Foglia provided a brief update on the Proposition 68 grant opportunity. The committee then conducted an initial brainstorm of potential pilot projects that could be included in the proposal. Matt noted that there may be additional opportunities for the committee to weigh in on the proposal's final content.
- Ad Hoc Stakeholder Outreach Committee. Pending member interest, an ad hoc subcommittee can be formed to assist with the development of the Scott Valley Communication and Engagement Plan (C&E Plan). Given that the meeting went over time, not all members were present when this option was presented. The facilitator committed to following up with those persons to gauge their interest in helping review draft versions of the C&E Plan as it is developed.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status/Deadline
Share digital copies of the GSA Board approved data	Matt Parker	Complete
collection agreement and well access forms.		
Put together tables with water consumption numbers	Technical Team	Prior to next
on alfalfa, pasture and grain for different model	and Matt Parker	meeting
outputs, and share with the committee for feedback.		
Numbers can also be split out between different times		
of year (e.g., one for total year, one for growing		
season.) Once ready, post this material for public		
viewing on the county website.		
When again sharing data and information initially	Technical Team	Prior to next
presented by the Technical Team at the May		meeting
committee meeting—create bigger, easier to		
understand slides (e.g., diagrams and maps) with		
legends, graphs and tables. Also share published		
journal articles about the Scott model.		
Provide information to Matt Parker and the Technical	Committee	Ongoing
Team if they have seen any evidence of overdraft in	members	
the basin.		
Keep the advisory committee informed as the	Matt Parker and	June 24 th for
Proposition 68 proposal comes together, and whether	Committee	project
or not any additional feedback is needed from	members	proposal ideas
committee members. Committee members provide		
Matt Parker with any additional project concepts or		
ideas for consideration in the proposal.		
Committee members review the stakeholder ID chart	Committee	June 7th
and let Rich Wilson and Matt Parker know if there are	members	
any key groups or individuals missing.		
Prepare and distribute the May advisory committee	Rich Wilson, Matt	By established
meeting summary and establish a deadline for review	Parker and	deadline once
by committee members. Committee members will let	Committee	draft summary
Rich Wilson and Matt Parker know, by the established	Members	sent out to
deadline, if they have any comments, questions or		committee
feedback on the meeting summary. If no feedback is		
received, Matt Parker will post the meeting summary		
on the county's website.		
Schedule calls over the summer with individuals who	Rich Wilson	Ongoing over
volunteered to serve on an ad hoc subcommittee that		summer
will review the draft Scott Valley stakeholder outreach		
plan.		

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 24th, 2019 from 3:00 – 5:30pm, Ft Jones Community Hall, 11960 East St, Ft Jones.

View Siskiyou County's groundwater website for posted meeting materials.

MEETING SUMMARY

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

CCP Facilitator Rich Wilson opened the meeting and noted that Advisory Committee Chair Tom Menne would, moving forward, help chair the meetings, while CCP still offers impartial facilitation support as needed. Rich suggested a new approach for the committee to review and provide approval of past meeting summaries as well as stay informed about the status on action items that emerge at each meeting. Moving forward, the facilitation team will send a draft copy of the meeting summary for committee review in the weeks following the meeting. At this time, an established deadline for review and feedback will be set for the committee. If feedback is received, it will be addressed and an updated meeting summary will either be resent or shared at the outset of the following meeting. If no feedback is received, it will be assumed that the summary has been reviewed by the committee, is acceptable in its current condition, and may be posted on the county's website. All committee members supported this new approach. The facilitator noted that the process for drafting, securing committee review and consent, and posting of the summary can be revisited as needed.

Public Comment Period

One member of the public offered comments during the initial public comment period. He noted that he lived in Scott Valley from 1976 until 2002, and owns a lot in Etna. He shared his opinion that the in-stream flow right associated with the Scott Valley adjudication, specifically the USFS water right, is not being met during certain times of year. He noted that diverting high flows to groundwater storage could be useful. He stressed that the Scott Valley GSP ensure these flows are met. He concluded by stating support for the committee and acknowledged challenging work ahead.

District Staff and Other Updates

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

Well access agreement and data release form. The GSA Board approved two documents, a well access agreement and data release form, at its May meetings. The two forms are available to persons interested in providing groundwater elevation data or other water data relevant to GSP development to the District and its SGMA Technical Team as it develops the water budget for Scott Valley. One committee member inquired if county counsel has to sign the forms and another asked if these forms would be used moving forward. District staffer Matt Parker noted that these are templates that anyone interested in participating in the voluntary well

monitoring network can use. Anyone interested in participating should contact District staffer Matt Parker.

Charter Adoption. The GSA Board, at its May 21st meeting, approved the charters with some minor edits from county counsel. Matt Parker briefly reviewed and described the rationale for the new edits. He also noted that the Board did not approve the use of alternates. Following Matt's update, the committee adopted its charter by consensus.

Tribal Advisory Committee Concept. Based on interest in multiple basins expressed by several tribes, the GSA Board has discussed possible formation of a Tribal Advisory Committee to provide advice and recommendations to the Board related to GSP development and SGMA more generally. The Board tasked staff to conduct initial outreach to gauge interest in the concept from different tribes in the area and then report back to the Board at its late June meeting. A few committee members voiced support for the county securing tribal input but expressed concern about separate processes. Matt clarified that any tribal committee that comes together would operate parallel to the already established committees. Another committee asked the tribal representative on the Scott committee why general tribal feedback would not just come through her. She noted that it may come to this. She voiced support for the concept, but noted that, due to a large geography and busy schedules, that it may be difficult to make the concept a reality. Matt concluded by noting that it's a conceptual idea at this stage. The GSA Board, he said, is trying to incorporate tribal interests into the SGMA process. If it's too difficult to make the concept work, the county will explore different ways to work with tribes.

Water Budget, Outreach and Anticipated Next Steps

Dr. Thomas Harter, a member of the Siskiyou County SGMA Technical Team, introduced his colleague Gus Tolley to the committee. Gus is known by some but not all committee members for his past work. In his capacity as a UC Davis graduate student, Gus has assisted Thomas and Dr. Laura Foglia, the SGMA Technical Team Lead, in developing the Scott Valley groundwater model. Gus and Thomas jointly presented as they took turns at explaining slide material. The presentation began by re-visiting DWR's requirements for developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). Highlights include what kind of information and input will be needed from committee members and the wider community. The draft GSP chapters that the Technical Team will soon develop were pointed out, namely the Plan Area and Basin setting sections. The speakers then described the requirements for developing sustainable management criteria, as well as later sections that identify management actions and projects.

In developing the water budget for Scott Valley, the Technical Team considers three elements of the system—soil and landscape, surface water, and the aquifer—and looks how water moves through the different elements and how much is stored in each element of the system at any given time. Thomas reminded the committee that the groundwater model was originally developed in response to the Regional Water Board Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Clean Water requirements. The model currently spans the years 1991 – 2011, and the Technical Team would like to update it with data up to 2019. He pointed out that the model may be good at

predicting stream flow in some areas but perhaps not in others, and the committee can help the Technical Team determine the ways in which the model needs to be updated.

Thomas and Gus continued to describe how the Technical Team will need the committee to review and help validate its work as the GSP is developed. The Technical Team is putting together a physical conceptual representation of the valley (e.g. flows, pumping, etc.) and ensure this representation is as close as possible to reality, at high level of resolution. Later in the presentation they went through a series of slides that showed different iterations of the estimated water budget, including groundwater use estimates by various crops in the valley. A few questions and comments from committee members interspersed the conversation and helped clarify some of the information from the presentation slides, including the following:

- Question: Can you break the valley up into sections and do sensitivity tests in different areas? <u>Response</u>: Depends on how we build the parameters of the model, and also depends on connectivity.
- Question: What is the actual acreage that would be represented by grain, alfalfa and pasture? Response: Approximately 50,000 acres total, of which about 14,000 acres are alfalfa and 2,000 acres are grain (grains rotating with alfalfa about once every 7 years), about 12,000 acres are pasture, and about 20,000 acres are non-irrigated vegetated, mostly natural landscape including riparian. This is an example of information that you can help validate; do these numbers match compared to your actual practices?
- <u>Comment/question</u>: It seems pasture and alfalfa acreage numbers may be off. (A few other committee members agree.) Where did these numbers come from? <u>Response</u>: From the model. <u>Additional comments</u>: The number of acres in pasture may have dropped since the model development process began years ago. At the same time, pastures are also irrigated more.
- Question: If one or some of these estimates were grossly off you would not have agreement between predicted and observed use, correct? Response: Probably not.
- <u>Comment</u>: Seems actual evapotranspiration rate estimates for alfalfa are too high.
 <u>Response</u>: A three-year study was conducted by farm advisor Steve Orloff with Dr. Rick Snyder from UC Davis to study alfalfa evapotranspiration. Data were used to guide model calibration.

In response to the committee's queries, the Technical Team concluded by suggesting it can put together tables with numbers on alfalfa, pasture and grain for different model outputs and then share this information and solicit additional committee feedback. One committee member suggested it may also be good to show input to the system from the upper watershed. Thomas acknowledged this comment and suggested that this may be a candidate for the future scenarios that will need to be considered. The Technical Team also suggested it could split out water use numbers between different times of year, perhaps providing estimates for both the full year and for the growing season. A final acknowledgment was made that there is plenty of water in the watershed (about one half million acre-feet per year, on average), but that it's all

focused on winter and spring. Future projects will need to consider how to improve late summer stream flows.

Basin Funding Opportunities and Project Brainstorm

Matt Parker and Laura Foglia revisited and provided an update on the Proposition 68 grant funding opportunity which could benefit Siskiyou County. The county is beginning to construct a proposal that could, if funded, provide a significant amount of supplemental funds to the already partially funded GSP development process. Matt and Laura noted that a range of projects could be considered for inclusion in the proposal, with perhaps a particular focus on collecting data and further building a baseline monitoring network. They noted that the funding opportunity, at this stage, can only support pilot projects, and that implementation funding may come at a later date. An initial brainstorm with the committee ensued and the following comments and potential project ideas were put forward:

- Use the model to inform what kind of management actions and projects should be considered in the proposal
- Consider groundwater recharge projects
- Change irrigation practices in the spring
- Consider pilot studies

Laura concluded by noting that the Technical Team can continue brainstorming proposal ideas. Monitoring to create well informed baseline conditions, she emphasized, could be useful and would help inform what kind of pilot studies should be considered.

Stakeholder Outreach and Communication

At the conclusion of the meeting, facilitator Rich Wilson reminded the group that the Scott Valley SGMA Communication and Engagement Plan (C&E Plan) will be developed over the summer months. He suggested formation of an ad hoc subcommittee, with the goal of ensuring that local knowledge and insights be brought into the plan development process. One committee members volunteered to join the subcommittee. Others had already left meeting, as the agenda had run past time, and so Rich noted that he would follow-up with those who had not heard the announcement. A draft version of the Scott Valley C&E Plan will be presented for consideration by the full advisory committee at its September meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

Drew Braugh, CalTrout, Environmental/Conservation Brandon Fawaz, Private Pumper Jason Finley, Private Pumper Tom Jopson, Private Pumper Tom Menne, Scott Valley Irrigation District

¹ Three members of the public attended the meeting.

Crystal Robinson, Quartz Valley Tribe (Tribal representative) Michael Stapleton, Residential Paul Sweezey, Member-at-large

Absent Committee Members

Bill Beckwith, Fort Jones (Municipal/City 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 Bill Rice, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Gaby Castrellon, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Cab Esposito, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates Gus Tolley, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program