AGENDA Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting

Date/time: Monday, November 18, 2019; 3:30pm-6:00pm

Meeting Location: Santa Rosa Utilities Field Office, 35 Stony Point Road, Santa Rosa

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

Email: arodgers@westyost.com | Phone: 707.508.3661

| Time | Agenda Item | Materials |
|------|--|--|
| 3:30 | Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review Committee Chairman Bob Anderson Andy Rodgers, GSA Administrator | Agenda; September meeting summary; meeting calendar |
| 3:35 | General Public Comment Public comment on matters not on the agenda and within committee jurisdictions. | |
| 3:40 | GSA Staff and Advisory Committee Updates Administrator, Plan Manager, and other Staff Advisory Committee Members GSA Board meeting activity Groundwater User Registration Program update Future meeting schedule/topics Objective: Provide relevant updates that inform Advisory Committee discussions. | PPT Presentation |
| 3:50 | GSA Grants Update Andy Rodgers, GSA Administrator Shallow well installation through Technical Support Services Program Prop 68 grant funding Objective: Provide relevant updates that inform Advisory Committee discussions. | PPT presentation Map |
| 4:10 | Discussion of Groundwater Use for Cannabis Operations Robert Pennington, Permit Sonoma Christopher Dillis, North Coast Water Board Default water use Summary of existing and pending cannabis operations, including groundwater use for each basin Summary of permitting trends and anticipated cannabis cultivation area/groundwater use Overview of zero net use areas Objective: Update Committee members on continued development of Sonoma County cannabis cultivation. | PPT presentation |

| Time | Agenda Item | Materials |
|------|--|------------------|
| 4:50 | Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Updates and Request for Input Marcus Trotta, Sonoma County Water Agency Advisory Committee Members Groundwater Flow Model and Water Budget Updates SMC updates Summary of data needs and AC input to date Schedule/process updates Next steps for SMC development Discussion Items: Prioritization of data needs Significant and Unreasonable Effects Sustainability indicators | PPT Presentation |
| 6,00 | Objective: Prioritize data needs, receive input on "significant and unreasonable effects" to develop strawman scenarios, begin definition of sustainability needs. | |
| 6:00 | Meeting Adjourns Next Advisory Committee meeting: January 13, 3:00-5:30 | |
| | Next GSA Board meeting: December 12, 2019, 1:00 – 3:30 p.m. | |
| | All-GSA Workshop: Groundwater Recharge: December 11, 2019, | |
| | 4:00 –6:00 p.m. | |
| | Public Workshop Update | |

Accessibility

If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Andy Rodgers at 707.508.3611 or <u>by email</u> (arodgers@westyost.com). Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility of the meeting.

Agenda Materials

Agenda materials are available for review at West Yost Associates, 2235 Mercury Way #105, Santa Rosa, CA 95407, during normal business hours, and a copy of the agenda packet will be available for public review at the meeting. Any documents provided at the meeting by staff will also be available to the public. Any documents provided to the Advisory Committee during the meeting by the public will be available the next business day following the meeting. The agenda and agenda packet materials are also available at the Santa Rosa Plain GSA website: (http://santarosaplaingroundwater.org).

Public Comment

Members of the public may attend meetings of the Santa Rosa Plain GSA Advisory Committee and may comment before Advisory Committee consideration of individual agenda items, or during General Public Comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Advisory Committee. As needed, time limits may be placed on public comments to ensure the Advisory Committee is reasonably able to address all agenda items during the course of the meeting.

Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Date/Time: September 9, 2019 | 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Location: Santa Rosa Utility Field Office, 35 Stony Point Rd, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

GSA Administrator Contact: Andy Rodgers, West Yost Associates

Email: arodgers@westyost.com | Phone: 707-508-3672

www.santarosaplaingroundwater.org

Meeting Recap

Summary of Actions Items

| Action Item | Responsible Party | Deadline |
|--|-------------------|--------------|
| UCCE Vineyard Irrigation Water Usage Survey – if | AC Member | End October* |
| you know anyone who would like to participate, | | |
| contact UCCE/FB. | | |
| All-GSA Recharge Meeting on December 11. Mark | AC Member | Now |
| your calendar. | | |
| The terminology for sustainable management | AC Member | Now |
| criteria is confusing. It would be good to get | | |
| peoples' feedback and true engagement of | | |
| what they would like to see the Basin look like | | |
| in the future. Provide feedback to Ann DuBay. | | |
| Look at the registration draft form and mailer | AC Member | September 30 |
| and give Andy feedback. | | |

^{*}Subsequent to the meeting, this deadline was extended by UCCE to December 31.

Next Meeting: November 4, 2019, 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m., City of Santa Rosa Utility Field Office (UFO), 35 Stony Point Rd.

Meeting Summary

Andy Rodgers, Santa Rosa Plain GSA Administrator, provided an update on the August GSA Board meeting activity and indicated future meeting schedules and topics.

Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, provided an introduction to Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC). His presentation focused largely on key terms and definitions, schedule and process, and next steps.

Marcus Trotta introduced GSP modeling team members Andy Rich of Sonoma Water and Lisa Porta of Montgomery Associates, who presented an overview of general Water Budget Requirements and SGMA requirements. They also covered the Existing Groundwater Flow Model which included an overview of the existing Santa Rosa Plain Hydrologic Model and planned updates.

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, facilitated the meeting as Rich Wilson is transitioning out of the facilitator role. Rodgers mentioned he would provide details about filling the role later in the meeting.

General Public Comment

None.

GSA Staff and Advisory Committee Updates

Andy Rodgers, Administrator, mentioned this is the second Advisory Committee meeting of year three of the GSA. The GSA sent out the groundwater sustainability fee and alternative plan contribution invoices to the municipal pumpers and County and have received a number of payments. A JPA has been executed with the City of Sebastopol and their contribution has been received. Their Board member will be sworn in at our October Board meeting. For those that haven't confirmed their AC participation moving forward, send an email to Andy Rodgers. Rich Wilson is transitioning out, the CCP recommended three replacements who were then interviewed. Mr. Sam Magill was selected as Wilson's replacement and was present in the audience. Magill was noted as a standout candidate with excellent state, local and GSA references.

Magill introduced himself and said he would be observing this first meeting and looking forward to getting to know everyone.

The Turf and Toilet replacement program introduced at the last meeting has found some interest for replacing both turf and toilets. Applications have been received and are being reviewed.

Questions/Comments

Question – Is it possible the Turf and Toilet replacement program will start to give us some information for the water usage of the rural residential de-minimis user?

Response: It could.

Vineyard Irrigation water usage survey. An alert was sent out regarding an August 12 meeting at the Farm Bureau to learn about an important survey being conducted by the UC Cooperative Extension in Santa Rosa Plain, Sonoma Valley, Petaluma Valley, and Alexander Valley. Knowing the volume of applied water on a regional basis will allow models to integrate deficit irrigation practices into farm irrigation water budgets. Pooled data can be used to improve the accuracy of agriculture irrigation estimates for models that will be utilized by the GSAs. A similar study was conducted in Paso Robles in 2010-2013. If you know anyone who would like to participate, it would be very helpful for the GSA.

Question Matt – I was out of town when the meeting happened and haven't been able to get any information.

Response: We are working to obtain copies of the presentation and handout materials. We will make them available as soon as we have them.

Question Rue – I am a little concerned about the smaller acreage, getting information from them will be very difficult.

Response: Andy – Hopefully we will get more information, but you are right.

I would like to make sure that December 11 is on your calendar – an all-GSA Groundwater Recharge meeting.

Marcus Trotta – Currently working on the Basin Setting section, a revised draft is targeted for the November meeting. Looking at figures, comments, and will also be looking at what other data they might need to prepare to move to the next phase. The other work is related to the technical support funding to install up to 12 shallow groundwater monitoring wells. They are coordinating some access permits and are close to having agreements in place with DWR for the work. Still waiting for some access permits, but it is moving along, drillers are tentatively scheduled for October 7. Trotta will keep the Advisory Committee members updated, there might be an opportunity to see the drilling.

Questions/Comments

Question: Joe – shallow is less than 200 feet?

Response: Yes, looking at groundwater/surface water interaction. Specifically looking at the upper 50 feet.

Question: Bob – Did you get all the locations you wanted?

Response: Yes, publicly owned, public right-of-ways. 40-50 ft to a couple hundred feet from stream banks, they did target locations with existing stream gauge.

Trotta also said he has been coordinating with Dr. Philip Bachand who is doing work on behalf of SAVE. He has done a lot of on-farm recharge projects in the Central Valley. Trotta is sharing information with Bachand's firm. Dr. Philip Bachand will be presenting at the December 11 all-GSA Groundwater Recharge workshop.

Questions/Comments

Question: Rue – How broadly is that workshop going to be publicized?

Response: Ann DuBay – It is for all three basins, there is a budget to publish it through

traditional and social media but there is no budget for a postcard mailing.

Rodgers also mentioned there had been one Board meeting since the last Advisory Committee meeting and some actions were completed. The Board approved the first reading of the modified ordinance, (second reading will be October 10), and in-kind support for Sonoma and Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District grant for groundwater recharge studies and best practices. The Board also approved the City of Sebastopol as a new member paying a pro-rated amount.

Introduction to Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

Marcus Trotta, started by talking about new language that SGMA introduced for the GSP. His plan for the meeting was to introduce the terms and set expectations. They have started to review some approaches that have been taken by other critically over-drafted areas of the state. The plan is to bring the Board their thoughts and plans to the next Board meeting in October.

Trotta described the different sustainability indicators of the Sustainable Management criteria. The process is split into five iterative steps: 1) Assess which criteria needs to be addressed; 2) Develop narrative description of what constitutes significant and unreasonable effects for each Sustainability indicator; 3) Translate narrative description into quantitative values; 4) Decide what are desirable conditions = measurable objectives and 5) Set interim milestone to achieve measurable objectives and define sustainability goal.

The six sustainability indicators are applicable unless evidence can be provided that an indicator does not exist and could occur. For Santa Rosa Plain, evidence can be provided that seawater intrusion doesn't exist and could not occur, as the basin isn't connected to the ocean.

Undesirable results and Minimum Threshold define what is unacceptable within the basin and determine whether the basin is being managed sustainably. Measurable Objectives defines what is desirable within the basin and the conditions which the GSA must strive to achieve. Once it is determined what you don't want as undesirable results, they can work on measurable objectives for a desirable basin condition. Once measurable objectives are set, they set interim milestones, and show the plan to get there in five-year intervals and use to track progress.

Ann DuBay, Outreach – The terminology is confusing, we will be developing an outreach plan for sustainable management criteria. It would be good to get peoples' feedback and true engagement of what they would like to see the Basin look like in the future. There is a handout in the package for providing feedback. Provide any feedback to Ann at the meeting or in future.

Questions/Comments

Question: Craig – Where did DWR get this terminology?

Response: Marcus – I don't know exactly, some are from the California Water Plan. SGMA is different from most other groundwater programs in other states. A lot of the terminology is new.

Question: Rue – As we move through the target of sustainability, how are we going to consider things like more wells, bigger population, more houses, land intensification of use? I would like to ensure what we do now works in the future. We are working with other jurisdictions – with the water control board and with the planning dept in general. We need to rely on them to implement the plan and need their feedback to achieve the plan.

Response: Marcus – All good comments and points, it is important to coordinate with other agencies, particularly those with land use responsibilities. Regarding population growth, it is required to forecast future conditions, so the information needs to be incorporated into the threshold/plan.

Comment: Joe – It is important to make clear upfront that sustainability is not in perpetuity, but for the 20 years of the GSP. All the cities in the basin except Sebastopol are hooked up to the aqueduct system for their primary source of water, so population growth will not have as big an effect on cities as in unincorporated areas.

Response: Marcus – The 20 year timeframe the GSA has to correct any undesirable results that are identified to achieve sustainability. The GSA will have to continue to prove sustainability after 20 years.

Comment: Mary Grace – in Rohnert Park, we had to do a mini-version of this exercise almost 20 years ago when the General Plan was adopted in 2000. We were experiencing undesirable results, groundwater levels were dropping under the city. We were able to model a pumping rate that was sustainable. We were able to make some decisions to use a variety of water supplies and a strong focus on conservation. It has proved to be something the city could do while managing growth. It is a creative opportunity we have here that does work, we have an achievable goal. We have a basin that is relatively in good shape, and the tools to manage it.

Question: Bob – Slide 38 "Outreach Opportunities", includes a facilitated workshop in Petaluma Valley and Sonoma Valley. Is there the same planned for Santa Rosa Plain? **Response:** Ann DuBay – There is currently no budget, maybe next fiscal year.

Question/Comment: Sebastian – Question about the 2015 watershed. What is the function of the agency? What are we trying to do? Reach the requirements of SGMA? Or is the goal water management? The 2015 benchmark becomes irrelevant if we are concentrating on water. To say that 2015 was a benchmark isn't relevant. We need to look at sustainability goals in terms of function and the outcomes we want, not just checking off boxes.

Question: Bob – Slide 26, last bullet. What are the implications of this? Set thresholds for each monitoring site? There are differences between geological areas. But for "undesirable results", it says the entire basin, how do you square those things?

Response: Marcus – It allows you to set minimum thresholds differently as tied to conditions at the end of the 2014 drought for example, and a different threshold in another area. Undesirable results must be the same across the basin. For example, if undesirable results are determined to occur when 30% of wells exceed their minimum threshold, it covers the entire basin not just one management area.

Question: Jennifer – In terms of outreach, I appreciate the information is very dense and I know we have some resource limitations. I am wondering if we could try to attend events where the public is, as opposed to creating our own event, to bring people there. Maybe have a table at an event with information?

Response: Andy – Maybe we could create roadshow presentations, good thought.

Question: Jennifer – In terms of the development of minimum thresholds, is there any opportunity, that we can develop some thresholds that can be applied across all three basins or is it really going to be unique to each basin? As part of the development of the JPA, one of the goals was to comply with SGMA.

Response: Marcus – It would be good to share status updates. Any opportunities to have uniformity across the basins and share information would be great.

Question: Bob –Sebastian brought up a valid point of using 2015 as a baseline. I think it is a major point to take that into consideration.

Comment: Mary Grace – I would like to echo Jennifer's point. I hope we can agree to work together for baseline compliance.

Overview of Water Budget Requirements and Existing Groundwater Flow Model

Marcus Trotta introduced Andy Rich, Groundwater modeler at Sonoma Water, and Lisa Porta, Project Manager at Montgomery Associates. Montgomery Associates was brought on board as a subconsultant to Sonoma Water to help advise about the models applicability for complying with SGMA and water budget development. Lisa Porta presented an overview of general water budget components and models and how they relate to SGMA and our next steps in the process and Andy Rich gave an overview of groundwater modeling, the modeling tools that we have to work with. He and Trotta described the existing model, the applicability and how it can be used to address SGMA requirements, and some initial recommendations for making some improvements to the model.

Questions/Comments

Question: Bob – I appreciate having the model. How complicated is it to shrink it to the basin? How good is the data?

Response: Breaking up the data from the SRP basin, and in terms of extraction of data of model budgets, it is pretty basic to do the extraction. There should likely be more focus on the basin itself. So much of the total water coming into the basin is coming from upland areas. There are eight climate stations used to generate the precipitation time series for the model.

Question: Bob - How many of the eight stations are in the watershed and how many in the basin?

Response: Andy Rich – I believe there are eight within the basin and a few more outside.

Comment: Bob – I have yet to see a single number based on the basin rather than the watershed.

Response: Andy – Internally we have done some of those extractions, we are trying to make some of the corrections to the watershed data.

Response: Marcus – We have provided some of the numbers from the water budget for the sub-basin to the advisory committee previously and Raftelis was comparing them along the way.

Question: Matt – How we are hoping to use the model for the USGS revisions? Does the USGS timeline give you any worries?

Response: Marcus – Because of the USGS timeline, we are not planning to use the 2.0 version of the model for the development of the GSP. We are using the "1.0 plus", taking the 2015 conditions and making other refinements. We will be coordinating with USGS as well over the next several months.

Question: Sebastian – One of the parts of the budget is the historical water budget that is pulling data back to 1975. What is the functionality of the historical groundwater conditions compared to current? Why do we need historical and what determined the data at which we set that historical budget?

Response: Lisa – Historical data helps you understand the differences over time, it is essentially informational. Current gives you where you start and the future. You need to have everything in place before you start to look at the future.

Next steps – We will be working on incorporating some of the revisions and bringing an update to the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Andy Rodgers – We need the context of the watershed to understand what is in our jurisdiction. Perhaps, the answer is to look at this next spring.

Comment: Rue – Most of us could help with general outreach at local public meetings.

Comment: Sebastian – This is where the agency can help and shift to services.

Groundwater User Registration Program Update

Andy Rodgers – We have a rebate program and we are offering a registration program. We have a fee structure and ordinance in place that has been approved. A work group is working hardon developing a phased roll-out over next 3 years. We want to improve the information we have. In January, 2020 we will launch the program. Permit Sonoma been very helpful to develop an interactive map. They will be able to see what about the parcel is key to how the fee was calculated. We will have a form for folks to give us additional information, a hardcopy draft of the form is in the packet. Look at the draft form and mailer and give Andy feedback by September 30. The form and mailer will be updated and brought to the November meeting.

Andy Rodgers closed the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

Meeting Attendees

Advisory Committee Members (present)

Agriculture, Bob Anderson

City of Cotati appointee, Craig Scott

City of Santa Rosa appointee, Jennifer Burke

City of Sebastopol appointee, Henry Mikus

Environmental, Sebastian Bertsch

Environmental, Rue Furch

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, Maureen Geary – arrived 3:07

Gold Ridge RCD appointee, Matt O'Connor

Sonoma Water appointee, Carolyn Dixon – arrived 3:10

Town of Windsor appointee, Elizabeth Cargay (Alternate for Sandi Potter)

Rural Residential, Marlene Soiland

Business, Joe Gaffney

City of Rohnert Park appointee, Mary Grace Pawson

County of Sonoma appointee, Mark Grismer – arrived 4:15

Advisory Committee Members (absent)

Agriculture, David Long

Independent Water Systems appointee, Chris Bates

Rural/residential, Doug Beretta

Sonoma RCD appointee, Wayne Haydon absent

Staff

GSA Administrator, Andy Rodgers

Sonoma Water, Marcus Trotta

GSA Administrative Assistant (minute taker), Simone Peters

Facilitator

Sam Magill, Sacramento State University – Consensus and Collaboration Program

Public

Approximately 10 members of public