

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

Date/time: Monday, September 14, 2020; 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: <https://csus.zoom.us/j/92070363373>

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: October 19, 2020, 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, welcomed the group, covered meeting protocol, and conducted roll call. He then ran through the day's agenda.

### General Public Comments

None.

### Agenda and 2020 Meeting Schedule Review

Andy Rodgers reviewed the annual meeting schedule. He said staff is considering adding at least one Board meeting as there is quite a bit of work ahead of us. Ann DuBay, Sonoma Water Outreach, mentioned that the July 29 Community workshop went well, and presentations and audio are posted. We are hoping to have a workshop on Sustainable Management Criteria early in 2021 specific to Santa Rosa Plain. The next Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for October 19.

### Sustainable Management Criteria Proposals

*Objective: Confirm final modifications to Subsidence SMC; review and discuss Water Quality SMC proposals and next steps.*

Marcus Trotta mentioned there are two SMCs to discuss today and the goal is to reach recommendations to bring to the next Board meeting.

Trotta gave an update of what is new in the **Land Surface Subsidence SMC**:

- Removed condition for 5 continuous years of any measure subsidence to trigger Undesirable Results.
- Added condition for determining Undesirable Results exceedance using SMC for chronic lowering of groundwater levels based on recent discussions with DWR.

- Added additional options for size of area experiencing any future total subsidence that would trigger Undesirable Results for Advisory Committee input and recommendation to GSA Board.

Marcus Trotta than provided staff recommendations with Undesirable Results options and followed that with a preliminary assessment of SMC impacts:

Options:

1. Any rate of future inelastic subsidence due to groundwater pumping significant and unreasonable.
2. Annual Minimum Threshold and Measurable Objective set at 0.1 feet total subsidence.
3. Undesirable result occurs if:
  - a. Annual Minimum Threshold of 0.1 feet total subsidence due is exceeded **OR**
  - b. Cumulative total subsidence of 0.2 feet is exceeded within 5-year period
  - c. **AND** Measurable Threshold exceedance is determined to be correlated with 1) groundwater pumping and 2) a MT exceedance of the Chronic Lowering of groundwater levels SMC.

Options for undesirable results determination based on minimum-sized area over which subsidence occurs: 2.5 acres, 25 acres, 50 acres, other?

Sam Magill asked the Advisory Committee if they are supportive of staff recommendation for questions 1-3 above. Response = 13 yes (100%)

Magill then asked what the Advisory Committee recommendation is for the minimum size area for the Undesirable Result.

**Response** = 2.5 acres (1 pixel) = 0  
 25 contiguous acres (10 pixels) = 8  
 50 contiguous acres (20 pixels) = 5  
 Other = 1

### *Questions/Comments*

Craig Scott – Does ground subsidence due to erosion, landslides and earthquakes show up as subsidence or is there an algorithm that screens those out?

Trotta – The inSAR measurement does not identify sources of subsidence, it measures total subsidence; those are things that would need to be screened out.

Rue Furch (chat) – Does anyone know the size of the area near Rohnert Park that experienced subsidence?

Trotta – They identified an area that appears to be mostly elastic subsidence related, it covered a large area in the vicinity of the city subsiding about 0.2 feet. The subsidence has recovered since groundwater pumping was reduced in the area. The 0.2 elastic subsidence data is from the timeframe we have the InSAR data.

Furch (chat) – Thanks for the responses regarding Rohnert Park subsidence. I'm aware of the difference between elastic and inelastic ... just thought the number of acres might be interesting as it has been experienced.

John Rosenblum (chat) – Will trends be monitored (subsidence and groundwater) and reported?

Trotta – Yes, trends will be evaluated and reported in the required annual GPS reports.

Bob Anderson (chat) – Looking at the maps on pages 28 and 29, what determines the variations in colors? There is one dot but and many color changes.

Trotta – The dots are continuous GPS stations in the basin, the changes shown in color are the data from the InSAR datasets.

Matt O'Connor - Parcel or just contiguous acres?

Trotta – Contiguous acres. Also, as a reminder, the 2.5 acres represents one pixel, 25 acres = 10 pixels, etc.

O'Connor – Hundreds of acres is too large in my opinion; want to get some warning to respond if it affects a still larger area. I think of the area as a warning.

Mark Grismer – Agreed, 20 pixels is enough.

Joe Gaffney – During the 15 years until 2002, we relied 70-80% on groundwater. We faced many challenges from people that were causing subsidence, but it was never documented. We never noticed any subsidence around well heads or cracking of sidewalks / foundations in walls in the vicinity of the wells attributed to subsidence. The telling point was after the lawsuit with Penngrove when Rohnert Park shifted from majority groundwater to majority aqueduct water use, the groundwater tables recovered and there was no inelastic subsidence.

Peter Martin – I don't really have a strong opinion for what a good number is for this. If I did, it wouldn't be based on factual data.

Craig Scott – I am with Peter Martin, I am having a tough time deciding. InSAR data doesn't distinguish where subsidence is from. I am going for a larger area is better, maybe 200, 300, or 400 acres.

Chris Watt – Like Peter Martin, if you have a sense of what kind of subsidence is likely to occur in the basin, it seems like you need a larger area. It needs to relate to the impact of subsidence.

Furch – I agree with Chris Watt and Matt O'Connor. The large size might be too late.

Trotta responding to previous comments – Because we haven't experienced any documented inelastic subsidence to our basin, it is hard to know where the thresholds are for actual impacts on the ground. From staff recommendations perspectives, we feel comfortable with the range of options and evaluating trends as we go. Once we move forward with this and proceed to the Board, we will develop a draft GSP section for this SMC that will be similar to the draft sent out last week for the Water Quality SMC.

### **Water Quality**

Lisa Porta recapped key points on Water Quality SMC; Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives and Undesirable Results.

The seven steps for development (recommendations *italicized* in brackets) of Sustainable Management Criteria for Water Quality are:

1. Define level of groundwater quality management and coordination (*Propose "do no harm" approach*).
2. Determine type of metric to use. (*Propose "number of affected supply wells"*).

3. Determine and identify beneficial users. *(Propose drinking water users and agricultural users).*
4. Define Constituents of Concern (COC) for identified beneficial users. *(Propose Arsenic, Boron, Nitrate, salts be categorized as Constituents of Concern).*
5. Determine the limits and concentrations for each COC and category of beneficial user. *(For drinking water, recommend using MCLs and SMCLs and crop toxicity thresholds for irrigation).*
6. Identify existing water quality monitoring programs that can be used for setting SMCs. *(Propose to identify sets of supply wells that are currently monitored for various groundwater constituents and supply uses such as drinking water and irrigation water).*
7. Establish SMC.

Sam Magill asked the Advisory Committee if they are comfortable with the staff proposed draft statement for Undesirable Results:

*“Significant and unreasonable water quality conditions occur if Santa Rosa Plain GSP projects or management activities cause an increase in the concentration of constituents of concern in groundwater that lead to adverse impacts on beneficial users or uses of groundwater. Adverse impacts include diminished supply due to water quality impacts, such as non-compliance with drinking water standards or undue costs for mitigating negative impacts such as wellhead treatment or well replacement”.*

Response = Yes 7, No 6

#### *Questions/Comments*

Gaffney – One area I am not comfortable is with well replacement. Wells get replaced occasionally and require maintenance occasionally. We want to make sure that well-head treatment or well replacement is backed up by water quality testing that shows that well replacement is due to significant water quality impacts and isn't just a casing issue.

Porta – Good comment, thank you. Keep in mind this is something we may want to revise based on your comment.

Furch (chat) – This seems to say if the Plan projects or management activities cause the problem. What if adverse impacts are caused by something else? How will the GSP address those issues?

Porta – Because it is a “do no harm” metric and because there are a lot of other water quality programs. If the problem isn't due to GSA projects or actions, the GSA isn't responsible to do anything about that.

DuBay (chat) – In Sonoma Valley, the Advisory Committee added the words "directly or indirectly" cause an increase in the concentration .... This was suggested to clarify the GSAs responsibility. Suggested by Caitlin Cornwall with SEC.

David Long – Opening statement seems backwards and restrictive. We are trying to create a management platform, seems backwards to me.

Furch – I agree with David Long. If we are saying that constituents of concern are caused by the SMC plan projects, basically it is the plan that creates the problem, we aren't achieving sustainability, there could be other causes. I can't agree with the first sentence. Also, we should consider well maintenance issues, it is part of life for the well.

Porta – The GSA cannot be responsible for all impacts that occur in the basin. All things are inter-related, and we will take them into account. There are other programs out there, the GSA isn't trying to take over water quality management from Regional or State Board programs already occurring. There is a fine line of purview of GSA water management versus water management from others.

Sandi Potter – It is important for us to stay on task and scope of responsibilities. I understand we want highest quality groundwater and to create sustainability resource management. Other sources of contaminants of groundwater management are buried. I am concerned about the cost if we set this up, so the GSA is identified as having the obligation to manage groundwater contamination with or without our strategies. It is important to stay focused.

Furch (chat) – I'd like to hear from the North Coast Water Quality Control Board on the issue of sustainable water quality.

Chris Watt – The Water Board is the agency that regulates the discharge of waste that can impact groundwater quality in the basin. Our ability to do that is with robust monitoring. To the degree the GSA can have a representative and comprehensive groundwater monitoring program, that will inform the ability of the Regional Board to regulate the discharges. I view the Water Quality SMC as having both – the GSA doesn't regulate water quality but can inform the Water Board to take actions to regulate the water quality. The interplay needs to be well described.

Long (chat) – I think Chris Watt just hit on a very important take on the quality aspect.

Trotta – The coordination will be an important component going forward. The three constituents of concern we have identified to use to track/monitor for SMC and flag if any undesirable results are experienced, the coordination aspect with the Regional Board, and others, will help inform this SMC going forward. Our proposal and recommendation are more along the lines "do no harm" and assessing for impacts the GSA has some control over and power to address.

Furch (chat) – The Plan should identify water quality issues and find ways to address them. The Plan may not be responsible to address the problem but should be able to identify and seek ways to address the problems - or we cannot achieve sustainability.

Porta (chat) – The water quality issues are identified in the Basin Setting.

Rosenblum – I don't understand how we got to this point that the GSA will be responsible for anything that is discovered by the monitoring of the Plan. This is a plan/platform to inform us of trends and impacts. If we identify the GSA is going to be responsible, who pays for it? We are talking about a plan of how our groundwater can be impacted.

Porta – Water quality issues are identified in the basin setting. We have identified three constituents that have the potential to cause undesirable results; generally, this basin doesn't have enormous water quality issues. I think it is well understood what the potential challenges are.

Watt – Relative to other GSAs in the north coast, this basin probably has the most threats to water quality. There are a lot of onsite wastewater systems, recycled water, dairy and irrigated ag. We need to have coordinated monitoring so that we are getting the whole picture. The GSA

can provide information that will allow for the Board to take action. The GSA has no authority to regulate the discharge of waste. I look to the GSA as a mechanism to support that.

Potter – I appreciate the need for coordination on the water quality issue.

O'Connor (chat) – A small change would be different than a larger one of significance.

Rosenblum (chat) – Why focus only on GSP activities - does this exclude other impacts?

Trotta (chat) – Adverse impacts caused by other impacts, such as industrial or other land-use based impacts fall under the purview of other regulations/regulatory agencies. Staff proposes the GSA closely coordinate with the other regulatory agencies and have already started coordinating with the RWQCB on this sustainability indicator, as the GSA will be monitoring water quality during GSP implementation.

Rosenblum (chat) – I'm also concerned that the three elements are only the currently known impacts. For example, there may be changes in organic toxics because of increasing concentrations.

Trotta - Routine coordination and consultation with Regional Water Quality Control Board and others would help identify any potential future threats, such as increasing concentrations of "organic toxics".

Furch (chat) – A goal should be to expand both Ag and domestic monitoring wells in the future. There will be volunteers.

David Long (chat) – I think we are going way too deep here for no pertinent reason. What is an example of a GSP project or management activity?

Trotta (chat) – Voluntary monitoring to incorporate other types of wells is something that can be considered for the implementation program in the GSP if there is interest. It would need to be considered and prioritized with other proposed programs and data needs by the GSA Board. Examples of projects and management actions could include managed aquifer recharge with local stormwater.

Beth Lamb (chat) – Is the monitoring network of wells both shallow and deep? Are they combined on these maps?

O'Connor (chat) – How would an increase be attributable to GSP actions anyway?

Rosenblum (chat) – I am concerned the whole structure conflicts with the Water Quality Act's anti-degradation policy.

Long (chat) – I am really feeling like the water quality topic is going down an unclear path for no apparent reason or return.

Lamb (chat) – How are you going to show that exceedances are attributable to GSP? Arsenic is naturally occurring, but nitrate could be a manmade cause.

Furch (chat) – Is there a difference between knowing there is a problem and being required to address it through the GSA?

Gaffney (chat) – I thought the goal was to monitor impacts from groundwater usage, not groundwater operations like recharge.

Furch (chat) – Information gathering should be done in collaboration with other jurisdictions so that everyone knows what is being done by whom to address the problem. We need to work with all responsible agencies and jurisdictions to reach sustainability. A statement that included that could be helpful

Trotta (chat) – The existing monitoring network currently consists of public water supply wells, these include municipal supply wells, mutual water system wells, trailer park wells, other commercial uses, and other public water supply systems. The majority of these are likely completed primarily in the deep aquifer system, however we are seeking better information on construction of these public water supply wells.

Furch (chat) – Domestic wells are all over the place both physically and functionally. Those of us who rely on domestic wells can't use water if the quality is compromised and shouldn't be left to the unknown. Also, domestic wells tend to be shallower.

Furch (chat) We can differentiate between what data is collected and what the GSP is responsible to address.

Haydon (chat) – Undesirable result triggers an investigation, correct? But, not necessarily mitigation? No necessary mitigation?

Gaffney (chat) – So, if your neighbor pumps like crazy, drawing more arsenic into your well, no harm, no foul?

Long (chat) – Seems like this is a solution looking for a problem rather than the other (proper) way around.

Rosenblum (chat) - I would like to see a commitment to coordinating with other agencies for quality data - likely greatly reducing the scope and cost of monitoring by the GSA

Trotta (chat) – Undesirable results determine whether the basin is sustainable or not, so could trigger mitigation.

Haydon (chat) – What would the GSA be doing, that is not already being done?

Gaffney - What is EC?

Porta – Electrical conductivity; another constituent of concern.

Rosenblum – We had a poll, 50% said we agree with “do no harm”, 50% said no. We should've had more of a discussion. There is disagreement. The structure is built on something we don't all agree.

Magill – I believe the significant and Unreasonable impact statement is the foundation for the rest of the SMC.

Porta – We will be happy to get input from the Advisory Committee; we will then clarify the statements with the comments you made. If you have more comments, put in chat or email to staff. Many things we just developed are based on the foundations set for some months following feedback from Advisory Committee at previous meetings.

Rosenblum – My understanding of previous discussions was we were developing a plan framework, not specifically of when the GSA needs to take action, etc. Coming back to that foundational statement, I don't like the first sentence. And I don't see any mention of coordination with other programs. Another issue I have is that ag wells aren't currently monitored, we would have a much wider network. There are many more ag wells – with outreach, the owners would agree to have their wells monitored. In this group we haven't heard anything about pesticides and herbicides. These are some specifics that need to be included in the foundational statement.

David Noren – Are private wells not considered under the guise of supply wells?

Porta – They are supply wells, but we don't have an existing network. This is a placeholder to be added when we can add ag wells to the supply network.

Noren – Water quality and water quantity are inextricably linked. My comment is it is critical to establish criteria for private wells. There is an expectation from the private well owners to have preservation of water quality and quantity. SGMA did set a 2015 trendline. There is an abundance of groundwater data. In the standard environment realm, you immediately do a retest protocol if there is an exceedance.

Porta – I agree on the retesting and robust data. Those data are the ones we look at. The second year, we would look to see if the problem is still there. On domestic wells, when projects are implemented there will be a robust monitoring program to set up; they will be protected through that.

Chris Watt – I am new in this position and didn't participate in early discussion. It seems the approach that is being taken here for minimum thresholds and monitoring are linked to projects of the GSA. I think there was a comment in the chat, if we are just using this to look at water quality, what about the monitoring and anti-degradation analysis that would go with the project in the first place, I don't see the value in the process of having the data analysis supply wells related to GSA projects. The effort and energy looking at supply wells and minimum thresholds may be better focused on informing the agencies that have the authority to regulate the discharges that are causing the impairment in the first place. Maybe the focus could be on having a program that can better inform the land uses and discharges that are affecting the water quality in the basin. Focus the energy on getting good data so agencies can do better.

Sam Magill asked those that have concerns with the “do no harm” recommendation, what would you prefer, how it will play out? What might an alternative look like?

Furch – If information gathering is done collaboratively but responses to GSA program impacts are the responsibility of the GSA, then the collaborative can decide who is doing what, otherwise we won't know what falls through the cracks. The statement needs to be beefed up in the first sentence to make it clear it is a collaborative process to determine where water quality problems are.

Trotta – I understand a lot of the questions and comments. One of our issues is, because there are all these other regulatory agencies and programs and SGMA regulations are quite clear, the balance we are trying to strike is to conform with the GSP regulations and other concerns. It is our reason for recommending ongoing coordination with other agencies. It needs to be a basin-wide monitoring network.

Furch – We can differentiate between what data is collected and what the GSP is responsible to address.

Jay Jasperse – Rue Furch makes a good point. I also want to reiterate what Sandi Potter said, if it's not going to be a “do no harm” framework, the liability both legal and financial for the GSA could be significant. Coordination and developing a robust monitoring program are absolutely

necessary. In terms of the SMC, there needs to be a framework and focus of what the GSA will be held liable for.

Gaffney – I am still a little confused on how this section only applies to the operations of the GSP. I thought the whole idea of SGMA was to ensure groundwater quality in the basin, but if we are only looking at operations from the GSA, what does that do for the balance of the users in the basin? I think it should be expanded to all groundwater users in the basin.

Sam Magill said the staff and consultant team will put together a modified statement to bring back to the group. Magill suggested everyone have a look at the current proposed significant and unreasonable impact statement and then send feedback and/or questions to staff. Lisa Porta recommended to read through the GSP section for context before providing feedback.

Andy Rodgers – I really appreciated some of the points mentioned on how we could navigate the complex things to comply with SGMA, and for how to add and not duplicate the picture, emphasizing the collaboration, and looking at monitoring programs and ways to augment the other agencies actions.

## Overview of Climate Futures

*Objective: Provide climate change boundaries and scenarios, as well as how they will be incorporated into GSP. Discuss next steps for scenario modification and finalization.*

Marcus Trotta provided the review process and assumptions for selecting appropriate future climate models for developing the Groundwater Sustainability Plan groundwater models. He described differences between two emissions scenarios and how they may affect the development of the GSP modelling. Trotta said he would like to get feedback from Advisory Committee on the two potential emission scenarios to move forward on the groundwater modeling for future water budgets.

Lisa Porta walked through the modeling approach and options for the emissions scenarios. Porta covered the two steps to choose the future climate for the subbasin: 1) choose General Circulation Model (GCM) with specific Greenhouse Gas Emission scenario (done); then 2) choose the representative concentration pathway. The Modeling team chose one emission scenario that best represents projected median conditions for Russian River watershed and Sonoma County basins. They recommend HadGEM2-ES for use in all three Groundwater Sustainability Plans. With HadGEM2-ES, staff compared two scenarios used by DWR – RCP 4.5 (more optimistic) and 8.5 (more pessimistic) using the Santa Rosa Plain hydrologic model Lisa – the approach to the model of the 2 scenarios. We can adapt and make changes as we go.

## Questions/Comments

Peter Martin – Where are we with the model? Are we still waiting for input, is there anything in the short term that might change the projections going forward?

Trotta – The climate scenario is one piece of the future projected water budget and simulation; the other piece is the projected future water demand.

Porta – The model framework/calibration is ready to go.

Rosenblum – I attended the meeting and sent very detailed information to staff, but never heard back from anyone. I am trying to save others time. I do expect to get answers outside of meetings. I have been dealing with climate issues for many years. The issue of context is extremely important; what are the actions of others and what are the impacts on our groundwater. RCP 1.9 is what was proposed in Paris Accords. That would completely change scenarios - how do we coordinate this in the much larger framework? 8.5 is a good start, it includes worst case of what we know about today. No one expected the

ice to melt so fast in the North pole. Everything is accelerating. 4.5 is garbage, it is wishful thinking and doesn't indicate actions that others are considering. I would like to see 8.5 and maybe 2.9. What can we do, how can we adapt? We need to see what other larger options are. DWR has its water data consortium set up to do the kind of monitoring that we are limited with now. Setting up simulations is expensive. Appealing to DWR to enlarge their project would be well worth it. I would appreciate specific answers to specific questions that I sent staff.

Magill – A few of us had the opportunity to speak with you earlier and will be in touch again soon.

Sam Magill then asked which RCP options the Advisory Committee is most comfortable with?

#### Response

RCP 4.5 = 4

RCP 8.5 = 7

Need more time to consider = 3

#### Questions/Comments

Haydon (chat) – Page 66. Groundwater Model Outputs...

1. While RCP 8.5 predicts an extreme drought, that is not until 2040-2045.
2. But. RCP 4.5 predicts a “Larger initial storage decline” starting 2020-2025.
3. Haydon Question – Seems RCP 8.5 has an impact in 20 years, while RCP 4.5 has a more immediate impact on Groundwater. Should we consider using RCP 4.5 now, can we switch to RCP 8.5 in future? Referencing Page 67, “Concern with using RCP 8.5...call for projects...too restrictive...” Page 28. What do Climate Scientists Say? I don't see a really strong argument for one RCP over the other.

Furch (chat) – Don't you have to achieve sustainability in either scenario?

O'Connor (chat) – Long term sustainability and mitigation actions are determined by real future events or by simulations?

Gaffney (chat) – In that the GSP is a living document, it seems fruitless to determine mitigation actions 40 years out.

Porta (chat) – Long term sustainability is shown with monitoring data; but the plan is developed with modeling information.

Trotta (chat) – Long term sustainability and mitigation actions are determined by real future events (whether any undesirable results are exceeded based on the SMC thresholds). The simulations inform what we need to plan for and how likely we are to achieve measurable objectives.

Anderson (chat) – Describe what would be done to fix the storage gap.

O'Connor (chat) - So the need is for plausible contingency plans that could meet the challenges posed by climate change.

Trotta (chat) – Correct.

Furch (chat) – If I understood the feedback in September, people felt that if 8.5 worst case scenario were used, it could be walked back, but if 4.5 were chosen, it is harder to up the ante later. Others were concerned about early costs.

Grismer (chat) – But these will change, the 8.5 scenario forces us to consider the full range of possible actions now, whether needed in the future, good to anticipate now and plan for worst.

Furch (chat) – I agree with Mark Grismer.

Rosenblum (chat) – In general most climate economists warn against the extreme costs of delaying action - and planning.

Marcus presented a slide covering next steps on the water budget and computer model.

## GSP Parallel Process Report: Practitioner Work Group and Other Meeting Updates

*Objective: Provide summary of Practitioner Work Groups and other discussions, including initial outcomes and next steps.*

Sam Magill provided a summary of progress on practitioner work groups to-date. An overview is in the meeting packet.

### Questions/Comments

Furch (chat) – At some point small farmers were to be included in the Ag focus group. Supervisor Hopkins suggested a CAFF representative. Has that happened?

Magill – The current membership is listed in the packet.

O'Connor (chat) – Is the membership of the last group (for depletion of interconnected surface water) established?

Magill – The group hasn't met yet; we will have more to report at our next meeting.

Anderson (chat) – Will the model use the Dept of Finance population estimate?

Trotta – To be determined, still assessing and is being considered.

Haydon (chat) - Page 70. Mapping of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems. I have not seen maps, but I anticipated using from Veg Map phreatophytes like “emergent wetland”, “Estuarine”, “lacustrine”, “wet meadow”, etc.

Magill – Yes, maps have been used, will share going forward.

Marcus Trotta said staff had a meeting with John Rosenblum, Matt O'Connor, David Noren, and a few Board members to cover questions/comments John Rosenblum had raised regarding the water budget and how the model handles fluxes between Wilson Grove and Santa Rosa Plain. The outcome, I believe, satisfactorily addressed John Rosenblum's questions. We made clear the boundaries of our basin are an important component of our basin and need to be taken into consideration in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan. We have started identifying data gaps in the hydrological model and they will be brought to the Advisory Committee and the Board. We are trying to address everyone's specific concerns and questions and appreciate your patience.

## Updates

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

Andy Rodgers – I appreciate all the comments received and wish to recognize the effort by staff for all three Groundwater Sustainability Agencies. We want to achieve sustainability; we need to be aspirational, achievable, affordable. If there is a way you can add those thoughts to your comments going forward, it would be very helpful.

The key piece of the August 13 Board Meeting was keeping the Board up to date with what the Advisory Committee is wrestling with; not many action items. We are on the final approach with the Groundwater User Registration Program, it continues to be delayed but we are ready for the Beta test – maybe all three GSA Advisory Committees will see the official launch next week. There were some budget adjustments in August with the Board; the main item was executing a contract with SCI on rural outreach.

Marcus Trotta said that with regards to the grants we are working on with Prop 68 funding: rural residential outreach is kicking off; Permit Sonoma is doing work on the well permitting process and integrating data to track with the GSA database; construction of four deep monitoring wells in the basin – working on that, hoping to start construction in spring 2021.

Andrea Rodriguez said if anyone is scheduling outreach meetings and/or need help with said meetings, to let her know. We are kicking off our rural residential outreach with SCI; we are laying out the steps and schedule. The Community workgroup slides and audio, are online.

## Review Meeting Action Items and Discuss next Meeting Agendas

*Sam Magill, Advisory Committee Meeting Facilitator*

- The next GSA Board meeting is October 8, the next Advisory Committee is October 19.
- Water Quality – staff will put heads together and send follow up email incorporating AC input.
- For climate futures discussion, please send input to staff in next week or so (4.5 or 8.5), or other scenarios.

## Attendees:

### Advisory Committee Members (present)

Agricultural representative, Bob Anderson

Agricultural representative, David Long

City of Cotati appointee, Craig Scott

City of Santa Rosa appointee, Peter Martin

City of Sebastopol appointee, Henry Mikus

County of Sonoma appointee, Mark Grismer

Environmental representative, Beth Lamb

Environmental representative, Rue Furch

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria representative, Maureen Geary (arrived late)

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, Sandi Potter

Business representative, Joe Gaffney  
Rural Residential representative, Marlene Soiland

#### Advisory Committee Members (absent)

Sonoma County Water Agency appointee, Carolyn Dixon  
City of Rohnert Park appointee, Mary Grace Pawson

#### Staff/Presenters

Andy Rodgers, SRP GSA Administrator  
Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff  
Andy Rich, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff  
Lisa Porta, Montgomery Associates  
Jay Jasperse, Sonoma Water, Plan Manager  
Ann DuBay, Sonoma Water, Outreach  
Andrea Rodriguez, Sonoma Water, Outreach  
Simone Peters, GSA Administrative Aide, (*recorder of meeting summary*)

#### Facilitator

Sam Magill, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

#### Other Attendees

Christopher Watt, Regional Water Board  
Colin Close, City of Santa Rosa  
Tim Parker, Facilitator, Sonoma Valley AC  
Elizabeth Cargay, Public Works, Windsor