<u>Meeting date/time</u>: November 5th, 2019 I 3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. <u>Location</u>: Montague Community Hall, 200 S. 11th Street, Montague <u>Key contacts</u>:

-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 <u>r.wilson@csus.edu</u> I 415.515.2317 -Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead I <u>lfoglia@ucdavis.edu</u> I 530.219.5692

MEETING RECAP

- Action Item Update and Approval of Past Meeting Summary. The committee received an update on the status of past action items and approved its September meeting summary.
- **Public Comment.** Public comments were interspersed throughout the meeting, particularly during the discussion of the updated water budget estimate for Shasta Valley.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker provided an overview of key elements and associated budget of the Proposition 68 grant proposal that was put together by GSA staff, with technical support from the SGMA Technical Team. If awarded, funds from this proposal will support GSP development and associated work that was not funded by the Proposition 1 grant award. Matt also provided a brief update on the county's coordination with the State Water Board regarding its modeling development and work on the Shasta River.
- Stakeholder Communication and Engagement. The facilitator introduced and reviewed the latest round of edits provided to the Shasta Valley Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan (C&E Plan). The committee initially engaged in a general conversation about stakeholder engagement, sharing several ideas about how the committee itself could meet more frequently so as to better understand technical presentations and provided needed feedback to District staff and the local SGMA Technical Team. The committee provide a few minor comments and then provisional adopted the plan. The document will be revisited by the committee at key milestones in the GSP development process and, as needed, updated and improved.
- GSP Development. Dr. Laura Foglia, SGMA Technical Team Lead in Siskiyou County, presented the draft GSP section 2.1. She provided an overview of the team's work, the range of information included in this section, and, with support from Matt Parker, reviewed a form that committee members should use to provide feedback on draft materials. Committee members have until November 30th to provide additional input on this draft material. The facilitator briefly reviewed a form that committee members and interested parties should use to submit comments. Byron Clark with Davids Engineering provided an update on his team's work to develop an estimated water budget for Shasta Valley. He and Laura fielded a range of questions, from both committee members and the public.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

| Action Item | Responsible Party | Status/Deadline |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Send around the summary of action items and prepare | Rich Wilson | November |
| and distribute a draft meeting agenda. | | |

| Share information she has regarding which surface | Leah Easley, Matt | Prior to next |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| water rights in Shasta Valley are active and which are | Parker, Laura | committee |
| not to aid the committee discussion. Matt Parker and | Foglia | meeting |
| Laura Foglia will work with the local watermaster first | | |
| on this issue, then information can be brought back to | | |
| committee. | | |
| Clean up and send the provisionally adopted C&E Plan | Rich Wilson | Prior to next |
| to committee members. Members are requested to | | committee |
| provide pictures of Shasta Valley for cover page (the | | meeting |
| valley, farms, the river, fish, people living and enjoy | | |
| the place). Photo credit will be given. Matt Parker will | | |
| post the plans (from Scott Valley, Shasta Valley and | | |
| Butte Valley) on the county's SGMA webpage. | | |
| Distribute the draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan | Matt Parker, | November 30th |
| chapter 2.1, along with a reviewer form for providing | Committee | |
| feedback. Committee members will utilize the | members | |
| reviewer form and provide any feedback by November | | |
| 30 th . Committee members will also let Matt Parker | | |
| know if they have any trouble or concerns about the | | |
| reviewer process. | | |
| Email questions or comments on recently presented | Committee | Nov. – Dec. |
| material to Byron Clark from Davis Engineering: | members | |
| byron@davidsengineering.com | | |
| Share various water quality publications that may | Thomas Harter, | November |
| inform the SGMA process. Matt Parker will post these | Matt Parker | |
| publications on the county's SGMA webpage. | | |
| Matt Parker, with support from Laura Foglia and Rich | Matt Parker, | January |
| Wilson, will develop and put forward a proposal to | Laura Foglia, Rich | committee |
| address the committee's concerns regarding the | Wilson | meeting |
| possible need for more meetings | | |
| | | |

Next meeting: Wednesday, January 29th, 2019 from 3:00 – 6:00pm, Montague Community Hall, 200 S. 11th Street, Montague.

View Siskiyou County's groundwater website for posted meeting materials

MEETING SUMMARY

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

Facilitator Rich Wilson reviewed the meeting agenda, provided a brief update on past action items, and secured consent from the committee to finalize and post the September meeting

summary on the county's SGMA webpage. No questions or concerns about the agenda were expressed committee members.

Public Comment Period

At the outset, members of the public may comment on items not on the consent agenda. The public is asked to wait until the appropriate item to comment on issues directly related the current meeting agenda. No questions or comments were received by the public at the outset of the meeting.

District Staff and Other Updates

Matt Parker provided updates on a range of issues:

- Water Board Coordination. The State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) and the Department of Fish and Wildlife will implement a suite of individual and coordinated administrative efforts to enhance flows statewide in at least five stream systems that support critical habitat for anadromous fish, including the Shasta River. Siskiyou County has developed a collaboration agreement with the Water Board. The local SGMA Technical Team has begun collaborating on the process and publicly available data/information with Water Board staff and its consultants and is jointly developing models with the Water Board's technical consultants. Dr. Laura Foglia and her team will work on a surface water and groundwater model, the Water Board will work on a surface water model, and the models will be paired. In the future, scenarios will be worked on together. At times, Water Board staff or their consultants may come and present at committee meetings.
- **Proposition 68 Grant Proposal.** Matt Parker provided an update on the Proposition 68 grant proposal. DWR extended the deadline to submit to November 15. GSA staff was largely ready to submit regardless. Matt reviewed key elements of the proposal and associated budget:
 - Four components:
 - GSA County-wide
 - Butte, Scott, Shasta
 - Any acquired funds must be used by April 2022
 - Proposal includes funds for items not included in Prop 1 proposal
 - DWR formula to determine maximum ask (figured about 540K per basin)

Matt went on to cover major tasks in the proposal:

- Stakeholder engagement
- GSP development (can include looking at economic analysis of projects)
- Fee study
- Database development/GIS work
- Materials/equipment
- Grant Administration

Matt noted any funds acquired would cover tasks ahead that are not covered in the Proposition 1 grant. Laura emphasized the importance of studying surface water/groundwater interaction. The GSP, she noted, needs data to demonstrate sustainability over the next 20 years. Having baseline conditions will be very helpful. She also noted the group's interest to consider the entire watershed in the model, and that forest management practices can be integrated into the model. Matt and Laura fielded a handful of questions from committee members, about flexibility of spending on real needs, limited funds for geophysical studies, and the next DWR Proposal Solicitation Package the will provide resources for GSP implementation.

• Advisory Committee Chair/Vice-Chair. John Tannaci was formally nominated and elected by consensus to fill the role of chair. Susan Fricke was elected as Vice-Chair.

Stakeholder Communication and Engagement

Facilitator Rich Wilson introduced the latest iteration of the Shasta Valley Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Plan (C&E Plan). He thanked committee members and others who have provided feedback on the draft to date. Committee members initially engaged in a general conversation about stakeholder engagement, prior to providing additional feedback on the draft plan itself. Some committee members expressed concern about the amount of information being shared at meetings, and the difficulty of members being able to digest technical presentations and associated material.

A few suggestions were put forward, including responses at times by GSA staffer Matt Parker and SGMA Technical Team Lead Laura Foglia, during open group discussion:

- Subcommittees could be a useful way to help the committee to better understand what is being shared, and in turn, help ensure quality information, and not inaccurate information, is shared with the public
- Ensure information is not just presented and then the conversation moves on
- Perhaps the committee needs to meet more frequently (monthly); seems a lot of time at each meeting is spent catching up from last time
- Information could be introduced at one meeting and then discussion more thoroughly at a subsequent meeting
- The local SGMA Technical Team could come early and stay after meetings in order to answer questions
- Have refresh sessions on an as needed basis
- Consider videoconferencing meetings
- Ensure better processing of information by committee members and the public, as well as better feedback
- Technical information will likely be an ongoing challenge
- Regularly revisit when more meetings are necessary or warranted

At the culmination of the discussion, Matt Parker agreed that he and his SGMA team would come up with a proposal to address the aforementioned issues which could be presented and considered by the committee at its January meeting.

Following this discussion, the facilitator reviewed the various parts of the updated C&E Plan, showed recent updates, and asked the committee if it had any outstanding questions, comments or concerns about the document. Just a few minor comments were received. Some were focused on needed additions to the local stakeholder table. Another comment focused on embedding proactive conflict resolution as part of the plan. After addressing suggestion edits, the committee provisionally adopted the C&E Plan, understanding it will be revisited at key milestones during the GSP development process and, as needed, revised and improved.

GSP Development: Shasta Valley Groundwater Basin Setting

Dr. Laura Foglia provided a status update on the SGMA Technical Team's work. She described where continuous well monitoring is taking place across the valley, noted that the next installation will occur in mid-November, and reminded the group that volunteer participants in the well monitoring program are still needed. She acknowledged interest shown at recent meetings about the need to have more precipitation data and the challenges associated with the many microclimates that exist in Shasta valley. She again reminded the group of the equipment secured through the Bureau of Reclamation grant, and looked for volunteers who are interested to do continuous monitoring and receive a soil moisture sensor and rain gage.

Laura then described the key elements of the draft GSP chapter 2.1., including a cover letter that, for this and future draft materials, will be used to give background information on what committee members are receiving. Matt Parker followed with a brief explanation of a reviewer form that committee members should use when reviewing and submitting comments on draft GSP materials to the GSA. Committee members will have until November 30th to review and provide input on this draft material. One member requested that the Technical Team provide the materials at least a week in advance of the meeting, so as to be able to review them and come prepared to the meeting to discuss. Another suggested that any tracker form that the GSA maintains of comments submitted should include the name of who submitted comments.

Laura's review of the draft material was followed by an updated presentation on the estimated Shasta Valley water budget by Byron Clark of Davids Engineering. Byron again reviewed the three budgets his team is considering: soil, surface water, and groundwater system. As Byron review the water budget analysis area, he and Laura fielded questions on a range of topics, with most coming from committee members whereas some came from the public:

- How budgets are normalized in areas with varied vegetation
- How evapotranspiration can be estimated over time
- Ability to show percolation based on soil parameters
- Considering snow pack when estimating the water budget
- Considering that water is often used multiple times

- Not considering 2015 as a normal precipitation year
- Determining how long it will take for precipitation to lead to groundwater recharge
- How the model calibrates the many different soil types in Shasta Valley
- How the model considers seasonal conditions of soil

Several committee members, similar to the previous meeting, expressed concern that technical consultants are using 2015 as a normal precipitation year. Water that did hit the ground in 2015, was "drank up" right away given the previous drought years. Some suggested that the technical consultants do not integrate 2015 as a normal year into the model. Scott Valley committee members, it was shared at one point, had a similar discussion, also expressing concerns about viewing 2015 as a normal precipitation year.

As Byron concluded his presentation, he described next steps, including further refinement of the water budget based on local knowledge, incorporation of additional surface water use into the model, and dividing applied water estimates. He let committee members know that they could reach out at any time with additional questions, comments or suggestions about the work that Davids Engineering was presenting to the group.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

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

Absent Committee Members

None

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

¹ Approximately ten members of the public attended the meeting.

Byron Clark, Davids Engineering

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program