

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

Meeting date/time: November 18, 2020/ 3:00 – 6:00 pm

Location: Zoom Online Platform

Key contacts:

-Matt Parker, County Natural Resources Specialist, mparker@co.siskiyou.ca.us 530.842.8019

-Katie Duncan, Stantec Consulting – Facilitator. katie.duncan@stantec.com 916-418-8245

-Laura Foglia PhD, U.C. Davis Technical Team Lead, lfoglia@ucdavis.edu 530.219.5692

MEETING RECAP

- **Approval of Past Meeting Summary.** The committee provided conditional approval of the October meeting summary for posting on the Siskiyou County SGMA website provided a reference was clarified.
- **Public Comment.** No initial public comments.
- **District Staff and Other Updates.** Matt Parker provided a review of overall GSP development and schedule and a brief recap of the November ad hoc meeting.
- **Review of Draft GSP Chapters.** The technical team provided brief comments on GSP chapters in progress, but this discussion was largely postponed to prioritize planned SMC discussions.
- **Presentation and Discussion of SMCs in Shasta Valley.** Dr. Laura Foglia and Cab Esposito presented on potential SMC approach for Shasta Valley.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

| <i>Action Item</i> | <i>Responsible Party</i> | <i>Status/Deadline</i> |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Redistribute list of springs in Shasta Valley | Bob Solecki | Completed |

Next Meeting: January 27, 2021. Due to current circumstances surrounding covid-19 the meeting will be held online with Zoom technology.

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

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda Review and Approval of Past Meeting Summary

The facilitator welcomed all participants and thanked attendees for their patience with ongoing use of Zoom as alternative meeting platform during the pandemic. There was a clarification requested on the October meeting notes regarding reference to the State Water Board's California Water Action Plan. Matt Parker will update notes. In consideration of that correction, committee members consented to post the October meeting summary on the county's SGMA webpage. No committee members put forward questions or expressed concerns about the agenda at the outset of the meeting.

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

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 comments were provided.

District Staff and Other Updates

Matt Parker provided a range of updates.

- Key GSP milestones and schedule were reviewed. In the coming months it will be important for the Advisory Committee to come to consensus on a range of important GSP elements.
- The Surface Water ad hoc committee met on November 12, 2020. A key suggestion to come out of the meeting was for more diverse and consistent public outreach. The ad hoc members provided some ideas, and the project team will follow-up.

Ethan Brown from the RCD provided a brief update on new upper-watershed precipitation stations.

Review and Discussion of Draft GSP Chapters

Dr. Laura Foglia, SGMA technical team lead, provided a brief update on GSP chapters in progress. For Chapter 3, Bacteria can be included as a water quality constituent. Chapter 2 will be finalized in January. There was a question regarding minimum vs. maximum threshold, and Dr. Foglia provided a background for when each would be used. For water quality constituents you typically use a maximum threshold that should not be exceeded, whereas for groundwater levels you would have a minimum threshold that you would not want to go below.

Presentation and Discussion of SMCs in Shasta Valley

Dr. Laura Foglia and Cab Esposito presented on potential SMCs in Shasta Valley. The presentation started by reviewing previous data provided and a discussion of existing data gaps. The technical team must build from what they have. The GSP will highlight the monitoring network and actions to address data gaps. The technical team also reviewed “SGMA Basics” and discussed SGMA expectations, responsibilities, and authority.

It was suggested that the Nature Conservancy has data and can be used to compare and correlate other hydrographs. The technical team has coordinated with the Nature Conservancy for that data but needs well logs and construction information. Because long-term groundwater levels need to be considered, the technical team needs to look at wells with continuous and historical data.

Comment: How are volcanic formations included in the analysis?

Response: Volcanic formations should be captured in the data. Hydrographs we have show that even in volcanic aquifer groundwater levels are stable. Geophysics will also help us understand and piece together all this information. Volcanic aquifer is considered different properties. We want consistent representation of entire volcanic aquifer.

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

The Advisory Committee discussed how small cities and residential wells are represented. Small cities are represented by land use differently from agriculture projects. The model uses 1991-2018 to show baseline, and growth is shown in simulated scenarios.

Comment: Overall groundwater withdrawal should be accounted for. Impact for streams or impacts cannot just fall on agriculture.

Comment: Scenarios look at buildout of communities in valley. Weed, Grenada, Montague, Yreka, Shasta Vista/Big Springs.

Comment (summarized): This discussion is relevant to Planning Commission action. Must balance the proportional impact of domestic versus agricultural wells.

Response: We will consider all possible impacts and start applying numbers as part of developing good measures. We can simulate additional pumping easily.

Comment: When considering potential recharge, an area with adequate percolation and water source is necessary. Will potential recharge areas be evaluated?

Response: Yes, we want input on preliminary locations.

Comment: Should we plan a brainstorming session to discuss locations and water sources related to MAR?

Response: We can create some hypothetical situations that you can build off of. We also need to think about where this is needed the most. The possibilities in Shasta Valley may be limited. We will need to put a lot of little pieces together to get to where we need. Also dependent on year type.

Comment: Is there potential for excess high season flows to be used for MAR.

Comment: MAR is not listed as beneficial use for surface water.

Comment: There are several folks with winter water rights in Shasta Valley.

The technical team reviewed historically available data:

- Historic CASGEM water levels
- River flow data from various stream gages
- eWRIMS water diversion data
- Watermaster diversion data
- Spring discharge measurements

The monitoring network will need to be developed to show sustainability and data gaps.

Comment: Springs recovered this year. Trust what data shows rather than discredit it.

Response: We can't take one piece of info and tell the whole story. We have a partial picture.

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

Comment: Alluvial basins (down south) 6-16 month time delay to see effects of. We need good data which includes continuous monitoring.

Comment: From ad hoc, hydrographs were performed before the Decree in 1920s. Do we still have the same amount of water coming out of the stream? What is the start point? Where is the calibration?

Response: For SGMA we must set criteria for streamflow SMC. There are so many programs and actions related to surface water that affect stream flow that SGMA does not have the jurisdiction to regulate. The GSP is a way we can categorize and show how we can work with existing programs to work with what these programs have defined to meet SGMA objectives.

The Advisory Committee discussed the proposed SMC approach from the technical team including defining the minimum threshold by primary and secondary indicators. The group discussed what should be included in each.

Comment: Need to show how springs impact surface water flows. How does groundwater interact with surface water? What must happen to make sure there is guaranteed flows to meet all requirements.

Comment: We need to look at the defined surface water thresholds and use those for the GSP thresholds. We do not have data to show connection between wells and the river. Connectivity is unknown.

Comment: There is not a Shasta River threshold and the riparian right is unregulated. There have been recent subdivision changing water use, at some point it will need to be decided what can or cannot be developed.

Comment from NCRWQCB - just a clarifying point, there are no established instream flow thresholds that are legally enforceable outside of decree. These are flow recommendations only and voluntary actions.

Comment: Riparian rights should be included in primary threshold box as well as Water Board's flow recommendations.

Comment: Right now, Shasta is not working right, we need additional thresholds. We need to protect quality and quantity. Currently there is a cold water 45 cfs TMDL and there are also issues of connectivity that must be considered because springs need water, and that source needs to be protective. Somewhere in this plan it may make sense, regardless of GSA authority, to include that when you see these conditions build a collaborative response.

Response: We are seeking and envisioning collaborative approach just as described where we are working with the water master, State Board, Regional Board and other entities to improve conditions.

Comment: Undesirable result is decreased volume of surface water. Is it one number? Is there a timing component? Looking at upstream gages (not installed yet). Looking at stream flow as indicator. Historic component to threshold? Minimum level for groundwater table? Model

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

needs to reflect reality and then look at crystal ball questions to understand book ends.

Response: Doesn't need to be a single number. Start with stream flow. If we base on streams will need to develop data. Will not be single recipe. Different thresholds will be affected by different dynamics.

Comment: Extractions from groundwater that may affect springs - does it matter how ground water will be used? Does model account for leaching/recharge? If you flood irrigate in spring will that water show back up in fall.

Response: Something we can investigate, difficult to do in model.

Comment: GSP should manage groundwater extractions that support spring flows, stream flows, water rights, GDEs, etc. Look at key springs. Can we identify group of springs that are good indicators and adequate indicator in terms of volume?

Response: That is the ideal. I would add enhancing supply and managing groundwater supply.

Response: Looking at spring use as indicator - looking at priority users (Stream flow vs. groundwater users). Should be cautious from a legal standpoint.

Response: The data is just not there. If springs are used - its not to enforce certain spring flow they will be indicative of what is happening in larger areas. It will not be tied to specific wells or specific actions. Used as representative flow points.

Comment: Discussing difficulty in navigating some regulatory programs - want to do a lot of great thing, but the capacity to do that is challenging. Look to agency folks to find solutions to complicated issues.

Comment: GSP can help ensure that interconnected surface water gets to river and other process determine where water goes after.

Response: Through this process its important to keep economy in perspective too. Not trying to step on that. Lots of interconnections with existing water rights. If we pump less does that just mean surface water and riparian rights get used more.

Technical team suggested that they could look at extreme scenarios to provide a bookend to scale thresholds and actions. Bookends define operational boundaries within the valley. Economical evaluation will need to be done to maintain viability of agriculture and livelihood in valley.

The technical team guided a discussion focused on undesirable results definition. They are looking for specific numbers to define scenarios. Undesirable Results:
Looking for numbers, scenario definition. In January bring some hypothetical scenarios.

Comment (CDFW): Adding on to the discussion regarding collaboration, regulatory agencies can fill in gaps of other programs. It will be necessary to work collectively towards basin goals. For

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

minimum thresholds not just looking at springs but looking at GDEs that need to be protected from being impacted from groundwater management. As far as numbers - setting them too low or not having one at all has caused plans being rejected. We need to set a number we can all work collectively towards. Burden should be shared.

The group discussed a list (provided previously) regarding springs and spring information. Susan Fricke asked for the list to be distributed again.

ACTION ITEM: Redistribute list of springs in Shasta Valley.

Comment (NCRWQCB): Little Springs and Big Springs may be most representative of Pluto's Cave Basalt and that production.

There was some side discussion regarding agency response to other planning efforts in the basin. This conversation was asked to be taken offline.

The facilitator provided closing comments and thanked all for participating.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Tristan Allen, Montague Water Conservation District
Lisa Faris, Big Springs Irrigation District
Susan Fricke (Vice-Chair), Karuk Tribe
Blair Hart, Private Pumper
Justin Holmes, Edson Foulke Ditch Company
Steve Mains, Grenada Irrigation District
Justin Sandahl, Shasta River Water Users Association
Pete Scala, Private Pumper
John Tannaci (Chair), Residential
Gregg Werner, Environmental/Conservation

Absent Committee Member

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
Cab Esposito, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates
Brad Gooch, UC Davis/Larry Walker Associates

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

Facilitation Team

Katie Duncan, Stantec

Agency Staff

Eli Scott, Norther Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jessica Boyt, Department of Water Resources

Dan Worth, State Water Resources Control Board

Bob Solecki, State Water Resources Control Board

Kevin Delano, State Water Resources Control Board

Public

Ethan Brown (Shasta RCD)

Brandy Caparoso

Leah Easley

Angela Murvine

Bonny Nichols

John Clements

Giuliano Galdi

Heather Moran

Dan Wendell

Ginger Sammito

Dave Webb

Konrad Fisher

Jack Rice

Lorie

Sydney S

Stan Leake