Thursday October 26, 2023, 2:00 – 5:00 P.M. In-person at the Fort Jones Community Hall or online via Zoom

Action Items:

- Thomas Harter, UC Davis, to redo the graphs using the conventional water year timeline rather than starting with July.
- A flyer will be distributed to the Advisory Committee regarding an upcoming in person Mobile Irrigation
 Lab presentation anticipated to occur in the January timeframe.

Attachments/Links:

PowerPoint Presentation Slides (attached)

Attendees: See last page

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Call to Order, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Chair Tom Menne conducted a roll call to establish quorum after calling the Scott Valley Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 2:03 PM. Matt Parker, Siskiyou County Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) staff, welcomed attendees, reviewed the Agenda, and called attention to virtual attendees. Meeting attendance is provided on the last page.

2. Approval of Past Meeting Summary

Chair Menne presented the August 29, 2023 meeting summary for the Committee's approval. The minutes were approved with the following discussion points and/or edits.

- Michael Stapleton clarified that his contribution to the well metering discussion (near the end of page two)
 was not questioning the scientific basis of the GSP so much as merely posing an inquiry. However, no
 specific edits to the discussion were requested.
- Charnna Gilmore clarified that her contribution to the well drilling discussion near the top of page three
 was merely inquiring if any concerns should or would be triggered within this group if the City of Etna
 were to drill another well given the size of the city.
- A word on page five is duplicated and should be deleted.

Committee members Theo Johnson and Tom Jopson motioned and seconded, respectively, for approval of the notes pending the edits noted above.

3. Public Comment Period on Non-Agenda Items, including Non-Agenda Updates from Committee Members and Other Agencies

No updates were provided at this time.

4. DWR Updates

Alyse Briody, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff, reported that DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM) Program awards from the latest solicitation of applications had been finalized. The Financial Assistance Branch of DWR is currently working to draft the agreements for the awards and is hoping to complete and execute them soon.

5. District Staff Updates

Matt relayed to the group that the Siskiyou County Department of Environmental Health will be presenting to the Board of Directors meeting on November 14. Laura Foglia, Larry Walker and Associates (LWA) will be discussing development of a tool for evaluating well permits. There are no additional concrete details from the Department on this matter at this time.

6. Technical Team Presentation

The technical team planned to present several updates to the group, including groundwater basin conditions for 2023, the region's geological modeling, and the final SGM grant awards as well as a report-out from the ad hoc meeting on monitoring network expansion that was convened on October 12, 2023.

Groundwater Elevation Data

Laura shared about the visualized groundwater level data for 2023. There is an updated Precipitation-Runoff Modeling System and Airborne Electromagnetic data available for Scott Valley.

- There are 15 wells that are measured continuously and captured in 15-minute intervals. Two of the sites
 have measurements at different depths—40 and 80 feet—to help with calibration. Of those wells, 11 are
 measured manually.
- The technical team is hoping for tipping bucket information and all other well data to help fill in the gaps where needed.
- Committee Member Bonnie Bennett noticed that Kidder Creek was not present on the map being displayed. Kelsey McNeill, LWA, stated that it was a national map that did not include a lot of known tributaries.
- LWA took measurements from October to September to acquire the mean groundwater elevation and cumulative precipitation for the 2020-2023 water years. While there were 17 inches of precipitation this water year, there are clearly lower mean groundwater elevations in the wintertime and increased levels in the summer.
- Averages for the 11 wells in the community program were derived by collecting one day of each month.
 The technical team is working with the County to establish agreements with the well owners to gain access to the data. The well data starts in 2006 and ends with the 2023 water year.
- Michael Stapleton asked why the data starts in July rather than using the conventional water year.
 Thomas Harter, UC Davis, responded that the graphs could be prepared using the conventional water year timeline.

Scott Valley Integrated Hydrologic Model (SVIHM)

Thomas provided an overview of the study area, climate, geologic, and hydrologic make up of Scott Valley as well as the motivations supporting use of the SVIHM. See the attached PowerPoint presentation for details.

The SVIHM model includes:

- An Upper Watershed Model: a regression model that characterizes streamflow entering Scott Valley
- A Soil-Water Budget Model: a tipping bucket model that estimates recharge and pumping within the Valley
- A Groundwater-Surface-Water Model: a MODFLOW model that delivers detailed groundwater levels and streamflow estimates within the Valley

Thomas emphasized that all models carry an inherent degree of uncertainty and there is always room for error or omission.

Related to the Upper Watershed Model:

- Michael asked if the technical team runs multiples with the model. Thomas replied that the team uses gauge data related to the French Creek gauge and Laura also has a similar model covers the entire watershed.
- Another member of the Committee asked how base flow is factored in. Thomas said that estimates tend to fluctuate.
- Bonnie asked if the team was going to expand the number of diversions, and Thomas replied (later in the
 meeting) that rather than having all diversions at the end, the model should represent proper diversion
 points.

Overall, the upper watershed model should transition into soil-water budget model, as the soil-water budget model generates a monthly divergence of groundwater across the valley floor. The model's input data includes transient land use which means the model typically works well for farmers.

- Chair Menne asked if the team has received information on changes to irrigation practices. Thomas replied that they need to update the model, image analysis, and procure feedback from the group for that. Some of this will need to be accomplished through field inspections.
- A Committee Member asked how this relates to the variability of drought. Thomas responded extra evaporation off of the wheel lines is not lost as it is not in the crop coefficient within the model.

Related to the Groundwater-Surface Water Model (MODFLOW):

- In response to a question about whether all fields were assumed to have the same soil type, Thomas
 replied that no, the field capacity changes from field to field.
- After discussing the model's streamflow capabilities, another Committee member asked if errors stay the same when a model is extended. Thomas confirmed that the errors are consistent.
- In response to a question about how the technical team will account for water rights that have expired over time, they shared that the SCI team is exploring scenarios of that nature, but there are no concrete answers at this point in time.
- In response to a question about whether applied water assumptions have been set, Thomas replied that yes, the technical team did not use actual water use in the model. They looked at the reduction, and that is as close as they can get without further study.
- The model should have been able to show the difference based on curtailments and a 30 percent reduction. A Committee member asked how that compares to actuals. The team is unsure of that at this time, but they believe they are as close as the group has seen in the past. The 2022 model was more optimistic in its projections than what actually happened. Thomas contextualized that model scenarios essentially assume that historical events happened differently than they did. Models are run to show the differences in flows, water levels, water budgets, etc. under different conditions. The technical team started the model scenarios from 1991 since there was more data to build the model from that point forward.
- Chair Menne commented that he did not remember discussing salmon or fish species' migration in connection with SGMA compliance. Thomas said that the groundwater and surface water sustainability indicators are, to the extent possible or relevant, there to protect groundwater dependent ecosystems, and this includes salmon. The model update will not change the message.

In the interest of time, Laura focused the remainder of the presentation on the following topics, foregoing other technical team updates:

Mobile Irrigation Lab

A land efficiency study opportunity has arisen through the mobile irrigation lab (MIL). It will evaluate agricultural irrigation systems. The technical team could get a list of available farmers, and the lead for the MIL will work from that list at a rate of two farms per day to help them gain a better understanding of their systems. If this is something this group and the surrounding community would like to pursue, they would need to book the MIL's time sooner rather than later so that the lab's lead isn't booked up by other priorities. Information collected by the MIL can feed into the model as well.

The MIL lead is willing to come up to the basin in January to explain how the MIL process works and begin conducting farm and irrigation efficiency assessments. The group will send out a flyer for an in-person presentation. The technical team is also connecting with a similar group in the Corning Subbasin that can serve as a back-up if MIL's capacity is limited.

SGM Awards

Laura described the significant funds that DWR awarded to the Subbasin to support SGMA compliance and implementation. Well inventory support is a task scoped under the awarded funds, and the technical team would like to start immediately. The team is requesting voluntary Committee support for the development and operation of a subgroup dedicated to this effort. The group would be comprised of Committee volunteers from the Shasta Valley, Butte Valley, and Scott Valley groups and the intent would be to discuss the most successful methods for conducting public outreach and engagement (e.g., surveys, emails, weekly contact, monthly contact) to increase the technical team's chances for success.

7. Update on Strategy Document and 2024 Facilitation Support Activities

In the interest of time, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

8. Updates on Groundwater Related Projects not led by the GSA

In the interest of time, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

9. Committee Member Discussion

In the interest of time, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 PM.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS:

* online participant

Advisory Committee Members Present:

Bonnie Bennett
Charnna Gilmore
Jim Morris
Michael Stapleton
Theo Johnson
Tom Jopson
Tom Menne

Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Amanda Cooper Brandon Fawaz

Agency Staff and Members of the Public:

Alyse Briody, California Department of Water Resources Betsy Stapleton

*Chris Watt, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

*Cystal Robinson, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

*Eli Scott, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

Janae Scruggs, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

*Les Grade, California Department of Water Resources

Linda Söller, UC Davis

Monique Gaton

*Nick Murphy, The Nature Conservancy

*Philip Cramer, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Sari Sommarstrom

Tim Morris, Grower

Project Team:

Haydee Yonamine, Stantec Kelsey McNeill, Larry Walker and Associates Khandriale Clark, Stantec Kyle Mattingly, Larry Walker and Associates Laura Foglia, Larry Walker and Associates *Marisa Perez-Reyes, Stantec Matt Parker, GSA Staff Olin Applegate, Larry Walker and Associates Thomas Harter, UC Davis