

# Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting Meeting Summary

Date/time: Monday, March 29, 2021; 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: Zoom

Contact: Andy Rodgers, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), Administrator

Email: [arodgers@westyost.com](mailto:arodgers@westyost.com) | Phone: 707.508.3661

Next meeting: Monday, May 10, 2021, 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

## 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. Bob Anderson, Chairman, and Rue Furch, Vice-Chair also welcomed the participants. Magill then briefly reviewed meeting protocol, conducted roll call, and ran through the day's agenda.

## General Public Comments

None.

## Agenda and 2021 Meeting Schedule Reviews

Andy Rodgers walked through the 2021 calendar. Despite adjustments, the Groundwater Sustainability Plan development process and decision milestones continue to progress and remain on schedule for a September release for public review. There may be some schedule adjustments needed between today and August. Currently, it looks like the Advisory Committee will need the June 14 meeting, but it isn't confirmed yet.

## Question/Comments

Bob Anderson – When you say a September release for public review, my assumption is that is approval by the Board. When does the Advisory Committee have to take action, for that to happen?

Rodgers – As of now, I am not exactly sure which extra meetings we need. As we get closer, it will become clearer.

Rue Furch (chat) – A request to give us as much advance notice as is possible on meetings that change from “hold” to “on”, thank you.

Rodgers (chat) – Yes, we'll communicate extra meeting changes with the Advisory Committee (either changing from 'Hold' to 'On', or 'Hold' to 'Cancel') as soon as is possible.

## Review Action Items and Approval of March 8 Meeting Summary

Sam Magill asked if any corrections to the previous meeting summary are required. One small correction to a typo was received from John Rosenblum. Send any other comments to staff by the end of the week so the summary can be finalized and posted.

## SMC for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water (ISW SMC)

*Objective: Provide an overview on draft ISW SMC approach and methodology. Receive AC feedback and recommendation on proposed methodology and Undesirable Results options for Board consideration.*

Sam Magill said the practitioner workgroup has been working on much of the information you will see here today. Staff has put together a background document titled “Background Proposed Adaptive Approach and Key Themes and Outcomes from March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting”. Magill highlighted a few comments and input from the meeting.

Marcus Trotta gave an overview of Interconnected Surface Water SMC and said there are a lot of uncertainties and unknowns of Interconnected Surface Water Depletion. Key challenges include data and information limitations, technical complexities in identifying fraction of surface water depletion caused by groundwater pumping, and surface water rights. Trotta highlighted the need for an adaptive management approach for this SMC. The proposed Significant and Unreasonable Statement is:

*“Significant and unreasonable depletion of surface water from interconnected streams occurs when surface water depletion, cause by groundwater pumping within the Subbasin, exceeds historical depletion or adversely impacts the viability of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) or other beneficial users of surface water.”*

### Questions/Comments

Rick Rogers, National Marine Fisheries Service, gave a background of his agency’s concerns with SGMA with regards to Undesirable Results of streamflow depletion. 1) We want to avoid any linkage of a SMC that is set to the 2014 period or any period in the middle of our last historic drought when instream conditions and streamflow depletions were very bad for all beneficial uses. 2) We are looking for SMC that link to the Undesirable Result, and when talking about streamflow depletion, it is the significant and undesirable impacts to beneficial uses to the surface water. We want to make sure if we are using groundwater levels as a proxy, they are linked to what the instream conditions are. Are those avoiding the significant and undesirable impacts to beneficial uses? I appreciate the GSA convening the group, it was very valuable and great to hear everyone’s concerns. I hope the way we are working this out, and what we find, will be a good model for other GSAs to come up with metrics.

Peter Martin – Great presentation, I enjoyed reading the outcomes from the practitioner workgroups. I am comfortable with the fact we adopted a policy as far as groundwater well levels of not having any additional declines beyond historical lows. That helps in that we aren’t expecting any net groundwater lowering in this basin. This approach and adaptive management style are good. Are we still required to do mapping of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) as part of this GSP?

Trotta – Yes, we are required to map groundwater dependent ecosystems as part of the GSP. We had a separate practitioner workgroup helping us out with these maps for the basin.

John Rosenblum – I am really impressed with the adaptive improvements and recommendations. Where I have some skepticism is, we seem to be continuously reminded that we are siloed into the management within the Bulletin 118 limits. There is an obligation to communicate those concerns to the agencies that have authority. From what I read at the State level, not all diversions are reporting their diversion volumes in a consistent way. On water rights, it is a terrible legal regulatory issue; we need to convey the concern about the diversions to the agencies responsible. Excellent recommendations, but it would be good to add some Non-governmental organizations to the practitioner workgroups. It is worthwhile mining local knowledge.

Rosenblum (chat) – I'm impressed by the recommendations for adaptive management. However, it will be important to look upstream (a high priority in TNC's recommendations). Also need enforcement of stream diversion reporting and rights.

Trotta (chat) – Enforcement of stream diversion reporting and rights remains under the purview of the State Water Board (SWRCB). As I will describe later, we are working with SWRCB staff on an approach for coordination and information sharing that we will describe in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Bob Anderson (chat) – To Rick Rogers' point that we can provide a model for other GSAs. Is the adaptive approach being proposed acceptable as a model? Or, is thinking that will come during Implementation? Added verbally – Are you expecting that we do the work later? It isn't clear that other GSAs would follow what we are doing.

Rogers – The way that everybody is diving into developing the Groundwater Sustainability Plans, the GSAs don't have the information. No one has been asking the questions in the past. The first years of the GSP, they will be trying to fill in data gaps to understand how the system is working. I think the adaptive approach is the best way. We are looking for the commitment to go in the right direction, we will not have the result for a while as we generate the right information and models.

John Rosenblum (chat) – The well not considered for Mark West Creek will be important because of fire impact. The well not considered on Crane Creek will be important because it is upstream of the Laguna Sub Regional water waste plant – and heavy urban channeling in Rohnert Park/Cotati.

Lisa Porta (chat) - As a reminder, the GSA is responsible for evaluating potential impacts to streamflow depletion due to groundwater activities (such as pumping).

Furch (chat) – Thanks, a good reminder. Since groundwater – surface water is a two-way street, it is still important to me to account for surface water changes to reach sustainability.

Joe Gaffney (chat) – Must evaluate surface water diversions on losing or disconnected streams.

Furch (chat) – Ditto.

Porta (chat) – GSPs will account for all beneficial uses/users on the streams.

Rosenblum (chat) – How will fire impact upstream in Santa Rosa Creek and Mark West Creek be evaluated for impacts within the GSA?

Porta - Fire impacts are not directly related to groundwater management activities. They will affect the streams but cannot be managed by the GSAs.

Rosenblum (chat) – Silo-ing will ignore local trends that will eventually impact management. As with all climate-related issues, pretending that procedures have higher priority than substance is the very reason for the problem.

Furch (chat) – How long between Phase 1 and Phase 2? Strictly financial?

Trotta (chat) - I think the timing between Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be somewhat iterative and we will need to be opportunistic (e.g., if funding opportunities come up for new monitoring infrastructure, we may need to move that up in priority).

Furch (chat) – Along the lines of monitoring – we need data to inform choices so I'd hope we can target funding opportunities for increasing monitoring.

Anderson (chat) – How does the adaptive approach relate to Undesirable Results?

Furch (chat) – I believe Adaptive Management can only be as good as the target goal (being clear about what we mean to achieve) and the data collected.

Matt O'Connor – It sounds like where we are with this SMC is that we don't have enough information and we should 'kick some things down the road'. As Rick Rogers pointed out, National Fisheries doesn't want to see 2014 enshrined as our baseline. Does anyone on the Sonoma Water team have an outlook how that can be accommodated in our approach?

Trotta – That is a good transition to the next set of slides. Even though there is lot of information we need to collect to characterize this SMC, we need to develop Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives, and Undesirable Results for our 2022 Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Furch (chat) – As we've said before ... I agree with Matt O'Connor and Rick Rogers regarding the baseline in a drought year (any drought year).

Sam Magill asked the Advisory Committee if they are comfortable with the proposed Interconnected Surface Water SMC adaptive management approach. There were some technical problems with the use of the "yes" and "no" buttons on Zoom:

YES = 7

Undecided = 2

Wayne Haydon (chat) – I vote Yes.

Rosenblum (chat) – I am neither yes nor no because there are several boundary issues (i.e. where to stop looking upstream).

Marcus Trotta then introduced Stephen Maples, Engineer at Sonoma Water who outlined the first step of the adaptive approach we are taking. Maples said we have a sophisticated modelling tool in this basin that was developed over many years in cooperation with USGS. In the absence of hard data, we are using the modelling tool to set initial values for Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives for surface water depletion.

#### *Question/Comments*

Haydon (chat) – Great presentation, it answered several of my questions.

Rosenblum (chat) – Can the supply wells for Windsor and Cal-am, and Ag irrigation wells be used to supplement the data and model? Verbally he added "In order to calibrate the past, there is data from those wells. Use historical data to better calibrate the model. I am concerned about using just two wells, goes back to Matt O'Connor's, and Rick Rogers' comment about the starting point being during the severe drought. It is a question of if there is enough budget".

Trotta (chat) – Not sure what you mean. Information from supply wells, including Windsor, Cal-am and ag irrigation wells is incorporated into the model and is used to calibrate to historical conditions back to 1976. Do you mean as points for collecting groundwater-levels in the future? Some information was estimated such as for ag, any other information that becomes available in the future that is representative of past conditions would help better calibrate the model going forward.

Gaffney (chat) – If we are already falling below the minimum threshold values, how valid is the numerically-derived value? He added verbally that it seems we are in a drought period. Do we want to set a Minimum Threshold or Measurable Objective where we are behind the 8-ball? We need to look at how we got to

where we are today. Is it based on excessive groundwater pumping or lack of rainfall? I commented in the chat about losing streams and disconnected streams, there is a lot of impact from surface water run-off. If some of the streams are experiencing surface water diversions, it could appear there is groundwater depletion and not related to surface water. We need to consider where we are now in terms of a normal rainfall year before setting thresholds that will penalize us in the future.

Trotta – Your point is right, without knowing causes and effects of surface water depletion, it is hard to set initial Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives. That is why we looked at available historical data. Many of the wells were near or below their historic lows in the shallow aquifer system during fall 2020. Initially, we feel that is the best information we have, to move forward. How to balance that is something we can discuss with our Undesirable Results options.

Matt O’Connor – I like the direction this is going. In your discussion of the workflow you identified one of the sites that had a nearby well that gave you some information to work with. Are there other wells that could provide supporting information?

Maples – We had to lean on adjacent wells to make assumptions. There are multiple wells, we looked at the average, there was a lot of consistency between adjacent wells, but we did have to exclude some wells that weren’t representative.

O’Connor – How close are the wells? What is the radius?

Maples – Adjacent wells are anywhere from 1000 to 6000 feet radius.

David Noren – I think it is great to do management of groundwater but at the same time, if we look at the Russian River, the tributaries are the main issue, are not flow controlled but have water rights on them. If we look at domestic wells, it is different. If you want to look at a flow objective to see what it looks like, look at the one done for the Shasta River. It is very wise to set this up as an adaptive management process, there is a lot to deal with.

Rick Rogers – How would you go about setting flow related sustainable management criteria? It is something we will be working on during several years of the Plan. The beneficial uses we are most concerned about are salmon rearing, spawning and migration flows. Most likely for streamflow depletion it will be rearing and migration flows. We could lean on the ‘California Environmental Flows Framework’, a tool being used to inform what flows are necessary for salmon. There have also been some studies in the west county looking at summer low flows and identifying when bad things start happening for habitat and fish. It is something we will be looking at when implementing the Plan. We are looking for SMC linked to the Undesirable Results of streamflow depletion, whether there are impacts experienced by instream aquatic habitat or organisms. Jay Jasperse, Marcus Trotta, and I had a good discussion about managing to a baseline that is consistent with 2014 conditions.

Anderson (chat) - Will the model be able to show what it would take to keep from going below Minimum Threshold?

Martin (chat) – Apologies if you've covered this - will any of the proposed RMPs being utilized for this SMC be the same as the shallow Groundwater Level SMC?

Trotta (chat) – There are a couple of locations where the RMPs would be used for both ISW and GWL SMCs. I'll follow up with which ones those are.

Rosenblum (chat) – Considering the steps required to justify mitigation measures, and knowing that the MODFLOW model calculates evapotranspiration, is there a plan to add temperature/humidity correlations?

Maples (chat) – Regarding model correlations with ET, we haven't looked at that, but we could potentially look at that with the model.

Furch (chat) – How are streamflow standards set for sustainability? Minimum thresholds should be set to a streamflow that is sustainable. Joe’s comments also make good sense.

Porta (chat) – Sustainable streamflow would be achieved as the Measurable Objective.

Furch (chat) – Sorry ... streamflow minimum standards shouldn’t be set during a drought - when other beneficial uses must be considered.

Trotta – Streamflow and instream flow are complicated and take time to develop, they are typically done by the Dept of Fish and Wildlife with other outside agencies. The GSA would not be taking the lead on developing instream flow requirements but would be involved in the discussion process in the future. We feel the methodology would lend itself to incorporating instream targets in our SMC in future.

David Noren (chat) – The North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) is working on a flow objective that will likely be based upon supporting all beneficial uses. It is very difficult to set a numeric flow objective on a stream without significant data and study and support from agencies such as the State Water Board who has jurisdiction over water rights.

Furch (chat) – That is useful information. (To staff) – How soon will flow objectives be determined that would inform our criteria?

O'Connor (chat) – Coast Range Watershed Institute model for Mark West Creek identified flow thresholds upstream for spring fish outmigration; might be a thread to help determine flow thresholds in lower Mark West Creek.

Furch (chat) – I support the adaptive management approach. It is likely the only option available to us. But I do think that until we have more data - we need to take the most cautious approach.

Noren (chat) – Since there are so many external influences to flow depletion beyond wells, it seems that it would be very difficult to set the SMC for these criteria as presented.

Martin (chat) – I'm struggling a bit with the (small) size of the monitoring network overall and determining what should trigger a determination.

Furch (chat) – Thank you. I’m certainly struggling, as it seems is David Noren, Peter Martin and possibly others.

Anderson (chat) – How many potential scenarios?

Trotta (chat) – Not sure what you're referring to in terms potential scenarios?

Anderson (chat) – I am referring to Stephen Maples saying you could use the model to test different approaches.

Rosenblum (chat) – To clarify my comments relative to the stream depletion: there have already been impacts in the Atascadero/Green Valley creeks.

Marcus Trotta presented a review of and Undesirable Result (Quantitative description of the combination of minimum threshold exceedances that cause significant and unreasonable effects in the Basin/Subbasin) and provided options for the Board to consider for determining Undesirable Results.

Furch (chat) – How will we determine trends without historic data?

Trotta – For trends that Stephen Maples went through, we are relying on historical data that went into the model.

Furch (chat) – Without trends - perhaps caution is the better approach.

Haydon (chat) – With all SMC, I would like to hear from staff on why they choose these Undesirable Result options and their pros and cons for each option. It could be presented before the meeting in the meeting materials.

Trotta – Some of it was looking at what other GSPs are including. We have seen some GSAs include consecutive year exceedances within their Undesirable Results for surface water depletion, so we thought of having a mixture of those. In terms of number of wells, we thought that having more than one exceedance for an Undesirable Result was appropriate. We have seen a hesitancy by the Advisory Committee and Boards to have a UR based on a single exceedance. In terms of pros and cons Options 1-4, Option 1 is more protective and less flexible with Option 4 being on the other end. Staff recommendation to use drought rather than non-drought years makes sense given where we are setting the threshold. So, if in non-drought years, we see something otherwise only seen in drought years, it would get our attention and be considered an Undesirable Result.

Rosenblum – We are 100% dependent on recharge from outside the boundary. It would be good for the GSA to expand the analysis of boundary and put in monitoring wells. Then it would be OK to use the small number of wells. Unless, there is protection for the GSA members 100% dependent on recharge, there is no reason for me to agree to this proposal.

O'Connor (chat) – The GSFLOW model could perhaps be used to develop sensitivity analysis of factors in the model that are likely to affect streamflow depletion. It probably would take some substantial time and effort...but might help us understand the relative likelihood of groundwater pumping versus evapo-transpiration (for example) relative likelihood of various factors causing streamflow depletion. Do we need to be conservative or not? Does the discussion of Undesirable Results right now only apply to this SMC?

Trotta – Yes, the discussion of Undesirable Results only applies to this SMC.

Maples – Regarding the sensitivity analysis, isolating the impacts of stream depletion by pumping is very hard to do with data and measurements. The value of the model comes in handy as you can create various scenarios to isolate the pumping.

Mary Grace Pawson (chat) – The small size of the network, the short data set and the potential for seeing "undesirable results" as a result of activities not related to groundwater pumping does suggest there is a risk of being too conservative on this one.

Porta (chat) – This Undesirable Results approach is very common in other GSPs as well.

Sam Magill conducted a poll regarding Undesirable Results options. Results follow:

## **POLL**

### **1. Which Undesirable Results option is your preferred approach?**

- a. Option 1: 25% of RMPs (2 wells) = **0**
- b. Option 2: 25% of RMPs (2 wells for 2 consecutive years) = **3**
- c. Option 3: 25% of RMPs (2 wells) during drought years and 10% of RMPs (1 well) during non-drought years = **3**
- d. Option 4: 40% of RMPs (2 wells during drought years and 10% of RMPs (1 well) during non-drought years) = **4**

## 2. Which Undesirable Results option are you uncomfortable with?

- a. 25% of RMPs = **7**
- b. 25% for 2 consecutive years = **4**
- c. 25% during drought/10% during non-drought = **1**
- d. 40% during drought and 10% during non-drought = **2**

### Question/Comments

Furch (chat) - Responding to the poll – until we have enough data, it seems reasonable to choose the most cautious route.

Marcus Trotta then provided next steps for this SMC. We need to evaluate to what degree the model will get us to the granularity needed to assess Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives with the thresholds. It could be for the initial GSP, instead of relying on groundwater levels, we may need to look at a broader metric to explore Projects and Action scenarios. On the logistics side, we will write up a description of the SMC (Chapter 4, targeting to get to you the next month).

### Project and Management Actions

*Objective: Provide overview presentation for projects and management actions, including proposed criteria. Receive AC feedback on approach and criteria*

Marcus Trotta gave an overview of projects and management actions including next steps:

1. Develop process for simulating/evaluating conceptual projects with computer model
2. Simulate conceptual projects using baseline 50-year projected water budget
3. Identify and prioritize conceptual projects and management actions for inclusion in the GSP

### Questions/Comments

Bob Anderson – What is the process? The first item is to develop a process. Are you asking the Advisory Committee to come up with a list?

Trotta – In terms of a list of potential projects, we will provide it to the Advisory Committee. We have already received many ideas and thoughts. Step 1 refers to the technical process for how we are going to compile the projects into the model.

Anderson – What is the timeframe?

Trotta – We are currently developing the timeframe. We are targeting early April for the model team to develop procedures for how to run the simulations. We would want to starting running simulations in May.

Anderson – How many simulations?

Trotta – We need a better idea on how much work will be involved in each of the projects/actions. When we have a good sense, we will let you know.

Rue Furch – You mention looking at alternatives to streamflow. How would it work? What would it entail? Without data, I am having a hard time figuring out how to proceed.

Trotta – I was referring to have a metric to compare various model scenarios throughout the basin. To evaluate projects and actions, we need to develop a methodology. We can look at stream flows and use the model to estimate how different projects and actions help support future stream flows.

Rosenblum – I stand corrected. I am concerned about data. You are trying to simulate possible measures that will be taken if something happens. I would like to see a lower representative pathway in the modeling. If you run 3, 4 or 5 different RCPs, it could identify what additional measures could be taken. One of the

biggest issues in the residential sector, there isn't enough weather controlled landscape irrigation. Evaluating what would happen to the urban landscape if it were controlled. Australia got serious with water conservation with bans, you weren't allowed to fill a swimming pool, etc. I know that ag has very sophisticated irrigation. The next step would be retirement of ag lands, it is already happening in the Central Valley. It would be great to have the model run for more more pathways and GCMs.

Rosenblum (chat) – Before anything, shouldn't there be a monitoring project (e.g. more dedicated wells and data collection for more existing wells) - and an expansion of the modeling boundaries?

Porta (chat) – Monitoring projects are part of filling the data gaps; so, it will be included in the GSP implementation plan that way.

Rosenblum (chat) – Different modelling scenarios can reveal which projects/measure would be most significant and offer an insight into inter-agency collaboration.

Pawson (chat) – How much coordination has occurred with the Santa Rosa Subregional System? Their system has documented dry year challenges with recycled water supply.

Porta (chat) – Modeling expansion and refinements will also be part of the GSP implementation efforts. Projects and actions are related to actions that need to be taken to better manage resources to meet the sustainable management goal.

O'Connor (chat) – We would benefit considerably by a model scenario(s) assuming basin-wide reduction of groundwater use by various quantities...2%, 5%, 8%...for example...as a sensitivity analysis approach to observe response to reduced groundwater use, whatever the means by which it is achieved.

Colin Close (chat) – Something to consider, most urban water providers have seen significant reductions in water use over the past 30 years. Santa Rosa, for example, used 14% less water in 2020 than in 1990 (despite 53% increase in population and lots of new development). The per capita use decreased 44% (comparing 2020 to 1990). This is largely due to water conservation programs for three decades, as well as ordinances, plumbing codes, and state regs focused on reducing urban water use.

## Updates

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

Marcus Trotta – We are continuing to follow up on Groundwater Levels and Groundwater Storage SMCs, taking the output from the 50-year projected water budget and looking at preliminary SMCs we established for Groundwater Levels, and further developing our methodology on Groundwater Storage SMC. We presented these SMCs at the last Board meeting and will be bringing those two SMCs, along with the Surface Water SMC to the April 8 Board meeting for direction. We continue to develop the text of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan. We are working on getting the Basin Setting section out for comment. There will be four weeks to review.

Other work includes grant funded work, planning for development of the 500 feet-deep monitoring wells for this basin that we aim to construct later this year.

Andy Rodgers gave an overview of the GUIDE program. The project finally launched this week! The mailers have been sent out. We are receiving inquiries, so far about two dozen voicemails and some emails; we are starting to call people back. A letter was sent to the Water Suppliers including talking points and the press release in case they get questions. If you get inquiries, try to answer, or send people to the dedicated GUIDE phone line.

### Questions/Comments

Furch (chat) – I've received email questions regarding the mailer.

Rodgers (chat) – Thank you. Feel free to respond if comfortable and/or forward email inquiries to us at the GSA.

Furch (chat) – Is there a 'Frequently Asked Questions' sheet I can send via email to those who inquire?

Andrea Rodriguez, Outreach staff said the Rural Residential Outreach program is currently forming the focus groups. We are looking at another survey component to give people that weren't selected for the focus groups, the opportunity to provide feedback. Thank you to Rue Furch for coordinating an all-basin Environmental stakeholder meeting, the second meeting is tomorrow night. If I can help with any outreach, please contact me.

### Review Meeting Action Items and Discuss February Meeting Agenda

*Sam Magill, Advisory Committee Meeting Facilitator*

- GSP Section 3 will be available, staff to let the Advisory Committee when it is available for review.
- Staff to confirm June meeting date.

The next Board meeting is April 8 and the next Advisory Committee meeting is May 10.

Bob Anderson requested that the Advisory Committee receive a compilation of all the Sustainable Management Criteria in one place. He thanked Rick Rogers and all the members for attending. The meeting adjourned at 5:39 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 (arrived later)  
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 RCD appointee, Wayne Haydon  
Town of Windsor appointee, Elizabeth Cargay  
City of Cotati appointee, Craig Scott  
Business representative, Joe Gaffney  
Rural Residential representative, Marlene Soiland

#### Advisory Committee Members (absent)

Agricultural representative, David Long  
County of Sonoma appointee, Mark Grismer  
Sonoma County Water Agency appointee, Carolyn Dixon

### Staff/Presenters

Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator  
Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff  
Stephen Maples, 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

Rick Rogers, National Marine Fisheries Service  
Colin Close, City of Santa Rosa  
Sandi Potter, Town of Windsor (arrived later)  
Brad Potter, Member of Public  
Heather Johnson, Member of Public  
Claire Nordlie, Member of Public