

**Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Advisory Committee Meeting
Meeting Summary**

Meeting date/time: February 12, 2019 I 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Location: Valley of the Moon Water District Office, 19039 Bay Street, El Verano

Contact: Ann DuBay, Sonoma Valley GSA Administrator

Email: AnnDuBay@scwa.ca.gov Phone: (707) 524-8378

MEETING RECAP

- Fred Allebach, SVGSA Advisory Committee Chair, welcomed all attendees and kicked off the SVGSA Advisory Committee meeting.
- The meeting agenda and schedule were reviewed.
- The previous meeting summary for January 2019 was approved unanimously by Advisory Committee Members to finalize and post.
- Kent Gylfe, Sonoma Water, provided an overview of Sonoma Valley Stormwater Scoping Studies conducted since 2012.
- Susan Haydon, Sonoma Water, discussed the Southern Sonoma Stormwater Resource Plan which is online.
- Steve Lee, Sonoma Ecology Center, provided an overview of Sonoma Valley stream flow/seepage measurements.
- Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, provided an update on Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) progress, an overview of the figure handout that will be provided in Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model and Groundwater Conditions sections, and an update on proposed DWR-funded monitoring wells.
- Brief Administrator, Plan Manager, and Legislative Updates were provided.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
1) Post January meeting summary as final on website	Staff	Feb. 2019
2) Provide AC date of climate change workshop	Staff	ASAP
3) Review calendars and let staff know if proposed dates for July-December AC meetings create any conflicts	AC Members	Feb. 2019
4) Add “and saline areas” to the ad hoc goal	Staff	Feb. 2019
5) Work with the ad hoc to find a date/time to meet	Staff	Feb. 2019
6) Provide feedback on figures handout to staff	AC Members	Mar 1, 2019

Next Meeting: March 12, 2019, 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m., Valley of the Moon Water District

Sonoma County Groundwater Website: <http://www.sonomagroundwater.org/>

MEETING SUMMARY

Roll Call, Public Comment

The public was provided an opportunity for comment at the beginning of the meeting. There were no public comments.

Agenda and Meeting Schedule Review

The Advisory Committee (AC) reviewed the meeting agenda, and meeting schedule. The AC commented that no meetings are scheduled in April, June, and August. This is due to the SVGSA AC meeting budget (8 meetings annually).

ACTION: AC to let staff know of any potential meeting conflicts with proposed AC meeting schedule by March 1.

ACTION: The AC wants to know the date of the Climate Change workshop ASAP – staff to provide.

Approval of January Meeting Summary

ACTION ITEM REVIEW:

All Action Items were completed.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION: The previous meeting summary for January 2019 was approved unanimously by the AC to finalize and post.

ACTION: Staff to finalize and post the January meeting summary on the SVGSA website.

Ad Hoc Proposal

Facilitator Tim Parker and AC Chair Fred Allebach reviewed previous AC discussions regarding well permitting in areas of depletion, and proposed that an ad hoc be created to review specifically how wells are permitted and whether there might be a way to work more closely with Permit Sonoma. Vice-Chair Cornwall noted that the creation of the ad hoc will be a timesaver for the AC, which has already spent a lot of time discussing the need for some sort of well permitting process modification in areas where there is documented groundwater depletion and where salinity intrusion in the south end of the basin is a concern.

Chair Allebach reviewed the proposed ad hoc goal, tasks, outcomes and schedule (handout -attached).

The AC recommended that ‘saline areas’ be added to goal statement, and to make sure that the ad hoc is focused on the well permitting issues that were discussed at last meeting. The biggest concern expressed is how much support that the ad hoc will get from Permit Sonoma staff. Another corresponding concern is that if it evolves into a regulatory approach, nothing will likely happen. Can the AC work with Permit Sonoma to approach the issue from well permitting as an administrative perspective? Might be quicker and less controversial.

The AC Chair noted that there might be information that can be aggregated and to shoot for an outcome that the SVGSA Board could use for sustainability criteria later in the groundwater sustainability plan. The AC and ad hoc should look for a win-win with Permit Sonoma and the SVGSA. AC member Greg Carr volunteered to serve, and noted that it's important to have an agricultural representative on the ad hoc whose input would be really helpful.

Jim Bundschu expressed interest in participating as an agricultural representative, but wondered whether we have the total amount of technical knowledge needed for decision making: worried that the AC might be putting the cart before the horse.

An AC discussion followed regarding whether this could lead to preventing well owners from using wells in areas of depletion: possibly, but the likelihood is more toward discussing the well permitting process, including the connection between land use planning and the SVGSA.

The AC Chair noted that this fits with the advice that the SVGMP Basin Advisory Panel provided for the GSA to move forward.

The AC noted that this could be a waste of time unless we have some legal background, etc.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACTION: The AC agreed that an ad hoc is a good idea, as proposed in terms of scope and schedule in the handout, and the AC Chair appointed the following members to serve on the ad hoc: Allebach, Cornwall, Carr, Bundschu, Johnson.

ACTION: Add "and saline areas" to the goal.

ACTION: Administrator Ann DuBay will work with the ad hoc to find a date/time to meet.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The ad hoc might want to think about wells that seem abnormal to the situation: for example, an 1,000 foot well was installed under an administrative permit, with a subsequent application to develop a new winery.

Storm Water Scoping Study and Storm Water Resources Plan

Presentations provided by Kent Gylfe and Susan Haydon, Sonoma Water.

Kent Gylfe reviewed the Sonoma Valley storm water scoping studies that began in 2012. The key points include:

- Flood reduction opportunities are best in the upper watershed (because it helps reduce downstream flooding).

- Nathanson Creek watershed also has flood reduction potential because of possible impacts to the downstream city of Sonoma.
- The best possibilities for recharge/flood reduction are in the upper watershed/valley floor in the Kenwood area; also spots within the Nathanson Creek watershed.
 - Question regarding water rights issues and whether capture was an appropriate water right
Kent noted that this possibility led this option being less attractive.
 - Betty Andrews noted that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) pulled together a legal-policy subcommittee to look at water rights issues regarding storm water capture-groundwater recharge. It remains a bit of a grey zone. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) also has a process for looking at this issue, and has developed a draft streamlined storm water capture-groundwater recharge permitting process.
- Highest priority project types: Off-stream basin, high-flow diversion/recharge; infiltration gallery
- Kent also discussed a project that received a \$1.9 million grant (with Sonoma Ecology Center (SEC), city of Sonoma, and the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District). The project was originally proposed for a detention recharge basin on pasture land with culvert improvements downstream and creek restoration.
- After public opposition and technical challenges, the project was then changed to an infiltration gallery at the Veteran's building parking lot with culverts and creek restoration. This was publicly rejected also, and the funding was moved to Petaluma Valley.
- Challenges of the project included
 - Technical (recharge wasn't ideal with fine grained shallow sediments; would potentially move flooding downstream; complex geology)
 - Public opposition; public sites (people feel a lot of ownership)
 - Changes are challenging – more success with willing private landowners)
 - Water quality could be an issue in the future
- For moving forward need
 - Additional collaboration with community
 - Fill data gaps and determine where successful recharge is more likely
 - Land use policies/plans
 - Consider strategic funding (spending more upfront on investigative studies)

Susan Haydon discussed the Southern Sonoma Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP), which is now complete and available online, www.sonomawater.org

Key points:

- Lots of partners participated technically and collaborated to build a plan, even post-fire

- New projects day-lighted – democratizes opportunities
- Value-added tools:
 - Sonoma Resource Conservation District developed an approach and guidelines for recharge potential
 - Consultant ESA developed self-help assessment for flood benefit
- Map of possible projects shows some overlap with scoping studies
- Majority of projects are programmatic and studies, which is indicative the phase that possible projects are in the field
- In two areas with recharge project types (public right of way near Carriger Creek, and Ernie Smith Regional Park)
 - Conducted surface geophysics surveys - electric resistivity and well boring in Carriger Creek area
 - Learned that geophysics can really help you understand the best areas to conduct more expensive and intrusive further testing (shows perched conditions and conditions that aren't perched)
- Next steps: People can still submit projects; funding available in summer 2019; SWRP is a living document and can be updated

AC COMMENTS

- Seems like there is a natural tension between urban areas where people want to move water out and possible project locations. Wouldn't it make more sense to send water to agricultural lands or to a large tank that allows water to slowly infiltrate into ground?
- Cultural shift needs to occur; need to reframe the story, possibly using water security or restoration as hooks
- Los Angeles just passed a storm water parcel tax
- SEC is doing outreach to neighbors upstream of Sonoma Developmental Center; also looking at project at SDC itself
- People object to everything that is proposed – how hard did you push? Very hard

PUBLIC COMMENT

One community member lives in 'Sonoma 1' area (the Kenwood area) and has done a lot of swales, hollows, berms to reduce storm flows and sink water into the ground. The area is a high recharge and flood potential area, but in the Kenwood basin and not the Sonoma Valley basin. In the future, might be good to add this area to the Sonoma Valley basin.

It was noted that the SVGSA can support projects outside the Sonoma Valley groundwater basin boundary, if it contributes to groundwater to the basin.

Sonoma Valley Stream Flow/Seepage Measurements

Steve Lee with the Sonoma Ecology Center, presented an overview of stream flow/seepage monitoring conducted by SEC.

Key points:

- Discussed the type of stream areas (alluvium and bedrock) - alluvium has a lot of infiltration, and bedrock not so much
- Losing, gaining and neutral reaches are determined based on multiple individual measurements of flow velocity across a given reach and calculation of flow volume, and comparison to up- and downstream reaches to determining type of reach
- 56 sites measured semi-annually (Sept and March)
- 18 sites measured every other month
- Sonoma Creek in the upper watershed, where it crosses the Kenwood plain, there is abundant alluvium at the surface, stream water seeps into alluvium, which makes this a losing stream reach - note that the 'losing' reaches are recharging the aquifer
- As Sonoma Creek proceeds down the watershed, it encounters bedrock and is no longer losing but a neutral reach
- Information provides good a look at surface water-groundwater connections across the watershed
- The data includes 2 years of drought and 2 years of normal/high water years

AC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

- How do you account for a stream that is gaining water through overland flow that isn't in tributaries?
Ideally try to measure this out, but don't have the capability to get at non-point source. This is where 10% fudge measure comes into play.
- Regarding fish passage:
Anadromous go up during winter; other fish patchwork their way up the creek or huddle up in wet areas
- Saturated soils that feed creek?
Water flowing through subsurface in Kenwood Plain where there is typically losing stream, except on the west where it turns south and is gaining, then squeezes out in Warm Springs area where the creek is underlain by bedrock and the reach is gaining
- How groundwater pumping out of creek (or close by) affect losses?
Know that it affects it, but not sure how much. SEC is looking at this in other ways through other projects. Haven't seen single major diversion signals, but lots of cumulative diversions from smaller landowners.
- Discussion of impervious surfaces and creek flashiness and getting more water into the ground
Velocity of creek comes up and goes down so quickly. Would be nice if people who contribute to velocity had scientific understanding of why, so wouldn't always blame farmers.
- 8th Street East development has large pipes that hold water and lets it out slowly; also doing bio-swales to hold and slow water – small, disbursed projects plus big projects can help.

GSP Basin Setting & Monitoring Wells

Marcus Trotta provided an update on the GSP Basin Setting section. He noted that Sonoma Water is behind schedule due to injured staff and US government shut-down. Will have a more in-depth discussion of 3.1-3.2 at next meeting in March (hydrogeological conceptual model). Marcus:

- Reviewed new figures and updated figures.
- Discussed monitoring wells, and data provided. Data will help provide important information for recharge potential.
- Have scoped out six shallow monitoring wells to be funded by the state. The final figure in the handout shows potential deep nested wells that could be funded by DWR, too.
- Next time, the AC will get handouts before the meeting and can share comments before, during or after the meeting

ACTION ITEM: AC can provide comments on the new figures provided in the AC packet by March 1.

Administrator:

Budget:

- As of January meeting, spent about 16% of budget, but expect a large Q2 invoice from Sonoma Water – should start to catch up on that.
- Proposed 2019-2020 draft budget: \$710,208 in expenses, which includes 2 months operating reserves. Anticipate that about \$308,000 will be covered by grant, and there will be a significant balance forward. Member agencies contributions should be: \$10K for SRCD and NBWD; \$25K from City and VOMWD; approximately \$35k from county and \$115,000 from Sonoma Water.

SRP Fees:

- Big public meeting on 1/30, with an overflow crowd and lots of negative comments, but several positive written comments and some verbal.
- Three new community meetings scheduled on March 4, 6, and 7. Two will be recorded/televised.

Technical update:

SV GSA basin boundary modification received final approval from DWR.

Legislative/Administrative Update:

Governor appointed Joaquin Esquivel as Chair of State Board.

Assembly member Eggman proposed legislation regarding beneficial use of GW - AB 441.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No further public comment received.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Fred Allebach

Jim Bundschu

Helge Bruckner

Greg Carr

Caitlin Cornwall

Norman Gilroy

Vicki Hill

Ken Johnson

Craig Lichty

Matt Stornetta

Staff

Ann DuBay, SVGSA Administrator

Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water

Tim Parker, Facilitator, Parker Groundwater

Proposed Ad Hoc to Evaluate Well Permitting Options in Depletion and Saline Water Areas of Sonoma Valley

Goal: Consider policy and technical options for additional requirements/information to be submitted under a ministerial well permit in the Sonoma Valley areas of groundwater depletion and saline intrusion.

Tasks: Conduct 3 to 4 Ad Hoc meetings, some with Permit Sonoma Permit staff to discuss:

- Issue statement
- Overview of well installation information in Sonoma Valley, depletion and saline water areas
- Possible policy and technical options to address issue, including pros and cons of each option
- Permit Sonoma input on options identified
- Recommendations for Advisory Committee consideration

Outcomes: Working with SVGSA Staff, prepare short narrative report covering Ad Hoc Tasks

Schedule: Report back to SVGSA Advisory Committee on May 14, 2019