

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

Meeting date/time: May 26, 2021/ 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 approved its April meeting summary for posting on the Siskiyou County Website.
- **Public Comment:** Public comments provided captured below.
- **District Staff and Other Announcements:** Matt Parker provided an update on the project and management actions ad-hoc meeting. Ethan Brown provided an update on monitoring. Pat Vellines provided updates on DWR resources.
- **Presentation of Shasta Valley Future Water Budget:** Cab Esposito presented the Shasta water budget and received comments from the Advisory Committee.
- **Presentation of Draft Yearly Cost Estimate:** Matt Parker and the Technical Team presented an overview of the draft cost estimate.
- **Draft Chapters 3 & 4 Comment Response Review:** The Advisory Committee provided comment regarding the purpose and feasibility of the proposed PMA list.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Status/Deadline</i>
Provide County Board Meeting Agenda and Recording of budget discussion	Matt Parker and Facilitator	Complete
Convene Surface Water Ad hoc meeting	Facilitator	Complete
Convene Projects and Management Action Ad hoc Meeting	Facilitator	Complete

Next Meeting: June 23, 2021/ 1:00 – 4:00 pm.

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

MEETING SUMMARY

Call to Order, Agenda Review and New Online Meeting Platform

The Facilitator thanked all for joining, reviewed the virtual meeting platform procedures, indicated that quorum had been reached and called the meeting to order. She then reviewed the meeting agenda.

Review of Past Meeting Summary

The Facilitator obtained consent from the Advisory Committee to post the April meeting notes to the County’s Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Website after noting a change to the meeting notes requested by an Advisory Committee member.

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

Review Action Items

The Facilitator reviewed action items and provided updates regarding progress toward their completion.

Public Comment Period

Ginger Sammito commented that all wells in Shasta Valley should be included in the Technical Team’s model. She indicated that well-usage information is relevant to total quantity of water leaving the Valley. Ginger Sammito provided additional context that some domestic wells can pump up to 400 gallons per minute.

The Facilitator obtained clarification that Ginger was referring to domestic wells. The Technical Team indicated that domestic water usage is included in the water budget. However, the model does not currently capture single residential houses without designated irrigated land. The Facilitator noted that water usage is estimated in terms of evapotranspiration, which is not applicable to single residential homes.

The Technical Team recognized that Ginger’s comment regarding pumping for illegal cannabis grows identifies an ‘excessive use of water’ or a water-sale situation. This might be modeled as a separate, test-scenario, but does not fit well into a ‘base-case’ scenario. The Technical Team and Facilitator noted that the current model is a first assessment and will be improved in subsequent iterations.

Pat Vellines (DWR) indicated that the initial plan is not expected to be perfect.

District Staff Updates and Other Announcements

Matt Parker updated the Committee on the Projects and Management Actions (PMA) ad-hoc meeting. He noted the meeting provided an opportunity to build common understanding among those present. The Technical Team noted they had reframed some approaches based on the ideas presented in the ad-hoc meeting and noted that the discussion was very helpful.

Ethan Brown (RCD) indicated the Resource Conservation District was engaged in ongoing data collection.

Pat Vellines (DWR) provided updates regarding a statewide wide webinar on June 8th for airborne electromagnetic surveys and informed that Prop 68 funding has tripled for medium and high-priority basins for implementation projects. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) would send a survey to Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) on the topic of Prop 68 funding. Dave Webb asked when DWR would be releasing comments on past plan review; Pat indicated early June.

Gregg Werner indicated dissatisfaction with the virtual meeting platform and requested that in-person meetings be held. He also suggested that an in-person platform might be more amenable to the significant time requirements of reviewing each section of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Chapters.

Matt Parker noted that that the County is working through logistical in-person meeting

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

challenges. In-person meeting venues require the availability of reliable internet access; the County is in the process of finding a workable option.

Presentation of Shasta Valley Future Water Budget

Cab Esposito (Technical Team) presented the model results related to the Shasta Valley water budget.

Grant Johnson asked when the model would be made available to the public for review. The Technical Team responded that the model data would be made available in the GSP appendix; the model itself will be made available per County direction.

Justin Holmes commented that the budget for Shasta Bulletin 118 Basin appeared to underestimate pumping and asked the Technical Team to explain the information used to develop this aspect of the model. Cab Esposito indicated that the David's Engineering report along with DWR data were the basis of the information modeled. Justin Holmes requested new well data in the Valley should be incorporated. Cab Esposito noted that the data utilized does not come from specific wells, rather from land-use data.

Gregg Werner commented that dry years should indicate less water seeping into groundwater than other years. Cab acknowledged that the model shows the reservoir feeding groundwater even in dry years. The Technical Team indicated that this is a limitation of the model and they intend to revise this particular aspect of the model in the 5-year update.

Dave Webb asked Cab to comment on 'recharge-durability' and how long water from a wet year remains in the ground. Cab indicated that longer-term dry-wet cycles had been considered via input from and coordination with DWR. He indicated he would provide an additional response to Dave Webb's question after further consideration.

Angelina Cook asked whether Shasta River instream flow were considered in the water budget, since the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) recommendation is not usually met. The Facilitator indicated that the budgets shown are for the aquifer. In-stream flow would be calculated in a separate budget. Cab Esposito stated that in-stream flow rates have not yet been released by CDFW. When this data is released, the information would be folded into the appropriate water budget.

Cab Esposito provided context on DWR guidance for future conditions and climate change. He displayed visual representations of changes in precipitation and evapotranspiration over time. He indicated that the presented material would be posted to the County's SGMA website and written into Chapter 2 of the GSP. He summarized the findings; 'near' and 'far' scenarios show the expected slight increase in streamflow and recharge, while the 'wet' and 'dry' show extremes changes.

Grant Johnson requested model calibration via recent precipitation data. Cab Esposito explained that the scenarios shown are designed to follow DWR guidance. To implement the

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

change requested, by creating change factors, the Technical Team would need more time than is available to meet current deadlines. Grant Johnson summarized that the current analysis shows DWR recommended data, not actual, measured data. Laura Foglia noted the Technical Team agreed it would be pertinent to explore additional climate change scenarios in subsequent model iterations.

Blair Hart indicated that ‘cherry-picking’ or removing wet years would corrupt the model. If modeled scenarios remove wet years for analysis, then modeled scenarios should also remove dry years for comparative analysis. Grant Johnson clarified that ‘cherry-picking’ was not the intention. The goal is to use representative data. The concern is that DWR-provided data is not representative of the most recent measured data.

Presentation of Draft Yearly Cost Estimate

Matt Parker introduced a high-level cost analysis. He informed the Advisory Committee that a fee study conducted by a subconsultant would be presented at the next Siskiyou County Board meeting and welcomed all to attend. Laura Foglia presented the draft cost estimate in terms of required monitoring. Matt Parker commented on the cost ranges, indicating that some costs would be shared across the three Flood Control District’s Basins.

Gregg Werner asked whether the costs represent individual salaries or portions of multiple individual’s salaries. Matt Parker indicated intent that multiple people would fulfill the specified tasks and that costs would be allocated between various budgets.

Dave Webb asked whether a County staff person would be capable of updating Technical Team-produced models or if a technical consultant would be needed. Matt Parker indicated that costs are currently front-loaded in the direction of the first 5-year update since a lot of work would need to be done then by the Technical Team. Laura Foglia added that the Technical Team is working on incorporating these costs in the draft plan and applying for grant funding.

Gregg Werner noted the complexity of the GSP-proposed land-use regulation system and cautioned that it would not occur by itself. He indicated that it’s cost should be reflected in the budget. The Technical Team indicated that PMA projects are planned to be covered with grant or other funding, but they would note that funding should be identified and obtained for all PMAs.

The Facilitator indicated that the team would distribute the County Board Meeting Agenda and the Board Meeting recording with relevant draft cost estimate material.

Draft Chapters 3 & 4 Comment Response Review

The Facilitator reminded the meeting participants of the GSP development process. She reminded all of agreed-to principles and ground rules. After reviewing the comment response process, which involves a comment-response matrix, she indicated how the draft chapters would be provided for formal review. The Facilitator indicated 235 comments had been received and reviewed. To make sure potential gaps in understanding were adequately addressed, she identified topics for discussion designed to cover comments identified as ‘comment level A’ or comments requiring Advisory Committee review and input.

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

The Facilitator introduced discussion of the Interconnected Surface Water (ISW) Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) GSP proposal.

Cab Esposito expressed that many comments requested the inclusion of waterwheel and SPU gauges. He updated the Committee on progress to include these gauges and noted that DWR intends to add a gauge near Parks Creek, which will be included once operational. The additional data would substantially increase the overall quality of data in the Valley. Responses to comments would be included in the GSP.

Grant Johnson indicated he had comments related to the ISW criteria. Elisa Noble (Watermaster District) requested additional information about the specifics of the ISW equation. She also indicated that the Watermaster District would be helpful in general monitoring activities. The Facilitator advised that an ad-hoc meeting is planned to address this topic.

Laura Foglia added that extra monitoring was written into a PMA to prioritize this action and to obtain funding. Grant Johnson asked that the DWR funding 'wish-list' (to be distributed to GSAs this summer) include a monitoring proposal since funding is available.

The Facilitator introduced discussion of PMAs and described the tiered approach in the GSP.

Justin Holmes asked why groundwater pumping is noted in combination with other PMAs. Laura Foglia clarified the overall strategy of the PMA plan, to present possible multi-benefit purposes of the PMAs to increase chance of funding in combination.

The Watermaster asked why projects unrelated to groundwater management would be written into the plans. Laura Foglia indicated that the interconnected nature of the basin might link various water uses to groundwater usage. Multi-benefit projects are more likely to be funded. Matt Parker added that partnering with various entities committed to improving the watershed would be beneficial to all.

Dave Webb noted a lack of specific planning and investigations for projects. He asked that the projects be reviewed closely in the interest of public service and due diligence. Grant Johnson asked that a priority matrix and a process be put forth to clarify the plan for proposed projects. Laura Foglia indicated that a road map would be included in GSP chapter 5. She proposed that specific planning occurs when a specific project is identified for possible implementation.

Justin Holmes noted that the proposed list is more a list of ideas than projects. Compiling a more robust plan might be helpful but currently they are ideas, not projects.

Ethan Brown commented that some grant opportunities related to SGMA are only available to GSAs and that there are other entities already working in PMA-described areas. He indicated that an existing Flow Transactions Program might be replicated. Ethan to provide project details.

The Facilitator introduced discussion of PMAs text and tables currently written into the GSP.

Laura Foglia indicated that Aquifer Characterization Analysis should be moved to Tier 1.

Gregg Werner asked whether analysis of the ongoing dry residential well problem should be

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

listed as a separate PMA. Laura Foglia indicated that this data does need to be obtained and analyzed and agreed to include as a separate PMA. Matt Parker noted that the County recognizes the need to investigate where dry or abandoned wells are in the Valley. He also noted the complexity of the subject and suggested tailoring language to a well 'inventory program' and coordination with the County.

The Technical Team indicated ongoing model calibration as pumping data becomes available. Gregg Werner cautioned that modifications from status quo would require commitments from various entities as well as land-use regulation. Laura Foglia agreed, commenting that this type of PMA would occur in partnership with other entities.

Blair Hart provided context of various laws related to changes in land use and cautioned that the proposed PMAs may not be economically or politically feasible. Blair indicated that there are proposed PMAs that are not feasible in the context of those broader considerations. He noted substantive limitations to these proposals. Laura Foglia clarified intent to identify for land-use planning entities infeasibility of pumping expansion when considering existing groundwater use. Blair Hart noted the baseline consideration for projects is economics.

The Facilitator introduced discussion of metering.

Tristan Allan stated that in the context of groundwater sustainability and SGMA, there must be groundwater user coordination. Metering is a concern to agricultural users. Not all meeting participants have the time to provide written comment. Siskiyou County water users do not have the funds to fund the projects that have been proposed.

Dave Webb requested that the Technical Team review resources he had provided them.

Ethan Brown suggested that conjunctive use may not result in a net increase in groundwater. He also indicated that Siskiyou County might have rights to Klamath water and this could be included as an additional PMA.

Leah Easley stated that surface water users measure and report their use.

The Facilitator proposed PMA list modifications be discussed at an ad-hoc meeting. She asked the Advisory Committee members to voice general thoughts about the completion of the GSP draft.

Blair Hart asked for refinement of the actions as written, specifically the land use and conservation easement language. He stated that he hoped the document will not be put on the shelf because the Valley needs water management.

Grant Johnson indicated that the details need refinement.

Gregg Werner indicated that he believed the GSP is getting there with the qualifier that the adequacy of the GSP would be related to the commitment of implementation. At this point, they don't have the proper data. .

Justin Holmes indicated that the document needs to be of a size and a focus that leads to further action. He indicated a desire that a reasonable number of projects that may actually be implemented be specifically identified. He recommended focus.

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

Lisa Faris indicated that the list was a starting point.

Tristan Allen asked that the document continue to incorporate additional data. He indicated that the goal is to be able to hand the Valley to the next generation.

Steve Mains indicated that the GSP is a rough framework and is pleased with the direction. He commented that incorporation of more data is very important.

Meeting Adjourns

The Facilitator thanked all for participating and adjourned the meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Justin Sandahl, Shasta River Waters Users Association
John Tannaci, Residential
Justin Holmes, Edson-Foulke Ditch Company
Blair Hart, Private Pumper
Steve Mains, Grenada Irrigation District
Tristan Allen, Montague Water Conservation District
Gregg Werner, Environmental/Conservation
Robert Moser, Municipal/City (Lake Shastina Community District)
Lisa Faris, Big Springs Irrigation District
Grant Johnson, Karuk Tribe

Absent Committee Members

Pete Scala, Private Pumper

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
Katrina Arredondo, Larry Walker Associates

Agency Staff

Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jessica Boyt, Department of Water Resources
Pat Vellines, Department of Water Resources
Kevin Delano, State Water Resources Control Board
Pat Graham, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bob Solecki, State Water Resources Control Board
Dan Worth, State Water Resources Control Board

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

Facilitator

Katie Duncan, Stantec
Elizabeth Simon, Stantec

Members of the public

Ethan Brown, Shasta RCD
Angelina Cook
Ayn Perry, SVRCD
Ngodoo Atume
Michael Spiess
Dave Webb
Nick Joslin
Ginger Sammito
Leah Easley, Scott and Shasta Valley Watermaster District
Rod Dowse, Shasta Valley RCD
Pat Witt
Theo Whitcomb
Elisa Noble, Executive Director Scott Valley and Shasta Valley Watermaster District
Heather Wood, NRCS
Jim Patterson, NRCS