MEETING NOTES | August 14, 2014
Santa Rosa Plain Basin Advisory Panel

MEETING IN BRIEF
Meeting Overview

- Facilitator Rich Wilson re-capped the July Panel meeting and subsequent outreach effort that informed development of the August meeting agenda and ensured broad Panel member preparedness. During this time, a broad cross-section of Panel members expressed interest to weigh in on whether or not to recommend the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) for adoption by the Water Agency Board of Directors.
- The Panel, using decision-making procedures outlined in its charter, initially conducted a straw poll to determine consensus, or lack thereof, and then focus subsequent discussion. The straw poll vote demonstrated that the Panel did not have complete consensus, but did have sufficient votes to recommend the GMP for adoption.
- In the absence of consensus, the Panel explored and documented minority opinion. In addition, the public was given the opportunity to provide comments on the GMP.
- The Panel then conducted a formal vote and recommended the GMP for adoption. (Vote results and associated comments included below.)
- Technical Consultant Tim Parker provided an update on the Water Bond and pending proposed groundwater legislation. He stressed the benefits of moving forward with a locally designed and broadly supported GMP at this time.
- Project Manager Marcus Trotta provided updates on the cooperative funding agreement that will support implementation, and offered to assist with constituent briefings as needed. He provided potential dates for when the Water Agency Board would hold a noticed public hearing and consider a resolution to adopt the GMP. Panel members will be informed when a date is set and encouraged to attend the meeting. Jennifer Larocque reviewed outreach materials that will be available to Panel members.
- Marcus and Tim briefly reviewed the early steps of the GMP implementation process, including monitoring and scenario modeling with the USGS model.

Project website: www.scwa.ca.gov/srgroundwater/

Audio Recording
The Sonoma County Water Agency (Water Agency) has a policy that when an attendee is recording a Panel meeting, staff does so as well and makes the recording available to all. An observer was video-taping this meeting and another acknowledged he was recording; hence, staff also recorded the meeting. See link:

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/97horyprfkk4o62/AAB2aahWWml3wpYtUJh2cIyga?dl=0

Next Panel meeting: To be determined. When the date for the Board meeting is set there will be communication to the Panel.

MEETING SUMMARY

Opening Remarks
Facilitator Rich Wilson provided a re-cap of the July Panel meeting and subsequent outreach to Panel members. At the July meeting, the Panel met to determine its readiness to recommend the GMP for adoption by the lead agency. During the meeting the Panel came to consensus on a few

additional minor GMP revisions and generated a list of items for discussion by the TAC early during the implementation phase. He described how July meeting results and subsequent outreach informed the August meeting agenda:

- Panel members specifically requested a final draft GMP (sent shortly after the July meeting) for constituent review so as to be adequately prepared to discuss a potential GMP recommendation at the August Panel meeting.
- Since the July Panel meeting the facilitation team conducted extensive outreach with members via phone and email to inform the August meeting agenda and ensure submission of proxies from any members who could not attend.
- Feedback received at the July meeting and during subsequent outreach showed a broad desire by Panel members to vote to recommend the GMP for adoption by the Water Agency's Board.
- The facilitator acknowledged the multi-year Panel and TAC effort to produce a final draft GMP and affirmed that the group would have the opportunity to vote for making a formal recommendation at this meeting.
- The facilitator oriented the Panel to the agenda, secured consensus on common ground rules, and acknowledged the public could offer comments on the GMP at a set time in the agenda.

GMP Recommendation Process

July Meeting Outcomes and GMP Recommendations Procedures, Including Proxy Options

- The facilitator began reviewing the GMP recommendation procedures by defining consensus as stated in the Panel's charter, and ensured members understood this definition would be used for decision-making.
    - "Consensus means that all group members either fully support or can live with the decision or overall plan and believe that their constituents can as well. In reaching consensus, some Panel members may strongly endorse a particular proposal while others may accept it as "workable." Others may be only able to "live with it." Still others may choose to stand aside by verbally noting a disagreement, yet allowing the group to reach consensus without them. Any of these actions still constitutes consensus."
- One Panel member noted he felt the Panel decision was from the onset intended to be only by consensus. He expressed frustration that items he recently submitted to the facilitators had not been placed on the agenda. He described what he considered a workaround to consensus that had been established by the Panel.
    - The facilitator reminded the group that the Panel is a *consensus-seeking* body, however consensus is not always forthcoming and the group is not bound by consensus. In the absence of consensus, the group has alternative decision-making procedures as set forth in the charter.
    - The facilitator also re-stated that the August 14 meeting agenda is based on July meeting outcomes (agreements), combined with broad Panel member desire to vote to recommend the GMP for adoption by the Water Agency Board.
- One Panel member requested the facilitator clearly explain the alternative decision making procedures. He felt the group long understood that it had this option in the absence of consensus. He expressed hope that the group could still reach consensus.

Overview of Alternative Decision Making Procedure

- The facilitator continued by describing, per the charter, the Panel's alternative decision making procedure. The alternative decision making procedure is a two-step voting process. Voting can take place in person or via proxy.
    - Any panel member or the facilitator can call a vote to vote. If 75% or more of total Panel membership votes that they would like to hold a vote (regardless of attendance at the meeting that day) then the issue moves forward to a formal vote.
    - If the Panel approves the proposal with 75% of total Panel membership, then the proposal moves forward.
    - Any minority opinion will be documented and memorialized in the meeting summary, and the voting period will be open for ten days.
    - Those holding a minority opinion also have the opportunity to submit written comments to attach to the meeting summary.
- One Panel member stated he has no confidence that any minority opinion will be well documented because past information sent to the facilitators should have been distributed to aid the group's decision-making.
- The facilitator pointed out that he was referencing decision-making procedures outlined in the charter. He noted that the group would take time during the meeting to explore and memorialize any minority opinion for inclusion in the meeting summary.
- One Panel member at this stage of the discussion asked that all Panel members abide by the ground rules to be respectful and also avoid editorial interpretation of comments made by others.
- One Panel member inquired as to why 75% was required to make a recommendation.
- The facilitator reminded the group that the Panel discussed and agreed to this alternative decision making procedure much earlier in its planning process.
- Another Panel member inquired as to how the conversation would unfold in the absence of consensus.
- The facilitator introduced the straw poll concept below, based on decision-making procedures included in the Panel's charter.

Straw Poll Leading to Formal Vote

The facilitator introduced the GMP recommendation process as a straw poll to let the group see if it had consensus or not, and then focus subsequent discussion. If voting proceeded, and the group so chose, it could move to a formal vote. He stressed that the straw poll did not amount to a formal vote. He also noted that the public would be given the opportunity to provide comments on the GMP before a formal vote. As described, the straw poll did not constitute a formal vote. The straw poll proceeded as follows:[1]

- The facilitator asked the Panel: "*In your capacity as a Panel member, do you recommend the final draft Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan for Adoption by the Water Agency's Board*?"
- Responses demonstrated a lack of consensus – one member was not in favor of recommending the GMP for adoption; the Panel called to move forward to a vote to vote, resulting in the facilitator asking the two follow-up questions:
- "*Do you support the Panel using its alternative decision-making process*?"
- Responses exceeded the 75% threshold to proceed to an actual vote on the recommendation
- The Panel called for and conducted a straw poll (not formal vote) on whether or not to recommend the GMP for adoption by the Water Agency Board

[1] All responses to the straw poll included in table 1.

- In conducting the vote, the facilitator reviewed response options
  - **Yes** I recommend the final draft Groundwater Management Plan for adoption by the Water Agency's Board
  - **No** I do not recommend the Groundwater Management Plan for adoption by the Water Agency's Board
  - **I stand aside**

Table 1. Straw Poll Results

1. Consensus: In your capacity as a Panel member, do you recommend the final draft Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan for Adoption by the Water Agency's Board? (Yes / No / I Stand Aside)				
2. Vote to Vote: Do you support the Panel using its alternative decision-making process? (Yes / No)				
3. Straw Vote: Whether or not to recommend the final draft GMP for adoption by the Water Agency Board -Yes I recommend the final draft GMP for adoption by the Water Agency's Board -No I do not recommend or I stand aside recommend the final draft GMP for adoption by the Water Agency's Board -I stand aside				
Name	**Q1. Consensus**	**Q2. Vote to Vote**	**Q3. Straw Vote**	**Notes**
Broughton, Garrett	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Burns, Michael	Yes	Yes	Yes	
CAFF (proxy w Rue Furch)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Calhoon, Mark	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cargay, Elizabeth	Yes	Yes	Yes	
DiGenova, Margaret	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Furch, Rue	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Gaffney, Joe (proxy w Curt Nichols)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Gallagher, Dawna	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Geary, Maureen	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Grossi, Edward (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Guardino, John (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Heckert, Kara	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Iverson, Lloyd	No	No	No	
Jasperse, Jay (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Keene, Bill	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kelly, Sue (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Lema, Melissa	Stand aside	Stand aside	Stand aside	Contact post-meeting[2]
McArthur, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mickelson, Gary (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Nagle, John (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Nichols, Curt	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Nielsen, Jane	Yes	Yes	Yes	
O'Bid, Damien (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Parkinson, Pete	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sanchez, Daniel (proxy)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Submitted Proxy Form
Sasaki, Tito	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Vogler, Rocky	Yes	Yes	Yes	

[2] Via an email sent to the facilitation team on August 27, 2014, the Western United Dairymen's Association chose the stand aside option.

Open discussion during and following the straw poll proceeded as follows:

Proxy voting

- Early in the straw polling process one Panel member expressed interest in submitting a proxy for John King; he noted that Mr. King is not able to attend Panel meetings that take place during working hours.
- The facilitator noted that the voting is based on the list of current members affirmed by the Panel itself at its May meeting, which did not include Mr. King.
- A Panel member recollected that early in the process Mr. King expressed a view that consensus was not achievable and therefore chose not to participate in the process to develop a GMP.[3]
- Technical consultant Tim Parker reminded the Panel that Mr. King favored adjudication over the AB 3030 process agreed to by the Panel and memorialized in its charter; also that Mr. King had not participated in Panel meetings for more than two years.

GMP recommendation

The straw poll vote demonstrated that the Panel did not have consensus, but did have sufficient votes to recommend the GMP for adoption by the Water Agency Board. The facilitator then opened discussion to document minority opinions:

- One Panel member noted support for documenting minority opinions but suggested that these opinions may be too extensive to cover during the meeting.
- The facilitator noted that minority opinion would be explored at the meeting, memorialized in the meeting summary; he further reminded the group that the charter allows any Panel member to submit written comments as an attachment to the meeting summary. He turned to the Panel member who had voted no to request a summary of concerns that reflect his minority opinion. He shared the following concerns:
    - He felt "duped" by the alternative voting procedures; he again described these procedures to be a work around to consensus.
    - He believes there is a direct conflict of facts in the GMP with other documents (e.g. the Canon Manor West 2004 Environmental Impact Report pg 2-18).
    - He believes the USGS characterization of Santa Rosa Plain Basin, and the associated water budget, is inaccurate without including the Russian River as a source of recharge.
    - Private well owners may still have concern regarding who is using water and how much is being used.
    - He expressed concern about the use of Aquifer Storage Recovery (ASR) techniques, and noted that some have failed even with the best available science and technology. Additional documents that study ASR should be considered by the Panel before this method is considered.
    - He would like to have a GMP that protects the region's water resources, and he feels this GMP will not achieve that goal.

- Following no vote Panel member's summary of concerns, one Panel member requested that comments, both by Panel members and the public, be specific to the GMP that is being discussed; she noted the difficulty of addressing broad comments or comments that are not

[3] A formal letter by Mr. King was submitted and attached to the June 2012 Panel meeting summary, available on the SRP-GMP website (www.scwa.ca.gov/srgroundwater/).

germane to the discussion. The facilitator noted that this suggestion is in alignment with the ground rule to stay focused on groundwater issues in the Santa Rosa Plain.

- One member noted that the Panel is an advisory body making a recommendation; it is the Water Agency Board of Directors that may formally adopt the GMP. She noted that the extensive work by the Panel in developing the GMP is critically important. She acknowledged the benefit of a minority opinion and emphasized how it pushes the group to do good work.
- One member noted that she and her constituency support recommending the GMP and remain at the table to have a voice in how it is implemented. She acknowledged that minority opinion stimulates thinking and emphasized that the Panel continue to work to get the GMP right as it moves towards implementation. She stressed that monitoring is an important first step.
- Another member noted her support for the recommendation but also described how her constituency does not want to see certain projects implemented (e.g. ASR projects). She also stressed the importance of remaining at the table, which may bring the added benefit of thoroughly vetting projects and potentially securing funding for projects that the Panel broadly supports.
- The Panel Member voting no expressed concern about language in the California Water Code that allows a GMP to be converted from voluntary to regulatory. He suggested that people would not support the GMP if they knew that it could be converted into a regulatory document.
- One Panel member expressed frustration some members were taking up too much time in the agenda and requested the facilitator move to the public comment period.
- One Panel member brought attention to the fact that pending legislation allows the State to manage groundwater in basins that have not developed a local groundwater management plan. She reiterated the importance of implementing the GMP to maintain local control and avoid interference from the State.
- Another Panel member affirmed that a locally created and managed Plan is desirable and that the GMP has never been intended as a regulatory document.
- Another Panel member noted that language in Section 1.5 clearly states that the goal of the GMP is to locally manage groundwater resources in a voluntary, non-regulatory manner.
- Another Panel member stated on page 6-3 the GMP acknowledges that an agency might develop and propose regulatory processes, but it must be in collaboration and concurrence with the Panel per the Governance Proposal which was developed by Panel members earlier in the process and incorporated into the GMP.
- One Panel member noted that potential future projects recommended in the GMP may be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and have an opportunity for further review and public comment.
- Building upon the two previous comments, another Panel member again noted that it is critically important for the Panel to vet future projects.
- The Panel member voting no again expressed concern at the potential for the GMP to become a regulatory document and felt additional language was needed to emphasize the voluntary, non-regulatory nature of the document.

The facilitator summarized the aforementioned comments prior to moving to the public comment period. He thanked members for responding to issues raised, clarifying key concepts and speaking to their interests during the discussion.

Public Comment Period

- One member of the public stated:

    - There has not been adequate outreach, specifically no mailing to private well owners, and this may cause backlash.
    - Private property values and access to water will change when these plans are no longer voluntary.
    - The California Water Foundation has submitted legislation that will override voluntary control of groundwater resources. The State creates an illusion of a public process.
    - Public input is minimized at this meeting by having only 3 minutes to comment.
    - She stated that she was "horrified" that the Panel believes the GMP could be voluntary.
    - She again expressed frustration at what she perceived as "Delphi" facilitation techniques that limit public input.
- Another member of the public commented:
    - The big picture water problem is that our weather is being manipulated and the drought is geo-engineered; this is documented.
    - Our government is misleading the public.
    - When you privatize water you end up with a landscape that is very much like our energy landscape.
    - China has been creating 55 billion tons of artificial rain per year. Next year they intend to create 280 billion tons of rain.
    - Central question: If China can commission so much artificial rain (that is the cause of the drought) why can't we?
- One member of the public stated:
    - Referencing the frequently asked question (FAQs): use the word "only" when describing 4% of the water is misleading.
    - The meeting is hard to understand when there is so much interruption. Recording is necessary because paraphrasing what people say is not adequate.
    - Concern that the Brown Act would call for different meeting management protocols. The facilitator noted the Panel is not a Brown Act body.

Recommendation of GMP for Adoption by the Water Agency Board
Following a break after the public comment period, the facilitator asked if any Panel member would like to formalize a vote to recommend that the Water Agency's Board adopt the GMP. A number of Panel members responded in the affirmative.

At the onset of the voting process one Panel member expressed support to add new "voluntary, non-regulatory" language in the front of the GMP to further achieve consensus among the group. The facilitator reminded this member of the request made in July that constituents need a final draft GMP to review. He also noted that the Panel generated a list of important issues for the Panel to discuss early during GMP implementation. He asked the Panel member if this issue could be added to that list so the Panel could still have an opportunity to vote on the final Draft GMP. The Panel member agreed to such an addition.

The facilitator then repeated the question as to whether or not the Panel would like to call for a formal vote on the GMP. Several again responded in the affirmative. He reminded Panel members of their response options (i.e. yes, no, stand aside). He further noted that Panel members could make a brief comment associated with their vote if they so choose. Results of the formal vote are documented in table 2 below.

Table 2. Formal Basin Advisory Panel Vote

-Yes I recommend the final draft GMP for adoption by the Water Agency's Board
-No I do not recommend the final draft Santa Rosa Plain GMP for adoption by the Water Agency's Board
-I stand aside

Name	Formal Vote	Notes
Broughton, Garrett	Yes	
Burns, Michael	Yes	
CAFF (proxy w Rue Furch)	Yes	
Calhoon, Mark	Yes	Comment: This is an important first step, and although it is only a first step it is an important one to take. Let's move forward.
Cargay, Elizabeth	Yes	
DiGenova, Margaret	Yes	
Furch, Rue	Yes	Emphasized comments that she had mentioned earlier.
Gaffney, Joe (proxy w Curt Nichols)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Gallagher, Dawna	Yes	Comment: Would like to thank everyone in the room for their patience.
Geary, Maureen	Yes	
Grossi, Edward (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Guardino, John (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Heckert, Kara	Yes	
Iverson, Lloyd	No	Comment: Steps have not been taken to let my constituents, who are the broad majority of stakeholders, know what is going on
Jasperse, Jay (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Keene, Bill	Yes	
Kelly, Sue (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Lema, Melissa	Stand aside	Stand aside
McArthur, John	Yes	
Mickelson, Gary (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Nagle, John (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Nichols, Curt	Yes	
Nielsen, Jane	Yes	Comment: More than half the Panel constitutes private well owners in the Santa Rosa Plain, especially the OWL foundation and Water Coalition, which were formed to protect water supplies for all Sonoma County water users, and that is our objective in being here. Not to take water, but to protect water resources for everyone. We want to bring a GMP to the SRP so that everyone can have a say, as representatives of larger groups. Sonoma Valley is a successful GMP, and I hope we can continue to follow this successful model.
O'Bid, Damien (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Parkinson, Pete	Yes	Comment: The fact that we have been able to reach consensus within this diverse group, with one notable exception, is remarkable.
Sanchez, Daniel (proxy)	Yes	Submitted proxy vote
Sasaki, Tito	Yes	
Vogler, Rocky	Yes	Comment: To my knowledge there is no nefarious attempt to privatize groundwater in this basin or do anything other than protect and conserve a resource that is vital to everybody.

- A summary of the formal Panel vote is broken down as follows:
    - Yes: 26
    - No: 1
    - Stand aside: 1
- One Panel member noted limited participation by the absent Panel member. The facilitator reminded the group that she was included on the membership list affirmed by the Panel at its May meeting. He further noted that he would follow-up with the absent member to discuss her interests relative to voting on the GMP. (The absent member chose to stand aside in an email sent to the facilitation team on August 27, 2014.)
- The Panel member who voted no again commented that John King's proxy vote should be considered because he has valuable ideas to contribute to the development of a GMP. He also noted that members of the public may have good contributions to the GMP.
- Similar to previous discussion, Project Manager Marcus Trotta noted a distinction between Mr. King and other Panel members. When the Panel decided to pursue an AB 3030 process (voluntary, non-regulatory), Mr. King noted that he would not support this nor participate in that process. He favored adjudication. The facilitator noted that this conversation is documented in the June 2012 meeting summary.
- The Panel member who voted no emphasized that the Panel needs to know why Mr. King thinks adjudication is better than an AB3030 process. He again expressed frustration at lack of information sharing for the decision-making process.
- Another member disagreed with this Panel member's comments, both in terms of what information had been shared for the Panel to consider, as well as how meetings are facilitated.

Conclusion

- The facilitator noted that the Panel, via its formal voting results, has recommended the final draft Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan for adoption by the Sonoma County Water Agency Board of Directors. He again emphasized that the Panel member who voted no would have the opportunity to submit additional written comments that could be attached to the meeting summary. He also noted that the voting period would stay open for ten business days.

Legislative and Water Bond update

Technical Consultant Tim Parker gave the following legislative update:

- 7.5 billion for Bond passed August 13th, 2014
    - $900M for Groundwater Sustainability – includes new money for developing GMPs – all areas (basins and subbasin) that are high and medium priority basins must be under GMPs.
    - $810M for Regional Water Reliability
    - $520M for Safe Drinking Water
    - $725M for Water Recycling
    - $1.495B for Watersheds
        - $2.7B for Storage
        - $395M for Statewide Flood Management
- Sustainable Groundwater Management Legislation – fluid, continuing to change
    - The legislation would apply to high and medium priority Bulletin 118 groundwater basins and subbasins as defined by the CASGEM prioritization process
    - There are two bills, one in the Assembly and one in the Senate, both must pass or both fail

        - SB 1168 Pavley http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB1168
        - AB 1739 Dickinson http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB1739&search_keywords=
    - 2 years to develop a new entity, 5 years to develop a plan (does not affect adjudicated basins)
    - 20 years after the plans are developed and in place the basins must be sustainable basins
    - The purpose of the legislation is to promote local, collaborative groundwater management. The State does not want to step in and manage, but has provisions in the bill to do so as a "backstop" to inadequate groundwater management
    - The two bills passed out of Appropriations Committees; they are being amended and are set to go to floor before August 31.
    - It is important for the Basin Advisory Panel to have a plan. The SRP is a medium priority basin, which means that the State would mandate that it create a GMP.
    - Tim agreed to send email updates with legislation information at key milestones.
- Project Manager Marcus Trotta announced that the Water Agency is tracking legislation closely. He reiterated that the Santa Rosa Plain is one of the basins that would be affected by this legislation (medium priority basin), and therefore it is best to create a GMP voluntarily rather than wait to be mandated by the State, as the requirements will likely change.

Cooperative Funding Agreement Update
Marcus Trotta provided updates on the status of the Cooperative Funding Agreement and expected timeline to present the recommended GMP to the Water Agency Board of Directors.

Cooperation Funding Agreement
- The Water Agency is working to develop cooperative funding for the first two years of the program.
- The funding subcommittee met earlier in the year; the group negotiated a cooperative funding agreement that is now under review by interested funders.
- Funding agencies are planning to bring the agreement before their respective Boards and Councils prior to the GMP being presented to the Water Agency Board for adoption.
- Funding agencies are focusing on priority actions in the GMP.

SRP-GMP added to Board agenda
- Potential dates (Tuesday Mornings) to bring the Plan to the Board are: Sep 23, Oct 7, Oct 14.
- The Water Agency will send the Panel an email update when the date is finalized.
- Panel members are encouraged to attend the Board meeting.

Obtaining Letters/Resolutions of Support
Marcus Trotta volunteered to provide materials to help Panel members update constituent groups about the GMP recommendation, including a frequently asked questions (FAQs) document and sample letters of support.

Additional Panel Comments:
- One Panel member stated that the Water Coalition is interested in including a mailer to well owners as the priority Panel actions, and then looking for funds to support this effort.

- Another Panel member recommended that the Water Agency present a summary of the USGS report to the Water Agency Board of Directors and other interested parties, emphasizing the drought and potential affects to land use.
- Another Panel member noted that the Sonoma Resource Conservation District is interested in helping with outreach.

Update on Available Outreach Materials

- Jennifer Larocque reviewed outreach resources available to Panel members. The Water Agency expects materials will be available within seven to ten days of the August Panel meeting. Resources will include:
  - GMP overview flyer
  - FAQs
  - Newsletter blurb with updates and information, including date the GMP will go before the Water Agency Board
  - A GMP flyer that can be printed and posted in public areas
- In addition the Water Agency will:
  - Communicate via the email list that has been developed at the GMP community forums
  - Place ads in local newspapers
  - Send a press release to an extensive media list and work with reporters to develop an article on the GMP.

Discussion of Early GMP Implementation

- Marcus Trotta reported that the first stages of implementation will include:
  - Monitoring
  - Using the surface water/groundwater flow Model developed by the USGS for the Santa Rosa Plain to conduct modeling scenarios (Water Agency staff will be trained on this by the USGS in September)
- Tim Parker noted that the monitoring program includes land subsidence monitoring and will be implemented as costs allow.
  - The Panel Member who voted no invited staff to inspect well-heads on his property.

Participants

Basin Advisory Panel

Broughton, Garrett
Burns, Michael
Calhoon, Mark
Cargay, Elizabeth
DiGenova, Margaret
Furch, Rue
Gallagher, Dawna
Geary, Maureen
Heckert, Kara
Iverson, Lloyd
Keene, Bill
McArthur, John
Nichols, Curt
Nielsen, Jane
Parkinson, Pete
Sasaki, Tito
Vogler, Rocky

Observers
Keith Abeles
Karl Adelman
Jim Bennett
Hattie Brown
Norman Gilroy
Mary Grace Pawson
Deborah Tavaris
Lou Tavaris
Niki Woodard

Staff
Marcus Trotta, Project Manager, Water Agency
Tim Parker, Technical Consultant, Parker Groundwater
Jennifer Larocque, Water Agency
Rich Wilson, Center for Collaborative Policy