<u>Meeting date/time</u>: December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 I 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. <u>Location</u>: Ft. Jones Community Hall, 11960 East, Ft. Jones <u>Key contacts</u>: Matt Parker, County Natural Personness Specialist I maarker@co.sicki

-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**

- Welcome, Agenda Review and Introductions. Matt Parker welcomed all parties, introduced the facilitator to the group, and noted that future advisory committee meetings will be supported with impartial facilitation services. He also described the technical support role that will be played by a scientific team from Larry Walker and Associates. All members subsequently introduced themselves.
- Public Comment and Approval of Past Meeting Summaries. Public comments were received at various stages of the meeting agenda, notably following presentations on a DWR grant opportunity, recent stakeholder assessment, and the introduction of a draft charter for the group. Following the opening public comment period, Matt asked if any committee member had questions or comments on the previous draft meeting summaries. With no comments received, the committee gave final approval of the summaries.
- **GSA Staff Updates.** Matt Parker introduced and sought initial feedback on a draft well survey that the District hopes to distribute soon. He also shared an online tool which enables local well owners determine if their well or wells are located in a specific groundwater basin.
- Stakeholder Assessment, Draft Advisory Committee Charter and Next Steps. Facilitator Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP), shared the results of a recent Scott Valley groundwater basin stakeholder assessment, put forward initial recommendations to guide next SGMA steps, and introduced and sought feedback on a draft advisory committee charter (governance structure).
- Initial Orientation to the Brown Act. Committee members received an initial overview of the purpose and requirements of Ralph M. Brown Act. As a standing committee created by the Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District—the local SGMA Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA)—the Scott Valley Advisory Committee is a Brown Act compliant body. The District will look into additional Brown Act training opportunities for committee members.
- Future Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule. Matt, the facilitator and the technical team will coordinate to develop a committee workplan, and will soon set meeting dates through the first six months of 2019.

#### SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeframe/Deadline
Let Matt know ASAP if there are particular	Committee members;	As soon as possible
days of the week or month that you are <u>NOT</u>	Matt Parker	
available for regularly scheduled committee		
meetings. Matt will propose meeting dates for		
the first half of 2019.		
Review and provide feedback on the draft	Committee members	January 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2019
well survey to Matt Parker.		
Review the draft charter and email questions,	Committee members	January 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2019
comments or suggested amendments to		
facilitator Rich Wilson and Matt Parker.		
Regularly track questions posed by the	Matt Parker and Rich	Ongoing
committee or public that may require expert	Wilson	
response or guidance.		
Coordinate to prepare a draft workplan for	Matt Parker,	Prior to next
committee consideration at its next meeting.	technical team and	committee meeting
	facilitator	
Consult county counsel on whether advisory	Matt Parker	Prior to next
committee members need to sign and submit		committee meeting
form 700 as part of Brown Act requirements.		
Look into Brown Act training opportunities for	Matt Parker	Prior to next
committee members.		committee meeting

Next meeting: TBD – likely late January or early February, 2019

#### Website for meeting material posting:

https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/content/natural-resources-groundwater

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

#### Welcome, Agenda Review and Introductions

Matt Parker, natural resource staff with the Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District), opened the meeting, welcomed all attendees and the public, and briefly reviewed the agenda. He noted a full agenda and requested the group focus and keep moving to get through all agenda items. No committee member offered any questions or comments on the agenda.

Matt introduced Rich Wilson, senior facilitator/mediator with the Sacramento State University Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP). He noted that future meetings will be supported, at no cost to the county, with CCP's impartial facilitation services, which the District requested

and acquired through the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Facilitation Support Services program. He followed by briefly describing the technical support role which Larry Walker and Associates will play, also with grant support from DWR, during SGMA implementation in the Scott Valley groundwater basin.

# Public Comment and Approval of Past Meeting Summaries

Time periods for receiving public comment will always be built into advisory committee meeting agendas. At the outset, members may address the advisory 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. One committee member noted that it may be difficult for the public to participate if they are only allowed to comment at the outset of the meeting. Several additional public comments were received at various stages later in the meeting.

# GSA Staff Updates and Guest Presentation

Matt Parker introduced and sought initial committee feedback on a draft well survey that the District has prepared and would like to distribute soon in the Butte, Scott and Shasta Valley groundwater basins. Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), the District serves as the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for each of these basins. SGMA requires development a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) by January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022 in each of these basins. Tools such as water models and budgets must be developed in order to build GSPs. Substantial amounts of data must be collected through groundwater well measurements and monitoring to build these tools. The District is therefore seeking voluntary participants in a groundwater well monitoring program.

Matt stressed that any participation in the monitoring program is voluntary and meant to help the county better understand the current condition of groundwater resources. He noted that names and personal information can be removed from collected data. He encouraged committee members to think, and provide advice to the District, about how best to distribute the survey and secure voluntary participation of well owners that can supply important data for the District's technical team, and thereby help inform development of an accurate water budget for Scott Valley.

Committee members asked a few questions, one immediately volunteered his well, and several suggestions were made for improving the draft survey:

- <u>Question</u>: How many groundwater wells are you looking to include in the voluntary program? <u>Response</u>: The SGMA technical team (Larry Walker and Associates) would likely say the more wells the better.
- <u>Comment</u>: Non-use wells are a good target for inclusion in the program.
- <u>Comment</u>: Provide a more detailed explanation of the rationale and benefits of the voluntary program.
- <u>Comment</u>: Include a Scott Valley map.

- <u>Comment</u>: Use something more specific for the opening greeting (e.g., Dear Resident) "Dear Stakeholder" is too general.
- <u>Comment</u>: About 30 people may participate as long as their personal information is not made public.
- <u>Comment</u>: Put the request out for voluntary participation in the Siskiyou Daily News.
- <u>Comment</u>: Include an estimate of the number of groundwater wells in the basin.
- <u>Question</u>: What's going to be installed? What are you going to measure? <u>Response</u>: Planning to measure the groundwater level in participating wells.
- <u>Comment</u>: Do continuous monitoring if funding becomes available.
- <u>Question</u>: Will you hire a local person to collect data? <u>Response</u>: This will be something to discuss with the technical team. Volunteers could include graduate students but something could also be worked out with the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District (Siskiyou RCD) pending available funding (both current and future opportunities).

Matt concluded by describing an online tool which enables well owners to determine if their well or wells are located in a specific groundwater basin. Finally, Matt requested that all committee members review and provide any feedback on the draft well survey by January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2019, if not sooner. The online tool can be accessed here:

https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/index.jsp?appid=gasmaster&rz=true

Following the initial well survey discussion, Matt introduced Preston Harris to provide a brief overview of an upcoming DWR Integrated Regional Water Management Program (IRWM) grant opportunity. Building on the foundational work of the U.C. Davis groundwater model for Scott Valley, Preston described a full-scale offseason flooding and recharge project, with the goal of demonstrating potential benefits and high recharge capability in the valley. Siskiyou RCD is likely the organization planning to apply for the DWR IRWM grant in April, 2020, with technical assistance from UC Davis and CalTrout. If acquired, the grant would support flooding and recharge and some analysis associated with impacts to fish populations in the Scott river, but also an agronomics analysis of crop impacts. Project implementation would occur over five years, starting in 2020. A few comments and questions from committee members interspersed the conversation:

- <u>Comment</u>: Drew Braugh from CalTrout, representing the environmental/conservation seat, provided a brief organizational background and linked it to the discussion of science, policy, and habitat restoration that may be supported by an IRWM grant.
- <u>Question</u>: Are these funds available as a result of Proposition 1 or Proposition 68? <u>Response</u>: Proposition 1.
- <u>Questions</u>: Are we talking about offseason recharge? Do rivers have to be at a certain level first before flood irrigation can occur? <u>Response</u>: There will be questions around these issues.
- <u>Question</u>: Are you planning to do five years of consecutive recharge efforts? And what is the status of the 33 wells you have been monitoring? <u>Response</u>: We will plan for five years of recharge, but can be flexible. The well monitoring ended with our last grant.

Preston concluded by noting that he hopes this IRWM effort can be incorporated into the SGMA implementation process in Scott Valley. He serves as the key point of contact for anyone wanting more information about the project concept. Matt brought this update to a close by noting that the GSA/County could provide a letter of support for this proposal.

# Stakeholder Assessment, Draft Advisory Committee Charter and Next Steps

Facilitator Rich Wilson presented themes and findings from a recent stakeholder assessment which CCP conducted across the Butte, Scott and Shasta Valley groundwater basins. The assessment enabled introductions between the facilitation team and a range of different stakeholders, tribes, Siskiyou County supervisors, District staff, and other interested parties. During the assessment CCP staff learned about the range of perspectives, issues and interests surrounding groundwater use and management across the county. Assessment results are currently being utilized to develop an optimal charter (governance structure), schedule and workplan to guide committee work in the Butte, Scott and Shasta Valley groundwater basins.

The presentation focused on Scott Valley, included a set of initial recommendations that emerged from the assessment and are expected to guide SGMA implementation, and covered the following topics:

- Assessment purpose and process
- List of interviewees
- Overall pulse in the Scott Valley groundwater basin
- Key themes and findings of the assessment
- Initial recommendations: next steps
- Longer-term SGMA planning considerations

Following the presentation, committee members offered a range of initial comments and questions. As needed, any clarifications regarding information included in the presentation were provided by the facilitator.

- <u>Question</u>: Did you hear similar themes across the Butte, Scott and Shasta Valley groundwater basins? <u>Response</u>: Yes. Some common themes across the county included skepticism about the motives and intentions behind SGMA, as well as a desire to bring all parties to the table and work together, protect the economy and the environment, maintain local control of groundwater management, and educate and include the wider community's perspectives during the collaborative process.
- <u>Comment</u>: Nothing heard during the presentation is surprising.
- <u>Question</u>: Working together was a common theme? <u>Response</u>: Yes, across all the basins.
- <u>Comment</u>: Some of the skepticism is rooted in the fact that in the past the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has not been responsive to our needs and interests. <u>Response from DWR representative</u>: The SWRCB is talking with the county and its scientific consultants on the flow model it is working to develop for the Shasta Valley. <u>Additional comment</u>: Past models did not understand how agriculture works; it is important to address this.

- <u>Comment</u>: It is concerning that many respondents to this assessment think the system is fine. Noting that a good snow year, for example, means everything is fine is subjective.
- <u>Comment</u>: Farmers worry about cuts to water use and resulting economic losses.
- <u>Comment</u>: Some people perceive that the river never really was that great.
- <u>Comment</u>: Maybe the group should collectively explore what success looks like.
- <u>Comment</u>: It will be important to find overlaps between what are good years for farms and what are good years for fish.
- <u>Question:</u> What is the biggest challenge and how do we address it? Response: Many commented during the assessment on the need for all interested parties to collaborate and find mutually acceptable solutions that help avoid litigation.
- <u>Question</u>: What is success for everyone? <u>Response</u>: One way to explore this question is to try and identify shared interests among all interested parties and then begin to build agreements based on those interests.

A few public comments were offered following the advisory committee's initial discussion of the stakeholder assessment results.

- <u>Comment</u>: The Scott river has insurmountable legacy issues (i.e., mining tailings). The system is not entirely groundwater dependent. So it will be hard to define success. The legacy issues need to be at the forefront of the discussion.
- <u>Comment</u>: The county's scientific consultants and the advisory committee will need to look at baseline data in order to start the conversation on a factual basis.

Following the presentation of stakeholder assessment results, the facilitator reviewed an initial set of recommended next steps, including the following:

- Finish recruiting and building out full advisory committee membership composition.
- Facilitate Brown Act education and training.
- Discuss and agree to a committee governance structure.
- Develop a workplan and regular meeting schedule.
- Begin integrating science with support from the technical team.
- Collaboratively develop and implement a communication and engagement strategy as SGMA work unfolds.

Following presentation of the initial recommendations, Matt Parker briefly described the process of building the Scott Valley GSA Advisory Committee membership. The District is aware of what needs to be addressed during the SGMA implementation process and sought to find good representation from affected interest groups. The law requires diverse representation on any advisory committees which are formed by the local Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA). The District therefore conducted outreach to identify groups and individuals who were interested to participate in the committee.

Several water users, one local irrigation district, a local resident, a member-at-large, the Quartz Valley Tribe and an environmental organization are currently represented on the advisory

committee. A municipal still needs to be filled. In addition, the Quartz Valley Tribe submitted a formal letter to District Chair Ray Haupt requesting the creation of an additional seat for the Karuk Tribe. The Karuk Tribe also submitted a letter to District Chair Haupt, formally requesting membership on the committee. Matt asked the committee how it felt about its current membership composition—noting that the committee needs to balance appropriate representation with the ability to function efficiently and effectively as a group—and received the following feedback:

- <u>Comment</u>: The chairwoman of the Quartz Valley Tribe has requested an additional seat for the Karuk Tribe.
- <u>Comment</u>: The current size is good. It will be hard to bring others up to speed who have not participated in the past.
- <u>Comment</u>: Representation does not matter as long as all views in the community get considered. I'm glad the tribes and environmental community are on board as they need to be a part of this process.
- <u>Comment</u>: Our meetings are always open to the public we're good at listening.

Finally, the facilitator introduced a draft charter (governance structure) for advisory committee consideration. He talked about what a charter is and why any formal group should have one. He described three key sources which informed the draft Scott Valley GSA Advisory Committee charter: 1) Advisory committee guidance documents that have been formally approved by the District; 2) stakeholder assessment results; and 3) CCP's experience with similar collaborations around the state. Committee members provided just a few initial comments regarding the draft charter, including some general questions about decision-making protocols and support for the committee's goals. One member suggested using the term "best available science", versus just "science" in the goals. Others responded that is important to not constrain the committee from using better science in the future, and thus the suggestion was dropped. Finally, the facilitator requested that the committee closely review the draft charter and provide any questions, comments or suggested edits by Friday, January 4<sup>th</sup>.

Following the brief charter discussion, committee members offered a few comments about participation of others at future meetings.

- <u>Comment from DWR Representative</u>: As needed, DWR specialists can come to committee meetings to give talks and answer questions. DWR wants to see success for the Scott Valley groundwater basin. <u>Committee member comment</u>: DWR has been pragmatic and this is good.
- <u>Comment</u>: A Shasta Valley GSA Advisory Committee member has been suggesting a basin-wide workshop to help educate the public; this is something worth considering.
- <u>Comment</u>: In the past it was been valuable to have DWR here, but we need a greater presence of county officials.
- <u>Question</u>: Can agencies be on the committee? <u>Response</u>: State or Federal agencies can be on the committee, but based on feedback to date have not requested to be on a committee. The only exception is a representative from CDFW sits on the Butte Advisory

Committee because the Butte Valley Wildlife Refuge has significant land ownership in that valley and wanted to participate in that process.

#### Initial Orientation to the Brown Act

The facilitator provided an initial overview presentation of the Ralph M. Brown Act, an open meetings law that is meant to ensure public participation and access to all stages of decision-making, in this case as SGMA implementation unfolds across Siskiyou County. Each of the advisory committees in the Butte, Scott and Shasta Valleys must comply with the Brown Act. Given the full meeting agenda, the presentation was only introductory in nature. Matt Parker will look into additional Brown Act training opportunities for committee members. He will also consult county counsel to determine if committee members need to sign and submit <u>form 700</u> as part of Brown Act requirements.

# Future Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule

Matt concluded the meeting by noting that the District, with support from the facilitation and technical teams, will develop a draft workplan and schedule for the committee to consider at its next meeting. He requested that all committee members let him know as soon as possible if there are particular days of the week or month that they are <u>NOT</u> available for regularly scheduled committee meetings. Once he receives feedback from all members he will then propose regularly scheduled meetings for the first half of 2019.

#### **MEETING ATTENDEES<sup>1</sup>**

#### Advisory Committee Members

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

#### District Staff

Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

#### Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In addition to committee members and District staff, three members of the public attended the meeting.