

Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting - Agenda

November 9, 2021 | 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

To join the meeting remotely, click on the link below or enter the URL directly into browser:

<https://scwa-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/92162795993?pwd=L245c0lDd1dQZ01STXMzQmdzTDBpQT09>

Meeting ID: 921 6279 5993 Passcode: 075557

One tap mobile (888) 788-0099 US Toll-free

Contact: Ann DuBay, Sonoma County Water Agency, SVGSA Administrator

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

Time	Agenda Item	Materials
3:00	<p><i>Welcome</i></p> <p>Tim Parker, Advisory Committee Meeting Facilitator</p> <p><i>Call Meeting to Order – Roll Call and Introductions</i></p> <p>Fred Allebach, Advisory Committee Chairman</p> <p>Susan Gorin, SVGSA Board Chair</p>	N/A
3:10	<p><i>General Public Comments</i></p> <p>This time is reserved for the public to address the Committee about matters NOT on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Committee.</p> <p>Tim Parker, Advisory Committee Meeting Facilitator</p>	N/A
3:15	<p><i>Agenda Review, Action Items Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary</i></p> <p>Ann DuBay, SVGSA Administrator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review September 13 Meeting Summary <p><i>Objective: Review actions items, confirm September meeting summary</i></p>	Agenda; September Meeting Summary
3:20	<p><i>Draft SVGSP Review and Discussion of Comments</i></p> <p>Ann DuBay, SVGSA Administrator</p> <p>Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of comment matrix • Discussion of comments received • Discussion of new substantive comments <p><i>Objective: Inform AC of new comments that have come in and how they are being addressed.</i></p>	Presentation (separate); GSP Comments' Matrix

4:20	<p><i>SVGSA Advisory Committee Future Roles, Responsibilities, Next Steps</i></p> <p>Tim Parker, Facilitator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Committee Role in SVGSP • Possible Tasks in 2022 based on GSP Schedule <p><i>Objective: Assess Advisory Committee member perceptions of the GSP after review comments received.</i></p>	<p>Presentation (separate); Post GSP AC Role; Draft 2022 Meeting Calendar</p>
5:00	<p><i>Updates</i></p> <p>Ann DuBay, SVGSA Administrator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit Sonoma • Groundwater User Information Data Exchange (GUIDE) <p>Andrea Rodriguez, Sonoma Water Outreach staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Meetings Review • Public Hearing on GSP • Rural Community Outreach <p><i>Objective: Provide relevant updates that inform the Advisory Committee - AC to ask questions if needed.</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
5:20	<p><i>Closing Comments</i></p> <p>Fred Allebach, Advisory Committee Chairman</p>	<p>N/A</p>
5:30	<p><i>Meeting Adjourns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Advisory Committee Meeting in 2022 - TBD • Next Board Meeting - Monday, December 6th - 4 to 6 p.m. 	<p>N/A</p>

Special Accommodations: If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Ann DuBay at (707) 524-8378 or by email at Ann.Dubay@scwa.ca.gov. 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.

Meeting Documents: Materials are available for review at Sonoma Water, 404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa, 95403, during normal business hours. Any documents provided at the meeting by staff will be available to the public. The agenda and agenda packet materials are also available at: <http://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/>

Public Comment: Members of the public may attend meetings of the Sonoma Valley 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 meeting.

Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Advisory Committee Meeting

Draft Meeting Summary

Tuesday, September 14, 2021 | 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Contact: Ann DuBay, Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), Administrator

Email: Ann.Dubay@scwa.ca.gov | Phone: 707.524-8378

Next meeting: November 9, 2021, 3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Tim Parker, Advisory Committee Facilitator, opened the meeting at 3:03 p.m. and welcomed the group. Caitlin Cornwall, Advisory Committee Vice-Chair also welcomed the group and then Ann DuBay conducted roll call.

General Public Comments

Roger Peters mentioned that another SGMA basin had filed for a groundwater adjudication.

Parker – Did you notice the basin name?

Peters – I can look it up and send it to Ann DuBay.

Parker – Thank you for bringing that up. I am involved in an adjudication in one basin. The main reason for adjudication is to bring the Federal Government in, otherwise they aren't involved.

Follow up note: A group of landowners in the *Cuyama Valley groundwater basin*, which has groundwater as its sole source of water supply, recently filed for a comprehensive adjudication of groundwater rights. The Cuyama Basin overlies parts of Ventura, Kern, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara Counties. Current ongoing adjudications in the state include the Borrego Basin groundwater adjudication, the Indian Wells Valley Basin groundwater adjudication, the Ventura River adjudication, the Las Posas Valley Basin groundwater adjudication, and the recently filed Oxnard and Pleasant Valley adjudication.

Agenda and Schedule Review

Tim Parker reviewed the day's agenda. He confirmed that the October 12 AC meeting is cancelled, and a Community meeting will be held on that date. November 9 is the next scheduled Advisory Committee meeting.

Comments/Questions

Greg Carr – We will take a poll today about how we feel about the Plan. Will we get another chance to be polled on the draft Plan after the revisions the staff is making based on discussion today?

Parker – The next opportunity would be at the November meeting following the public comment period.

Carr – So, any comments made in November will be sent to the Board and not necessarily considered by staff? I am looking for revisions in the Plan; right now, my poll will be answered one

way. If there is another opportunity to take a poll when the Plan is revised, I would comment differently. I understand the problem of timing and trying to meet a deadline.

Parker – During the public review period, you will also be able to comment. Send in your comments, staff will look at them and address them as needed.

Carr – I appreciate that but, it would be a ‘Greg Carr’ comment, not an Advisory Committee comment.

DuBay – We can do another AC poll in November following the public hearing/revised draft.

Carr – If we can do that as an Advisory Committee, that would be fine.

Cornwall – I am puzzled by the topic shown for the October Board meeting “draft resolution to adopt GSP for November meeting”. Why is there a whole meeting for drafting a resolution? So, the September and October meeting will be reviewing the draft?

DuBay – In September we will talk to the Board about comments we received from the Advisory Committee, the schedule, and to provide a high-level overview of the public meeting on October 12.

Vicki Hill – Will there be a way for us to get copies of the comments submitted on the public draft? Will they be posted online?

DuBay – Comments will not be posted online. They will be downloaded and shared with Advisory Committee after October 31.

Parker – They will be included as part of the final draft GSP that is submitted to DWR.

Review Action Items and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

- Work on action plan and future schedule/goals for AC – will do in November
- Create narrative for 10% conservation – will get something out for AC review in October

Caitlin Cornwall made a motion to approve the previous meeting summary, Norman Gilroy seconded. The Advisory Committee agreed. The previous summary will be posted as written.

Overview of New GSP Sections and Document Organization

Objective: Receive overview of GSP sections and overall document organization. NOTE: detailed comments will be discussed in the next agenda item.

Marcus Trotta gave an overview of the availability of the various GSP sections. New sections include the Executive Summary and Sections 6 and 7. The Executive Summary is intended for the General Public, so they understand what the GSP is, and comprehend the conditions of the basin. Section 6 Projects and Management Actions describes objectives and expected benefits of projects and management actions along with estimated costs and the funding plan. Appendix 6-A includes details and results of model scenarios. Section 7, Implementation Plan lays out the GSA plans for implementing the GSP with focus on the initial five years. It also includes an estimated budget for administration, communication, monitoring, addressing data gaps, model update, projects and management actions, and a funding plan. Appendix 7-A focuses on model maintenance and improvements.

Tim Parker covered the GSP comments received to-date on the different GSP sections. The October 1 draft GSP will include the comments. Marcus Trotta mentioned primary changes and edits in progress for the Executive Summary, Basin Setting, SMC, and Monitoring Network sections.

Comments/Questions

Caitlin Cornwall – The bullet “adding detail regarding GSA engagement on General Plan amendment policies” listed as a primary change and edit in progress, there could be more policy documents than just the General Plan amendment to which the GSA could refer.

Trotta – We describe a number of those other planning documents and planning processes of Municipal and Advisory commissions that are within the basin, etc., and they are all referenced in Section 7. The comment was a little more specific towards strengthening the description of how the GSA would be engaging in the General Plan process. Have a look at section 7. If there are other planning processes that should be included, we would love to hear about them.

GSP Review and Discussion of Comments

Objective: Review prior comments received, substantive new comments, and discuss how comments are addressed.

Questions/Comments

Vicki Hill – On Projects/Actions, I sent my comments late. It seems like there is room for additional details on Group 1 projects that could be useful, for example, on rainwater harvesting. There has been a lot of interest in rainwater harvesting. Could we make it more robust and include detail, so people understand what types of projects we are talking about and that they are feasible? And also, if there are any incentives or plans for incentives, give examples, I think it would be useful.

Ken Johnson – I am curious to hear from Greg Carr about the General Plan’s role and its interaction with the GSP and the county planning process. On a broader level, is the General Plan the right place to make sure we have everything lined up?

Carr – Yes, I think it is. There is a water resources element in the General Plan that gets into what you do with well permitting and what areas of the county are subject to more restrictions based on conditions. The GSP should inform the next General Plan update. It is appropriate.

Craig Lichty – The timing of the release of the Plan didn’t work well with my schedule. The document is very dense in text, are we also bringing in some graphics folks to pull out highlights on each page, so it would be more inviting to the public? When I look at the work and comments, I think it would be helpful in the Executive Summary and Project and Implementation sections, to call attention that this is our baseline GSP. Things have changed since we started preparing the Plan including fires, a pandemic, and the current drought. I think it is important for our credibility to mention the Plan is adaptive and we are securing additional information and watching weather trends. Is there something else for staff to create some tools, so we could take information from year-end, and Marcus Trotta could annually provide information about the deviations? We need to communicate to the public that this is an adaptive process; it would help with the credibility of the Plan.

DuBay – The primary audience is DWR, and the report needs to be downloaded in a certain format. There will be annual reports that summarize the data and how Sustainable Management Criteria are being addressed. There will be a fact sheet and FAQ designed for the General public that will highlight the key findings from each section. Interesting idea, maybe there is some DWR funding to do it.

Lichty – I was thinking of a more public digestible format.

Norman Gilroy – I would like to follow up on Craig Lichty’s comment. The current Plan is written by water people for water people. The people who will use the Plan are land use folks. I suggest that somewhere in sections 6 and 7, something be added that speaks to the relationship between the GSA, Permit Sonoma, and the County. It isn’t a feature in the Plan as it stands now. That relationship between the GSA and Permit Sonoma was something we saw that would be given attention during the Implementation. The interpretation of the General Plan is expected to come from Permit Sonoma. It wouldn’t take a lot to recognize it in the Plan. A while ago, I asked if we have enough geological information to be clear on how the earthquake faults, especially on the east side, are affecting groundwater, both in terms of groundwater retention and in terms of why and how those areas of the deeper aquifer are being affected. Those areas are the most problematic in the Plan and the geologic conditions around them are important and not well understood. I brought it up twice. It was included in the operational text, but doesn’t appear in sections 6 or 7. Could we put it back in? I read Roger Peters’ comments this morning. It is a very important piece of the underpinnings of the Plan.

Trotta (chat) – There is a description of coordination with other agencies in section 7.2.2. As indicated on a previous slide, we will be adding more detail, especially to the general planning process. Here's the language in the current draft: "In addition, the GSA will continue to engage and coordinate with local, state and regional agencies (including city of Sonoma, Valley of the Moon Water District, Permit Sonoma, other GSAs, Agricultural Commissioner, Sonoma County Ag + Open Space District, DWR, SWRCB’s Drinking Water and Water Rights Division, NCRWQCB and SFBRWQCB) on filling data gaps and implementation of projects and actions. This coordination will include discussions of partnering opportunities for funding implementation components that are mutually beneficial. The GSA will also engage with specific planning area processes in Sonoma Valley, including development of the Springs Specific Plan and Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan and will coordinate and share.

Trotta - With respect to the faults in the basin and uncertainty related to them, those are the primary data gaps described in section 7.2.4. We have a few different studies proposed to improve our understanding. If you have other ideas on what should be included in that, let us know.

Johnson (chat) – Aquifer testing is a good way to explore the impacts of the faults that can be helpful for refining and advancing the model.

Johnson (chat) – Norman Gilroy’s comment about linking to land use is just what we talked about earlier with regards to the planning process. Agree that it is a good thing to include.

Jane Whitsett – I haven’t reviewed sections 6 and 7 yet. Is there any consideration to add Group 3 projects? How do we address the possibility of delays in projects as they get planned and implemented in terms of modeling and addressing groundwater conditions if projects that we have in the Plan, are delayed? Is this addressed in the Implementation section?

Trotta – We will discuss it a little more in the next item. We need to prepare for potential policy options in case some projects don’t do the job we anticipate them to do. We will be further describing it in the Implementation Plan. The projects and management actions that we simulate in Group 1 through 2B – there are only two years (in the model simulation) that indicate Undesirable Results when we include all the projects and management actions. At this point we don’t think simulating additional projects is ideal for this GSP.

Cornwall – I think policy options are just another kind of management action. This issue of needing to go beyond the current batch of projects, is tied up with our climate projections. I think we will have a serious credibility issue with the projected climate projections. We're in the middle of this extreme drought and we don't know when it will end. And yet, our climate projections show rosy weather conditions ahead, and only way down the line, do we start getting into projected serious dry periods. We are starting with a condition now that is what we are supposed to achieve. No water use rights are being curtailed in the state. Something else also needs to be done to show we are dealing with reality.

Trotta – For the climate future, even though the first 20 years are on the normal/wetter side, the first three years are characterized as very dry. It will continue to be a challenge if this drought continues. SGMA is not meant to be responsive for year-to-year droughts. It is a longer-term program. In terms of the challenge that there is a wetter period in the projection, we are not looking at the sequence, but looking at the longer period.

Cornwall – Some of the projects are very hard to turn on.

Lichty (chat) – This is exactly my comment. Maybe we create a dashboard that shows what was modeled and what is happening. We do this for DWR and SFPUC right now on the entire state water project and Hetch-Hetchy. Expensive, but great tools and communications. Evaluating 'what if' scenarios and then stress testing the model projections and the short-term realities against other threats.

Carr – I think the problem is that the uncertainties are very large and the likelihood that all of them can be overcome with the water supply project is very low. I think the additional 20% water conservation is optimistic, and that the Russian River users being agreeable to sending water down here, is at least a question. What I am concerned about is the uncertainty of all three factors, it isn't going to be enough to deal with the problems. My point is to beef up the demand reduction policies, they don't need to be ready in five years, but they need to be developed. It will take a long time to develop the ordinance and regulations and adopt it. It is a long time from starting to end point to get things in place. We should set out with specific direction. These things need to be ramped up and committed to in two years. If there isn't something in the Plan that mentions "do this", it won't happen, and we are failing the public.

Ken Johnson – It takes a long time to implement these things, so they need to be factored into the calendar. When talking about climate change, I have concerns about the scenario we chose. The purpose was not to predict the future but, to use the model and therefore, explore the impact of the monitoring program. I wonder if we don't need to be clearer.

Cornwall (chat) – The fastest type of response to a very dry year or years is to limit pumping in key areas. This will be very unpopular, but it is a necessary response to reality. Agree with Greg Carr. Need enough preparation that the GSA could implement mandatory demand reduction between, say, a dry winter and the following May.

Gilroy (chat) – Agree with Greg Carr. Two years from now we (the GSA) need a document that we can negotiate with Permit Sonoma. That's where the change can/should take place under today's county management system.

DuBay (chat) – Just a reminder that Prop 68 included funding for, and we have an agreement with PRMD to do much of the work laid out by the AC task force. GSA staff have been focused on completing the GSP

and Permit Sonoma has been working on updating the database for Sonoma Valley and will be turning to the well permitting issues soon.

Carr (chat) – That's good, but it still needs to be committed to in the Plan.

Public Comment

Roger Peters – I looked at the Executive Summary. On page 13, it says the Sonoma Valley GSA chose one potential climate change scenario to limit the number of model simulations and to provide better comparability between various potential projects and actions. In a sense it was a testing function, and I don't think it is what the public believes. There is a credibility issue because of that problem. The public will read the document carefully to find answers to three questions:

1. What assumptions were used regarding climate change and water availability?
2. Is the water budget (now as we project using those assumptions) out of whack, or are we close to sustainability with some projects that have been identified?
3. Are we going to have to consider controls on groundwater extraction?

We all know the issues are very complicated. Somehow there needs to be an effort in the document acknowledging the limitations of the assumption that were made, that things are changing and have changed, and there is an intention and commitment to be looking at situations where the water situation is not normal or wetter. As you go through the document there is a discussion about normal and wetter but nothing about drier. If we are going to err on the side of drier or wetter, I would rather err on drier because if it is wetter, we don't have a problem. If it is drier, we have a big problem, so this document needs to convey to the public that there is a sense of urgency. I don't get that anywhere in the document. I am uncomfortable because the three questions I mentioned aren't addressed. It seems there is reluctance to mention "groundwater extraction controls". I don't know why; it should be front and center as one of the policy options that is being considered because it is going to be seriously considered everywhere else in California.

Trotta – We are in the process of making changes to the documents and putting some demand projection options to the forefront. We currently include a discussion of other potential management actions in section 3 in more detail. We can pull from there to make some of the things are clearer upfront in section 6 and in the Executive Summary.

Questions/Comments

Ken Johnson – I agree the public is going to be very interested in Roger Peters' comments. I would suggest that the Executive Summary include the three questions as separate paragraphs and address some of these issues upfront. The bottom line is, there are some actions that we may need to take if things go drier than we want or expect them to. I think introducing the urgency to the overall objective is important.

Hill (chat) – I'd like to thank Roger Peters for his thoughtful comments.

Whitsett (chat) – Thank You Roger Peters!

Cornwall (chat) – If the plan includes statements about water demand for future housing, it must say how much less water-hungry new housing is or can be than most of our existing housing. This is one of those policy levers that the GSA could work with.

Vicki Hill (chat) – Re the point that Roger Peters brought up about the housing needs of Sonoma Valley and the assumptions around that and if we want to put some caveats about the assumptions that were made; what the Regional Housing Needs Allocation are (the targeted) numbers (of homes) for Sonoma county (from ABAG) that are not on par with what the General Plan or what our projected growth is.

Trotta (chat) – Yes, thank you [to Roger Peters], very helpful to have your comments.

Advisory Committee General Assessment of the GSP

Objective: Assess Advisory Committee member perceptions of the GSP after review of comments received.

Zoom Rating, Open Text and GSP Components polls were conducted by Ann DuBay live at the meeting. It serves as an indication to share with the Board. DuBay explained the Response Key.

- 1- Needs substantial modification
- 2- Needs minor modification
- 3- Ready for public/board review
- 4- I believe this will meet the GSA Board's Needs and all statutory requirements under SGMA
- 5- I believe this meets all statutory requirements and significantly advances sustainability in the basin
- 6- No opinion/ not applicable

Rating Poll – Question 1: Score 1.9 (38% = 1, 50% = 2, 13% = 4)

On a scale of 1-5, What is your general opinion of the GSP (with 1 being “needs improvement” through 5 being “I believe the GSP addresses Sonoma Valley's needs under SGMA”)?

Rating Poll – Question 2: Score 2.4 (14% = 1, 57% = 2, 29% = 4)

On a scale of 1-5, do you feel the Groundwater Sustainability Plan and the Implementation Plan represent a good starting point for achieving sustainability (with 1 representing “will no achieve sustainability” and 5 representing “I believe the GSP will achieve sustainability”)?

Open Text Poll – Question 3: Yes (100%)

Are there any items in the GSP that will likely raise concerns with the stakeholder group that you represent?

Comments

Gilroy (chat) – The concerns of well owner residents in SC were well summarized by Roger Peters' remarks. His list applies.

Carr (chat) – As county rep I can say that there will be stakeholders who like it and those who do not depending upon which policies/programs are being discussed.

Cornwall (chat) – I think the environmental community will be concerned about the climate projections being too rosy, the assurance of sustainability being too optimistic, and the lack of data/clarity/assurance about protecting streamflows. If policy options aren't highlighted, they would be rather annoyed.

Lichty (chat) – Climate modeling, growth projections.

Cornwall (chat) – Regarding issues with the community at-large, refer to Roger Peters’ three questions.

Gilroy (chat) – Same answer.

Open Text Poll – Question 4: Yes (100%)

Do you feel there any items in the GSP that could raise concerns with the community at-large?

Comments

Carr (chat) – Same answer as before...community at-large will feel differently depending upon which issues are being discussed.

Lichty (chat) – Well monitoring.

Carr(chat) – Not sure what reasonable is.

Whitsett (chat) – City of Sonoma concerns are as follows: 1. For the 8th St. East/Denmark area there is no city water line near Napa Rd and there is no potable water supply to recharge groundwater. This area has no Russian River water coming to it. It is technically feasible, but given the public concern about urban growth boundary, is a concern.

Open Text Poll - Question 5: Yes (43%), No (57%)

Does the GSP make the case that it can be reasonably implemented?

Comments

Cornwall (chat) – The crushing drought will influence reception. Vineyards shouldn’t be seen as being let to continue past levels of water use, while levels decline, and streams dry up.

Gilroy (chat) – The implications of implementation are not described in the Plan - at least not in a way and in a location that the public can use and understand.

Cornwall (chat) – Regarding implementation: it’s so much easier to implement voluntary projects, even expensive ones, but policy changes are far harder.

GSP Components / score 1-5 (6 = no opinion)

Layout – Score 2.3 (71% = 2, 29% = 3)

Graphics – Score 2.1 (14% = 1, 57% = 2, 29% = 3)

Clear/Understandable – Score 1.9 (14% = 1, 86% = 2)

Underlying Science – Score 2.7 (29% = 2, 71% = 3)

Projects/Management Actions – Score 1.9 (29% = 1, 57% = 4, 14% = 3)

Sustainable Management Criteria – Score 3.0 (100% = 3)

Water Budget/Usage Estimates – Score 2.3 (71% = 2, 29% = 3)

Updates

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

Ann DuBay mentioned the Sept 27 Board meeting will be to discuss the release of the draft GSP, to review comments received from the Advisory Committee, and discuss the October public meeting.

Mitch Buttress gave an update on the multi-level monitoring well progress. He said they have been working with landowners on potential sites and have narrowed it down to four sites spread throughout basin: 1) Sonoma County Road, Maintenance Yard; 2) Burndale Road at Herschel Rd; 3) Hwy 12 at Hwy 121, and 4) Arnold River at Felder Road. The project is currently out to bid; bids are due September 21. Staff is finalizing easements with property owners and construction is anticipated to start early 2022. Various challenges encountered include bids coming in higher than expected mainly due to material costs. For this reason, the project was put out to bid with a base bid for three multi-level monitoring well locations, with the fourth location included as an optional bid item.

Comments/Questions

Ken Johnson – Did you consider multi-port installation methods, like the West Bay instrument type of monitoring device?

Buttress – We didn't consider it. Some are limited by depth. I remember when I did one of those in the past, the monitoring costs were quite high. Here, we went low-end as far as costs, we considered sonic drilling, but costs are too high.

Johnson – Are they going to mobilize multiple rigs throughout the county?

Buttress – We have the option to do multiple rigs. We gave them six months from award to finish the project.

Johnson – They are busy these days. You were going to say something more about the well, marked 'alternate' on the map.

Buttress – SVD and WD are on the east side of the eastside fault where there is a big data gap, SVDMW 3 is the alternate because there are many hurdles to being on a Caltrans right of way.

Andrea Rodriguez on outreach, reported that the consultant has developed a new landing page – <http://sonomacountygroundwater.org/>, have a look, provide your feedback to staff. Messaging and materials are under development including POP postcards, social media messaging, a fact sheet and FAQ templates, as well as lawn signs: 4G H2O, For Groundwater!, and sonomacountygroundwater.org. The drought drop-by held on Aug 21 was very successful.

Jane Whitsett – Exciting, monitoring wells and public outreach is looking really good.

Review Action Items and ask for any Closing Comments

Tim Parker said the next AC meeting is November 9. A community meeting (possibly virtual) will be held on Oct. 12, save the date. He thanked everyone for attending and their comments and then reviewed the list of action items:

- Work on action plan and future schedule/goals for AC –November
- Create narrative for 10% conservation – will get something out for AC review in October
- At end of public review period, share comments with the Advisory Committee members

Caitlin Cornwall thanked everyone for their work on this complicated topic. She adjourned the meeting at 5:14 p.m.

Attendees:

Advisory Committee Members (present)

Caitlin Cornwall
Craig Lichty – departed 4:55
Greg Carr
Jane Whitsett
Kenneth Johnson
Norman Gilroy
Steve Wolf – arrived later
Vicki Hill

Advisory Committee Members (absent)

Fred Allebach
Jim Bundschu
Matt Stornetta
Taylor Serres

Staff/Presenters

Ann DuBay, Sonoma Valley GSA Administrator
Marcus Trotta, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff
Andy Rich, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff
Mitch Buttress, Sonoma Water, Technical Staff – arrived later
Andrea Rodriguez, Sonoma Water, Outreach Staff
Simone Peters, GSA Administrative Aide (recording meeting summary)

Facilitator

Tim Parker

Members of Public

Roger Peters

First Name	Last Name	Agency or Organization (if applicable)	Address (City)	Attachments	Overall Comments	Page or Figure Number	Entry Date
Wendy	Krupnick	CAFF	Santa Rosa	https://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-1ec770bd601ac3000ba0123f66991f86/2021/10/GSP-comments_10-31-2021.pdf	Please see attached comments from Sonoma County chapter Community Alliance with Family Farmers.		10/31/2021 16:50
Wendy	Smit	Milo Baker chapter, California Native Plant Society	Healdsburg	https://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-1ec770bd601ac3000ba0123f66991f86/2021/10/MB-Comments-on-Grundwater-Sustainability-10302021.pdf			10/31/2021 14:29
Stephen	Rogers	VOMWD / GSA / Chantarelle HOA	Sonoma		<p>Tremendous good work has been done in the document to lay out where and how water is used in the basin and future stresses on the basin from existing and new wells. Very specific work has been done and outlined in the document on how some projects will impact the future of the basin. Section 6: Simulation of Projects and Management Actions Groundwater Sustainability Plan for Sonoma Valley Groundwater Subbasin places too much emphasis on Projects at the expense of Voluntary and other means of reducing current draw from the aquifers. The document has a projects first bias for solving Below Minimum Thresholds rather than voluntary and specific plans to reduce current draw. No apparent cost benefit analysis is presented tin the document to guide leadership in approving budgets of projects for various plans. Although the document plans on Grants to defer the costs of some projects, the ongoing costs, such as the cost of water for ASR are not mentioned and these costs could be significant.</p> <p>The budgeted amount for plans to promote voluntary reductions in acquihire draw of \$80,00 is insufficient to mount any kind of campaign that has significant impact. In addition, no mention is made on how this campaign will be managed and how results will be measured. Other measures such as metering, well permit restrictions do not seem to have measurable impacts so the Board could make decision about trade offs between projects that have significant funding requirements vs well permit restrictions or mandatory best practices.</p>		10/30/2021 16:08
Jessie	Maxfield	CA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife-Bay Delta Region	Fairfield	https://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-1ec770bd601ac3000ba0123f66991f86/2021/10/Sonoma-Valley-Groundwater-Basin-GSP-DuBay-MAXFIELD102721.pdf			10/30/2021 7:22

Ngodoo	Atume		Oakland	https://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-1ec770bd601ac3000ba0123f66991f86/2021/10/Public-Comment-Letter_DraftGSP_Sonoma.pdf	<p>Hello, I am writing on behalf of Audubon California, Clean Water Action, Clean Water Fund, Local Government Commission, The Nature Conservancy, and Union of Concerned Scientists with the attached comments on the draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan for this basin. We know that SGMA plan development and implementation is a major undertaking, and we want every basin to be successful. We would be happy to meet with you to discuss our evaluation as you finalize your Plan for submittal to DWR. Feel free to contact us at ngos.sgma@gmail.com for more information or to schedule a conversation. Sincerely, Ngodoo Atume, Water Policy Analyst , Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund</p>		10/29/2021 14:03
Todd	Board		GLEN ELLEN		<p>It's a curious thing to draft these comments during the late October atmospheric river (AR), with a rain gauge topping 7 inches since this event began less than 24 hours ago. ARs are the ultimate rain forecasting "black swan," certain to occur at least occasionally over the very long term, yet impossible to predict with confidence more than perhaps a week out, even while they significantly impact seasonal rainfall totals. I comment because I see on page 3-129 figure 3-38, "projected mean participation under future climate scenario." At a high level, the depiction is very misleading for a generalist audience, since the precise amounts at the water-year (WY) level look very much like out-year precision forecasts. It may be that the blue line into the future is the only intended reference to "mean" values – or, are the individual WY forecasts themselves also (presumably) intended to reflect means within broader outcome bands (drawn from various modeling scenarios in the ensemble)? Instead of dots, should each WY's value show a vertical band of plausible scenarios? Are the WY values literally means (involving occasional outliers, in turn involving some degree of expert judgment for inclusion/exclusion from the mean)? Should these means instead be the inherently more conservative median as an indication of central tendency? I understand why means (with thoughtful outlier excision) might be included here to build in plausible worst-case/max-swing scenarios, but ideally this would be made explicit somewhere, and I don't see where it is. The preceding page says that appendix 3-A provides a detailed summary of how future conditions were incorporated in the model – but I don't see that in 3-A, nor do I see any other appendix titles that would seem to.</p>		

Todd	Board		GLEN ELLEN	<p>Regardless of exactly what’s intended by the term “mean” here, the experienced modelers certainly understand the WY values as a reflection of central tendency among ensemble scenarios. Underlying the pattern of out-year dots connected by the dotted line “must be” some form of error/variation range, accessible to the modelers but not to the public. The problem with this data representation is that it’s far too easy for generalist readers to interpret these as (quite magical) precision WY forecasts when they aren’t, because of course they can’t be. This (seeming, though I must assume not literally intended) “artificial precision” can in turn lead members of the public to think several things: (1)The forecast of relatively wet years in the next 1-2 decades is suspect, meant to calm anxieties about the urgency for drought planning...; (2)Or, the relatively wet-leaning forecast means we have an opportunity/need to get moving on greater groundwater well retention investment...(3)Or, a seeming “certainty” of see-saw rainfall pattens over time means we need to plan based on the implied sequencing effects, showing swings between wet and dry years (or runs of wet or dry years) as shown in figure 3-38. I saw a reply from Jay Jasperse to a question in the recent SV GSP public meeting, at least implying that sequencing effects aren’t practically operative in using the model [“we don’t use the sequence pattern of precipitation”], rather that interannual variability is the modeling focus. The way the data are publicly represented doesn’t fully communicate this understanding, in my mind. The important notion of interannual variability also needs to reflect the inherent predictive variability/uncertainty within years as well.</p>	Page 3-129 10/26/2021 15:23
Todd	Board		GLEN ELLEN	<p>Related, elsewhere I’ve seen informed commentary that, in fact, the sequencing and extent of wet/dry year runs can have an impact on long-run basin characteristics. Given what’s depicted in figure 3-38, if the modeling in fact isn’t attempting to show sequencing effects, though the modelers believe they may be significant, it would be helpful to note this modeling limitation (all models inevitably have limitations). These comments aren’t intended as 11th-hour armchair quarterbacking, or complication. We know there will be forecasting revisions as more data are collected over time. These comments are provided at this juncture because I know there already is confusion among some in the public on this figure, including among some who have paid attention to water use, land use, and environmental concerns for a long time. I don’t believe figure 3-38 communicates what the modelers intended, including the unavoidable degree of uncertainty in a broad forecast of this type. It also would be helpful to clarify the appendix 3-A reference earlier, which doesn’t seem to provide a “a detailed summary of how future conditions were incorporated in the model.” Let’s trim the sails of potential confusion here. It wouldn’t be difficult to include variation/error bands as an overlay to the datapoints depicting central tendency. My guess is that this may help general interpretation of that chart – though of course, there’s always the possibility it may generate new questions (e.g., “how can we reasonably forecast even a broad range of possibilities for a rain year 10/20/30 years out?”).</p> <p>Thanks for all the work the authors have invested in this complex and important process, and thanks for reading public comments.</p>	

			Santa Rosa	<p>Appendix G, Table 2 has the rankings that were used to pick middle of the road models- yet the rankings seem all over the map for the various parameters, and the report even says the model pick of GEM2-CC, warm-dry, was somewhat arbitrary. It also say that the GCM projections will likely test water supply and management the most, and could be considered for a 'stress test'. This was mentioned in the Q&A- but where are those stress test projections? At very least you need to they run those stress test projections. It is hard to understand how a warm dry model predicts wetter than normal precipitation for the next 20 years. How much weight has been put on the water coming in shorter bursts on fewer days in the winter, causing more runoff and less ground water recharge? How much additional water was factored in for fire fighting, as the wetter winters cause more understory fuel grows, contributing to more and stronger wildfires in the hotter drier spring-summer-fall?</p> <p>You talked about using Russian River flows in the winter to recharge ground water basin through wells. How is this physically done?</p>	Appendix G	10/14/2021 15:34
Craig	Harrison		Santa Rosa	<p>I am unable to attend the meeting on this tonight, but I want to provide brief comments on the draft Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan. These comments also apply to the Petaluma Valley and Santa Rosa Plain groundwater sustainability plans. I understand that all three plans contain an assumption that rainfall will be "above average" during the next 20 or so years. Any such assumption must be justified by science. I suspect it is purely an assumption, because so far as I know there are few if any credible projections for decades in the future. As Yogi Berra famously said, "It's tough to make predictions, especially about the future." If I were projecting rainfall over the coming decade, I would be much more inclined to use the rainfall during the past decade rather than the rainfall during the 1970s, 1980, 1990s, or any other prior time. We are told by scientists and politicians that we're in a "new normal" when it comes to drought and wildland fires. Why assume the "old normal" is still the current norm? This element of the plan seems likely to drive most results and policies that will be based on the plans. Unless your assumed can be justified, I suggest that you do the following. Perform all analyses based on three different scenarios/assumptions: 1. Average rainfall over a designated period. 2. Above average rainfall by a certain percentage over a designated period. 3. Under average rainfall by the same percentage over a designated period.</p>		10/12/2021 15:45
Deborah	Eppstein		Santa Rosa	<p>Thank you for all your work on these GSAs. Although I not am a water expert, I am a scientist. As a scientist, I am very concerned that the climate model chosen, predicting wetter weather for the next 20 years, does not reflect best current knowledge concerning hotter drier climate, with significantly more water loss to evaporation-transpiration. Even with a slightly wetter model, predictions are for precipitation to come in shorter, more intense periods during the winter, with much less during the former shoulder periods of spring and fall. Even if greater total precipitation, this pattern causes more runoff and less ground water recharge. Also climate predictions include more intervening years of severe drought which further cause ground water levels to lower, even if they are followed by wetter years. Using only a model that predicts more than average rainfall for the next 20 years is ignoring the science. At very least I recommend that you use a range of options, and prepare for the worst scenario. If updates are made every 5 years, we could be left high and dry (literally) in 5 years if we base our current planning on a wetter next 20 years, but that does not materialize.</p>		10/12/2021 15:18

deborah	Eppstein		Santa Rosa	<p>https://sonomavalleygroundwater.org/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-1ec770bd601ac3000ba0123f66991f86/2021/10/water-Projected-Changes-in-Reference-Evapotranspiration-in-California-and-Nevada-Implications-for-Drought.pdf</p>	<p>This allows a sensitivity analysis for your results and conclusions. The public and decision makers can readily ascertain the degree to which this assumption drives the results. For results that are the same or nearly the same under all three scenarios/assumptions, you will have confidence that you can made sound policy judgments based on those results. Where the results are different, you will have a clear warning that you do not have a sound scientific basis for policy decisions based on these results. In that event, I suggest that you employ the precautionary principle and take actions to preserve options in the event any optimistic assumptions turn out to be wrong. I ask that your report specifically analyze, discuss, and justify your assumptions on rainfall. Failure to do so will cause the public to lose faith in your efforts. It might be contrary to law. Thank you for your work on this important issue. I am concerned that the climate model does not reflect best current knowledge concerning hotter drier climate, with more water loss to evaporations-transpiration and with precipitation coming in shorter, more intense periods, causing more runoff and less ground water recharge, and also with more intervening years of severe drought which further cause ground water levels to lower. Using only a model that predicts more than average rainfall for the next 20 years is ignoring the science- at very least you should be using a range of options, and preparing for the worst scenario.</p> <p>I have not down an exhaustive search, but for example, see article below by McEvoy et al (2020): Earths Future Vol 8, issue 11 Nov 2020; Projected Changes in Reference Evapotranspiration in California and Nevada: Implications for Drought and Wildland Fire Danger; Daniel J. McEvoy, David W. Pierce, Julie F. Kalansky, Daniel R. Cayan, John T. Abatzoglou, First published: 29 October 2020; https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001736</p> <p>Also, what analysis is being done for all the unincorporated areas that are not within the three GSAs? Both agriculture and cannabis as well as homes use ground and surface water in these areas, and this usage may increase significantly if there is not a solid water availability analysis to guide future permitting. Even the state Department of Cannabis Control has asked the county (through Permit Sonoma) to perform analyses of cumulative impacts of water usage across the entire county, for all water uses, surface and groundwater. NOAA has also requested such.</p> <p>I hope you will commit to revise these GSA's before they need to be submitted, to include additional climate prediction models encompassing less precipitation, greater water loss due to evapotranspiration, and periodic years fo extended drought. This may be the new normal.</p>	10/12/2021 8:58
deborah	Eppstein		Santa Rosa			10/12/2021 8:58
rachel	zierdt	The Kut-Ups of Rohnert Park	Sebastopol		<p>Dear SCWA,</p> <p>Although it would be nice to have a crystal ball into the future, the statement that we will be having adequate water supply for the next 20 years seems to be based on conjecture, not science. The county will love to use your statement to justify the fact that we will not be having any water issues moving forward....so that development and agriculture should no problem being expanded. This would be a reckless assumption based on a faulty assumption on your part. Please revise your report to reflect that it is just conjecture or show the science that led you to believe that your report is accurate. Unfortunately much of the county isn't even within the scope of this report which compounds the problem. Regards, Rachel Zierdt</p>	10/12/2021 15:11

Sonoma Valley Advisory Committee Tasks

GSP Implementation 2022-2026

TASK	TECHNICAL INPUT NEEDED?	STAKEHOLDER INPUT NEEDED?	TIMING
Fee study		X	Jan-June, 2022
Policy Options -- Study	X	X	2022-2023
Policy Option -- Implement		X	2023-2026
Data gaps: Refinement of monitoring networks	X	X	2022-2026
Water-Use Efficiency/Alternate Water Sources Project: Assessment of tools	X	X	2022
Water-Use Efficiency/Alternate Water Sources Project: Implementation		X	2023-2025
ASR feasibility study update		X	2022-2024
ASR investigations and pilot		X	2023-2026
ASR project implementation		X	2026
Stormwater Capture/Recharge-Site investigations		X	2022-2024
Stormwater Capture/Recharge-Pilot		X	2023-2025
Annual Reports	X	X	2022-2026
5-year evaluation & Model Updates	X	X	2025-2026
Tracking water use?			
TASK	INFORMATION SHARING AND UPDATES		TIMING
SVCS D Recycled Water Projects			2022-2026
ASR – VOMWD/City of Sonoma			2022-2025
Farm Plan Coordination			2022-23

Sonoma Valley GSA 2022 Meeting Calendar

Board Meeting Zoom Information:

<https://scwa-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/96441789806?pwd=dG5mL3VHekJtcnZ4Z0o3RUtBUzVtZz09>

Meeting ID: 964 4178 9806#

Passcode: 722795#

Advisory Committee Meeting Zoom Information:

<https://scwa-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/92162795993?pwd=L245c0lDd1dQZ01STXMzQmdzTDBpQT09>

Meeting ID: 921 6279 5993#

Passcode: 075557#

Board Dates & Topics	Advisory Committee Dates & Topics
January 24 (if needed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final GSP (placeholder, in case there are any filing issues; needs) 	January 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GSP Implementation: Discussion of policy options Rate/Fee study options
February 28 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee Options 2022-23 Draft Budget 	
March 28 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee options FY 2022-23 Budget Draft GSP Annual Report 	March 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft GSP Annual Report Fee update Policy Options
April 25 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft fee report Policy Options 	
May 23 (if needed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final fee report 	May 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee update Policy options
June 27 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final fee report Fee adoption 	
	July 12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GSP implementation/policy options
August 22 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GSP Implementation/policy options Fee 	
	September 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GSP implementation/policy options
October 24 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GSP implementation/policy options 	
November 28 (if needed)	November 8 GSP implementation/policy options
Community Meetings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder Meetings on Fee, March-April, Dates TBD Community Meetings on Fee, April-May, Dates TBD GSP Implementation Update, Fall, Date TBD 	