

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

Meeting date/time: March 4th, 2020 | 3:00 p.m. – 6:00 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 January 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 during the conversation about groundwater quality in Shasta valley.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker, Laura Foglia and Brandy Caporaso of the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District provide a range of updates related to filling vacant advisory committee seats, to ongoing well equipment installations, to coordination between the SGMA technical team and the State Water Resources Control Board.
- **Development of Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) – Water Quality.** Laura Foglia and Thomas Harter, of the SGMA technical team, presented and helped the committee advance its discussions on sustainable management criteria for groundwater quality in the Shasta valley groundwater basin. Committee members put forward a range of questions, comments and suggested considerations.
- **Development of Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) – Land Subsidence.** Laura Foglia explained the concept of land subsidence and reviewed SGMA requirements related to this issue. It’s less of an issue in Shasta valley as compared to other SGMA indicators, however, the team will look at available data and follow DWR guidelines.
- **Surface Water Ad Hoc Committee.** Matt Parker provided an update on the work of the surface water ad hoc committee. Several participants on the committee weighed in on the group’s work to date and how this work can be compiled and brought forward for review by the full advisory committee.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Status/Deadline</i>
Post the DWR Draft Sustainable Management Criteria DWR publication on the Siskiyou County SGMA website	Matt Parker	By April meeting
Check on the availability of studies in the Klamath basin that have looked at the levels of contaminants found in fish in local tributaries.	Local NCRWB staff (Eli)	Next advisory committee meeting

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

Continue to help identify and recruit participants in the voluntary well monitoring network.	Committee members	Ongoing
Check to ensure the online well monitoring website being set up by Larry Walker and Associates includes CIMIS station and groundwater well data	Participants in the voluntary well monitoring network	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring a map to the next meeting which shows where the GSA does and doesn't have wells in the voluntary network. • Drop sodium from the shortlist of chemicals to monitor • Add coliform bacteria to the shortlist of chemicals to monitor • Consider how to write the GSP flexibly, calling for study of certain issues of concern that could also lead to expanding the initial list of contaminants (shortlist) • Include in the GSP that the observation network be expanded by recruiting voluntary domestic wells as key observation tools • Reach out to Bob Solecki for available consolidated water quality data for the Shasta valley region 	Technical team	Ongoing as work on water quality SMC continues
Prepare and distribute meeting summary	Rich Wilson	Prior to next committee meeting

Next Meeting: April 15th, 2020. Due to current circumstances the meeting will be held online with Zoom technology. More information is forthcoming.

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

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 January 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

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

of the meeting. Several public comments interspersed advisory committee discussions, most notably during the sustainable management criteria for water quality agenda item.

District Staff Updates and Other Announcements

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

- The application period to fill open advisory committee seats is now closed. At the next GSA board meeting Justin Sandahl will be formally seated to fill the Shasta River Water Users Association seat.
- The surface water ad hoc committee has held two conference calls to date. The calls have focused primarily on committee objectives and information which participants have to share on the topic.
- RCD update: The Shasta Valley RCD has put out an RFP to secure assistance to install well monitoring equipment. Larry Walker Associates has also submitted a scope of work to participate in the local science fair on May 16th.
- The SGMA technical team continues to install well monitoring equipment. The new website will soon be up and running so participants in the well monitoring network can check the status of their well in real time.
- The Shasta groundwater model is up and running. The technical team continues coordinate with the State Water Resources Control Board to ensure they and the Water Board are doing comparable work, and to share relevant information and data.
- The technical team will soon roll out the model and start showing results for committee consideration. Committee members will play an important role in helping to verify results of the model.

Development of Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) – Water Quality

Dr. Laura Foglia provided a recap of the sustainable management criteria (SMC) development process which was introduced at the previous advisory committee meeting. She reminded the group that it will assist the technical team in building a “thermometer” (i.e., the SMC) for six sustainability indicators described in SGMA. This will entail work defining undesirable results and associated measurable objectives, thresholds to avoid, and triggers which, if reached, would suggest the system is in declining health and may require some kind of management response to stay healthy.

Water quality was introduced at the January, 2020 advisory committee meeting, and remained the focus of much of the discussion at this meeting. At the prior meeting, committee members explored what an overall sustainability goal might look like, as it relates to water quality, as well as other indicators. Many committee members, Laura noted, highlighted the importance of safe drinking water and availability of good, clean water for farms. At the same time, the SGMA Technical Team shared several maps of Shasta Valley in advance of this meeting and asked committee members to begin considering the attributes of a SGMA water quality SMC.

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

Laura noted that the technical team's presentation would focus on currently available water quality data. The technical team, she noted, will provide policy options for setting and maintaining water quality criteria. She asked that the committee weigh in on what policy should be used, and that this input will inform what is sent to the GSA Board for consideration. Ultimately the technical team, with guidance from the advisory committee, will need to develop SMCs for each SGMA indicator, bring forward for review and consideration by the GSA Board, and have them represented in the Shasta Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

Dr. Thomas Harter followed Laura's introduction and began leading the water quality discussion. Work on water quality is very complex, he noted, and it's easy to get lost in technical details. He reminded the committee of its central charge to provide the technical team, and ultimately the GSA, with overall direction and input on the GSP goals and contents, including SMCs for each SGMA indicator. It is the technical team's responsibility to provide the corresponding technical details.

The committee, Thomas stressed, is not expected to provide technical expertise. Such expertise is welcome from committee members who do have a technical background, however, overall the committee is positioned to provide policy guidance on desired groundwater basin conditions, undesirable results to avoid, and management actions that, if or when needed, will keep the system healthy. Thomas introduced several foundational questions to explore early in developing SMCs, including for water quality:

- What data is available and what kind of monitoring network will be used to track the health of the groundwater system?
- Where we don't have monitoring, shall the GSP provide direction on where and/or how to expand and build a more comprehensive network?
- What is the desirable operating range for any SGMA SMC?
- What does it mean if the thermometer (i.e., the SMC) shows the temperature is getting high (i.e., system health is declining)?

Thomas began showing maps and explaining how the technical team used available well data to produce a list of water quality constituents for consideration by the advisory committee. He described two primary sources of available data, those being public supply wells and known contamination sites. He then described the SWRCB GAMA site as a useful resource that compiles water quality data from a wide range of sources and compiles it in one location that is accessible to the public. This site, he noted, is where the technical team acquired much of the information that it is now presented to the committee.

At the prior meeting, the advisory committee looked at available Shasta valley water quality data and brainstormed an initial list of water quality constituents that are important to the group. The technical team was then tasked to prepare a shortened list based on what's reasonable to monitor and manage in the valley. In addition to reviewing available data on the

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

GAMA site, the technical team, Thomas noted, also looked at recently submitted GSPs from around the state to see what water quality parameters these plans are considering.

Prior to opening up group discussion, Thomas described the role and responsibility of various state and federal agencies with legal mandates related to water quality. He used an example from Orange County to describe how the local GSA can play a proactive role in monitoring the local groundwater basin, measuring the system's health, and seeking guidance or support, when needed, from other agencies which have enforcement or other capabilities that the GSA may not possess or necessarily hold primary responsibilities. Seen in this context, he noted, the GSA can serve an important role as a local steward of groundwater resources in Shasta valley.

Thomas summarized by asking the committee how well it understands the presented material. The technical team, he noted, would like to secure additional input on how to develop a locally appropriate and effective water quality SMC for Shasta valley. Committee members offered a range of questions and comments. The technical team provided most responses, with, at times, GSA staff and the local NCRWB staff weighing in on the discussion.

- Comment: The NCRWB is the controlling agency, but locally we oversee day-to-day activities. Under SGMA we need to make sure everyone is doing the right thing. If we see a problem, we proactively attempt to address it instead of calling enforcement authorities.
 - Response: SGMA provides an enabling context for dealing with problems locally at the GSA level, using education to support best practices, and doing whatever you need to do to address a problem.
 - Additional comment: It's important to note that the Shasta river has been the subject of many scientific investigations and experiments. We have to understand the significance of every resource out there. A partnership has to happen between the local community and all responsible agencies, and it has to occur on both sides. Compromise has to be a tool we have to use, and we have to understand we're not winners and loser. We have to coexist.
- Comment/question: I do not understand the chain of command under SGMA. All state agencies you mentioned have police authority. The advisory committee does not have policing authority. We rely on information presented to us. We help direct the technical team so you can make recommendations to the GSA Board. Does the local GSA have policing authority?
 - Response: The GSP will help provide a structure for GSA Board as to what kind of constituents to look at, and determine whether the monitoring network should be expanded.
 - Additional comment: It seems there has to be a process of the GSA Board reporting to authorities when necessary, as well as local people reporting to GSA.
 - Response: The GSP will have to design a monitoring network. Well data will need to be reported to DWR every year by GSA.

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

- Additional comment: The arrangement of different local agencies, and how they need to report to the GSA, should be explained in the GSP.
- Question: How much time does the GSA Board spend looking at the full Scott valley and Shasta valley watersheds?
 - Response from NCRWB staff in attendance: This is my full time area of focus.
 - Additional comment: It will be important to always have a direct line of communication between the local community and the NCRWB.
- Comment/question: Thinking of the intersection of all these agencies, and the importance of having a comprehensive monitoring network, we really need to consider what we build into the GSP and how we manage these processes. This is especially important for ensuring the GSA gets the data it needs.
 - Response: It may not need to be too specific. Perhaps capture that a main intent of the GSP, and all parties involved, is to effectively collaborate on the types of issues being highlighted in this discussion.
- Question: What if we are seeing a trend in the system in a direction we don't want to go? Can GSA try to remediate before it becomes a significant issue? Can we be proactive and preventive before NCRWB comes in with stick?
 - NCRWB response: This would be ideal as far as the NCRWB is concerned. If the NCRWB needs to get involved, we would first we want to figure out if there is a way to work collaboratively to solve a problem. If needed, the NCRWB would move to various types of enforcement mechanisms it possesses. Yesterday at the Scott valley advisory committee meeting I brought up the anti-degradation policy. The idea is that if you have high quality water, try to keep it that way.
 - Additional response from SGMA technical team: A key element of this groundwater planning effort is to design the network in a way that allows agencies, both the local GSA and others, to observe and catch things before they become a problem.

Public questions/comments

- Question: Is the North Coast Water Quality Control Board (NCRWB) looking closely at GSP processes around state. Response: The NCRWB has a groundwater specialist. As local NCRWB staff here in Siskiyou County, I am probably the first line of communication on SGMA related work.

After this initial group discussion, Thomas then reviewed additional slides and further described how a local SGMA water quality SMC could be developed. He described how the technical team came up with a short list of water quality constituents to monitor. He showed available data from the past 30 years, and highlighted a few areas, namely contamination sites, where exceedances of water quality thresholds have been observed. He showed what is known about the valley, based on available data, for constituents such as arsenic, manganese, boron, iron, and a few others. Additional committee questions and comments followed.

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

- Question: For all these wells you are showing, do we understand direction of flow in the ground?
 - Response: Limited understanding. Better understanding is needed.
- Question: Does red on your slides mean maximum contaminant load (MCL)? Do we have a recommendation from other areas?
 - Response: That's an important question that we will come back to this in a later part of the discussion.
- Comment/question: I haven't seen benzene used by itself in decades. Is there a reason you used it in your initial work?
 - Response: We have more samples for this particular constituent. It's recorded this way in the GAMA database.
- Question: Do we have any superfund sites in Shasta valley?
 - Response: No, just one a little outside the basin. It's important to know about and keep an eye on that site.

Thomas paused and asked the group if the presented list of constituents is appropriate to include in the Shasta Valley GSP. He also noted that others could be added to the list, either now or in the future if issues or concerns arise. The facilitator stressed that for a question like this it is important to hear from all the stakeholder interests represented on the committee. Additional committee questions and responses followed.

- Question: Any reason for not including bacteria?
 - Response: We don't currently have data on bacteria, but this could be added.
 - Additional comment: It's primarily a concern for surface water.
 - Additional response: The technical team might be able to find coliform in available data listed in the GAMA site.
- Question: Can you talk a little about pH, as this is easy to test.
 - Response: There was nothing significant in the data. We are trying to make this initial constituent list as small as possible. Why should pH be monitored?
 - Comment: If we have a known relationship with any of these constituents, like pH, this could be useful.
 - Response: Good point. We could include a recommendation to add pH as a component of the monitoring protocol, where appropriate.
- Comment: On e coli, it's going to be yes/no on whether or not you have a detection.
- Question/comment: Do we really need to break out sodium as a separate constituent to be monitored? Specific conductance will pick up the presence of sodium. But if ranches have a sodium issue, maybe we need to consider.
- Question/comment: What about other chemicals that are surfacing as related to superfund sites. We might want to consider this knowing we have a site in Weed.
 - Response: Some pesticides contain TCP but this has not yet showed up in the available data for Shasta valley.
 - Additional comment: This is on the hot list for water producers.

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

- Question by GSA staff: Are you referring to legacy issues, like the presence of mercury in Scott valley?
- Response: The county landfill got closed down. And there's a site down in Gazelle, the old chip board plant. Not sure how much these sites are monitored. NCWQCB comment on TCP: This chemical was used from about the 1930s – 1960s for controlling nematodes.
- Question: Are we considering chemicals being used to grow cannabis? If discussion is heavy in this committee on this issue, the board will be interested.
 - Response by GSA staff: The GSA, and its technical team, can take discussion on this subject, do some research on what other basins are doing, and come back with what we found out about how to perform monitoring to address this issue.
 - Technical team comment: One way to address is the GSP could specify which agency will take into consideration potential polluting activities. This could include cannabis, TCP, others. As issues arise, studies could be initiated and look at how best to address the issue.
- Question: Is solid waste management a separate database?
 - Response: Nothing is showing up.
 - Additional comment: Important to consider that around landfills, stuff could be leaking off site.
- Comment: At the last meeting we talked about pesticides and herbicides leaking into groundwater. We need to ensure this is addressed in the GSP. And the valley, like many places, may have legacy issues linked to past use of DDT.
- Question: Regarding legacy issues, if we don't think we have issues now, and yet later we see something show up, can be addressed later versus putting it in the GSP now?
 - Response: Yes.

Public comments/questions

- Comment: The mercury issue is interesting because the agencies which give us grants sometimes ask if we have mercury at our clean-up sites. We might want to piggyback on whatever they decide in Scott Valley. It's important to add this constituent and keep an eye on it.

Back to advisory committee comments

- Comment: When we consider if there are contaminants in fish, we should bring this back to our monitoring programs. Additional comment: Recent studies looked at this issue statewide.
 - NCRWB: The NCRWB can check into the availability of this data for the Klamath basin.
- Comment: What was said earlier about the directional flow of pollutants is important. In looking at the presented maps I don't see where there are problems. But it's important to look at whether monitoring is picking up pollutants downstream from the source area where they are being used. if pollutants being taken downstream would that be picked

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

up in monitoring. It's critical that we have strategic monitoring points collecting a time series of information looking for any harmful chemicals/constituents. This will allow us to see if things are actually getting into river and harming fish, but also harming drinking water wells and Ag wells.

Thomas asked the group if the existing monitoring network should be utilized in the GSP, or if a more expansive network should be built out across the valley in a selective manner. In either case, the network can sample regularly for constituents of concern. Thomas also asked if the technical team should craft a GSP to say we are using public monitoring wells, or should we use these wells but also consider adding 10-15 wells to monitor constituents of concern. Questions, comments and responses followed:

- Question: How many wells are currently being monitored, and how many would need to be added?
 - Response: The nitrate map shows the current monitoring network. An additional 10-15 wells could be added to data poor areas.
- Question: If adding wells, does this commit agencies to drill these wells?
 - Response: The commitment would be for the agency to bring this additional monitoring network to life in perhaps the first five years of the GSP. Including a desire to build out the monitoring network could also serve as the basis to write a grant and secure resources to do this.
- Comment: Yes, we need basin wide monitoring via an expanded network. This is especially true in areas where we don't have wells.
- Comment: With the network of existing or additional wells, you can monitor for what we're talking about, and add other things as needed later on.
 - GSA staff: Yes, some of these locations are groundwater level wells. We can use them to monitor for water quality as well.
- Comment: Agree, an expanded network is a necessary to effectively implement SGMA.
- Question/comment: Does monitoring have to be limited to wells? You could monitor springs as well? Response: yes, the GSP can include this type of monitoring.
 - Additional comments: Others also think this type of monitoring should be conducted.

Public comments/questions

- Question: If you put monitoring in your plan can you get SGMA funding?
 - Response: More likely, but not guaranteed to access available funding if it's in there. Can also design by phases. The GSP doesn't promise everything at first, but the plan is adjustable.
 - Additional response from committee member: We need to write a plan as if we're going to get the funding. It's important to think the gold standard plan we want, and therefore a robust monitoring network needs to be included.
- Comment/question: Perhaps the groundwater model can simulate things like plumes.

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

- Response: In this basin that's challenging because of limited understanding of where groundwater flows. We need to be cautious in using the model to really tell us something.
- Question: Would a tracer study be worth investing in.
- Response: This kind of study could cost an enormous amount of money.

Thomas and Laura asked a final question about setting thresholds and triggers for the water quality constituents. They noted that the technical team has considered setting thresholds on drinking water at current MCL standards, and maybe setting triggers at about 80% of that level. If the valley gets near or hits a trigger, the GSA could conduct studies to show what's happening and what needs to be done to prevent the situation moving towards a threshold. He noted two primary questions for group consideration:

- 1) Should we look at the average or median of a well and a reasonable number of exceedances?
 - 2) Should we also look at trends, as these could cause a trigger to be hit?
- Question: Wouldn't we want to know maximum value instead of medians or averages?
 - Response: This can be done in various ways. We'll have to put something in the GSP that speaks to number of exceedances relative to a long-term average.
 - Additional questions/ comment: If arsenic shows up at or near a local school what does that mean? Do we need to look at trends? It's important to think about this.
 - Comment: A lot of this work will take a scientist to analyze why things are happening.
 - Question: So if we wanted to look at averages, would that prevent us from looking at hot spots?
 - Response: No, this could still be done.
 - Question: So each constituent will need to have a different criteria?
 - Response: Yes, this is correct.
 - Technical team question for NCRWB staff: Does the NCRWB have protocols on this?
 - Response: Depends on the constituent and the context.
 - Comment: Trend lines are helpful if you get a lot of data.

Thomas paused the back-and-forth conversation for a moment and illustrated some examples on the nitrate map which show exceedances. He noted, for example, if two wells out of 20 show exceedances, the technical team could take a proactive approach in studying this problem and go from there on what kind of actions and engagement from GSA board would be necessary. Comments and questions followed.

- Comment: Kind of depends on what source of nitrates are.
- Comment: If whole corner of map turns red, that shows you need to look at something.
- Question: Do we just look at things basin wide, or can we look also at specific issues faced in specific areas?

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

- Response: We can do the latter.
- Comment: If you've got good data, it's important to look at it.
- Comment: We need more monitoring wells on the east side.
 - Additional comment: It's a tough crowd on east side.

Thomas acknowledged the group stressing that if problems come up, and numbers confirm suspected problems, there needs to be some action to better understand what's going on?

- Comment: Yes, important to consider patchy basin. It's also important to think about acute thresholds.

Public comments/questions

- Comment: Trends are not as valuable in this basin. Need to look at hot spots.

Thomas briefly summarized feedback heard during the course of the discussion:

- Looks at peaks, not just averages and trends. (NCRWB comment: If an area has good water quality, you may want to look at trends). Also look at trends in areas that may have benzene.
- Build expansive monitoring network
- Add coliform (e.g. total coliform, fecal coliform, or E. coli) to the list of constituents
- As part of initial water quality work, specific studies could look at vulnerabilities and whether these warrant more actions (e.g., old dump, pesticides on marijuana, etc.)
- Scott suggestion potentially helpful in Shasta: Build a flow chart of the expanded network. If something happens, if impact is significant, then consider what needs to be done. That is to say, consider your management options. This creates a kind of actionable flow chart. This chart will be helpful later on down the line, especially if the committee is made up of new people in the future. The flow chart can be updated every five years or as needed.

The facilitator reminded the group to, moving forward in this SMC development process, look closely at summaries and make sure feedback put forward during the meeting was captured accurately, or if anything was missed. Feedback will also be compiled and sent to the technical team to help them construct and share SMCs for committee consideration.

Matt Parker wrapped up the water quality discussion by commenting on the prospect of building out an expansive voluntary well monitoring network. He noted that as more is learned about groundwater conditions in Shasta valley, as more gets shared in the advisory committee setting, as the committee gains more comfort with the technical team, all these things will put committee members in a better position to ask people to voluntarily offer up their well. Ultimately, having a good monitoring network and an effective GSP, he noted, is better than having Sacramento come and manage resources in Shasta valley. Laura noted that the technical team relies on committee members to talk to their neighbors and build out the network.

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

Development of Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) – Land Subsidence

Laura Foglia presented a few slides to explain the concept of land subsidence and review SGMA requirements related to this issue. It's less of an issue in Shasta valley, she noted, as compared to other SGMA indicators. Still, the team will conduct due diligence in looking at available data and following DWR guidelines. InSAR data is available from mid 2015. In April, a new data set will come out that shows the updated basin boundary. The GSP will state that the GSA will keep using existing DWR monitoring data and conducting due diligence.

Surface Water Ad Hoc Committee

Matt noted that to date the surface water ad hoc committee has conducted two phone calls. Discussion has largely centered on the question of what available information and data is out there that could help the technical team pull together a summary of the basin to build criteria for the surface water indicator. Matt welcomed those participating to provide their own thoughts on progress to date and important consideration ahead. A few comments followed:

- Susan Fricke shared documents from the North Coast Water Quality Control Board and Karuk Tribe. The Water Board, she noted, could help connect the dots and, further, Bob Solecki has already done a lot of data consolidation for the California Water Action Plan. She hopes the technical team will distill and use this information, then bring it back to the ad hoc and eventually the full committee.
- Janae Scruggs (CDFW) noted that flow recommendations exist for the canyon in Shasta valley. CDFW developed a flow study it would like to advance, however, funding has not yet been secured. Eli Scott of the North Coast Water Quality Control Board noted that 45 cfs is recommended for the Shasta river.
- Gregg Werner acknowledged material received from the technical team that the ad hoc committee is reviewing. He agreed it would be good to find existing in-stream flow standards and build these into the GSP. It was noted that CDFW has guidance based on criteria. Bob Solecki is also looking into what stream flows should be.
- Steve Mains noted that the conference call format is a bit challenging.
- Blair Hart noted that it appears there are multiple entities doing multiple studies on the Shasta river. So questions follow: Who has the best study, the most helpful study, what the best study that can inform today's work, not that of five years ago.

Matt Parker wrapped up the conversation by noting that development of a SGMA surface water indicator needs to be done in a way that doesn't conflict with water rights, voluntary flows or existing settlement agreements. The SMC needs to be centrally linked to groundwater. One ad hoc member note that the group needs to work with and conduct best available science.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Tristan Allen, Montague Water Conservation District
Lisa Faris, Big Springs Irrigation District
Susan Fricke (Vice-Chair), Karuk Tribe

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

Blair Hart, Private Pumper
Justin Holmes, Edson Foulke Ditch Company
Steve Mains, Grenada Irrigation District
Pete Scala, Private Pumper
John Tannaci (Chair), Residential
Gregg Werner, Environmental/Conservation

Absent Committee Members

Robert Moser, Municipal/City

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

Facilitator

Rich Wilson, Seatone Consulting

Public

Rhonda Muse – Scott & Shasta Watermaster District
Ayn Perry – Shasta Valley RCD
Ethan Brown – Shasta Valley RCD
Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish & Wildlife
Justin Sandahl
Heather Wood – NRCS
Eli Scott – North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Brandon Davison – CA Department of Water Resources
Brandy Caporaso – Shasta Valley RCD
Giuliano Galdi – UC Cooperative Extension
Lindsay Cummings – Siskiyou Daily News