<u>Meeting date/time</u>: May 25, 2021/ 3:00 – 6:00 pm <u>Location</u>: Zoom Online Platform <u>Key contacts</u>:

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

MEETING RECAP

- **Approval of Past Meeting Summary.** The committee approved its April meeting summary for posting on the Siskiyou County Website.
- **Public Comment:** No comments voiced at the outset of the meeting.
- District Staff and Other Announcements: Pat Vellines provided DWR resource updates.
- **Presentation on Scott Valley Future Water Budget:** Claire Kouba presented the water budget model and received comments from the Advisory Committee on the observed limitations of the approach and utilized data.
- **Presentation of Draft yearly cost estimate:** Matt Parker and the Technical Team presented a draft yearly cost estimate.
- **Draft Chapters 3 & 4 Comment Response Review:** The Advisory Committee and the public provided comments in response to facilitated discussion on specific topics where consensus was needed for GSP chapter finalization.

Action Item	Responsible Party	Status/Deadline
Provide stream flow rate material to Advisory	Technical Team	Complete
Committee Members		
Provide County Board Meeting Agenda and Recording	Matt Parker and	Complete
of budget discussion	Facilitator	
Convene Surface Water Ad hoc meeting	Facilitator	June
Convene Irrigator Ad hoc Meeting	Facilitator	Complete

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Next Meeting: June 22, 2021/ 3:00 – 6:00 pm.

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

MEETING SUMMARY

Call to Order, Agenda Review and Zoom Meeting Platform

The Facilitator thanked all for joining, reviewed the virtual meeting platform procedures, indicated that quorum had been reached and called the meeting to order. She then reviewed the meeting agenda.

Review/Approval of Past Meeting Summary

The Facilitator obtained consent from the Advisory Committee to post the April meeting notes to the County's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Website.

Review Action Items

The Facilitator reviewed action items and provided updates regarding progress toward their completion.

Public Comment Period

No comment was provided.

District Staff Updates and Other Announcements

Pat Vellines (DWR) provided updates regarding a statewide wide webinar on June 8th for airborne electromagnetic surveys and informed that Prop 68 funding has tripled for medium and high-priority basins for implementation projects. Department of Water Resources (DWR) would send a survey to Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) on the topic of Prop 68 funding.

Presentation of Scott Valley Future Water Budget

Claire Kouba (Technical Team) provided an overview of modeled climate change scenarios. She described how historical data was utilized in the models.

Grant Johnson asked for the Technical Team's justification for utilizing 1991-2001 data. Claire indicated that the Technical Team had utilized DWR's recommended change-factor database.

Grant Johnson asked how incorporation of an El Nino versus drought year would affect the model. He indicated that the data incorporates an El Nino year; it does not include recent drought years. Claire Kouba indicated that a more sophisticated climate analysis would incorporate more recent data, but the Technical Team had decided to follow DWR guidance. The 5-year update would incorporate recent data (precipitation and changes in snow).

Michael Stapleton noted that the model shows an optimistic representation of precipitation.

Crystal Robinson noted a change in precipitation ratio is evident in current data.

Claire Kouba presented modeled changes in streamflow and projected, future water budgets. The models show cycles of dry and wet years. Groundwater demand is fairly constant over time.

Andrew Braugh asked for clarification of the storage depiction in the modeled scenarios. Claire described how increases and decreases in groundwater storage are represented in the graphs. Thomas Harter described that differences between inflows and outflows are indicative of a change in groundwater storage.

Michael Stapleton asked for period of data replication and indicated that the models seem to reflect optimistic, not realistic, dry scenarios. The Technical Team indicated that the data was replicated on a 20-year basis. Claire Kouba noted that the Technical Team is complying with

DWR guidance. She noted that additional iterations of the model would likely not be completed within the available timeline.

In response to a question in the chat from Leah Easley (Watermaster), Claire indicated that the Fort Jones gauge is utilized to simulate tributary flow. She indicated how dry behavior is included in the model. Thomas Harter provided the document used to determine where tributaries are dry. Leah Easley indicated she would provide additional information if applicable. (See http://groundwater.ucdavis.edu/Research/ScottValley/ under "Reports" for more information.)

Ngodoo Atume obtained clarification that stream leakage is included in water budgets.

Joshua Saxon obtained clarification on how inter-annual variability is monitored. Claire Kouba described that the results of the model are not yet incorporated in the other management decisions. Joshua Saxon indicated that measured data should be incorporated; use of estimated data exclusively may be insufficient.

Betsey Stapleton asked that interpretive material be provided prior to the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. She also asked for clarification on whether guidance had been provided for model updates. The Technical Team commented that they had accomplished analyses that were required, but believe additional analyses are needed. Thomas Harter indicated that current models assess general variability sufficiently; they would provide helpful guidance.

Presentation of Draft yearly cost estimate

Matt Parker introduced a high-level cost analysis. He informed the Advisory Committee that a fee study conducted by a subconsultant would be presented at the next Siskiyou County Board meeting and welcomed all to attend. Laura Foglia presented the draft cost estimate in terms of required monitoring. Matt Parker commented on the cost ranges, indicating that some costs would be shared across Siskiyou Basin.

Tom Menne obtained clarification on monitoring equipment installation and the monitoring progress. The Technical Team indicated that equipment is primarily in place, but in-person monitoring would be required during the implementation phase of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

Brandon Fawaz commented that water-use is universal throughout the Valley.

The Facilitator indicated that the team would distribute the County Board Meeting Agenda and the Board Meeting recording with relevant draft cost estimate material .

The Technical Team responded to questions in the chat regarding the monitoring network and disadvantaged communities. The Facilitator indicated that resources shared in the chat would be included in the meeting summary for convenience.

The resources provided in the Zoom chat include:

- Supplemental Material: Estimating Streamflow into Scott Valley
- <u>University of California Scott Valley Groundwater Resources</u>

Draft Chapters 3 & 4 Comment Response Review

The Facilitator reminded the meeting participants in GSP development process. She reminded all of agreed-to principles and ground rules. After reviewing the comment response process, which involves a comment-response matrix, she indicated how the draft chapters would be provided for formal review. The Facilitator indicated that 353 comments had been received and reviewed. To make sure potential gaps in understanding were adequately addressed, she identified topics for discussion designed to cover comments identified as 'comment level A' or comments that required Advisory Committee review and input.

Michael Stapleton obtained confirmation his comments had been received.

The Facilitator introduced Interconnected Surface Water (ISW) Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) discussion topics. Thomas Harter indicated that the models consider a number of PMAs in the context of Advisory Committee input on feasibility. The Technical Team defined percentages for the interconnected surface-water SMC that can be utilized as a metric.

Crystal Robinson indicated that she was looking for an SMC that provides for the health of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs), including fish. She described that the current 15% threshold does not provide sufficient flow for all GDEs.

Thomas Harter provided explanation on average daily streamflow depletion as defined in part by depletion reversal and incorporates implementation of Projects and Management Actions (PMAs).

Crystal Robinson clarified that her concern is that there is a legal question related to an SMC that does not provide for fish habitat. Matt Parker and the Technical Team indicated that this question would be put to the legal team.

Tom Menne asked in the chat why modeled results are being considered that do not meet the requirements of SGMA in setting SMC and/or for quantifying if and when the undesirable result of streamflow depletion occurs. Thomas Harter indicated that the law stipulates undesirable results occurring after January 1, 2015 (new undesirable results) be addressed. Undesirable results occurring before that date (existing undesirable results) may also be addressed in a GSP if the GSA choses. He indicated that there are existing regulations that must also be considered.

Thomas Harter provided context on the specifics of the SGMA legislation. The Facilitator asked for Committee members to weigh in on an acceptable metric of stream reversal. Claire Kouba presented a graph showing flowrates to provide additional context on the topic.

Crystal Robinson indicated that the flowrates, expressed as cubic feet per second (CFS), provided are substantially more helpful than depletion reversal percentages.

The Facilitator indicated that Technical Team presented materials discussed would be provided to the Advisory Committee. A Surface Water Ad-hoc meeting would be convened to discuss the ISW SMC proposed definition.

Thomas Harter indicated that the Technical Team approach to PMAs (simulated scenarios) has considered both reasonable results and reasonable associated cost. The Technical Team has

incorporated committee comments into the GSP definition of the minimum threshold.

Tom Menne clarified that the minimum threshold should be an achievable threshold. Reversal in excess of the threshold is desired, but the goal is to define a realistic minimum threshold.

Crystal Robinson asked whether the economic analysis was included in the definition of the MT. The Technical Team indicated that they had generally relied on Advisory Committee input. She asked whether the Technical Team had reached out to commercial fisheries to include that input in their analysis. Matt Parker indicated that a consultant is looking into the topic.

Theodora Johnson asked how timelines impact PMA selection. The Technical Team indicated that due diligence must be shown to achieve reversal within the five-year window as discussed. Theodora Johnson expressed concern that turning off pumps would be the quickest and therefore one of the first PMAs to be implemented. The Technical Team indicated that the PMA list does not include mandatory pumping reduction.

Grant Johnson indicated that impacts are already felt on river flows and that all stakeholders should share in impacts. The minimum goal as defined is not an acceptable goal.

The Facilitator indicated that ad hoc discussions (surface water, irrigator) would address these comments and the information obtained would be reported back to the larger group.

The Facilitator initiated discussion of PMAs related to changes in land-use.

Jack Rice (Siskiyou County Farm Bureau) indicated that it would be helpful to include a broader understanding of changes in land use to include a conservation easement as one type of such a change under the broader category.

Brandon Fawaz noted that voluntary sale of land, individual property rights can both be incentivized and naturally occurring. He indicated that flexibility should be written into the plan so that individuals can choose whichever avenues work best for them.

The Facilitator obtained clarification on the terminology 'fish-friendly' as a term that implies attitudinal flexibility or actions. Tom Menne indicated that he voluntarily chooses environmentally friendly practices and considers himself a 'fish-friendly' farmer.

Jason Finley indicated that agricultural people within the Valley are constantly improving irrigation and pumping practices. He noted it is disheartening to hear that 'pumpers do not do anything' when they are constantly improving practices, voluntarily.

The Facilitator asked whether Theodora Johnson had ideas on how the GSP could incentivize land management to avoid the threat of invasive weeds. Theodora indicated that she was not categorically opposed to land-use changes but was concerned about how agricultural use changes would impact the culture of the Valley long-term. She indicated that the supply side should be prioritized.

The Facilitator indicated that supply side and land use change topics could be addressed at an ad-hoc meeting.

The Facilitator reviewed action items and asked for feedback on general process.

Tom Menne indicated that his concern is related to keeping the conversation on topic, specifically SGMA related discussion.

Brandon Fawaz indicated that he feels rushed in the important part of the process.

Jason Finley echoed Brandon's sentiments and indicated that the agricultural users will continue to become more efficient.

Paul Sweezey indicated that SGMAs sentiments are not new. He indicated that unmanaged fallowed land is not necessarily a positive outcome. If the intention of fallowed land is to have native species, then that land would have to managed. He indicated that agriculture in Scott Valley must also be saved as well as fish.

Crystal Robinson echoed Brandon Fawaz's sentiments.

Michael Stapleton indicated that he hopes the GSP will include both short- and long-term projects. He commented that managed recharge is an optimistic goal.

Meeting Adjourns

The Facilitator thanked all for participating and adjourned the meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Brandon Fawaz, Private pumper Tom Menne, Scott Valley Irrigation District Crystal Robinson, Quartz Valley Tribe Andrew Braugh, CalTrout, Environmental/Conservation Paul Sweezey, Member-at-Large Michael Stapleton, Residential Jason Finley, Private Pumper

Absent Committee Members

Bill Beckwith, Fort Jones, Municipal/City Tom Jopson, Private Pumper

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 Claire Kouba, UC Davis Kelsey McNeill, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Agency Staff

Pat Vellines, Department of Water Resources Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish and Wildlife Chris Watt, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Shari Whitmore, National Marine Fisheries Service

Facilitator

Katie Duncan, Stantec Elizabeth Simon, Stantec

Members of the public

Leah Easley, Scott & Shasta Watermaster District Jack Rice Betsy Stapleton Charnna Gilmore Giuliano Galdi Bonny Nichols, Scott & Shasta Watermaster District Theodora Johnson Ceiba Cummings Lindsay Cummings

Joshua Saxon, Karuk Tribe Grant Johnson, Karuk Tribe Ngodoo Atume Preston Harris Jim Morris