Meeting date/time: May 29th, 2019 I 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. Location: County Administrative Office, 1312 Fairlane rd. Yreka

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. No comments were received during the initial public comment period. At
 various points during the meeting members of the public asked questions and offered
 comments on the Tribal Advisory Committee concept, available past data that could inform
 the SGMA Technical Team's work, and revisions to draft maps presented for committee
 consideration at the meeting.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker and RCD staff provided updates on a range of issues, including a status update on DWR's basin prioritization process; 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. Laura Foglia provided brief updates on the SGMA Technical Team's ongoing coordination with the Water Board.
- Water Budget, Outreach and Anticipated Next Steps. The SGMA Technical Team provided a presentation, followed by an interactive group exercise, which outlined how a water budget is developed; described key considerations in developing a hydrogeological conceptual model; and allowed committee members to inform the team's work by viewing various draft area maps, identifying data gaps and potentially incorrect information, and suggesting ways to improve and validate how the maps illustrate current conditions in Shasta Valley. Ethan Brown provided a brief update on the work of the Shasta Valley RCD.
- Ad Hoc Stakeholder Outreach Committee. An ad hoc committee was formed in order to bring local knowledge and insights into the process of developing, under SGMA, the Shasta Valley Communication and Engagement Plan (C&E Plan). Five committee members volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee. Over the summer CCP will, in coordination with District staff and the Technical Team, prepare and solicit feedback on the draft C&E Plan from the ad hoc committee. CCP will then present this draft for consideration by the full committee at its September meeting.
- **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.

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.		·
When again sharing data and information initially	Technical Team	Prior to next
presented in its PPT presentation at the May		meeting
committee meeting—create bigger, easier to		
understand slides (e.g., diagrams and maps) with		
legends, graphs and tables.		
Keep the advisory committee informed as the	Matt Parker and	June 24 th
Proposition 68 proposal comes together, and whether	Committee	
or not any additional feedback is needed from	Members	
committee members. Committee members will		
provide Matt Parker with any additional project		
concepts or ideas for consideration in the proposal by.		
Distribute the Shasta Valley stakeholder ID chart and	Rich Wilson, Matt	June 7 th
adopted charter. Committee members will review the	Parker and	
stakeholder ID chart and let Rich Wilson and Matt	Committee	
Parker know if there are any key groups or individuals	Members	
missing.		
Provide committee members with digital versions of	Matt Parker,	June 12 th for
the draft outreach brochure and all maps shared at	Technical Team	feedback on
the May meeting. Committee members will review the	and Committee	brochure
draft Shasta Valley outreach brochure and provide	Members	June 14 th for
feedback by to Laura Foglia (<u>lfoglia@ucdavis.edu</u> or		feedback on
lauraf@lwa.com), with a CC to Matt Parker and Rich		draft maps
Wilson. Committee members will review and provide		
any additional feedback on draft area maps. The		
Technical Team will talk with RCD staff about any		
available past data that informs the maps discussed at		
the May committee meeting. The Technical Team will		
work with Matt Parker, once committee feedback has		
been received and incorporated on the brochure and		
maps, to post materials on the county website.		
Prepare and distribute the May advisory committee	Rich Wilson, Matt	By deadline
meeting summary and establish a deadline for review	Parker and	established
by committee members. Committee members will let	Committee	when meeting
Rich Wilson and Matt Parker know, by the established	Members	summary
deadline, if they have any comments, questions or		distributed
draft feedback on the meeting summary. If no		
comments are 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 Shasta Valley stakeholder		
outreach plan.		

Next meeting: Wednesday, September 25th, 2019 from 3:30 – 6:00pm, County Administrative Office, 1312 Fairlane Rd, Yreka

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 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

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 comment was offered at the outset. During the course of the meeting, a few members of the public, as well as local RCD staff, asked questions about the tribal advisory committee concept; sought clarifications and made suggestions about available past data during the Technical Team's presentations, and made a few suggestions about draft maps that the committee provided input on.

District Staff and Other Updates

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

DWR Basin Prioritization. Under DWR's basin reprioritization process, for basins of which the boundary was modified, Shasta Valley has maintained its status as a medium priority

groundwater basin. A public comment period on the statewide prioritization process was open from April 30th to May 30th. The release of final basin prioritization is expected in early summer. **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 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 Shasta Valley. Anyone interested in participating in the volunteer groundwater monitoring network should contact District staffer Matt Parker.

Water Board Coordination. The SGMA Technical Team received approval from both Siskiyou County and Water Board staff to begin exchanging emails with the Water Board's consultants, setting the stage for information sharing between the teams. Not much information has been shared to date, but the Technical Team has received maps from the Water Board's consultants. Dr. Laura Foglia, the SGMA Technical Team Lead, in responding to a few questions, clarified what SWRCB consulting staff she is working with and noted how the Water Board followed the committee's suggestion made at the January meeting, that is, preparation of two surface water models but the Water Board will use the SGMA Technical Team's groundwater model. A peer review process will occur once all the models are complete.

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. Matt Parker and Elizabeth Nielson responded to a few questions about the committee concept's intent and possible structure, its potential relation to other committees, whether or not more tribal seats will be opened on existing committees, and how it could provide additional input to the Board during GSP development. In response to a question posed directly to her, the Karuk Tribe representative on the committee noted that she coordinates with water quality staff from other tribes in the area, but does not make decisions on tribal input overall on SGMA. Finally, a member of the public stated that it is important that everyone recognize each tribe as a sovereign nation, to which Matt Parker noted that the county is respecting this and attempting to coordinate with each tribe with aboriginal lands in the county.

Water Budget, Outreach and Anticipated Next Steps

Laura Foglia revisited the goals and approach to build the volunteer groundwater monitoring network and reviewed a draft flyer that once approved, committee members can use to assist with outreach and recruitment of volunteer participants. Committee members were tasked to review the draft and provide the Technical Team and District staff input by mid-June. Laura then introduced a presentation and exercise designed to help inform development of the

Shasta Valley water budget and hydrogeological conceptual model (HCM). Technical Team member Cab Esposito followed by showing draft maps of the area which have been produced with existing DWR data. Both Laura and Cab fielded questions as they described how the model will be developed. The Technical Team introduced questions associated with each map so that committee members could help the Technical Team identify gaps, incorrect information, areas which require additional or otherwise newer data, and any other information based on local knowledge of Shasta Valley.

Following the Technical Team's presentation, the committee viewed large print out copies of each map and provided feedback to the Technical Team. A number of committee members commented, once back together as a group, that indeed there are some historical inaccuracies in the maps that need correction, and that more data is needed to improve them and give an accurate representation of the valley. Some offered to speak with constituents that can help provide additional information. A few specific comments and suggestions included the following:

- Validate which channel/stream tributaries to the Shasta river are dry for much of the year unless there is heavy runoff.
- Work with RCD staff to identify and consider past RCD data that can inform this effort.
- Validate which areas labeled as irrigated are actually irrigated.
- Consider looking at satellite photos to identify areas where illegal cannabis is grown, and identify the water source for these grows.
- Consider combining data from different maps and creating overlays.
- Use caution in how and where you distribute the brochure.
- Request a well location map to help identify wells.
- Public comment: Contact DWR or SWRCB about crop use estimates.

Laura concluded the discussion by suggesting the group take a few more weeks to look at digital copies of the maps and provide any additional insights to the Technical Team in advance of a late June field trip back to the region. She noted that the maps can be shared on the Siskiyou County website once they are further refined.

Following the Technical Team discussion, facilitator Rich Wilson reminded the group that the Shasta 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. Five committee members volunteered to join the subcommittee. A draft version of the C&E Plan that is developed over the summer will be presented for consideration by the full advisory committee at its September meeting.

Ethan Brown of the Shasta Valley RCD provided the final update of this session. He noted that the RCD has installed data loggers in multiple locations in the valley, and has received funding to acquire a few more. The RCD's goal is to focus on data poor areas with its monitoring. Finally,

Ethan noted, the RCD plans to install California Irrigation Management Systems (CIMIS) in the July timeframe.

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. In addition, Matt and Laura noted that perhaps 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 Proposition 68 funding opportunity, at this stage, can only support pilot projects, and that implementation funding opportunities may come later. An initial brainstorm with the committee ensued and the following comments and potential project ideas were put forward:

- Some kind of beneficial project on the west side (e.g. China ditch) such as monitoring off season groundwater recharge benefits
- Data collection that shows promise
- Maybe reach out to and work with North Coast Regional Water Board to relate GSP projects to TMDL requirements (i.e. don't reinvent the wheel)
- Identify places (i.e. "sweet spots") where recharge is needed and can augment the basin's natural conditions in order to improve summer flows
- Identify important monitoring locations and acquire money for gages
- Maybe talk with the water master district about placing new gages in priority locations
- Consider juniper removal as a means to bring springs back
- Promote best management practices (BMPs) under the pilot projects re: temperature in rivers and link this to the TMDL work
- Consider water efficiency projects
- Consider managed aquifer storage and recovery
 - A committee member noted to use the UC Davis recharge map as a guide for recharge projects
- Prioritize protecting springs
- Secure money to support fieldwork
- Consider what will actually work and be cautious regarding legal issues

One committee member asked what projects elsewhere would be beneficial to the Shasta. One committee member noted that she liked some of the projects put forward, but did not support others. Another inquired as to how Scott Valley who led a groundwater recharge effort in the past acquired the necessary permits to do so. Matt reminded the group that this was an initial brainstorm, and that there may be additional opportunities for the committee to provide input on the proposal. He concluded by noting that staff will keep the group informed of proposal submission deadlines as they become more clear.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

Tristan Allen, Montague Water Conservation District
Lisa Faris, Big Spring Irrigation District
Susan Fricke, Karuk Tribe
Blair Hart, Private pumper
Justin Holmes, Edson Foulke Ditch Company
Steve Mains, Grenada Irrigation District
Robert Moser, Municipal/City
Beth Sandahl (Chair), Shasta River Water Users Association
John Tannaci (Vice-chair), Residential
Gregg Werner, Environmental/conservation

Absent Committee Members

Pete Scala, 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/Larry Walker Associates 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

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

¹ Four members of the public and a few RCD affiliates attended the meeting.