

MEMO: SVGSP Planning Committee Update, TAC Update

To: SVGMD, Plumas County

From: Jenny Gant and Judie Talbot (outreach facilitator)

Date: April 18, 2022

Re: Sierra Valley GSP – Planning Committee and Outreach updates

The Planning Committee is submitting the following informational items as a monthly update for April 2022.

PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE

The SVGSP Planning Committee met on April 7, 2022 and discussed the following :

1. Forms needed to receive reimbursement for Category D activities: Environmental Intake Form; Notice of Exemption
2. Posting of the Annual Report
3. Possible grant opportunities
4. Inputting of data to the DWR portal
5. Executive Order N-7-22
6. Preparation for the Ad Hoc session on outreach, subsidence monitoring

OUTREACH UPDATE

An Ad Hoc session was conducted on April 18 from 3:00 – 5:00 pm. The meeting was lightly attended with five community members participating plus Planning Committee members. The agenda started with recent updates:

- Closing of the formal DWR Public Comment period on April 23rd for the GSP
- Posting of the Annual Report
- Governor’s Executive Order

Information was presented on activities and options related to the siting of four new geodetic survey markers (monuments) to monitor subsidence, including siting criteria and the location of existing monuments. After discussion, it was agreed that:

- Areas A, F, D, and E on the map should be the sites for the new monuments (if Area A is not needed, then replace with area C)
- When surveying the new monuments, include existing monuments identified by DWR as “Buttes” and “E143”

- Determine incremental costs for surveying monuments “D143” and “C143’
- Contact CalTrans on policy regarding permanence of existing monuments

The remainder of the meeting focused on an evaluation of outreach for development of the GSP where the following feedback was received:

Feedback on Outreach for GSP Development

What worked

- Presentations were very good, especially considering the amount of information that needed to be covered in a short amount of time
- Terrific job in TAC members attending and participating
- Good job trying to get people to participate
- Having participation from Plumas County
- Having a matrix of public comments and how they were responded to
- Having a charter of roles and responsibilities

What didn't

- It didn't seem that the TAC served as a Technical Advisory Committee to the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs), did more to inform the work of the technical consultants
- Never discussed, reached consensus or made recommendations to the Board
- Needed representation from both GSAs to know what the TAC was discussing – TAC recommendations did not seem to be conveyed to the GSAs
- Water quality needs to be considered in making informed decisions. Issues about water quality and quantity were discounted. Some management actions, such as ponding of creeks could be detrimental to water quality and the fishery.
- The domestic well issues were not addressed – requiring a number of wells to go dry is a dangerous proposition. Domestic well users were not represented.
- Would have been good see the Planning Department from Sierra County – the Supervisors need to rate this as a priority for staff
- Needed to revisit charter of roles and responsibilities
- The timing of this limited the amount of interaction with the public and what the TAC could do

Workshops

- It is difficult to absorb the ideas
- It was an invitation to participate
- The format of the workshops was more informational and in a group setting, which was a good process. Handouts and surveys supported an information-heavy workshop and provided options for continuous public involvement. In providing information, the workshops were helpful.
- It would be hard to interpret the plan to terms of understanding the impacts to domestic users and environmental interests. How the plan addressed, or didn't, potential impacts to their interests.