Date/time: July 22, 2021, 10:00 am - 1:00 pm

Location: Hybrid Meeting

In Person: Fort Jones Community Hall 11960 East Street Fort Jones, CA 96032

Virtual Online Zoom Platform

Key contacts:

- -Matt Parker, County Natural Resources Specialist, mparker@co.siskiyou.ca.us 530.842.8019
- -Katie Duncan, Stantec Consulting Facilitator, katie.duncan@stantec.com 916-418-8245
- -Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead, lfoglia@ucdavis.edu 530.219.5692

MEETING RECAP

- **Approval of Past Meeting Summary:** With the addition requested by Crystal, the committee approved its June meeting summary for posting on the Siskiyou County Website.
- Public Comment: Public comments provided below.
- **District Staff and Other Announcements:** Pat Vellines provided information about DWR's My Dry Water Supply tool.
- **Presentation of Updated GSP Adoption Schedule and Public Comment Process:** The Facilitator shared the updated GSP Adoption Schedule and provided an overview of the public comment process.
- Review and Discussion of Draft GSP Chapters 1 and 5: The technical team shared a high-level overview of the content in Chapter 1 and 5 and responded to questions.
- Review and Discussion of Substantial Updates to Chapters 2, 3, and 4: The technical team shared a high-level overview of the changes that have been incorporated to Chapters 2, 3, and 4 and responded to questions.
- **Discussion: Recommendation of Release of Public Draft GSP:** The Advisory Committee reached consensus to recommend that staff recommend the Board release the Public Draft GSP.
- Meeting Adjourns.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status/Deadline
Add Crystal Robinson's suggestion during the last meeting to include an economic evaluation the removal of the Klamath Dam to the June meeting notes.	Facilitators	
The implementation schedule will be updated to start Tier 2 and Tier 3 PMA feasibility studies in 2022.	Technical Team	
The technical team will add language to Chapter 5 to clarify how funding sources will be identified in year one of implementation.	Technical Team	
Advisory Committee members who would like to	Advisory Committee	

receive a hard copy of the Public Draft GSP should send a mailing address to the Technical Team.	members	
Advisory Committee members should hold their schedules for the GSP open houses (September 15,16) and block out the October 26-28 meetings. *Note originally it was discussed October meetings would be held during the week of October 18 th , but do to scheduling changes these meetings will be pushed to the next week.	Advisory Committee	

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

MEETING SUMMARY

Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Hybrid Meeting Platform

The In-Person and Virtual Facilitators thanked all for joining, reviewed the hybrid meeting platform procedures and called the meeting to order. They then reviewed the meeting agenda.

The meeting reached quorum after the agenda was reviewed.

Review of Past Meeting Summary; Update on Action Items

Crystal noted that her suggestion during the last meeting to include an economic evaluation the removal of the Klamath Dam was not reflected in the meeting notes. With that addition, the Facilitator obtained consent from the Advisory Committee to post the June meeting notes to the County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Website.

There were no action items from the June meeting.

Public Comment Period

A member of the public asked whether Little Shasta Valley is inside one of the SGMA basins. Matt clarified that the area is part of the Shasta Valley basin. The Facilitator added that members of the public can check whether their land is part of a basin by using the DWR tool.

District Staff Updates and Other Announcements

Matt Parker did not provide an update. Pat Vellines shared information about the My Dry Water Supply reporting tool.

Presentation of Updated GSP Adoption Schedule and Public Comment Process

The Facilitator presented the updated GSP Adoption Schedule in detail, including next steps for the Public Draft GSP and the roadmap to adopting the Final GSP.

The Facilitator presented information about the public comment review process. The Advisory Committee had no questions or comment.

Review and Discussion of Draft GSP Chapters 1 and 5

Kelsey McNeill (LWA) presented an overview of Chapters 1 and 5 of the Draft GSP.

Tom Jopson indicated that he didn't receive the email with Chapters 1 and 5. He requested modifying the implementation schedule to start the Tier 2 and Tier 3 PMAs in 2022 rather than 2023; the technical team agreed to update the implementation schedule.

Brandon asked why the preliminary implementation cost table had such a wide range of potential costs. Thomas provided some insight about the uncertainty in the budget, particularly noting that the availability of grant funds isn't accounted for in the table.

Crystal asked for clarification about the timeline for the implementation cost table. The technical team clarified that this is the preliminary estimate of the annually recurring costs for the GSA to implement the GSP.

Matt Parker provided an overview of the potential grant pathways and other funding mechanisms. The current Prop 68 grant only applied to planning and development of the GSP. Matt asked Pat Vellines to weigh in on how many years the prop 68 grant might cover (one year at a time? Five years?). Pat said Prop 68 implementation grants for critically overdrafted basins cover 3 years.

Crystal clarified that this cost table is just for Scott Valley. Thomas added that the minimum grant amount that Scott Valley will request is \$2 million.

Theo asked whether the cost of Monitoring and Technical Support could be reduced, or perhaps whether the monitoring task might be taken on by the County. Theo voiced her doubt that everything in the plan will be covered by grants and wanted to know whether the conversation about how the fees may impact residents should start now. Matt can't speak to the cost evaluation that the consultant firm put together; he directed Theo to review the fee study memo (posted online) and indicated that this conversation should be saved for later.

Andrew Braugh asked how much the State plans to invest in implementation of SGMA solutions. The group discussed the uncertainty and various, interconnected motivations DWR and the State Water Board share.

Pat said the GSAs shouldn't develop financial plans that rely solely on grants. The GSA should ask for every dime (\$5 million maximum per basin), but plan for alternate funding streams. Eventually Prop 218 fees may be assessed.

Drew shared his perspective that it seems like there's not a solid, long-term funding plan, especially considering it takes significant administrative effort to secure funding on a recurring basis. He shared that if he was a water user, he'd be concerned about the longevity of this program.

Pat added that another possibility would be to fund projects through the North Coast Integrated Regional Watershed Management (IRWM) program, which will receive a second round of implementation funding through the North Coast Resource Partnership.

Matt relayed the GSA will put together a working group in the first year of implementation to tackle revenue sourcing and potentially establish a tiered fee system that favors water users that implement water-saving measures.

The Facilitator requested the technical team add language to Chapter 5 to clarify how funding sources will be identified in year one of implementation.

Review and Discussion of Substantial Updates to Chapters 2, 3, 4

The Technical Team reviewed the substantial updates to Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

Tom Jopson noted that the Technical Team didn't take his recommendation to remove Tier 2 PMAs which have little to no impact on groundwater levels from the chapter. He conveyed that he doesn't think the GSA should include projects that the model indicates will have such a small benefit to long-term groundwater levels. Thomas replied that the decision to remove PMAs needs to be an advisory committee decision. He explained the rationale for why the projects are still included in the plan, largely that there are other water-related impacts aside from groundwater (interconnected surface waters, for example). Tom's concern is that the GSP is trying to be "too many things to too many people," though he recognizes that there are different perspectives on the issue.

The Facilitator asked whether stacking the implementation of Tiers 2 and 3 would magnify the issue? Tom said no; he thinks the GSA needs to move as quickly as possible to reduce depletion ASAP, presumably through MAR and ILR.

Crystal added that perhaps the smaller projects (those which the model indicates have smaller groundwater level impacts) would make a nice stepping stone for more hesitant water users.

Discussion: Recommendation of Release of Public Draft GSP

Crystal and Tom Menne indicated their discomfort in recommending the release of the public draft since they haven't read the new chapters.

Tom Jopson added that Scott Valley has had a terrible couple of weeks but recognized that it would be worse to not move forward with releasing the public draft at this juncture.

Brandon understands the need for the document to move forward and does recommend its release, with the recognition that it's not a perfect document.

Paul agrees with Tom and Brandon; he has not had time to read the updated material in the plan but he believes it's a good document and he understands the need to move it forward. He is in favor.

Andrew supports moving forward.

Crystal shared that as long as it's clear to the Board of Supervisors that not everyone on the advisory committee is comfortable with the content in the report, she is comfortable with releasing it to the public for review. Matt says he can make Crystal's views heard at the Board meeting and indicated that any Advisory Committee member should feel free to join the meeting.

Tom Menne shared that he has completely lost interest in this process, given the emergency drought regulations. If the State can step in and disregard the GSP, then we've wasted our time here.

Crystal shared her disappointment that the group's discussion on surface flows wasn't able to establish actions that have real benefits for drought flows.

Tom elaborated on the challenges of the state regulating for Coho, when in fact Chinook seem to be a bigger challenge. The fish are entirely dependent on fall rain.

Tom Menne let Claire on the technical team know that his monitor hasn't updated since July 2. Claire thanked Tom for the update.

Thomas elaborated on Tom's comment related to transparency and relayed that the technical team was contacted by State Water Board.

Katie offered to circle back and elaborate on the public comment process. No one was interested in revisiting.

Meeting Adjourns

The Facilitator thanked all for participating and adjourned the meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES

* = virtual attendee

Advisory Committee Members

Brandon Fawaz, Private pumper [left early] Crystal Robinson, Quartz Valley Tribe *Paul Sweezey, Member-at-Large Tom Jopson, Private Pumper

Tom Menne, Scott Valley Irrigation District

*Andrew Braugh, CalTrout, Environmental/Conservation [joined late]

Absent Committee Members

Michael Stapleton, Residential Jason Finley, Private Pumper Bill Beckwith, Fort Jones, Municipal/City

District Staff

Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

Technical Team

- *Dr. Thomas Harter, UC Davis
- *Katrina Arredondo
- *Claire Kouba, UC Davis
- *Tom Grovhoug, Larry Walker & Associates
- *Kelsey McNeill, LWA

Agency Staff

- *Pat Vellines, Department of Water Resources
- *Shari Whitmore, National Marine Fisheries Service
- *Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Facilitator

*Katie Duncan, Stantec Craig Moyle, Stantec Marisa Perez-Reyes, Stantec

Members of the public

Theodora Johnson

- *Bonnie Nichols
- *Grant Johnson
- *Giuliano Carneiro Galdi
- *Jeff Fowle
- *Lauren

*Lorrie Bundy

^{*}Sari Sommarstrom