

# CGA/GGA Joint Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**April 12, 2019 | 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

Colusa County Farm Bureau, 520 Market Street, Colusa, CA 95932

---

### **1. Call to Order and Introductions**

#### **In Attendance:**

**Committee Members:** Mark Lohse, Darrin Williams, Emil Cavagnolo, Oscar Serrano, Bill Vanderwaal, Zac Dickens, David Kehn, Brandon Davison

**Others in Attendance:** Lisa Hunter (GGA Staff), Mary Fahey (CGA Staff), Don Bills, George Pendell, Sajit Singh (CGA), Jilda Spyres, Byron Clark (Davids Engineering, Inc.), Kelsey McNeil, Alfred Sellers Jr. (CGA), Leslie Nerli (GGA), Shelly Murphy (CGA)

### **2. \* Approval of Agenda**

Motion to approve the agenda by Oscar Serrano, seconded by Darrin Williams, approved unanimously

### **3. Period of Public Comment**

There was no public comment

### **4. Update: Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model and Water Budget for the Colusa Subbasin**

Byron Clark, Davids Engineering, Inc., provided a powerpoint presentation and discussion about the progress on the hydrogeologic conceptual model (HCM) and water budget for the Colusa Subbasin.

The PowerPoint presentation can be found on the CGA website:

<https://colusagroundwater.org/meetings/agendas-2019/>

And on the GGA Website:

<https://www.countyofglenn.net/resources/agendas-minutes-water/glenn-groundwater-authority-technical-advisory-committee-meeting>

Mr. Clark described the GSP Basin Setting Components that are required under SGMA. These requirements include a hydrogeologic conceptual model, groundwater conditions description and water budgets.

Mr. Clark described some prior work that was completed in the Colusa Basin under funding from Proposition 1 Counties with Stressed Basins grants in Glenn and Colusa Counties. This work is a good foundation for the HCM and water budget. The next step is to update that work in conjunction with the Integrated Hydrologic Model (IHM). The difference between the HCM and IHM is that an HCM is a document that describes the system and will basically sit on a shelf, while an IHM is a more dynamic model that is used to simulate changes in conditions over time. Other steps will be to incorporate subsidence data, SkyTem data and other recent data.

Mr. Clark went on to describe the groundwater conditions and water budget GSP requirements under SGMA. He also discussed work that was completed in Glenn County to evaluate the different existing, and forthcoming integrated hydrologic models.

Mr. Clark explained that the HCM work has been progressing slowly because it needs to be reviewed along with the IHM. DWR's update of the C2VSimFG model is due to be released this month. We are quickly approaching a point where we will need to move forward if the model does not become available.

Question: What if the model does not meet expectations?

Answer: We would have to move forward. The Consultant team could build the model from scratch. Another option is to use the May 2018 version of C2VSim.

Ms. Murphy stated that we need to be sure we are inputting correct data, including actual water allocations.

Question: What model are the Critically Overdrafted basins using?

Answer: Many basins already have models from pre-SGMA. A lot are using the previous version of C2VSim.

Question: What would be better in the new version vs. the 2018 version?

Answer: Better characterization of land use, and splitting out the Tehama Colusa Canal and settlement contractors.

Mr. Vanderwaal suggested that we move forward if the updated version of C2VSimFG is not available by April 30, 2019.

Ms. Hunter asked if there was agreement on the model to use, and also on a drop dead deadline for the C2VSimFG if that is the preferred model.

Question: Is the data that you already have for the 2018 version going to be easily transferred to the C2VSim if we move forward before release of the newer version?

Answer: Yes. With SVSim it is a little more complicated. The CVHM model would be very difficult and we would basically have to rebuild it.

Ms. Fahey asked if the benefit to waiting is that they have already provided local data to DWR. Mr. Clark said yes.

Question: What are the changes to the model?

Answer: Just the inputs – land use, soil parameters, diversions, etc.

**\*It was the consensus of the group that we use the C2VSimFG and if not available in a timely manner, move forward with the 2018 version. Ms. Hunter and Ms. Fahey were directed to work with Mr. Clark on a schedule to set a reasonable drop dead deadline for moving forward if the C2VSimFG is not released.**

## **5. Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)**

- a. Discuss timeline for development and completion of the Colusa Subbasin GSP

- b. Discuss process to select Consultant Team for the Colusa Subbasin GSP, and determine a recommended path forward for consideration by CGA and GGA Boards

Ms. Fahey explained that Davids Engineering has been contracted to complete the HCM and Water Budget portions of the GSP but the GSAs have not chosen a consultant to complete the other components of the GSP. Also, the GSAs have not discussed the consultant selection process, if it would be a sole source, or RFP or RFQ process. It is a single plan for the Colusa Subbasin, so both GSA Boards have to approve the process. This is the first discussion to try to define this process.

The group reviewed the draft timeline for GSP completion and discussed various options for consultant selection.

Mr. Vanderwaal said there are hard dates in the schedule that are easy to plug in. It is going to be working through the contentious issues that are going to take time. What are those issues going to be?

Ms. Fahey said Management Areas and defining the Sustainability Criteria are the most contentious.

Mr. Vanderwaal asked what information will we need for these items? Likely the model and water budgets will be needed. He asked Mr. Clark when he thinks the model and water budgets will be completed if the model is available by end of May.

Mr. Clark said that the historical water budgets would go fairly quickly, especially the land surface budget. Calibration of the groundwater system would come next and probably take about 6 months. Once the model is calibrated, they could run scenarios. He advised that we could start working on defining Management Areas now. This can happen in tandem with the IHM and water budgets. This is how the Yuba Water Agency has approached their planning. They developed a Stakeholder group, and quickly worked on defining the Sustainability Goal. They are also working through defining the Sustainability Criteria.

Mr. Kehn asked about a Stakeholder Advisory Committee and the time that will be needed to educate and engage Stakeholders. Ms. Hunter and Ms. Fahey said that we currently do not have a Stakeholder Advisory Committee in place and that is something we need to take to the GSA Boards. A facilitated Stakeholder Advisory Committee was suggested.

Ms. Hunter said that she and Ms. Fahey are working with facilitators on an Outreach and Engagement Plan. Each GSA also has a Public Outreach Committee that can work together on this.

More discussion was held about the consultant selection process.

**\*The recommendation from the Joint TAC to the CGA and GGA Boards is to release a Request for Proposals for a single consultant or consultant team to complete the GSP for the Colusa Subbasin.**

**\*It was further decided by consensus that a subcommittee consisting of Bill Vanderwaal and David Kehn will work with Ms. Hunter and Ms. Fahey on a draft RFP that can be brought to the CGA and GGA Boards for review/approval at their May meetings.**

## **6. Review and Discuss Information related to Data Management Programs for SGMA implementation in the Colusa Subbasin**

There was discussion regarding potential Data Management Programs for SGMA compliance and implementation. Although it is important to begin thinking about data management basin-wide as well as individual GSAs, the consensus of the group was that it is too early to make any decisions on a Data Management System.

## **7. Member Reports and Comments**

None

## **8. Next Meeting:**

The next meeting was not scheduled

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

---

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

It was the consensus of the group that we use the C2VSimFG and if not available in a timely manner, move forward with the 2018 version. Ms. Hunter and Ms. Fahey were directed to work with Mr. Clark on a schedule to set a reasonable drop dead deadline for moving forward if the C2VSimFG is not released.

A subcommittee consisting of Bill Vanderwaal and David Kehn will work with Ms. Hunter and Ms. Fahey on a draft RFP for GSP development that will be brought to the CGA and GGA Boards for review/approval at their May meetings.

- GGA May Board meeting: May 13, 2019 (following meeting is June 10, 2019)
- CGA May Board meeting: May 28, 2019