

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

Meeting date/time: January 23rd, 2018 | 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Location: County Administrative Office, 1312 Fairlane rd. Yreka

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

- **Action Item Update and Approval of Past Meeting Summary.** District staffer Matt Parker provided a status update on action items from the December Advisory Committee (committee) meeting. Facilitator Rich Wilson (Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program or CCP) inquired if members had any outstanding questions or comments on the December meeting summary. None were received and therefore the final meeting summary was approved.
- **Public Comment.** No comments were received during the initial public comment period. Members of the public, and at times staffers from the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District (RCD), commented at various stages of the meeting on the availability of funds to support SGMA implementation, the committee’s membership status, and ways which the local RCD, Siskiyou County and the Advisory Committee can coordinate efforts.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker and RCD staff provided updates on a range of issues, including brief updates on future Brown Act training and Form 700; the status of the voluntary well survey; the recent draft DWR approval of the proposed basin boundary modification (BBM) for the Shasta Valley groundwater basin; and upcoming work of the local RCD.
- **Water Model Coordination Opportunities and Next Steps.** Dr. Laura Foglia (UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates) described concurrent modeling efforts of the State Water Resources Control Board and Siskiyou County’s local SGMA Technical Team. She presented five possible options for coordination between SWRCB and Siskiyou County, and sought feedback from the committee. Committee members agreed by consensus that option five—Siskiyou County develops a surface water/groundwater model and SWRCB develops a surface water model and Siskiyou County and SWRCB work collaboratively to develop data—appears to provide the best opportunity for ongoing coordination, sharing resources and information, and avoiding duplicative efforts. Matt Parker noted that he would share the committee’s input with the GSA Board as it considers how best to coordinate with SWRCB.
- **Other Technical Team Updates and Next Steps.** Laura’s team is preparing a SGMA data management plan for consideration by the committee, and to organize information for future annual reporting. Laura and her team will likely come back to the April meeting with refined ideas about data management, confidentiality and outreach to well owners. The RCD is also helping Laura’s team to advance groundwater monitoring efforts.
- **Charter Discussion and Provisional Adoption.** The facilitator introduced the latest iteration of the draft charter and inquired if committee members had any outstanding questions,

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

comments or suggested edits. Committee members offered a few minor comments and then, by consensus, provisionally adopted their charter. Adoption is provisional at this stage as County Counsel still needs to review the charter. The document will then require final approval from the GSA Board. Any edits provided by County Counsel will be shared with committee members at a future meeting.

- **Committee Schedule and Next Steps.** Matt briefly reviewed the emerging committee schedule, described SGMA outreach efforts to date and noted that a public workshop may soon occur. The facilitator briefly described SGMA requirements that necessitate development of a communication and engagement strategy for the Shasta Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plain (GSP). RCD staff noted that they would like to be involved in discussions around communication and engagement of the community.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Timeframe/Deadline</i>
Provide Matt with ideas on when and where the District should host a public SGMA workshop, and who to invite.	Committee members	February 15 th
Work on an iterative GSP development process and data management program, and bring a suggested approach for each back to the group for consideration at its April meeting. Work out a calendar of activities to be included in the committee workplan.	Laura Foglia and Technical Team	Next meeting
Share Laura’s PPT about science coordination options with the State Water Resources Control Board with committee members.	Matt Parker	DONE
Begin work on a draft communication and engagement strategy and bring materials for discussion at the next committee meeting.	Rich Wilson	Next meeting
Keep committee informed of when a Brown Act training opportunity will be provided for all three basins—Scott Valley, Shasta Valley and Butte Valley.	Matt Parker	TBD
Let the committee know by February 6 th if there will be a February meeting.	Matt Parker	DONE

Next meeting: Fourth week of April, 2019. Specific date TBD.

Website for meeting material posting:

<https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/naturalresources/page/sustainable-groundwater-management-act-sgma>

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

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 use of a queue during open group discussion in order to guide civil, inclusive and productive conversation. No committee member offered any questions or comments on the agenda. Matt Parker provided a status update on all action items from the December meeting. The facilitator then inquired and secured committee approval of the past meeting summary.

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 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. Throughout the course of the meeting various members of the public, at times including RCD staff, commented on availability of funds to support SGMA implementation, the committee's membership status, and ways which the RCD, Siskiyou County and the Advisory Committee can coordinate efforts.

District Staff and Other Updates

Matt Parker and local RCD staff provided updates on a range of issues, including:

- **Brown Act.** County Counsel will provide Brown Act Training to committee members, centrally located for all three SGMA basins and possibly linked to a public workshop. Committee members do not currently have to fill out Form 700 (Statements of Economic Interest) but may have to later as the committee's work progresses.
- **Voluntary well survey.** Many comments were received on the draft survey. District staff and the Technical Team have chosen for now to address data management and confidentiality issues prior to reaching out to the public.
- **Basin boundary.** DWR has approved the Siskiyou County's request to expand the Shasta Valley groundwater basin boundary. Matt thanked those who had provided input and comments during the proposal revision process. DWR is expected to finalize the BBM's statewide in February, then shortly after in either late February or early March release draft prioritization's of all statewide modified basins. DWR will then open a 30 day public comment period. Final prioritization may follow as early as the spring. On member inquired why basins were re-scored. Matt pointed out that this was only for those areas seeking a boundary modification.
- **RCD updates.** RCD staffer Brandy Caporaso noted that the Shasta RCD has, like the District, contracted the technical support services of Larry Walker Associates (LWA). The LWA technical team will assist the RCD in installing continuous well monitoring equipment and conducting analysis on 12 groundwater wells in Shasta Valley.
- **IRWM funding.** DWR staffer Pat Vellines briefly mentioned that the North Coast IRWM met recently. Upon receiving a question from a member of the public, she clarified that

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

some Proposition 68 funds may soon be available, and she is looking for crossover funds between IRWM and SGMA.

Water Model Coordination Opportunities and Next Steps

Matt Parker noted that the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), as directed by the California Water Action Plan, is developing a model to establish in-stream flow requirements in the Shasta river. Siskiyou County has initiated coordination with SWRCB on the issue. SWRCB understands that Larry Walker Associates, the local SGMA Technical Team, will also conduct modeling as a core element of the Shasta Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) preparation process. Both parties appear to agree that finding ways to collaborate and possibly share information and resources is the best way forward. Matt noted that the parties devised five possible scenarios to coordinate modeling efforts, and turned to Dr. Laura Foglia of the local SGMA Technical Team to review and discuss the scenarios with the committee.

Laura described interaction with SWRCB since the fall. There are many similarities between the modeling efforts with each looking to answer many of the same questions. Two technical teams met in November and subsequently came up with the idea of considering five possible coordination scenarios. Laura described the scenarios and reviewed the pros and cons of each:

- #1: Each party develops a fully independent surface water/groundwater model with no coordination on data collection.
- #2: Independent surface water/groundwater models with full coordination on data.
- #3: County develops groundwater model and SWRCB develops surface water model.
- #4: SWRCB develops surface water/groundwater model.
- #5: County develops surface water/groundwater model and SWRCB develops surface water model.

Laura emphasized that science coordination is critical for designing modeling scenarios; for Siskiyou County, the GSP model, for SWRCB, the in-stream flow requirements. No decision on coordination has yet been made and thus District staff and the Technical Team wished to present and discuss this information with the committee. Open group discussion followed wherein committee members asked questions and commented on a range of issues. Responses were variously offered by Laura and Matt.

- Question: Why does SWRCB want to use a different model? Response: Not clear at this stage.
- Question: Do we know which consultants are assisting SWRCB? Response: Paradigm Environmental, who then contracted S.S. Papadopoulos and GSI for the groundwater model.
- Question: Is SWRCB's view on the modeling effort coming from their consultants or a higher level in SWRCB? Response: Unsure. The model that Paradigm will use is typically used in an urban environment. Member follow-up: We might try to look into this as an outsider perspective may not be beneficial.

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

- Comment: SWRCB should work to gain local acceptance and understanding of their work.
- Comment: Collaboration is key. It seems redundant to have both a SWRCB and a SGMA model. Response: SWRCB's process started earlier and also does not have the deadlines (requirements) that will drive SGMA implementation.
- Comment: I received a call from SWRCB and they quickly asked for my data. This is not a good approach in this area.
- Question: Are you confident the two models will be agreeable? Response: Maybe the surface water model. There may be differences on the groundwater model. Past work may at this stage give Siskiyou County a better understanding of the system. Also, linking models is complicated.
- Question: How much information about these efforts to coordinate modeling has been shared with the GSA Board? Response: We're looking for direction from the committee to take to the GSA Board. We would like to see if the committee feels there is a best option.
- Question: On tours with SWRCB did you get much feedback from GSA Board staff? Response: They began to learn some things they didn't know.
- Question: Why is SWRCB conducting modeling in the area? Response: Following guidance from the California Water Action Plan the SWRCB is developing in-stream flow requirement along five rivers in California. Shasta is one of those rivers.
- Comment: Feels like the SWRCB is collecting remote sensing data on the watershed. Maybe some kind of memorandum of understanding between them and the county would be useful.

Several committee members began to express reasons why collaboration between Siskiyou County and the SWRCB is important, and came to support option five. Members cited issues like sharing data, getting models on the same track, maintaining the SGMA timeline, avoiding duplication of efforts and, moving forward, helping SWRCB staff with how to conduct outreach in the Shasta Valley. A few others noted that coordination may also open up additional funding opportunities. Laura had in her presentation noted that option five may present the best opportunity for coordination, sharing resources and information, and avoiding duplicative efforts. The facilitator at this stage checked and affirmed that the group, by consensus, supported option five as the best option. Matt Parker also asked and affirmed with the group that it considered option five the best. He concluded the discussion by noting that he would take the group's input to the GSA Board.

Other Technical Team Updates

Laura provided additional technical team updates following the modeling conversation. The RCD is helping the SGMA Technical Team advance groundwater monitoring efforts. The team is preparing a data management plan for consideration by the committee, and to organize information for future annual reporting. A database is being created on an Amazon server. The committee will play a key role in helping identify and fill data gaps. Committee members can

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

also help the Technical Team figure out how to conduct outreach to landowners. Laura and her team will likely come back to the April meeting with refined ideas about data management, confidentiality and outreach to well owners.

Charter Discussion and Provisional Adoption

Facilitator Rich Wilson introduced the next iteration of the draft charter (governance structure) to the group. Matt Parker followed by providing a status update on membership, which seats still need to be filled, and the forthcoming application process that will help complete the process. The facilitator inquired if any committee members had additional comments, questions or suggested edits to the charter. A few questions were asked about membership, why parts of the City of Weed are not within the groundwater basin, and how straw polls will be used during the collaborative process.

The facilitator asked if any committee member could not support or otherwise live with the charter in its current form. All committee members voiced support and thus it was noted that the group, by consensus, had provisionally adopted its charter. Adoption is provisional at this stage as County Counsel still needs to review the charter, and then the document needs final approval from the GSA Board. Finally, the facilitator noted that any edits provided by County Counsel will be shared with committee members.

Committee Schedule and Next Steps

Matt briefly reviewed the emerging committee schedule, described SGMA outreach efforts to date and noted that a public workshop may soon occur. Rich briefly pointed to SGMA requirements that necessitate development of a SGMA communication and engagement strategy for the Shasta Valley GSP. RCD staff noted that they would like to be involved in discussions around communication and engagement of the community. CCP will bring draft material for consideration and interactive discussion at the next 2-3 Advisory Committee meetings. As the meeting concluded, committee members made a few final comments about the benefits of having a member email list and the challenge ahead of getting community support and having the ability to implement and enforce a GSP once it's completed.

MEETING ATTENDEES¹

Advisory Committee Members

Tristan Allen, Montague Water Conservation District
Susan Fricke, Karuk Tribe
Blair Hart, Private pumper
Justin Holmes, Edson Foulke Ditch Company
Beth Sandahl (Chair), Shasta River Water Users Association
Pete Scala, Private pumper
Gregg Werner, Environmental/conservation representative

¹ Approximately a half dozen members of the public and RCD affiliates attended the meeting.

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

Absent Committee Members

John Tannaci (Vice-chair), Residential

District Staff

Matt Parker, County of Siskiyou Natural Resources Specialist

DWR Staff

Pat Vellines

Technical Team

Dr. Laura Foglia, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Brad Gooch, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

Cab Esposito, CSU Chico

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program