

MEETING NOTES | May 15, 2014

Santa Rosa Plain Basin Advisory Panel

MEETING IN BRIEF

Announcements.

- Consultant Tim Parker updated the Basin Advisory Panel on the "Governor's Sustainable Groundwater Management Initiative." (See Appendix A.)

Meeting Overview.

- Project Manager Marcus Trotta and Technical Consultant Tim Parker oriented the Panel to revisions to GMP Sections 2 and 6, and two versions of the draft executive summary; the Panel provided feedback.
- Facilitator Marci DuPraw (CCP) led a discussion of the Panel's readiness to launch a new committee to work on raising funds for GMP project implementation, and elicited their thoughts on the focus, composition, and approach of such a committee.
- Facilitator Rich Wilson (CCP) led a discussion focusing on finalizing plans for the May community forums seeking public feedback on the draft GMP.
- Facilitator Marci DuPraw (CCP) encouraged Panel members to brief their respective organizations and constituencies on the draft GMP, and invited Panel members to identify any assistance they might need with this.

The next Panel Meeting will take place June 12, 9:00-12:00, at 35 Stony Point Rd, Santa Rosa.

Topics: The June Panel meeting will focus on review of the GMP as a whole, discussion of how to incorporate feedback received during the May community forums into the draft GMP, and mapping final steps toward formal approval of the GMP.

MEETING SUMMARY

Revised Draft GMP: Executive Summary; Sections 2 & 6

Project Manager Marcus Trotta and Technical Consultant Tim Parker oriented the Panel to revisions to GMP Sections 2 and 6, explaining that these sections had been revised to make them more reader-friendly. Tim and Marcus also distributed two versions of a draft executive summary, differing in length and level of detail; one is comprehensive and one is succinct – more like a fact sheet for lay people. They propose to use both in different contexts, and want each to work as a stand-alone document when needed. They asked for any further written feedback on these materials by Monday, May 19. Panel feedback was as follows:

- Regarding Revised Draft GMP Section 2:
 - Where we provide numerous facts, add text to make the relevance of those facts clear (e.g., why they are important). See for example, p. 2-45, "simulations results... 54%...");
 - Where we talk about "average pumping... 48,600 acre feet over one year" on p. 2-13, be sure the essential message is clear to readers. They want to know what our real water use is.
 - In the following section, where we discuss rural domestic water use, use of the average is misleading; what is the peak, the range, the trend?

- Parts are still much too technical.
 - When we talk about trend lines and average use, note population and land use changes – they affect trends.
 - Show high and low or maybe a 5 or 10-year average so we can see numbers growing; explain reasons for highs and lows.
 - The description of the model comes from USGS. Can we select what subset of information we want to include here to show trends and make new graphs accordingly? Our job is to translate and explain the work of USGS in a way that lay people can understand. (Marcus affirmed that this is possible.)
 - In Section 2, under “recharge,” there is a note that the figures are in a separate file; please send those out to Panel for review.
 - The recharge discussion comes after the flood control section. What is the recharge potential with projects after re-establishing recharge basins above flood control channels? (Marcus indicated that this is a proposed action in Section 5. Section 2 is just where we are talking conceptually about the use of the model for scenario analysis).
 - Does the recharge map include recharge rates? (Marcus explained that there are two recharge maps. One from the Stormwater Recharge Scoping Study for the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed, uses GIS to show the slope of the land, soil permeability, geology and ranks relative recharge qualitatively based on those factors, but does not include rates. Marcus also noted that the other recharge map is from the USGS model report and shows *net recharge*, which does include rates that are estimated annual averages. Tim added that the USGS report is more spatially-specific regarding recharge, since it models activity cell-by-cell.)
- Regarding the draft Executive Summaries:
- Be sure to put facts in context so readers understand what they mean.
 - The discussion of decreased streamflow on p. ES-8 is good; expand, and use that text in the body of the plan.
 - In the following paragraph, clarify the meaning of the phrase “climate change lowers groundwater discharge to streams” and clarify why that is so important.
 - Also clarify what “evapotranspiration” is and why it is important.
 - Pete Parkinson offered to do a close edit if staff will send him the Word version.
 - Marcus noted there was an error on p. ES-8 where there is a reference to the average acre feet from 1976-2010. It should be an average of 3,300 acre feet.
 - We should distribute the shorter Executive Summary at the upcoming community forums.
 - Include a paragraph on “why we’re doing this” upfront in the Executive Summaries, the GMP as a whole, and in Rich Wilson’s opening remarks at the community forums. The current reference to water resources being increasingly stressed in the future is not persuasive enough yet. There is related text we could draw from in the PowerPoint slides prepared for the May community forums.
 - It is not clear what is meant by the sentence, “Success means well-owner and stakeholder participation.” Readers (and community forums participants) may ask what that means for the average person; we should prepare a response and

put it in the Executive Summary before we discuss what groundwater management is. Think “Groundwater and Me” – folks want to know where they fit in.

- The first paragraph refers to watershed in two different ways. Clarify the relationship between the Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed and the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sub-basin. (They are roughly contiguous, but it will confuse readers to use the terms interchangeably, at least without explaining first.)

Approach for Raising Funds for GMP Project Implementation: Initial Discussion

Facilitator Marci DuPraw led an initial discussion about establishing a fundraising committee to support GMP project implementation. (The previous ad hoc GMP Funding Subcommittee focused on funding for core functions, not projects.) The Panel had mentioned creating such a committee at some point, and Marci asked if: a) they felt ready to move forward with this; b) if so, whether they had thoughts on timing, charge, and composition; and c) if they would prefer to deal with project funding in some other way. Panel feedback was as follows:

- It’s good to have this discussion, but we’re not quite ready to launch this committee. We need to focus on the May community forums and getting the GMP approved first.
- The committee’s efforts should be driven by GMP priorities.
- In preparation for getting this committee launched, we should flesh out the feasibility of the priority recommended projects first, so that the committee can proactively pursue funding for the most “ripe” projects first.
- The committee should bring recommendations to the Panel for consideration, rather than act independently of the Panel.
- Committee members should include those who might be able to fund projects as well as others who may know of funding sources.
- Sonoma Resource Conservation District volunteers to be on the committee.
- Members of the committee need not be on the Panel; the Sonoma County Community Foundation would be a helpful member of the committee if they are willing to join.
- Composition will also likely be informed by the proposed projects and who has “stakes” in those proposed projects; those folks should participate.

Fine-Tuning Plans for Community Forums

Rich Wilson (CCP) led a discussion focused on fine-tuning plans for the May community forums, which he has been asked to facilitate. He went over the final agenda and talking points for the forums. Marcus and Tim went over the proposed Power Point presentation, which the community forum planning committee has helped refine. They invited additional feedback from Panel members, who in turn suggested numbering the slides and pointed out a math error to fix.

Rich asked Panel members to volunteer to help staff information tables at the community forums. Lloyd Iversen, Garrett Broughton, Dawna Gallagher, and Beth Lamb volunteered. Rich indicated that he would coordinate with them via email, as well as on site; he asked them to show up at the forums at 5:30pm for that purpose. Panel members noted the need for microphones and a laser pointer at the forums, which will be provided. All were encouraged to spread the word about these forums throughout their networks and encourage broad participation.

Check-in On Your Constituent Briefings

Facilitator Marci DuPraw encouraged Panel members to schedule briefings with those whom they represent to ensure they are comfortable with the final draft GMP at this important juncture. She distributed a briefing sign-up sheet (see Appendix B) and report-back forms. She encouraged anyone who needs assistance with such briefings to speak with staff.

Action Items

- Panel members are asked to schedule briefings on the final draft GMP for those whom you represent.
- Panel members who volunteered to staff information tables at the May community forums will arrive at 5:30pm to coordinate roles.
- Tim will send Pete Parkinson the Word version of the Executive summaries; Pete will provide a close edit.

Participants

Panel Members

- Garrett Broughton, Town of Windsor
- Sue Kelly, City of Sebastopol
- Tito Sasaki, Sonoma County Farm Bureau
- Dave Vossler, GHD (alternate for Elizabeth Cargay, Well Owner & Foothills of Windsor Homeowners Association)
- Jennifer Burke, City of Santa Rosa
- Rue Furch, Sebastopol Water Information Group (SWIG) and Sierra Club
- Jane Nielson, Sonoma County Water Coalition and O.W.L. Foundation
- Pete Parkinson (retired), County of Sonoma permit and resources Management Department
- Kara Heckert, Sonoma Resource Conservation District
- Maureen Geary, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
- Keith Abeles, Community Alliance of Family Farmers
- John Nagle, Sonoma County Winegrape Commission
- Ed Grossi, Sweet Lane Nursery
- Gary Mickelson, California Ground Water
- Dawna Gallagher, Well Owner
- Lloyd Iversen, Local Well Owner
- Daniel Sanchez, North Bay Association of Realtors

Observers

- Len Holt, Resident
- Beth Lamb, NCRWQCB

Staff

- Marcus Trotta, Water Agency (Project Manager)
- Tim Parker, Parker Groundwater (Technical Consultant)
- Marci DuPraw, Center for Collaborative Policy (Facilitator of Panel & Funding Subcommittee)
- Rich Wilson, Center for Collaborative Policy (Facilitator of Technical Advisory Committee & Community Forums Planning Committee)
- Pam Kuhn, Water Agency