

Meeting Summary

Ukiah Valley Basin Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation Meeting

January 26, 2017

County Administration Center, Agriculture Building Conference Room

890 North Bush Street

Ukiah, CA

Prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy, CSU Sacramento (based on meeting notes taken by Sarah Dukett)

Background	1
Meeting Summary	1
1. Welcome, Introductions, Review of Previous Meeting Summary & Overview of Today's Meeting	2
2. GSA Formation Committee Working Group Report	2
3. Research Update	2
4. Update on Draft JPA	4
5. Next steps and Timing	5
Attendance	6

Background

California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) provides a statewide framework for sustainable groundwater management. SGMA is intended to support local groundwater management through the oversight of local agencies, which are required to form Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) by June 30, 2017. GSAs must develop groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) by 2020 or 2022 (depending on priority) to achieve sustainability within twenty years of the GSP's adoption.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) is providing GSA development support to the County of Mendocino (the County) and various stakeholders in the Ukiah Valley Basin (the Basin). Following a series of public workshops held by the County in 2015, the DWR tasked the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) at California State University, Sacramento to support GSA formation efforts, including assessing the perspectives of a diverse set of stakeholders, facilitating stakeholder discussions, and helping finalize the governance process(es) for one or more GSAs. This is the seventh public meeting held as part of this process, and the sixth meeting held of the group as a GSA Formation Committee. After the July meeting, a Working Group was formed to discuss further possible GSA structures and return with these to the larger group.

Meeting Summary

This meeting's purpose and goals were to:

- Discuss draft Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) for the proposed GSA; and
- Identify next steps re: GSA formation.

Supporting Documents (on County website)

Supporting Document A – Meeting agenda

Supporting Document B – UC Davis presentation slides

Supporting Document C – LACO presentation slides

Supporting Document D – Draft JPA version 2.0_2

1. Welcome, Introductions, Review of Previous Meeting Summary & Overview of Today's Meeting

Mendocino County Supervisor Carre Brown welcomed attendees to the meeting. People introduced themselves.

Facilitator Dave Ceppos of the Center for Collaborative Policy, who was sitting in for Malka Kopell, reviewed the agenda.

By consensus, agenda item 4 was moved up to third position so that it could inform the discussion of the draft JPA.

2. GSA Formation Committee Working Group Report

Sarah Dukett reported back on the last Working Group meeting. This meeting occurred, as planned, on Jan. 5, and included Supervisors Susan Gorin and David Rabbitt from Sonoma County.

This meeting addressed a number of issues that had come up at the previous general meeting, and resulted in the following edits and additions to the draft JPA:

1. Costs should be accounted for in the technical assistance – this has been added to the draft JPA (section 13.4).
2. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be created (section 11.3).
3. Language reflecting Russian River Flood Control's (RRFC's) consolidation and recusal from GSA discussion was added (section 7.1.3).
4. Language was added to reflect that members of the GSA board must be elected officials (section 7.1.1).
5. Language was added that would allow people applying for the agricultural seat to apply through the Farm Bureau or the County (section 7.3.2a).
6. Language specifying the development of MOUs and by-laws was added (section 18.3).
7. There were no changes to the language on dues and voting.

3. Research Update

Presentation 1: Maritza Flores Marquez and Samuel Sandoval Solis, UC Davis – also see Supporting Document B

UC Davis has been preparing a water budget with an accompanying geo-database for the Ukiah Valley groundwater basin, which includes the Ukiah and Redwood valleys. The model accounts for all inflows to and outflows from the system, and captures changes in groundwater storage. Its period of coverage is 1991-2015.

Key findings:

1. Despite some important limits with the available data (a few annual gaps – 2005, 2008 – and a general shortage of data from the northern part of the basin), the aquifer seems to be stable: that is, not in overdraft.
2. The model suggests that surface water-groundwater interaction is occurring in different ways during different times of year. The Russian River is gaining water from the groundwater basin during the November to June period, in the amount of roughly 25 million acre-feet per year. During July to October, the recharge goes in the other direction, from the Russian River to the groundwater basin, although at a much smaller magnitude (645 acre-feet per year). Some of this may include the effects of discharges from Lake Mendocino.
3. There also appears to be lateral connectivity between groundwater basins. Losses occur from the Ukiah Valley groundwater basin to the Hopland Valley basin, while gains occur from either surface water or the Hopland Valley basin. The team suspects that the gains are due to surface water, but they cannot be sure from the available data.

The team has a number of steps outlined for the coming months, including finishing the geo-database and the report, and sharing results with LACO (see next presentation).

Key recommendations include installing an additional stream-flow gauge in the area north of Redwood Valley in order to improve the available data.

Q&A:

1. *Clarify where the gauge should go?* Near the boundary of Redwood Valley Water District, in the Russian River.
2. *Statement regarding current and possible gauge locations in the northern reaches.* It would be great to have another gauge up north.
3. *Were there any monitoring wells that showed the river discharging to groundwater, or was this finding just the result of the [water-balance] calculation?* The latter: from 1991 [onward?], the relevant data only came twice a year. This is just a baseline for the USGS to improve on.
4. *What was the source of the surface-water diversion data?* Reported diversions from a variety of sources (not “face amounts”).

Presentation 2: Brian Wallace, LACO Associates – also see Supporting Document C

LACO is working on an initial groundwater sustainability plan for the Ukiah Valley; their scope of work includes:

- Compiling existing data, doing a data gap analysis and writing a groundwater monitoring protocol manual;
- Creating a groundwater conceptual model that will aid in the interpretation of the numerical model that the USGS is creating; and
- Improving the precision of some of the terms of the existing water budget (cf. presentation 1), specifically increasing the precision of the terms of surface water-groundwater interaction, changes in storage, and boundary flow.
- Later, they will be working on the development of sustainable groundwater management criteria.

Progress report:

1. Outreach and agency collaboration is ongoing.

2. Compilation of existing data is complete.
3. Surface water-groundwater data gap analysis is complete.
4. The Groundwater Monitoring Protocol Manual is complete.
5. The hydrogeologic conceptual model is 20% complete.
6. The water budget development is 20% complete.
7. The development of sustainable groundwater management criteria has not started yet.

Q&A:

1. *What kind of specifics are you thinking about in terms of additional gauges?* They have not gotten into specifics yet – still at the conceptual level.

4. Update on Draft JPA

The draft JPA is provided as Supporting Document D.

The discussion began with general comments before proceeding section by section.

General comments

- One participant pointed out that the draft JPA does not currently have a clear scope when it comes to GSA structure, and asked how detailed the GSA needs to be, versus leaving details for the bylaws. Sarah, speaking for the Working Group, said that this is up to the group to decide. A number of participants expressed preference for making the JPA fairly general since it is difficult to change later.
- One specific dimension of this was a suggestion that the JPA reference an MOU with non-GSA members of TAC (e.g. Sonoma County Water Agency) that will be developed in parallel. A working group (Tamara, Jay, Patricia, Sarah) will begin working on the particulars for this MOU.
- There was also debate about how narrow or broad the TAC membership should be. Comments included:
 - The TAC should contain definite seats for elected officials and staff, plus additional seats as needed.
 - There are a lot of options for adding seats to the TAC (e.g. an environmental seat), as in the Sonoma Valley, where there is a wider representation than just board members and staff.

There was some debate about this, with no consensus.
- Please email any typos, run-on words, etc. in the draft JPA to Sarah in track-changes mode.

Section by section

Introductory paragraph and Recitals

- Clarification was requested on the creation of the tribal seat. Since tribes are sovereign under SGMA (they are allowed to participate but not obligated), the tribal seat will be created at the first meeting of the four GSA-eligible (state) agencies.
- In the introductory paragraph, “all of which” should be “both of which” since the Sonoma County Water Agency was removed.

Terms of Agreement

- Articles 1–5: no comments.
- Article 6. There was some discussion on the issue of how to apportion “previously incurred costs” to new members, since this could create disincentives to join. It was stated that this topic

had already been discussed in the context of differentiating RCDs from other members, and earlier language had been developed at that time; but a decision had been made later to remove that language in favor of the current language.

- Article 7 brought up four distinct concerns:
 - There was a concern that section 7.1.3 does not adequately address the issue of agencies having equal voting power, particularly in the case of Russian River Flood Control (RRFC). This was discussed extensively, and came up again at the end of the meeting. One proposal was for language that would require RRFC to defer to the Upper Russian River Water Agency, although this was not conclusively resolved. This issue remains outstanding. One proposal was for URRWA to represent Flood Control on the GSA Board; the other proposal was for recusal language not allowing Flood Control to participate in GSA matters with URRWA.
 - A question came up about the potential consolidation of the members of the Upper Russian River Water Agency into a single water district: what if it does not happen? Dave Ceppos from CCP noted in other areas in the state where water agency mergers are taking place or proposed, SGMA is generally proceeding with how things are *now*.
 - There was a concern with the addition of language in section 7.3.2a that enables the County to nominate people. It was clarified that this was added as a way to facilitate public participation in cases where people were not used to dealing with the Farm Bureau, and was not intended to be a review process by the County.
 - There is no language that describes the process for removing and replacing stakeholder directors, since they are different from member directors. It was requested that this be clarified.
 - A concern was raised that the process of nominating the agricultural stakeholder director was not inclusive enough. In answer to a question about how this is dealt with elsewhere, Dave Ceppos said that the CCP generally advises an aggressive approach to stakeholder inclusion and a careful effort to document this in case there are challenges later.
- Article 8: no comments.
- Article 9: There was extensive discussion on the issue of non-paying board members voting on fiscal items (section 9.3).
 - One proposal was that the phrase “including but not limited to” be removed in order to place clear limits on this exclusion, but there was no consensus on this.
 - There was also a proposal to remove this clause entirely, but there was no consensus on this.
- Article 10–18: no comments.

5. Next steps and Timing

Before the next meeting, the group specified above (Section 4, General Comments) will meet and put together an outline for scope of the TAC.

The County will do another review of the draft JPA and incorporate edits discussed today.

The next meeting will focus on the lingering issues (notably sections 7 and 9), and then hopefully discuss steps for ratification in order to meet the June deadline.

A Doodle survey and Dave Ceppos’s email address will go out to everyone.

Attendance

Attendees included but were not limited to the following individuals:

- Jerry Cardoza, URRWA
- Brandi Brown, Redwood Valley Rancheria
- Carre Brown, Mendocino County
- Kevin Doble, City of Ukiah
- Brian Wallace, LACO
- Chris Watt, LACO
- Jarod Thiele, City of Ukiah
- Mike Webster, MCRCD
- Devon Jones, MCFB
- Frost Pauli, MCFB
- Roger Kellerman, City of 10,000 Buddhas
- Carmel Angelo, Mendocino County
- Dan Hamburg, Mendocino County
- Aaron Cuthbertson, California DWR
- Tamara Alaniz, RRFC
- Patricia Hickey, MCRCD
- Bill Koehler, Upper Russian River Water Agency
- Jay Jasperse, SCWA
- Maritza Flores, UC Davis
- Sam Sandoval, UC Davis
- Susan Knopf
- Zack Sampsel, Pinoleville Pomo Nation
- Granville Pool, RVCWD
- Dave Ceppos, CCP
- Linda Mendez, UC Davis