.

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting Summary

Date/time: Monday, March 8, 2021; 3:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Zoom
Contact: Andy Rodgers, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), Administrator
Email: arodgers@westyost.com I Phone: 707.508.3661

Next meeting: Monday, March 29, 2021, 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Call to Order

Sam Magill, Facilitator, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program, opened the meeting at 3:02 p.m. and welcomed the group. He briefly covered meeting protocol, and then conducted roll call and ran through the day's agenda. Bob Anderson, Santa Rosa Plain Advisory Committee Chairman, also welcomed the participants.

General Public Comments

None.

Agenda and 2021 Meeting Schedule Reviews

Andy Rodgers walked through the 2021 calendar. He confirmed we will release the April 12 Advisory Committee meeting date but may be adding an extra meeting after May.

Review Action Items and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

Sam Magill asked if any corrections to the previous meeting summary are required. No changes were requested. Send any comments to staff by the end of the week so the summary can be posted.

GSP Section 2 Document Review Update

Objective: Staff provide update on GSP Section 2 Review.

Ann DuBay went through GSP Section 2 comments. She mentioned one comment regarding additional information about basin boundaries, from John Rosenblum; Marcus Trotta responded to John Rosenblum on his comments and said many of Mr. Rosenblum's concerns would be addressed in Section 3 that has a section on basin boundaries and inflows/outflows. Ann DuBay said Section 3 was a much longer section. It will not be posted until the end of this month; an email with a link will be sent out to the Advisory Committee along with a new more user-friendly comment form.

Questions/Comments

Rosenblum – I acknowledge my comments are recognized. The boundary issue isn't just a technical issue, it is a policy issue, and although the Advisory Committee can't address the issue, there is a need for the Board to address it. There needs to be a sound technical explanation to persuade the Board members that there is a policy issue.

Anderson – What is the due date to comment on Section 3?

DuBay – We will probably allow one whole month to provide feedback as it is a lengthy section. It may overlap with Section 4.

Recommended Preliminary Groundwater Level SMC

Objective: *Provide overview of Groundwater Level SMC, AC opportunity for clarifying questions, and AC recommendation*

Marcus Trotta said that today's objective is to review, discuss and recommend preliminary Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives for Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels and to recommend two to three options for defining Undesirable Results for Board consideration at their March 11 meeting.

Questions/Comments

Wayne Haydon (chat) – Comment on slide 18: Use of Historical Lows for Areas with Large Historical Drawdowns

1. I think the strongest rationale on slide 18 is "Absence of documented undesirable results at historical lows and demonstrated ability to recover indicates some level of resiliency and operational flexibility." We have seen large declines in the GWL did not cause subsidence, etc., and having "operations flexibility" will be important during disasters or otherwise when aqueduct water may become unavailable.
I like the 2 rationales, convinced me using historical data is a good way to do it. I am in support of using historical lows. I support using historical lows.
2. The weakest rationale I think is "Levels of municipal pumping in this area during the 80s/90s are unlikely to re-occur due to conservation, recycled water use, and policy limitations on municipal groundwater use (City of Rohnert Park, 2015 UWMP)." Municipal policy can change, it's a 3-2 world. I wouldn't want to rely on policies not changing.
3. Should the GSA pursue regulations to limit the "presence of other pumpers that do not have existing policy limitations in the area"? I wonder if it is something the GSA could potentially address so that we have some knowledge of what they are doing.

Mary Grace Pawson – I would like to bring Rohnert Park's perspective. We have been down the path of unsustainable management and had to move to sustainable management. Our local policy resolution is supported by a stipulated judgement. Even if our City Council would change its policy with regards to the cap on groundwater pumpage, we are still limited by the court. One of the things we learned, is it really helps to have the groundwater basin available under certain situations/emergencies. We could support the idea of a yellow light/warning line for when groundwater levels reach a point, to stop and understand what is going on. We believe the data shows the basin can recover from the historical lows.

Rue Furch (chat) – It would be important to establish an early "trigger" warning considering potential changes to Russian River/surface water supply - especially given the uncertainty with Potter Valley.

Joe Gaffney (chat) – Increased municipal pumping during a disaster (e.g., 1996 Aqueduct fertilizer spill) would be short-term and should not be considered as an "undesirable impact."

Matt O'Connor – I support the warning level threshold, question is "what does the 'warning level trigger', trigger?" I like drawing a line a little higher on the graph.

Trotta – Our initial thinking is to use Minimum Threshold as a warning level trigger. If you have any other thoughts, we would like to hear it. We will be building out the procedures in the draft SMC section.

O'Connor – One of my concerns is the mechanics of the program's 5-year reviews. The monitoring is happening on a shorter timescale. What is the timing of the trigger, there is no adjustment in the plan between the 5-year updates?
Trotta – Because SGMA requires annual reports and evaluation how you are doing against Minimum Thresholds; investigations would be on an annual basis.

Elizabeth Cargay – How many wells would be affected if we used our warning level as zero instead of across the board, what would that do as a warning level?
Trotta – If set to zero? In this case, not much different from the existing purple line. We wouldn't be proposing a trigger level for all monitoring wells. If we saw 50-80 feet of decline, the trigger would come into play.
Cargay – So it is with historical declines?
Trotta – Yes.
Cargay – I support the warning level.

Rosenblum – I would prefer to look at trends rather than triggers. Trends can have triggers in them for action. Instead of waiting for something to happen, we can anticipate. There will be trends.
Trotta – Evaluating trends is what the Sustainable Management Criteria is set up to do.
Rosenblum - Second point, my issue with the western boundary. There are already trends identified. Third point, all the CASGEM data goes through Sonoma Water. Why aren't we including the CASGEM data that has well information? What can be done to start asking the well irrigators to start sharing their data on wells and metering?
Trotta – If we start seeing trends that are below the minimum thresholds, that is where the investigation would come into play. CASGEM well data is included in the slides. If we did see issues outside the existing Representative Monitoring Point network, we would use that data to evaluate where we need more RMP wells in future.
Rosenblum – It still leaves out Wilson Highlands, it is a problem for us. The boundaries of the analysis need to include Wilson Grove Highlands. We need to bring this to the Board.

Scott – I support the idea of the early warning to give a chance to look in further detail and have time to act. Is there a time associated with the readings? I think the frequency of the readings should be in the criteria.
Trotta – Slide 36 addresses Craig Scott's question of frequency. We are proposing monthly frequency.

Gaffney – I am assuming an exceedance action will be triggered by a well owner suddenly complaining that the water level has dropped. Before any kind of investigation is instigated against an over-pumper, the GSA should look at the nature of the well of the property owner instigating the complaint. I saw many times that folks complaining had shallow wells and weren't familiar with well maintenance.
Trotta – For actual exceedances based on measured data there would need to be some level of investigation.

Haydon (chat) – I support the concept of "…threshold as a warning level that would trigger investigation into potential causes prior to reaching original MT".

O'Connor (chat) – CASGEM wells leave much to be desired regarding the level of detail and background info. (To John Rosenblum) Please respond in the chat regarding what findings attributed to me you were referring to.

Rosenblum (chat) - 2009-2014 well level decline in the upper Atascadero creek watershed.

O'Connor (chat) - John, thank you. This is a measure of decline in groundwater level during a recent severe drought in the Wilson Grove. In future modeling for SRP, we would hope that that information and/or additional or better data would be utilized to help define the groundwater elevation or groundwater gradient at the SRP model boundary.

Peter Martin (chat) – Keep in mind, CASGEM has some QA/QC components that can assist with ensuring consistency across different data points.

Rosenblum (chat) – If CASGEM data currently do not have good QA/QC. it can be remedied by the GSA purchasing and deploying common instruments on a regular basis, even with uncertain quantification, trends can be identified.

O'Connor (chat) – Regarding CASGEM wells, there are some wells where there isn't even a Well Completion Report available for the well. Water elevation data are of interest, but without some critical information about well construction that data would be difficult to interpret with any confidence.

Rosenblum (chat) – Improving the quality of local CASGEM data should be a measure to commit to in this 1st version of the GSP.

Pawson (chat) – Rohnert Park has monitored groundwater quality for approximately 15 years within a network established by DWR.

Lisa Porta (chat) – SGMA Is set up for long-term sustainability and is not really meant for a "trigger-level" approach. Basin should be sustainable by 2042, including with water levels. Therefore, the GSPs, and their updates, are working towards adequate Minimum Thresholds for sustainability, that can be refined over time, until 2042. Unforeseen items are not part of this general approach and they may not result in an undesirable result.

John Rosenblum (chat to Lisa Porta) - The modelling shows there will be foreseeable impacts. Also, ag and municipal demands will increase as climate impacts get worse - likely much differently that currently anticipated (like sea level changes).

Furch (chat) – Spring and fall readings should inform seasonal changes and important trends. The changes in recovery seasonally should be part of the discovery and action plans.

POLL
What is your preferred approach for Remote Monitoring Points with large historical declines and recovery?

Utilize original MT based on shallower of historical low/well depth impact metrics = **3 in favor**
Utilize shallower MT threshold = **0**
Utilize “Warning-level trigger = **11 in favor**

Marcus Trotta then covered Undesirable Results options.

David Noren (chat) - Would the reaction to undesirable results include actions such as additional monitoring to determine the cause of the problem? It would seem reasonable to have such actions to try and determine actions and further then to explore options of remedy.

O'Connor – I look at the options 2 and 3. I like there being a little more flexibility. You might have 2 and 3 happening at the same time. If you are going to have a trip wire, maybe the 10%, maybe two consecutive years. How do you adjust for climate effects?

> Trotta – That is an appropriate question. We have tried to address that in the Minimum Threshold methodology building a buffer for a four-year drought for each of the Representative Monitoring Points. It is something we will have to be adaptive and see as we go.

Furch (chat) – The goal being sustainability, we should determine early if there is a problem so we can initiate additional research & planned remedies. I agree that we need the "trip wire" to examine what has happened.

Andy Rodgers (chat) – Here is a comment submitted via email from Mark Grismer: I agree with these statements and lean towards option #3 on slide #24. Would add something about the areal distribution of the 10% or 25% of the RMPs together with the aquifer depth. If the Minimum Thresholds are exceeded by 3 or * RMPS in a particular area, there should be a closer look at that region and initiation of the other actions listed. If Minimum Thresholds are exceeded in RMPs scattered across the region but not reflected in sister wells, another path may be needed such as installation of more monitoring wells.

Haydon (chat) – Two RMP's in one aquifer could be up to 40 square miles of the Basin. Four RMP's in one aquifer could be up to 50 square miles of the Basin. Because of these large RMP areas, I recommend One RMP (one MT) for One entire year of Exceedance is an Undesirable Result, or a Warning Level requiring Investigation.

Furch (chat) – If the GSA does not have authority to institute a remedy - knowing there is a problem (with advance warning) the GSA can let well owners know the situation so they can voluntarily take action. Outreach is within the purview and should be used.

POLL

Which Undesirable Results option do you prefer?

1. Single MT exceedance within a single year = **1 in favor**.
2. 10% of RMPs (~3 RMPs or ~ 2 RMPs within same aquifer) exceed MT for 3 consecutive years = **7 in favor**
3. 25% of RMPs (~8 RMPs or ~ 4 RMPs within same aquifer) exceed MT for 2 consecutive years = **3 in favor**
4. Other = **1 suggestion**

Asked another way, are there any UR options you or your organization/interest areas would find unacceptable?

1. Single MT exceedance within a single year = **9 opposed**
2. 10% of RMPs (~3 RMPs or~2 RMPs within same aquifer) exceed MT for 3 consecutive years = **0**
3. 25% of RMPs (~8 RMPs or~4 RMPs within same aquifer) exceed MT for 2 consecutive years = **2 opposed**
4. Other (please explain via chat) = **1 suggestion**

Recommended Groundwater Storage SMC Approach

Objective: Provide overview of groundwater storage SMC, AC opportunity for clarifying questions, input, and recommendation.

Marcus Trotta presented a background on Groundwater Storage SMC and walked through staff's recommended approach of using Groundwater Levels as a metric. This SMC is developed for the entire Subbasin, not individual aquifers. The goal is to pump within the sustainable yield and have "zero long-term change in storage once sustainability is reached". Trotta provided an example Significant & Unreasonable Statement.

"Reduction of groundwater storage that causes significant and unreasonable impacts to the long-term sustainable beneficial use of groundwater in the basin, as determined by:

1) Long-term reductions in groundwater storage; or

2) pumping exceeding the sustainable yield."

He asked the Advisory Committee for their thoughts on the example statement and if they are supportive of using groundwater levels as a proxy for the groundwater storage SMC.

Questions/Comments

Rosenblum – My concerns are about using one methodology when we have so many uncertainties. I think we need to use two methods. For it to be practical, we need better quality data. We need to include ag irrigation volumes and well levels in evaluations. We can't just say we will get the municipals, the mutual water companies, and some volunteer individuals to provide information, if we are missing so much data from ag. Somehow, we need to include ag. We need the data to calibrate the model. All climate models are calibrated on past data. Unless we have past data, we won't know if the climate projection is worthwhile or not. My first reaction is we need more than one methodology. We have shallow and deep aquifers and we have some local areas like the Sebastopol area dependent on recharge that don't have data. Creating a report that says we are within the SMC with groundwater storage without looking at the localities, what is going to happen to the wells when the Russian River supply goes down? There are areas and localities that SGMA provides for separate evaluation within a GSA. There is a much broader issue than finding one solution.

> Trotta – That is what I was trying to convey. Moving forward with this methodology using contoured groundwater level data and estimates of storage coefficients, we will be comparing that and utilizing information from the model so that we have at least two methods we would be evaluating together. Once we are comfortable that they are consistent on an annual basis, we recommend using groundwater level as a metric.

O'Connor – The groundwater level as a proxy has the benefit of it being objective data. There is a lot to be said for groundwater elevation data. I am a little alarmed by your recommendation of using groundwater levels as a proxy for the groundwater storage SMC in that you find the prospect of running the model on an annual basis as problematic.

> Trotta – Generating all the data sets on an annual basis, as well as incorporating the climate data sets and the potential it will require re-calibration on certain time intervals, are some of the things I thought about.
>
> Andy Rich – It could be quite time consuming and expensive to update the model every year.
>
> O'Connor – It raises the question, once you get through this year and there is a plan in place, the use of the model between years is an opportunity to do other useful things. What is going to happen after the plan is approved? The model is a great tool and if only used once every four or five years, there is lot of a lost opportunity.

Porta – The model doesn't prove sustainability. It gives you a general idea of where the basin is now. The model will be used every five years to reassess the basin. Annually, it is all about monitoring.

Scott – On the example statement, it seems to me as written, that we are going to use long term reduction in groundwater storage and pumping exceeding the sustainable yield as criteria to determine there are unreasonable impacts; I don't think that is what the statement is intended to say. Maybe we could truncate it after 'basin' or clarify it by saying 'as caused by'. Numbers 1 and 2 are difficult to calculate. I am supportive of using groundwater levels as a proxy for the groundwater storage SMC.

Trotta – It seems the suggestion of changing 'as determined by' to 'as caused by' would work.

Cargay – I think 'as caused by' would be clearer. I like the idea of using groundwater levels as a proxy for the groundwater storage SMC. I also like the idea of looking at each aquifer separately as they can react differently depending where water is being pumped from.

Gaffney (chat) – We are sitting on a huge bathtub of groundwater, but we don't know where the bottom is, so we don't know the total volume available. 1) would limit groundwater pumping to the annual infiltration to the basin. What about dry years?

Furch (chat) – Will deep and shallow water storage be monitored separately? Changes may be more likely in shallow aquifers, no?

Porta - Yes, staff is proposing to determine change in groundwater storage for both shallow and deep aquifers. Shallow aquifers are more sensitive to changes in climate and hydrology; deep aquifers are more affected by deeper pumping.

O'Connor (chat) – Groundwater elevation recovery in Rohnert Park area took a decade.

Gaffney (chat) – How long does it take for surface water to infiltrate to the main aquafers? It is this filtration lag that gives us the high-quality groundwater that we have.

Andy Rich (chat) – It can take thousands of years for infiltrated water to reach deep aquifers. Less for shallow. Depends on aquifer properties.

Furch (chat to Matt O'Connor and Joe Gaffney) – So we'd need to know that circumstance in order to determine the remedy to reach sustainability.

Bob Anderson (chat) – What does it mean to have the GSA say pumping would not exceed sustainable yield?

Gaffney (chat to Matt O'Connor) – During which time the number of wells east of Rohnert Park increased.

O'Connor (chat) – Salient point.

Trotta (chat to Bob Anderson) - By tying the Storage SMC to the Groundwater Level SMC, the GSA would be essentially saying that pumping within the basin will not cause undesirable results.

Porta (chat) – SMC are proven with monitoring data, not with the models. Observations over the next 20 years of GSP implementation will help refine thresholds and identify how this basin needs to be managed for sustainability.

Pawson (chat) – Rohnert Park would be delighted to see the Penngrove Water Company adopt a pumping limit and manage to it...that would be good for everyone in the basin.

Gaffney (chat) – Plus 1!

Rosenblum (chat) – The cost of the impact to well owners might be higher than the cost of modelling.

Furch (chat) – How will this problem with running the model affect other "triggers"? We are voting on number of years for various thresholds / triggers … so how will those be affected if we're trying to reach standards?

Porta (chat) – Minimum Thresholds are evaluated with annual or sub-annual monitoring data.

O'Connor (chat) – Thank you for that helpful clarification. The distinction between a full model update and model runs for other purposes (with limitations) is what I hoped to hear.

Furch (chat) – Agree with Matt O'Connor.

David Noren (chat) – Doesn't this approach essentially couple SGMA with the CASGEM process? Using groundwater levels as the proxy seems reasonable if there is confidence of where the basis for sustainability is established. Lowering water levels were a big problem in areas south of Sebastopol, many of which have now recovered

Furch (chat) – Would monitoring in all sectors (and levels) address David Noren's question?

Furch (chat) – I agree with Elizabeth Cargay about looking at different examples.

Rich (chat) – There is also a large network of observation wells not operated by CASGEM that are included.

O'Connor (chat) – Need more information...in principal I am ok with the proxy, but the full implementation approach may affect my thinking.

Rosenblum (chat) – Groundwater levels are very good, but given the uncertainties, there is need for additional data and separate methods.

Haydon (chat) – Significant & Unreasonable Statement: Saying 'Long-term reductions in groundwater storage' seems circular, that is 'Less storage results in Less Storage'. We are already linking groundwater levels to groundwater storage, therefore, reducing storage lowers groundwater level and causes all the negative consequences of lowering groundwater levels such as Interconnected waters, subsidence, loss of available water (storage).

Porta (chat) – I think we are looking at it the opposite way: lowering groundwater levels reduces storage. So basically, a loss in storage is a result of lowering of groundwater levels - this is how these two indicators are connected.

Haydon (chat) – Yes, goes both ways. The two are linked. Thanks!

Haydon (chat) – I agree with the option of using Groundwater Levels as a metric to calculate changes in storage.

O'Connor (chat) – Yes, every attempt to simplify leads back to complexification!

POLL
Based on the information presented today, are you or your organization/interest supportive of using groundwater levels as a proxy for the groundwater storage SMC?

1. Yes **= 10 in support**
2. No = **0**
3. Need more information (describe information needs via chat) = **3 suggestions**

Marcus Trotta said staff would give an update to the Board this week. Staff will be working on a more detailed write-up of this SMC and it will be included in Section 4.

Projected 50-year Water Budget

Objective: Provide overview of projected baseline water budget and AC opportunity for clarifying questions

Lisa Porta gave an introduction to the subject and Andy Rich covered the Water Budget in more detail and outlined next steps.

O'Connor – Great presentation. My concern is that RCP 8.5 has such wet climate through the first 20-30 years of the projection, I gather all the decision making about that has long since passed. I think we have a Pollyanna forecast; I would prefer to have another climate projection of a worst-case scenario.

Rich – Noted, thank you.

Furch – (chat) – Agree with Matt O'Connor, we need to look at worst case scenarios.

Martin – For future Board presentations, it would be good to include the historical lines and marry them with the projected data well. The swings have some reference. I think this tells a good story about potential projects we should be targeting going forward.

Rosenblum – I didn't get an answer about the 'minus' on the green cumulative slide. The other thing is I don't understand what you mean when you say evapotranspiration. Your model is an agricultural model. Evapotranspiration itself is probably 10x larger than the water supplied to crops in agriculture. We are looking at Santa Rosa Plain, however, Sebastopol relies on recharge outside the analysis area. Cannabis is grown there. We don't really know the impact. Cannabis will become larger possibly as the value of the vines goes down. I am concerned about natural vegetation fitting into the model as well. What happens when you convert natural vegetation to homes, ag, or cannabis? Those are issues that come up for me. RCP 8.5 is not good. In all climate projections, every RCP is accompanied by obligations. Unless we do something, we will end up with RCP 8.5 and after 2100, there will be almost nothing to talk about.

Magill – There are a lot of questions in the chat about RCP 8.5. It was used to demonstrate the worst-case scenario.

Rich – This group and the Board chose 8.5 and that is what we are using as the projected baseline.

Porta – We can change it in the future. This is a good way to see a potential worst-case drought. The drought could happen later or before, but it allows us to look at the types of projects that will be necessary for future management. RCP 8.5 is being used for this Groundwater Sustainability Agency; it will be refined in five years. The Board has decided this is the way we are moving forward.

Rosenblum – I would like to know more about the 'minus' sign on the green line on the storage change graph on slide 75, what it means and where we are starting from on the ag model.

Rich – The green line is the starting storage at the end of the historical groundwater storage period. A negative value for a cumulative storage change represents the cumulative storage is going down, a positive value is going up.
Rosenblum – Maybe we should take this offline, possibly the caption is misleading.

Anderson (chat) - How does recycled water applied vary by type of year?
Rich – I kept recycled water as a constant value with the thought that changes in delivery would be a good example of a management action.

Scott (chat) – Would be helpful to have redline on the chart to show where the groundwater level SMC kicks in. That is, does this scenario to 2050 trigger that criteria?

O'Connor (chat) – RCP 8.5 climate projection looks benign...not many dry years.

Gaffney (chat) – Where is the demand from the cannabis growers? It's a growing industry (no pun intended) that shouldn't be ignored. RCP 8.5 is the worst-case, "do nothing" scenario.

Furch (chat) – How is precipitation forecast?
Rich (chat) – An output of the global circulation models.
Scott (chat) – How much of the inflow is from precipitation versus applied water?
Rich – About 99%.

Furch (chat) – Earlier someone indicated that it takes many years for surface water to percolate down to aquifers.
Rich – Deep percolation here is the water that enters the sub surface when it reaches the shallowest part of the groundwater system.

Furch (chat) – How long does it take from surface to shallower aquifers?
Rich – It can be very quick or slow, depends on many factors.
Furch (chat) – The length of time to useful recharge matters … don't answer this, but it clearly matters if it is years - not seasonal.
Magill (chat) – In a previous presentation staff provided a graphic with approximate filtration times for the various aquifers and sediment types throughout the basin. I'll try to track it down for you!

Rosenblum (chat) – Baseline is 1971? Or 2015 for SGMA? Graphs show from 2020?
Porta (chat) – Baseline is 2015, but the projection starts after the GSP is submitted.

Porta (chat) – RCP 8.5 includes an extreme 20-year drought later in the simulation; that helps the GSA plan for potential worst-case effects.

Trotta (chat) – The later stages of the 50-year projections using RCP 8.5 provide insights on types of projects may be needed to address less rosy scenarios.
Long (chat) – Doesn't RCP 8.5 present a worst case for groundwater demand due to increased evapotranspiration? I do not understand Matt O'Connor's comment about RCP 8.5 being "Pollyanna."
O'Connor (chat) – I simply see that it proves to be a nice and wet climate, albeit warm. We may have previously agreed, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't be concerned about how things play if it doesn't turn out to be wet as projected.

Furch (chat) – Thank you, I'm concerned about trends and predictions that would inspire preventative actions - if only voluntarily with some educational outreach.

Porta (chat) Management actions, and education of groundwater users are potential "projects" that can be reviewed.

Noren (chat) – Pretty grim predictions for an area that is greatly dependent upon groundwater for a good part of the residential land users. The take home message to me in these predictions is we better get the projects lined up for those management actions.

O'Connor (chat) – Yes...as per Lisa Porta's comment, we can see that if is dry early then we will have a substantial decline in groundwater storage.

O'Connor (chat) - Lisa Porta pointed out that the late part of RCP 8.5 has a long drought period; we can get the message from that part of this model run.

Rosenblum (chat) – I think that more than one scenario is needed whenever the model is run. For example, we were shown last year RCP 8.5 with a near-term deep drought, and RCP 4.5 with a much later deep drought. So, if the model is run every two years for example, it should include at least five scenarios.

Updates

Objective: Provide relevant updates that inform the Advisory Committee - AC to ask questions if needed.

Marcus Trotta – We are still working through the Inter-connected Surface Water SMC; we are hoping to have a proposal for this SMC to consider at the March 29 meeting. We have posted all the meeting notes and slides from the practitioner workgroup summaries and slides here: https://santarosaplaingroundwater.org/gsa-activities/

For Projects/Actions – We are looking at gathering information on potential projects and actions for us to review at our next AC meeting; our next phase is to start developing project and action scenarios we can simulate with the model to see if they potentially impact sustainable management criteria and overall water budget.

We are also looking at work related to the Prop 68 grant. We shared the information in the meeting packet, Mitch Buttress is taking the lead on that. We are hoping to start construction of some wells mid to late summer. Once we have designs further developed, we will share the plans.

Andy Rodgers said the program will launch the week of March 22 (or latest, the following week) with a press release and notification mailers. Staff is preparing materials for the Board, Advisory Committee, and outreach staff in anticipation of questions from the community the following weeks.

Andrea Rodriguez – SCI will present the final survey results to the Board this week. There was a 22% return rate for Santa Rosa Plain, and we received good data. Survey recipients were allowed the option to provide comments; 664 comments were made (many negative – which is common. The survey will be followed by virtual focus groups, 160 participants (15%) offered to participate – there will be five groups of about 10 people each, including one for each basin, and two across the basins (ag and one other specialty group).

Review Meeting Action Items and Discuss February Meeting Agenda

Sam Magill, Advisory Committee Meeting Facilitator

- GSP section 2 is still available for comments, send any additional comments to staff by the end of this week.
- Look for an email with link from staff to review Section 3.

Andy Rodgers thanked everyone for attending and their chat comments and said he would keep the Advisory Committee apprised of the GUIDE program. The next Board meeting is March 11, 2021 and the next Advisory Committee meeting is March 29, 2021.

Rue Furch asked that chat comments be attached to the meeting summary.

DuBay (chat) – The chat comments are already included in the meeting summaries!

Bob Anderson thanked everyone for attending. The meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Attendees:

Advisory Committee Members (present)

Agricultural representative, Bob Anderson
City of Rohnert Park appointee, Mary Grace Pawson
City of Santa Rosa appointee, Peter Martin
Environmental representative, Beth Lamb
Environmental representative, Rue Furch
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria representative, Maureen Geary
Gold Ridge RCD appointee, Matt O'Connor
Independent Water Systems appointee, John Rosenblum
Rural Residential representative, David Noren
Sonoma County Water Agency appointee, Carolyn Dixon
Sonoma RCD appointee, Wayne Haydon
Town of Windsor appointee, Elizabeth Cargay
Agricultural representative, David Long
City of Cotati appointee, Craig Scott
Business representative, Joe Gaffney
Rural Residential representative, Marlene Soiland (a few minutes late)

Advisory Committee Members (excused)

County of Sonoma appointee, Mark Grismer

Staff/Presenters

Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator
Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff
Andy Rich, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff
Mitch Buttress, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff
Lisa Porta, Montgomery & Associates, Technical Staff
Ann DuBay, Sonoma Water, Outreach
Andrea Rodriguez, Sonoma Water, Outreach
Simone Peters, GSA Administrative Aide, (*recording meeting summary*)

Facilitator

Sam Magill, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

Other Attendees

Tad Bedegrew, DWR
Colin Close, City of Santa Rosa
Sandi Potter, Town of Windsor
Gina Lisa Tamayo – Member of Public
Stefania Cappi, Member of Public
Paul Brophy, Member of Public