Meeting date/time: April 24th, 2018 I 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. <u>Location</u>: Ft. Jones Community Hall, 11960 East, Ft. Jones Key contacts:

- -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 r.wilson@csus.edu I 415.515.2317
- -Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead I Ifoglia@ucdavis.edu 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.** No comments were received during the initial public comment period. Some members of the public offered comments at various points on the SGMA Technical Team's presentation.
- **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. Advisory committee members posed questions on various issues, including what is considered baseline conditions under SGMA, the Scott Valley water budget, and how to handle past privacy agreements regarding collected groundwater elevation data, among others.
- 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. 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.
- 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).
- Stakeholder Communication and Outreach. Facilitator Rich Wilson reviewed statutory requirements—under SGMA and in the GSP Emergency Regulations—that require development of a stakeholder communication and outreach plan for Scott Valley. He noted

that an ad hoc subcommittee may be formed at the next meeting to help advise the development of this plan.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

| Action Item | Responsible Party | Status/Deadline |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Look into whether parties other than GSAs can apply | Pat Vellines | By next |
| for Proposition 68 funds, as related to groundwater. | | meeting |
| Send the committee information about the June 5 th – | Matt Parker or | Complete |
| 6 th GSP workshop, which is designed specifically for | Technical Team | |
| GSA Board and Advisory Committee members. | | |
| Send to Matt two DWR guidance documents on how | Thomas Harter, | By next |
| surface water/groundwater interaction may be | Matt Parker | committee |
| considered under SGMA. Matt will pass these two | | meeting |
| documents on to committee members. | | |
| Send around a weblink that provides access to a basic | Matt Parker | Complete |
| questionnaire which the SGMA Technical Team is | | |
| utilizing to conduct outreach across the basin and | | |
| build the voluntary well monitoring network. | | |
| Begin talking to some data providers about SGMA and | Tom Menne | Ongoing |
| how they may get involved and potentially share data. | | |
| Assist the SGMA Technical Team by helping identify | Committee | Ongoing |
| important areas across the basin to conduct | members | |
| groundwater elevation monitoring. (This came up | | |
| primarily in Butte Valley and Shasta Valley basins but | | |
| also applies to the Scott Valley.) | | |
| Keep the committee informed of the status of the | Matt Parker | As updates are |
| County's grant proposal to the Bureau of Reclamation | | available |
| WaterSMART program. | | |
| Share upcoming meeting dates and times. | Matt Parker | Complete |
| Share the committee's provisionally adopted charter | Matt Parker | May 21 st GSA |
| with the GSA Board and make a staff recommendation | | Board meeting |
| for approval. Also, put in a query about the use of | | |
| alternate committee members at the time the charter | | |
| is shared with the GSA board. | | |
| Prepare and distribute the April meeting summary. | Rich Wilson | Complete |

Next meeting: Tuesday May 28th, 2019 from 3:00 – 5:30pm, Ft Jones Commuity Hall, 11960 East St, Ft Jones.

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. During the course of the meeting, time permitting, the public may also comment on any agenda items. No public comments were initially offered. Some members of the public offered comments at various points of the SGMA Technical Team's presentation.

District Staff and Other Updates

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

- **Past Groundwater Committee Status.** The GSA Board decided that this committee will remain active as a resource if needed, but is not currently meeting.
- Advisory Committee Membership Composition. The municipal seat will be filled by Bill Beckwith, who currently sits on the Ft. Jones City Council. Bill will be appointed at next GSA Board meeting.
- **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 who attended shared her impression that many in the public do not know much about SGMA, and thus more public outreach is needed. Matt Parker acknowledged that it can be hard to reach people, but that more public meetings will occur in the future. Facilitator Rich Wilson noted that development of communication and plans for each basin, a requirement under SGMA, will help provide a roadmap to guide outreach efforts.
- **DWR Technical Support Services.** Siskiyou County put in application for Scott Valley to have a monitoring well installed at the airport, 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.
- 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 9-10 sets of equipment per basin (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. Following a question,
 Matt noted that any committee members who know of individuals who may be
 interested to participate in the program should inform Matt. In addition, the Technical
 Team has prepared an outreach survey that interested parties should complete.
 (https://www.getfeedback.com/r/JFf2RLBm/)
- Additional Grant Funds. DWR staff Pat Vellines 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, and Matt and Laura are already discussing necessary needs for the proposal. Matt and Laura fielded a few questions about how unexpected work to date has contributed to expending more funds than expected from the county's currently Proposition 1 grant, and therefore this grant opportunity could provide additional resources needed for GSP development. Another question was raised about how best to coordinate proposals. At the May advisory committee meeting, members will have an opportunity to brainstorm project proposals that will help fill data gaps and thus provide additional information to develop the water budget and hydrogeological conceptual model under SGMA. In addition, Pat Vellines agreed to look into whether parties other than GSAs can apply for Proposition 68 funds, as related to groundwater projects.

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 to 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

Claire Kouba of the SGMA Technical Team followed Thomas and gave a presentation to orient the committee to the work that she and her team will be conducting as the Scott Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development process unfolds. She described DWR's GSP content requirements, discussed early chapters that her team will soon begin developing (e.g. Plan Area and Basin Setting), noted how climate change scenarios will need to be explored. She then reviewed some currently available data sources and gaps in the Shasta Valley region. A range of comments and questions interspersed the presentations. Thomas and Claire provided responses throughout. District staffer Matt Parker at times also contributed to the responses below.

- Question: What are you using as a baseline? <u>Response</u>: SGMA requires that groundwater needs to be managed sustainability. Sustainability is defined as the absence of the six undesirable results (the six). The main goal of the law is for conditions to not worsen from 2015, which is the baseline defined in the law. The GSP will also have to take TMDL work in Scott Valley into consideration. <u>Additional member</u> comment: The TMDL for Scott Valley calls for better quality than the 2015 baseline.
- Question: Can you please further describe your role? <u>Response</u>: Our goal and the focus of our work bring forward a technical understanding to you and DWR of how the basin system works. This is the foundation for work that you need to do focused on setting management objectives, thresholds and what kind of projects need to be implemented.
- Question: How do you take into consideration changing weather conditions year by year? Response: Two things: 1) The GSP will have to define the variability of year-to-year variations. Thresholds will have to be defined as to what constitutes an undesirable result. The GSP must then demonstrate how undesirable results will be avoided even in dry years. 2) SGMA is explicit in requiring that the GSP look at climate change and 50 year projected climate scenarios. These scenarios are pre-defined by DWR. The model will take a lot of this information into one place and link it in a physically consistent manner that allows for "what if" type scenarios.
- Question: In regards to the TMDL, how do we reconcile 2015 conditions? What does SGMA mean to TMDL? Response: There is no clear answer to this question. The technical team can forward two guidance documents that have been developed that provide basic structure on when and what to look at the issue of groundwater/surface water depletion. These documents provide some insight in how to frame the discussion. Additional member comment: Perhaps it is a happy coincidence that the model data is from about this time. Response: The model is 1991 2011. The Technical Team will extend the model to 2019.
- Question: Does the model have a water budget? How does that factor in? <u>Response</u>: The water budget is done. It's a great gift from the past. However, it wasn't designed

with SGMA in mind. Under SGMA, the idea is to avoid undesirable results, so we could use your help to make updates to the model. We'll extend the scope of the water budget at least through 2019. We'll also have the ability to update the model moving forward. The nuts and bolts of the water budget are developed.

- Questions/comments: A few comments and questions heled clarify groundwater elevation listed in the PPT charts. More data points will create a clearer picture.
- <u>Technical team comment</u>: In response to some questions about the proposed protocol for handling data and feedback. The team is working on architecture for a data system that we would hand off to county. An internal system and a public system.
- <u>Question</u>: Is information available about the depth of individual wells? <u>Response</u>: This is largely in the well completion reports.
- Question: Regarding continuous transducer data, if we come up with a management action could we include this data in the GSP? <u>Response</u>: Information on a map should be available. Then there is also annual reporting and updates. There is likely room to have information available, make informed decisions, but not have to share all information.
- Question: What's the initial reaction that irrigators have to this data management discussion, and what real legal liability must be taken into consideration regarding the sharing of data? Member response (irrigator): We made promises to people in the past that we wouldn't share data. There was a big stir in the middle when we almost lost everyone when it was going to be public. It's unclear at the moment because the previous effort under the other groundwater committee. Maybe that original committee could meet again to discuss. Technical team response: In the past it was most important to not disclose property information. Public comment: It's an accurate recollection that in 2010 we had a lot of folks back out because the funding source at the time required mandatory reporting to the state. Later we got maybe two-thirds of these people back and we got private funding. Technical team response: Maybe an important message to tell people is that more data is better for GSP. Member comment: Maybe this can be addressed through the data agreements, but the other committee might also need to meet and discuss these issues.

IRWM Grant Proposal Update

Preston Harris noted that the submitted IRWM project for Scott Valley was not approved for funding. Initial feedback, he noted, suggests project was outside of the scope of what DWR was looking for compared to other projects which were funded. It was an outside the box concept that no one on review committee had experienced. noted that the project was too SGMA focused, and that this may have been an issue for the reviewers. Others suggested may the project could be resubmitted based on the emerging opportunity with Proposition 68 funds. Still others suggested that the situation presented an opportunity to engage in outreach to the Siskiyou County supervisors to ensure support is fully there in advance of submitting other proposals.

Charter Discussion and Provisional Adoption

Facilitator Rich Wilson introduced the next iteration of the draft charter (governance structure) to the group, which included additional edits from county counsel and Matt Parker. Matt reviewed changes to the charter's goals, member terms, and membership composition. The group had no questions about the updated edits and again provisionally adopted the charter. The next step will be for Matt to present the draft charter to the GSA Board for review and approval, which is expected to occur at the May 21st board meeting.

Stakeholder Communication and Engagement

The facilitator briefly reviewed statutory requirements—under SGMA and in the GSP Emergency Regulations—that requirement development of a stakeholder communication and engagement plan in Scott Valley. He noted that, at the next meeting, an ad hoc committee may be formed to assist in development of the Scott Valley plan.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

Tom Jopson, Private pumper
Tom Menner, Scott Valley Irrigation District
Paul Sweezey, Member-at-large
Drew Braugh, CalTrout (Environmental/Conservation)
Crystal Robinson, Quartz Valley Tribe (Tribal representative)
Bill Beckwith, Fort Jones (Municipal/City representative)

Absent Committee Members

Brandon Fawaz, Private pumper Jason Finley, Private pumper Michael Stapleton, Residential

District Staff

Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

DWR Staff

Pat Vellines, Regional Coordinator, Northern Region Office, Department of Water Resources

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

¹ Three members of the public attended the meeting.

Claire Kouba, 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 Brad Gooch, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program