MEETING NOTES | April 11, 2013
Santa Rosa Plain Basin Advisory Panel

MEETING IN BRIEF

Plan Chapters Reviewed
The Basin Advisory Panel provided feedback on the following chapters. Generally, the Panel was supportive of the chapter content and offered suggestions for refinement to improve the content.

- Chapter 3.0 Current Management Efforts
- Chapter 4.0 Goals and Objectives
- Chapter 5.1 Management Component: Stakeholder Involvement
- Chapter 6.0 (Partial Section) Implementation

USGS Report Presentation July 11 at BAP
USGS plans to release the characterization report in late May 2013 and surface/groundwater flow model in late summer 2013. USGS is scheduled to present on the characterization report at the July 11th Panel meeting; this meeting will be open to the public. USGS will also present the report at an evening public workshop on July 10 or July 11.

http://www.scwa.gov/srgroundwater/

Next Panel Meeting: May 9, 9:00-12:00, at 35 Stony Point Rd.
Topic: Water Quality

MEETING SUMMARY

USGS Study Release
USGS plans to release the characterization report in late May 2013 and surface/groundwater flow model in late summer 2013. USGS is scheduled to present on the characterization report at the July 11th Panel meeting; this meeting will be open to the public. USGS will also present the report at a public workshop on the evening of July 10 or July 11. Staff are planning to update the Groundwater Primer and to develop a fact sheet on the report. The BAP will have a larger meeting room on July 11 to accommodate anticipated visitors.

Groundwater Plan Review & Progress
Tim Parker presented an overview of progress made to date on the groundwater plan. Typically, the Panel has an initial discussion, and then the Technical Advisory Committee talks about the Panel's input providing more insights to allow technical consultant Tim Parker to draft sections. The Technical Advisory Committee then reviews the draft section to ready it for Panel input. During this meeting the Panel reviewed the following sections.

Chapter 3.0 Current Management Efforts

Urban Water Management

- Note that "larger proposed developments" equals more than 500 units.
- Add information about the Santa Rosa Groundwater Master Plan to avoid confusion.
- Clarify that the water agencies prepare the urban water management plans

Water Supply Strategies

- Identify specific strategies from the SCWA Action Plan related to groundwater

Unincorporated Area Water Supply Planning and Management

- Note recommendations for further studies from Pilot Studies of Water Scarce Areas and presence of additional water scarce areas
- Include Map of Water Availability Areas and consider overlying with Recharge Map

Water Conservation

- Section doesn't really represent the extensive existing conservation programs. Provide more detail from the SCWA annual report on gray water, rainwater harvesting, etc.

Water Reuse

- Note that water reuse has to be appropriately applied (quality and quantity) as noted in the General Plan water element
- Specify levels of treatment and distinguished between highly treated recycled water and untreated gray water
- Jennifer Burke will provide language on City of Santa Rosa's Water Recycling Program

Chapter 4.0 Goals and Objectives

The Panel agreed that certain objectives were trying to accomplish too much. The Panel recommended that the project team refine the objectives to focus on a primary purpose rather attempting to address multiple concepts. TAC members reported that this recommendation had also come up in the TAC meeting. The project team will work on revisions.

Chapter 5.1 Management Component: Stakeholder Involvement

Another role for stakeholders is to advocate for public funding to realize the goals of the groundwater management plan tied to the legislation that supports groundwater planning.

Chapter 6.0 (Partial Section) Implementation

The Cooperating Partners have not agreed to fund implementation as noted in the graphic.

The Panel, similar to the note under Chapter 5.1, recommended that a role in implementation is advocating for funding.

As part of implementation, the Panel would like to see an action item to identify mutual water companies in the area to engage them on groundwater management during implementation. One member mentioned that he knows of one that has 55 homes using groundwater. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is

currently developing a map of mutual water companies. Mutual water company representative Mark Calhoon has a list of about 72 in the project area. Janice Thomas from the Department of Public Health also has access to a list.

Management Component Headings

TAC member Rocky Vogler summarized recent TAC discussions that led to a different organization of the section on groundwater management components. Generally, members accepted the proposal and recommended that the team move forward with developing the plan in concert with this outline.

Modeling Schedule and Implications for Groundwater Plan

Jay Jasperse, SCWA representative on the Panel, asked the Panel for strategic input on the planning schedule. The planning effort is partially funded from a grant from the California Department of Water Resources (through the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan). The current grant schedule requires that the groundwater management plan be complete by December 2013. Because SCWA is concerned the timing of the model that will be used to conduct scenario-based planning may cause the Panel to miss the grant deadline, the group discussed the implications of these timing issues and agreed to continue to monitor carefully.

The model offers a great advantage to the Santa Rosa Plain as USGS has committed substantial resources to this effort, and the model is advanced from the one that SCWA was able to use in the Sonoma Valley. USGS is contracted to do the baseline models. Then, SCWA staff will conduct the scenario modeling with input from the TAC and Panel. The modeling report, which USGS will complete in advance of scenario planning, will provide the water balance that the public has requested. The report will document the estimated inflows and outflows of groundwater over an approximate 25 year period. The scenarios would help the Panel think about how management techniques, like groundwater banking or conservation, might affect the balance.

The Panel debated the pros and cons of completing the plan and then conducting the scenario planning as part of the first year of implementation. Although the scenario planning will contribute insights for groundwater management, the water budget will be part of the modelingreport and provide significant insight into groundwater in the basin. The groundwater management plan without scenarios would meet the requirements for a plan. One member stated that the scenarios would help with prioritization, but doubts that the plan's recommendations will change much as a result of the scenarios analysis. The facilitator expressed concern that if the planning process extends too long, membership will likely change, momentum can wane, and conditions can also change that could potentially jeopardize the likelihood of success for the planning process. Other members echoed the sentiment that they felt momentum was critically important to success so they would likely advocate for completing the plan and doing the scenario planning as part of implementation.

The Panel will continue moving forward to complete the plan and also seek an extension from DWR, as needed, although representatives of the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (which received the grant) are planning to request that DWR extend the deadline for completing other components of the IRWM plan, which would also extend out the deadline for completing the Santa Rosa Plain GMP. Staff will continue to track the schedules for both the USGS model publication and the planning grant and update the Panel on the two options (completing the groundwater management plan and conducting the

scenario planning as part of the first phase of implementation vs. extending the schedule for completing the GMP).

Charter Discussion

In November, the Panel had requested some changes to its charter. During this meeting, the group reviewed those changes and recommended a few more.

The Panel will review its membership annually in June. The Panel will then evaluate if membership to ensure balanced representation with group size.

Although the group had urged that a provision of the charter talk about active membership, Panel members were uncomfortable with the way it was presented. The intent of the language was to notify members not attending regularly that the group would move forward decisions in their absence, only making an effort to contact them if the decision is critical to the group's interest. The facilitator will work on the language with some members and circulate it after the meeting.

PARTICIPANTS

Panel Members
Keith Abeles
Jennifer Burke
Mark Calhoon
Elizabeth Cargay
Rue Furch
Joe Gaffney
Dawna Gallagher
Maureen Geary
Ed Grossi
Jay Jasperse
Darren Jenkins
Bill Keene
Sue Kelly
Gary Mickelson
Curt Nichols
Pete Parkinson
Rocky Vogler
Walt Ryan

Other Participants
Sierra Cantor
Dino Bonos
Alydda Mangelsdorf
Jeremiah Puget
Craig Hunt
Holly Lundborg
Bob Anderson

Staff
Tim Parker, Technical
Marcus Trotta, Project Manager
Jennifer Laroque, SCWA
Public Affairs
Gina Bartlett, Facilitator