

# **MEETING SUMMARY | December 9, 2013**

## **Santa Rosa Plain Technical Advisory Committee**

### **Recap and Review of Initial TAC Prioritization Results**

At the request of the Panel, the Project Team drafted a straw proposal of potential management actions that could be initiated in years 1-2 of GMP implementation and beyond. During its October meeting, the TAC discussed and agreed upon these preliminary priorities and then conducted a multi-voting exercise to prioritize an additional list of potential recommended management actions. Upon reconvening in December, the TAC again noted support for the straw proposal of potential management actions that could be initiated in years 1-2 of GMP implementation, and discussed the results of the multi-voting exercise.

### **Discussion of Management Recommendations Matrix**

The Project Team introduced a straw proposal matrix of recommended management actions that built upon the multi-voting exercise results and refinement of criteria for screening management action priorities. Following group discussion of the refined criteria and matrix as a whole, TAC members worked in pairs to apply the screening criteria to the unfilled columns in the matrix. TAC members not present at the December meeting, along with cities and other partners funding the GMP development process, will be afforded an opportunity to review both the preliminary list and the list of additional potential management recommendations.

### **Panel Feedback on Draft GMP Chapters 1-5**

The Panel reviewed and provided feedback on GMP draft sections 1 – 5 at its October and November meetings. Following discussion of suggested changes, the Panel agreed to set aside draft chapters until after the USGS model report is published, expected sometime in spring 2014. The draft chapters will again be reviewed once new information from the model report has been included. The TAC considered the summary of Panel feedback and offered minimal comments.

### **Audio-Taping**

To encourage free exchange of ideas at TAC and Panel meetings, the facilitation team continues to recommend that attendees not audio-tape meetings since it makes some members uncomfortable. If any attendee does choose to audio-tape, we ask that you announce your intentions to the group for transparency. In this case, the Water Agency will audio-tape as well, and make the tape available via the project website so all have access to the same information. At this TAC meeting, an attendee did announce the intention to audio-tape, and consequently, the Water Agency announced its intention to also audio-tape; the recording will be made available to the group via Dropbox.

**<http://www.scwa.gov/srgroundwater/>**

### **Next TAC Meeting**

Upcoming TAC Meeting Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2013 from 9-12 a.m. at the Sonoma County Water Agency office, 404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa.

## Action Items

Timeframe	Name	Action Item
December 31	TAC Members	Provide commentary on the draft matrix and application of screening and prioritization criteria

## Recap and Review of TAC Voting Exercise and Initial Prioritization Results

At its October meeting, the TAC discussed prioritization of recommended management actions that guide GMP implementation. The Project Team, at the request of the Panel, prepared a straw proposal, including two lists of recommended management actions (a “green” list and an “orange” list), to initiate the prioritization discussion. The green list included preliminary recommended management actions that the Project Team believes can be initiated in year 1 GMP implementation with existing funds. The orange list included additional potential management actions that may be prioritized pending new opportunities and available funding.

The TAC offered initial support for the green list and, with minor edits provided during a post-meeting review period, agreed that all items in this list do indeed represent immediate priorities. Building on discussion of these preliminary priorities, the TAC then conducted a multi-voting exercise looking at the orange list of additional potential recommended management actions. The exercise enabled members the opportunity to identify, based on constituent interests, the top management priorities in the orange list. Due to meeting time constraints, the TAC was unable to immediately discuss the results on the initial voting exercise. As such, the results were shared at the November Panel meeting, but no analysis or interpretation was provided at that time.

Upon reconvening the TAC in December, the Project Team reviewed minor additions to the green list, including two recommended actions for groundwater modeling and language revisions that helped link related management actions. The TAC again noted support for the green list and subsequently revisited the multi-voting results on the orange list. Initial responses to the multi-voting results included the following:

- The list of additional potential management recommendations is long, thus looking at what is attainable is important
- The ability for management actions to leverage opportunities is a significant criteria
- It is important to consider what this program could start in and of itself (versus other, ongoing programs)
- Voting might look different if the exercise is conducted at different times; the process continues to be iterative
- Voting results show an emphasis on conservation
- Many recommended management actions require development of a plan or strategy before implementation can occur
- #100 – Surprised “in lieu of recharge program” did not receive more votes
- #104 – low-impact development: assumption is that cities are doing this; not sure GMP implementation can add a lot to this effort
- #23 – seems to overlap with the CASGEM project; however note that CASGEM is more of a leveraging opportunity

The prioritization/screening process remains iterative in nature and is designed to help the TAC, and by extension the Panel, prepare a list of priority management actions that informs a GMP implementation plan and schedule. Both lists -- preliminary actions initiated during years 1-2 and additional potential actions -- will continue to be refined as available funding becomes increasingly clear. TAC members not present at the December meeting, along with cities and other partners funding the GMP development process, will be afforded an opportunity to review both the preliminary list and the list of additional potential management recommendations.

## **Review of Prioritization/Screening Criteria and Discussion of Management Recommendations Matrix**

The Project Team introduced a straw proposal matrix of recommended management actions, based on both the agreed upon priorities for years 1-2 (the green list) and the additional potential management actions pending available funding (the orange list). The Project Team also added two Modeling recommended actions to the matrix, and added one of the two new actions to the green list, and the other to the orange list. The TAC reviewed and accepted the two new Modeling recommended actions.

The matrix is a planning tool that helps the TAC and Panel to screen recommended management actions relative to one another in terms of level of priority as the group looks towards implementation of the GMP. As a straw proposal, the matrix incorporates the multi-voting results and screening prioritization criteria (in four of six columns) discussed at the October TAC meeting. Previous feedback provided by the TAC enabled merging of watershed health and multiple objective benefits into a single criteria versus two separate criteria, which would be duplicative. In addition, a high/medium/low rating was added to weight each of the criteria when considering potential additional management actions. TAC members discussed the criteria and matrix, and subsequently worked in pairs to apply criteria in the unfilled columns.

Criteria for screening and prioritization of the recommended management actions included in the draft matrix are listed below, incorporating feedback and edits from the TAC meeting.

- 1) **Relative Cost** – qualitative approximation of the relative cost of the recommended action
  - High (\$\$\$) – very high cost relative to other actions (millions \$)
  - Medium (\$\$) – in between high and low
  - Low (\$) – (low cost (\$1000's-\$10,000's), and may be addressed with staff/in-kind services

\* Indicates a long-term annual or periodic funding need
- 2) **Readiness to Proceed** – recommended actions that are ready to proceed in a relative sense to one another
  - High – can proceed with little or no preparation
  - Medium – needs preparation of a workplan and or studies
  - Low – needs plans and studies and likely a pilot to initiate
- 3) **Feasibility/Implementability** – recommended actions are considered in terms of relative complexity and likelihood of successful completion
  - High – low complexity and high likelihood of successful completion

- Medium – medium complexity and likelihood of successful completion
  - Low – high complexity and uncertain likelihood of successful completion
- 4) **Leveraging Opportunity** – recommended actions that can leverage multiple resources, multiple partners, and integrate several key opportunities are considered higher than those that do not
- High – high likelihood of leveraging resources and opportunities
  - Medium – may be a possibility of leveraging resources
  - Low – low likelihood of leveraging resources and opportunities
- 5) **Community and Political Support** – actions that have potential for community and political support are considered higher than those with poor potential support
- High – high community and political support
  - Medium – mixed or neutral community and political support
  - Low - Community and/or political opposition
- 6) **Multi-Objective/Supports Watershed Health** – Integrated projects that fulfill multiple objectives of the groundwater management plan and support overall watershed health, including aquifer recharge protection and enhancement, water quantity and quality, flood mitigation, and habitat protection, are considered higher than those that do not
- High – meets many objectives and actions to support watershed health
  - Medium – meets a few objectives and actions to support watershed health
  - Low – meets little or no objectives and actions to support watershed health

Review and discussion of the refined prioritization criteria elicited the following feedback:

- Criteria #6 – implies the inclusion of surface and groundwater
- Criteria # 5 – Include “opposition from the community” in the low rating
- General comment: consider how to break down annual versus overall cost
- Criteria are qualitative, and actions are considered relative to one another as a screening tool, and not as a quantitative ranking exercise
- Priorities may change for recommended actions during the course of implementing the plan and as opportunities come available.

Subsequent to the discussion of the screening and prioritization criteria, the TAC provided additional commentary on other aspects of the draft matrix. Feedback included the following:

- Some of the recommended management actions may still require wordsmithing to avoid a different interpretation by different people (e.g. #100); narrative text in chapter helps provide context
- Initial voting results, combined with straw application of criteria, demonstrate a preference for maintaining and protecting groundwater resources
- The matrix is a good first step to organize a lot of information and determine consensus amongst a diverse group
- The TAC needs to ensure that the matrix and associated implementation schedule is coherent and understandable as the Panel will have a much larger range of opinions
- An implementation schedule, based on TAC and Panel priorities, will be inserted into the narrative of the GMP; the final screening and prioritization matrix of recommended actions will be included as a table in an appendix

- Some TAC members were pleased to see that several low cost management actions were given high priority
- Some TAC members were surprised that certain management actions did not receive a higher number of votes (e.g. data management – it's not exciting and can cost a lot yet can also yield great benefits); suggest Project Team tries to capture these issues and ensure they are a priority

Following group discussion of the refined criteria and matrix as a whole, TAC members worked in pairs to apply criteria to the unfilled last two columns of the attached draft screening and prioritization matrix. Open discussion followed wherein each pair briefly summarized its results. The Project Team has since incorporated the results of this TAC work into the attached draft matrix<sup>1</sup>. In addition, the TAC agreed that the Project Team should complete screening of the remaining recommended actions that the TAC did not have time to complete (Sections 5.5.2-5.6.2: Items 92-108). TAC members not present at the meeting, along with city representatives that are helping to fund GMP development, are encouraged to provide additional input to the draft screening and prioritization matrix.

### **Basin Advisory Panel Update**

The Panel reviewed and provided feedback on GMP draft sections 1 – 5 at its October and November meetings. Following discussion of suggested changes, the Panel agreed to set aside draft chapters until after the USGS model report is published, expected sometime in spring 2014. The draft chapters will again be reviewed once new information from the model report has been included. The TAC considered the summary of Panel feedback and offered minimal comments. One TAC member highlighted the importance of having the GMP ready for completion regardless of the status of the USGS model report. Another member suggested that a TAC subcommittee could be formed to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of final document editing and wordsmithing. Another suggested that the Project Team take the lead in the final editing of the GMP, including preparation of an Executive Summary and a flyer, and updating the GW101 informational pieces as well. A Water Agency public affairs staff person will be available to help with final editing of the GMP.

Project manager Marcus Trotta briefly summarized the Panel discussion regarding the formation of a funding subcommittee and the plan for constituent outreach via community forums. A funding subcommittee has been formed to work on developing strategy to fund implementation of the GMP, with work taking place over the next two months. Subcommittee members will be those whose constituencies can contribute funds or in-kind services, or can help the Panel pursue grants. Subcommittee members need not be members of the Panel or TAC.

In spring 2014, a series of community forums will take place to educate the public about the GMP, build support for its implementation and counter any misinformation. The Panel did not yet reach consensus about the appropriate timing for the forums, likely to take place in Cotati, Sebastopol and Rohnert Park. The forums are expected to also provide an opportunity to share information about part II of the USGS report (the model report).

---

<sup>1</sup> The draft matrix (excel sheet dated 12-17-13) is included as a separate attachment to this summary.

## **TAC Meeting Attendees**

### **TAC Members**

Kevin Cullinen  
Rocky Vogler  
Jane Nielson  
Bob Andersson  
Mark Calhoon  
Michael Burns

### **Project Team**

Project Manager, Marcus Trotta  
Technical Consultant, Tim Parker  
TAC Facilitator, Rich Wilson

### **TAC Visitors**

Karl Adelman