

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

Meeting date/time: January 29th, 2020 | 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Location: Montague Community Hall, 200 S. 11th Street, Montague

Key contacts:

- Matt Parker, County Natural Resources Specialist | mparker@co.siskiyou.ca.us | 530.842.8019
- Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University Senior Facilitator | r.wilson@csus.edu | 415.515.2317
- Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead | lfoglia@ucdavis.edu | 530.219.5692

MEETING RECAP

- **Approval of Past Meeting Summary.** The advisory committee approved its November meeting summary. The summary will be posted on the Siskiyou County SGMA website.
- **Public Comment.** A few questions and comments were made by members of the public during the course of the meeting, most following the presentation about sustainable management criteria.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker provided updates on 1) new outreach materials that GSA staff will soon development; 2) early implementation of the acquired Bureau of Reclamation grant; and 3) the recent recommendation for approval that the GSA’s Proposition 68 grant received. Matt then led a simple exercise to determine new terms for all committee members.
- **Development of SGMA Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC).** Dr. Laura Foglia, SGMA technical team lead, provided a foundational presentation focused on 1) key SGMA requirements for developing SMCs; 2) a proposed collaborative process for developing locally informed SMCs for Shasta Valley; and 3) water quality, the first sustainability indicator that the committee would explore. Committee members put forward numerous questions and comments on the proposed collaborative process ahead and the specific topic of water quality. The technical team concluded this session by reviewing what kind of input it needs from the committee as the water quality SMC is developed.
- **Goal Setting Exercise.** Following the SMC presentation, committee members engaged in a brief exercise wherein each member, as well as interested members of the public, worked initially by themselves to describe what both sustainable groundwater management looks like, and what the worst case scenario looks like in the event groundwater is not managed sustainably. Members then briefly shared their individual perspectives with the full group.
- **Formation of Surface Water Ad Hoc Committee.** An ad hoc committee was formed to utilize local expertise to identify and provide information that supports development of the “interconnected surface water” SMC.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Status/Deadline</i>
Post relevant links on the Siskiyou County SGMA website to GSAs that are further along in the process.	Matt Parker	February

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

Committee members or interested public let Laura Foglia know of any landowner that wants their well in the voluntary network.	Committee members; public	Ongoing
Send DWR's Draft Sustainable Management Criteria BMP publication to committee members	Rich Wilson	February
Share relevant information that may help inform the SMC development process in Shasta Valley, directly to Matt Parker, who will share with the technical team.	Committee members; public	Ongoing
Share information on possible water quality parameters and other information to considered in developing a SGMA water quality SMC. Committee members respond accordingly to the technical team's request for input.	Laura Foglia and Matt Parker; Committee members	February
If particular data is missing or otherwise needs to be considered under the SGMA framework, let the technical team know how to access what is available.	Committee members, public	Ongoing
Schedule first surface water ad hoc committee meeting.	Laura Foglia, Matt Parker	Completed
Show which wells in Shasta Valley have mandatory monitoring requirements at the March meeting	Laura Foglia	March
Draft and share the meeting summary and associated action items.	Rich Wilson	February

Next Meeting: March 4th, 2020, 3 – 6 pm, Montague Community Hall, 200 S. 11th Street, Montague.

View [Siskiyou County's groundwater website](#) for posted meeting materials.

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda Review and Approval of Past Meeting Summary

Facilitator Rich Wilson reviewed the meeting agenda and secured consent from the committee to finalize and post the November 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.

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

District Staff and Other Updates

Matt Parker provided update on the following:

- GSA staff is going to prepare outreach documents such as SGMA FAQs. Matt is looking for examples in other basins. DWR’s regional representative Pat Vellines is also a good source.
- GSA staff, with support from its technical team, will soon utilize the Bureau of Reclamation grant to start installing groundwater measurement equipment.
- The GSA’s Proposition 68 grant proposal was recommended for approval. Following a public comment period, this will likely mean an additional \$1.6 million to further support SGMA implementation in Scott Valley, Shasta Valley and Butte Valley.
- Matt led a simple “draw a straw” exercise to affirm new membership, with some committee members serving two years and some three.

Matt Parker’s updates were followed by a brief presentation from Tito Cervantes, Senior Land and Water Use Scientist with the Department of Water Resources (DWR). Mr. Cervantes provided a historical perspective of how DWR has studied surface water and groundwater resources around the state. He noted that many things have occurred over his 33 year career with DWR—resource availability has changed, river flows have diminished and scientists are documenting climate change impacts around the state.

Tito emphasized that sustainable water management depends on improved communication and collaboration among agencies, water users and interested parties at local, regional and statewide levels. Irrigation efficiencies, he noted, have improved in the agricultural sector. At the same time, around the state surface water flows are now supplemented by groundwater to a much higher degree than in years past.

Tito recommended that GSAs and local stakeholders in groundwater basins around the state find more comfort in sharing their groundwater data, both with DWR and the public. To avoid regulations from Sacramento, he said, it’s important to share the data and sustainably manage resources at the local level. This is the opportunity afforded by SGMA. DWR staff, he reminded everyone, are available as a resource during groundwater management planning efforts.

A brief Q&A session followed Tito’s presentation. He responded to queries and comments about past data years, what is known and still needs to be known about the valley, and how thundershowers don’t occur monthly since around 2000. Dr. Laura Foglia, the local SGMA technical team lead, described the mapping exercise that was conducted at previous advisory committee meetings in Shasta Valley and Butte Valley.

Local RCD Update

Ethan Brown informed the committee that the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District has installed two new CIMIS stations in the valley. He encouraged committee members to log on to check out the collected information (<https://cimis.water.ca.gov/WSNReportCriteria.aspx>).

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

Development of SGMA Sustainable Management Criteria

Facilitator Rich Wilson briefly described SGMA work ahead, noting that the group had reached a critical period where, for the next 12-14 months, the committee, with significant support from the technical team, would collaboratively develop sustainable management criteria (SMC) across all indicators established by SGMA. He reminded the group that this is the opportunity to define management from a local perspective.

Matt Parker then framed both the short and long-term conversation ahead. He noted that following a foundational SMC development presentation, the group would soon start providing significant input across multiple topics related to SGMA's six indicators, as well as special presentations that will at times be appropriate or warranted. He emphasized that this is an important period for the committee to discuss, deliberate and build consensus around sustainable management of groundwater resources in Shasta Valley.

Matt acknowledged that public input is still welcome but may be more regularly structured at future committee meetings to occur at the end or beginning of specific meeting agenda topics. He asked all parties—committee members and the interested public—to continue using the shared comment form whenever draft GSP material is shared for review. Lastly, Matt emphasized that the GSA board is going to start receiving materials and information from technical team as it is developed with the advisory committee. The board wants to hear committees' collective input and judgement on the GSP. Comments made on draft GSP material will be made publicly available after all comments have been received. A few committee members noted that it is important to track public comments both during official comment periods and when they come in less formally.

Dr. Laura Foglia, SGMA technical team lead, began presenting on the foundational elements of SGMA SMCs—requirement of the law to avoid undesirable results; key SMC technical terms; and a proposed collaborative process for developing SMCS that melds technical information with local interests and insights. She then introduced key the topic of water quality, the first sustainability indicator that the committee would explore. She emphasized that the work ahead would focus on sharing interests and generating ideas around what groundwater sustainability looks like in Shasta Valley.

Several comments, questions and suggestions interspersed Laura's presentation, and she or Matt responded throughout.

- Comment: Suggest you superimpose the available wells and timeline of data collection and thus show all three measurements in one graph.
- Comment: It would be helpful to make rain data available. Local and real data, if people don't mind.
- Question: Is groundwater storage essentially our total water bank? Response: Yes.
- Question: How is your model going to look at degraded quality? Leeching is going on. How will we account for this? Response: The groundwater model is not for water

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

quality, but this is an important point. DWR staffer Pat Vellines: The Water Board will check things like what Blair is flagging.

- Question: What is a minimum threshold? Response: Anything lower than this is considered an undesirable result. Lowest you can go without something significant and unreasonable happening. This will be defined locally.
- Question: Just like with water quality, we might need to be operational sub-areas. How do you manage a whole basin that may have localized localized problems. Response: Management areas are an option, however, there are several considerations, including cost to have a unique management framework in several areas. Additional response: Management areas can be linked to just one indicator, doesn't have to be all indicators.
- Comment: In case of water quality, there are other standards. Response: Yes, and SGMA does not supersede any existing regulation.
- Question: In the context of a basin wide perspective, are we going to try to meet drinking water standards? Response: Yes, we'll talk about what's ideal for this basin.
- Question: Is defining an overarching goal coming last? Response: No, the committee will start with a simple exercise today.
- Question: Will some our discussion on sustainability indicators go back and forth to the GSA board as we do this work. Response: Yes, the board will be kept up to date and also review and weigh in on materials along the way. The committee will strive to build consensus along the way, and take the time needed.
- Comment: It's a slippery slope, building a SGMA "thermometer" for each SMC topic. In the real world, each ranch has its own thermometer. Everyone has their way of doing things. It's important for the technical team to understand that the data you gather is site specific. At a certain point in process you'll get disagreements. Sustainability and economic feasibility may not be compatible. Give and take in the committee discussion will continue and we'll have to have compromises. Mostly we do pasture in Shasta Valley. We all have different practices. We have to look at all of this. Response: This gets to the question of management areas. Additional comment: It would be hard to have 30 management areas. As a local community it will be tough to change.
- Comment: The aforementioned discussion is the reason we've asked the public to let us do our work. The public will still raise various issues. Additional comment: We know we're not going to agree on everything. Better to do it here in this committee setting. Our charter gives us ways to build consensus or have disagreements, this will help. Additional comment: We also don't have to get it exactly right at first, by the date of initial GSP submission that is.
- Question: How are you going to consider different geological features in our valley? How will we be able to tell whether we are impacting groundwater at all. Response: This is why the technical team has built the model. Additional comment: We need to look at urban use. Collectively, residential wells are pumping out more than 2 acre feet of water. Not individually, but collectively. Suggestion: Has to be some way in your model to extract the proportional amount withdrawn by the Ag community, but what's withdrawn by the urban community will also have to be accounted for.

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

- Comment: We're dealing with limited groundwater resource. Hopefully this GSP will help us to not get the system out of whack.
- Comment: Some committee members are talking about what happens after we get the plan done. We'll need to not just put a plan together but also talk about how do we implement this plan and get everyone to buy-in.

Goal Setting Exercise

At the culmination of the SMC presentation, committee members engaged in a brief exercise wherein each member, as well as interested members of the public, worked initially by themselves to describe what both sustainable groundwater management looks like, and the worst case scenario in the event groundwater is not managed sustainably. Members then briefly shared their individual perspectives with the full group. The facilitator noted that this input will be brought back to the committee and will be refined over time.

Water Quality

Following back and forth conversation about the proposed SMC development process, and early SGMA indicators that would be considered by the committee, Laura gave a presentation on water quality. She asked the group to think about what makes a good monitoring network. She described existing state and federal water quality regulations. She tasked the committee to consider what's important in Shasta Valley and what water quality parameters need to be considered.

Laura reviewed a number of slides that showed what is known from the existing groundwater monitoring network in Shasta Valley. A number of comments and question from committee members followed.

- Comment: Are we basing our SGMA work on the assumption that current water quality regulatory framework is appropriate? Response: If you want to make things better than existing standards that's ok. Additional response: It's important to remember there are costs around implementation and enforcement.
- Question: Does state have money to support monitoring? Response: Implementation grants are at times available.
- Question: Is it the state's expectation that you'll ultimately have to pay for all this locally? Response: It's important that the local GSA is cautious about this. The GSA might have to assess fees at some point to support implementation costs. The GSA does not want to go this direction now but it's important to understand.
- General technical team comment: A monitoring network is needed to demonstrate sustainability. Some things won't need a lot of measurements, some will need more. What's in the Shasta Valley groundwater monitoring network will be what is shared with DWR to demonstrate sustainability.
- Question: When you say data points you mean sampling points? Response: A number of tests for a single well. Two samples from the same well to show a trend.

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

- Comment: I have to sample nitrates monthly for some clients. Additional comment: I have to do it monthly because Lake Shastina is a municipality.
- Question: For people around the table mentioning data, is your data included in your database? Response: The state has data from municipalities based on Title 22 requirements.
- Suggestion action Item: If committee members or the public feel particular data is missing or otherwise needs to be considered under the SGMA framework, let the technical team know about studies or data, how to access what is available.
- Comment: We want to be able to do a long-term trends analysis, so we need to know where the data sets are.
- Suggested action item: At the next committee meeting it would be helpful to show the committee which wells have mandatory monitoring requirements. This will help us figure where we have monitoring data gaps.
- Question: Can Siskiyou County, when issuing a well permit, put monitoring requirements in place. Response: This would require a local ordinance.
- Comment/suggestion: We need long-term monitoring sources. We also need to look at what pesticides are prevalent in area.
- Comment: Drinking water and other data associated with local schools may be a good source of information. Ask the county pesticide people and determine the largest number of chemicals used and see if anyone has tested an Ag well. Additional comment: No one tests their wells like this. Additional comment: Its water utilities, title 22, look for common chemicals we use in this county in municipal wells.

Laura concluded the discussion by summarizing key tasks and input that committee members should provide on the SGMA water quality indicator.

- Think about what's important in Shasta Valley and what needs to be looked at—which parameters need to be considered in this basin?
- How should this data be represented?
- Which wells in Shasta Valley need to be monitored for water quality?
- Need to determine a minimum threshold (maximum, per other laws/standards), trigger, measurable objective for water quality.
- Need to determine what to measure, how to measure, where to measure, when to measure, and who will conduct this monitoring work.

Finally, Laura noted she would provide Matt with information on water quality, which he in turn would email to the group, requested feedback in advance of the March committee meeting.

Formation of Ad Hoc Committee

Looking ahead, an ad hoc committee was formed by volunteers Robert Moser, Susan Fricke, Steve Mains, Gregg Werner and Blair Hart; GSA staff, the technical team and the committee's facilitator will also participate. A summary will be created and shared with the whole advisory committee upon completion of the goals or at a relevant time. The primary purpose of the ad

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

hoc is to utilize local expertise to identify and provide information that supports development of the “interconnected surface water” SMC. All ideas considered by the ad hoc will be shared for consideration by the full committee.

Per its charter, the ad hoc is governed by the following:

“The Advisory Committee can form ad hoc subcommittees or workgroups as needed to assist with its work advising the GSA on groundwater sustainability plan development and implementation, or other SGMA-oriented issues. Subcommittee composition shall reflect the diversity of interests and interested members on the advisory committee. No final advice, decisions or recommendations will be made by any subcommittee. Rather, subcommittees will develop draft proposals or recommendations for full committee consideration.”

MEETING ATTENDEES

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. Katrina Arredondo, Larry Walker Associates
Cab Esposito, Larry Walker Associates

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Seatone Consulting

Public

Pat Vellines, Department of Water Resources
Rhonda Muse

**Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Shasta Valley Advisory Committee Meeting
MEETING SUMMARY**

Angelina Cook

Ethan Brown

Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish & Wildlife

Justin Sandahl

A few others were present but did not sign in