

**ARROYO SECO GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 9, 2021 @ 1:00 P.M.**

Attendance and Public Comment Changes Due to COVID-19

The Arroyo Seco Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“ASGSA”) will be conducting its regular meeting on June 9, 2021. Given the current Shelter-in-Place Order covering Monterey County and the Social Distance Guidelines issued by Federal, State, and Local Authorities, the ASGSA has implemented the following changes for attendance and public comment.

ATTENDANCE BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

The ASGSA meeting to be held on June 9, 2021 at 1:00 p.m. will only be accessible online. The meeting may be viewed through the following options:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

You are invited to a Zoom meeting.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86999938862>

Meeting ID: 869 9993 8862

Or One tap mobile :

US: +16699006833,,86999938862# or +12532158782,,86999938862#

Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592

Meeting ID: 869 9993 8862

The ASGSA Advisory Committee will also provide links to these viewing options on the City of Greenfield’s website. Unfortunately, physical attendance by the public cannot be accommodated given the current circumstances and the need to ensure the health and safety of the ASGSA Board, staff, and the public as a whole.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

All public comments, including general public comments, comments on a particular item on the agenda, or comments during a public hearing, must be made by e-mail. Please be aware that any public comments made, including your name, may become public information. Additional instructions for making public comments can be found below.

Public comments made by e-mail must be submitted to the following e-mail address:

cityclerk@ci.greenfield.ca.us. In the subject line of the e-mail, please state your name and the item you are commenting on. If you wish to submit a public comment on more than one agenda item, please send a separate e-mail for each item you are commenting on. Please be aware that any public comments received that do not specify a particular agenda item will be read aloud during the general public comment portion of the agenda.

For all general public comments and comments regarding specific ASGSA business items, public comments must be received by e-mail no later than 1:00 p.m. on June 9, 2021. For public comment on a public hearing, all public comments must be received by the close of the public hearing period. Comments received by the applicable deadline for submitting e-mail comments will be read aloud by a staff member during the agenda item or public hearing, provided that such comments may be read within the normal three (3) minutes allotted to each speaker. Any portion of a comment extending past three (3) minutes may not be read aloud due to time restrictions. If a comment is received after the applicable deadline for e-mail comments, efforts will be made to read your comment into the record. However, staff cannot guarantee that written comments received after the applicable deadline will be read. All written comments that are not read into the record will be made part of the meeting minutes, provided that such comments are received prior to the end of the ASGSA meeting.

The ASGSA thanks you for your cooperation in advance. Our community's health and safety is our highest priority.



ASGSA
Advisory Committee Meeting
Greenfield Civic Center
599 El Camino Real
Greenfield, CA 93927

Meeting Agenda
June 9, 2021
1:00 P.M.

Your courtesy is requested to help our meeting run smoothly.

Please follow the following rules of conduct for public participation in the meetings:

- Refraining from public displays or outbursts such as unsolicited applause, comments or cheering.
- Any disruptive activities that substantially interfere with the ability of the Agency to carry out its meeting will not be permitted, and offenders will be requested to leave the meeting.

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES AND PAGERS

The Arroyo Seco Groundwater Sustainability Agency Advisory Committee Meeting will be conducting its meeting on June 9, 2021. Given the current Shelter-in-Place Order covering Monterey County and the Social Distance Guidelines issued by Federal, State, and Local Authorities, the Agency is implementing changes for attendance and public comment. The Groundwater Sustainability Agency meeting to be held on June 9, 2021 at 1:00 p.m. will only be accessible online. Please review the Agency's Attendance and Public Comments Changes Due to COVID-19 for further information.

- 1. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA –** A three-minute time limit may be imposed on all speakers. **PLEASE NOTE:** Given the current Shelter-in-Place Order covering Monterey County and the Social Distance Guidelines issued by Federal, State, and Local Authorities, the Agency is implementing changes for attendance and public comment. Please review the Agency's Attendance and Public Comments Changes Due to COVID-19 for additional information. Please be further aware that all public comments must be submitted via email to the following email address: cityclerk@ci.greenfield.ca.us.
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 12, 2021 ASGSA ADVISORY MEETING**
- 3. REVIEW AND COMMENT ON REVISED FOREBAY SUBBASIN CHAPTERS 9 AND 10 (CHAPTERS IN PREPARATION AND WILL BE SENT AND POSTED AHEAD OF MEETING)**
 - a. Oral Report
 - b. Public Comments
 - c. Committee – Review / Comments / Action

- 4. RECEIVE GUS YATES COMMENTS ON FIRST VERSION CHAPTER 9 AND 10**
 - a. Presentation
 - b. Public Comments
 - c. Committee – Review / Comments / Action

- 5. RECEIVE UPDATE ON FOREBAY SUBBASIN GSP PREPARATION PROCESS AND SCHEDULE**
 - a. Oral Report
 - b. Public Comments
 - c. Committee – Review / Comments / Action

- 6. RECEIVE GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT**
 - a. Oral Report
 - b. Public Comments
 - c. Committee – Review / Comments / Action

- 7. ADJOURNMENT**

In compliance with the American With Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk at (831) 674-5591. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting (CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

This agenda is duly posted outside City Hall and on the City of Greenfield web site

ASGSA
Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes, May 12, 2021

Those in attendance: Committee members Allan Panziera, Michael Griva, Jim Thorp, Nancy Isakson, Jerry Lohr, Roger Moitoso, Mary Lerner and General Manager Curtis Weeks.

1. Public Comments: none
2. Consideration, review and comment on the Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability agenda update of Forebay Projects and Management Actions (Chapter 9):

Curtis Weeks presented an overview and summary of the item and highlighted areas of concern. The Committee discussed the various items and of the Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation Agreement between the Salinas Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency and the Arroyo Seco Groundwater Sustainability Agency.

Curtis Weeks presented the Agreement to the Committee and led the discussion. Discussion took place. The Committee expressed its concern that there wasn't sufficient information on what is being proposed and how they would be implemented – within the entire Forebay, the Management Area or entire Salinas Valley.

Public Comment was received from Tom Virsik.

Jerry Lohr made the following motion, seconded by Mary Lerner: requesting that Curtis Weeks that the plan identify, keep, maintain and preserve the sustainability of the ASGSA Management Area, and that any projects/management actions need to make the distinction of how and if they benefit the ASGSA MA. The Forebay GSP must recognize the distinct and uniqueness of the ASGSA MA and should be identified as separate from the overall Forebay.

Motion approved unanimously.

2. Receive presentation on Implementation Chapter:

Curtis Weeks gave a presentation and overview of the Implementation Chapter. The Committee discussed the Chapter and expressed concern that there was no distinction as to how the MA would be implemented differently.

Allan Panziera made a motion, seconded by Roger Moitoso: to have the ASGSA GSP's Chapter 9 and the Implementation Chapter inserted into the MA GSP of the Forebay GSP. Nancy moved an amendment to state that it needed to be consistent with the Implementation Agreement.

Motion approved unanimously.

3. Consideration of appointment of Paul Wood to the coordination subcommittee to replace Jim Thorp and make recommendation to the BOD.

Nancy made a motion to approve the appointment and recommend to the BOD, Allan Panziera made the second; motion was approved unanimously.

4. Receive General Manager's Report:

Curtis Weeks gave an update on process for moving forward with the GSP and continued coordination with the SVBGSA.

5. Meeting adjourned

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy Isakson

May 31, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Curtis Weeks, Arroyo Seco Groundwater Sustainability Agency

From: Gus Yates, Senior Hydrologist

Re: Forebay Subbasin GSP: Comments on Draft Chapter 9 “Projects and Management Actions”

I have reviewed the draft of Chapter 9 “Projects and Management Actions” posted on the SVBGSA website. I have the following comments:

p. 9-5, Table 9-1, Project B1. Implementation of reservoir reoperation (the winter release schedule) and construction of injection wells in CSIP should be split into two projects and analyzed independently. They are not inherently linked. Furthermore, the winter release scenario is not the only pattern of reservoir reoperation that can achieve benefits or decrease existing undesirable results. For example, different rules for carrying over storage from one year to the next can prevent the occurrence of three consecutive years without conservation releases, thereby eliminating the primary undesirable result that periodically occurs in Forebay groundwater conditions.

Therefore, this management action needs to be broadened to cover more variations and combinations of actions, and local and Valley-wide benefits should be evaluated for each. Hypothetical examples might be:

1. Reoperate reservoirs: winter release scenario
 - a. Stand-alone
 - b. With CSIP injection wells
2. Reoperate reservoirs: increased carryover storage
 - a. Stand-alone
 - b. With CSIP injection wells
3. Interlake Tunnel
 - a. Stand-alone
 - b. With winter release scenario
 - c. With increased carryover storage
 - d. With CSIP injection wells

Quantitative analysis of the hydrologic effects of each variation and combination is straightforward using the reservoir reoperation model and FFM18 groundwater flow model

developed by ASGSA and SVWC. By exploring a broader range of possibilities, the most cost-beneficial action can be identified.

p. 9-25, Section 9.4.3. Project B-1. The description of the winter release scenario implicitly assumes that most of the water released in winter would flow to the ocean unless it were rediverted downstream. This is not necessarily true, depending on the magnitude of the reservoir pass-through runoff event and operational criteria applied to those events (e.g. pass through only flows up to the amount that can be percolated in the Salinas River channel). Thus, it is incorrect to assume that reservoir reoperation requires downstream rediversion to prevent waste. As stated in the previous comment, those elements should be evaluated independently as well as in combinations to identify the most cost-beneficial option.

p. 9-26, Section 9.4.3.2, 1st paragraph Evaluation of reservoir reoperation should not rely on the Salinas Valley Operations Model alone. Give the history of delays and inaccuracies experienced with the SVHM, SVBGSA and ASGSA should also evaluate management actions using the reservoir operations model and FFM18 groundwater flow model developed by ASGSA and the SVWC. Those tools have demonstrated reliable results and rapid turn-around times for scenario analysis. Furthermore, using multiple models to obtain independent estimates increases confidence in the results. This multi-model approach is routinely used with climate change forecasting.

p. 9-26, Section 9.4.3.2, first bullet. The text asserts that the winter release scenario will eliminate “most” summer releases and that it would increase carryover storage. Neither of these is necessarily intuitive. If analysis has been completed demonstrating those effects, it should be presented.

p. 9-27, 1st paragraph after bullets. The definition of the winter release scenario in the settlement agreement between SVWC and MCWRA does not state that summer releases be curtailed to carry water over for subsequent winter releases. It only specifies the circumstances under which winter releases would be made and the downstream flow targets for those releases.

p. 9-27, Section 9.4.3.3. The text states that reservoir reoperation will be implemented only after the HCP has been completed. This should be changed to state that SVBGSA and ASGSA will participate fully in the HCP development process so that reservoir operations and flow regimes that achieve habitat objectives and ones that achieve water supply and groundwater objectives can be evaluated concurrently and comprehensively. This strategy will allow for an outcome that maximizes overall benefits. For example, various reoperation rules might have different water supply outcomes but equivalent biological outcomes, or vice versa.

p. 9-38, Section 9.4.5.5. The ad-hoc activation of the Drought Technical Advisory Committee (D-TAC) and its limited focus on current-year releases simply perpetuates the history of short-sighted reservoir operation that resulted in three consecutive years without conservation releases during 2014-2016. If MCWRA waits until a drought arrives before

taking action, options are limited. MCWRA must prepare for droughts in advance, which means quantitative analysis of flows over multiple decades of operation under a given set of rules. Rules that prevent undesirable results during droughts may require storing additional water during non-drought years, which MCWRA's ad-hoc D-TAC is inherently incapable of doing.

The D-TAC is not an SVBGSA or ASGSA activity. It is an MCWRA activity. This management action for the GSP should state that SVBGSA and ASGSA will develop drought management strategies that are not constrained by MCWRA's D-TAC approach or MCWRA's "template" for release schedules. If analysis demonstrates that the SVBGSA/ASGSA strategies will produce superior outcomes over the long run, then SVBGSA/ASGSA will actively pressure the MCWRA Board of Directors to adopt those strategies.

p. 9-42, Section 9.4.7.2. The discussion of fallowing incorrectly implies that a reduction in pumping results in an equal increase in storage. This is not true. All head-dependent boundaries in a groundwater system respond to a change in any part of the water budget. In this case, a reduction in pumping would decrease average annual percolation from the Salinas River and increase average annual groundwater discharge to the river.

p. 9-42, Section 9.4.7.3. Fallowing appears to be a management action in search of a purpose. Groundwater conditions in the Forebay Subbasin are sustainable. There is no demonstrated need to decrease consumptive water use. If implementation were linked to a change in circumstances that warranted decreased consumptive use, it might be reasonable. But the text includes no such trigger and states that fallowing is voluntary. What grower would voluntarily fallow their land for no purpose? This management action should be omitted entirely, particularly in light of Management Action C3 (Pumping Restrictions TAC), which is mandatory and accomplishes the same objective of decreasing net consumptive use if it becomes necessary.

p. 9-48, Section 9.5. At the end of this introduction to Implementation Actions, add: "A fourth implementation applicable to the ASCMA is a policy opposing dams or new diversions from the Arroyo Seco."

p. 9-50, end of page. Insert new Section 9.5.5 Policy Regarding Arroyo Seco Dams and Diversions with the following text: "This implementation applies to the Arroyo Seco Cone Management Area and consists of adopting a policy to actively oppose construction of new dams on the Arroyo Seco and its tributaries. ASGSA opposes new appropriations of water from the Arroyo Seco watershed that would diminish groundwater recharge or sustainability in the ASGSA area or adversely impact the ecosystem and fishery resources." The subsidiary sections describing expected benefits, circumstances for implementation, etc. can be copied from the May 18, 2020 draft of the Arroyo Seco GSP.

This action is a high priority for ASGSA. It should be noted that SGMA regulations allow management areas to have different management actions than other parts of the GSP area, if appropriate (§351(r)). Because of the pronounced role of Arroyo Seco recharge in the

ASCMA, this implementation action is appropriate and should be included in the Forebay GSP.

May 31, 2021

MEMORANDUM

To: Curtis Weeks, Arroyo Seco Groundwater Sustainability Agency

From: Gus Yates, Senior Hydrologist

Re: Forebay Subbasin GSP: Comments on Draft Chapter 10 “GSP Implementation”

I have reviewed Chapter 10 “Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation” of the draft Forebay Subbasin GSP and have the following comments:

p. 1, Section 10.1.1.1. MCWRA’s current network of wells for monitoring water levels is not adequate. In its May 2020 draft GSP for the Arroyo Seco Cone area, ASGSA identified several shortcomings that need to be overcome to achieve a program adequate for this GSP. First, water level data collected by MCWRA are confidential pursuant to ordinances adopted by MCWRA. Chapter 10 does not mention the confidentiality issue and how that would be overcome to achieve data that are publicly available, as required by SGMA. Second, ASGSA identified geographic data gaps in network coverage, particularly in the upper Arroyo Seco Cone area where storage fluctuations are relatively large. Refer to Section 5.2.2 and Figure 5.2-1 of the ASGSA draft GSP for details. Additional wells need to be added to the network in the ASCMA to achieve adequate coverage. Chapter 10 (and Chapter 7) need to state that.

p. 1, Section 10.1.1. In addition, this section does not discuss temporal issues with MCWRA’s monitoring of water levels. The annual water-level measurements collected in November-December are sufficient to detect multi-year water-level declines that cause undesirable results. However, SGMA regulations explicitly require at least semi-annual measurements that coincide with the seasonal low and high water levels (§354.34(c)(1)(B)). The draft monitoring program for the 180/400 Foot Aquifer Subbasin GSP identified August as the month when the annual minimum water level typically occurs and December or January or February as the most common month for the annual high water level (Montgomery and Associates, 2020). A sample of seven Forebay wells with monthly data over an 11-year period revealed that in the ASGSA area the seasonal high water level most commonly occurred in March and the seasonal low in September. Chapter 10 of the Forebay GSP needs to address how MCWRA’s existing monitoring program will meet this SGMA requirement.

p. 4, Section 10.1.3.2. Chapter 10 must show the locations and construction of the three existing monitoring wells that the text asserts are adequate for monitoring groundwater-surface water connection along the Salinas River. I am not aware of any existing wells that

indicate water table elevation in the 0-30 foot range relevant to riparian vegetation. Shallow monitoring wells are inexpensive to construct and important to the sustainability evaluation. The Forebay GSP should not shirk this monitoring requirement.

p.4, Section 10.1.4, 1st bullet. To pay for the shallow monitoring wells, the proposed pump tests should be scrapped. An 8-hour pumping test will provide a transmissivity estimate for a limited fraction of basin thickness over a limited radial extent, and an estimate of storativity that is useless for calculating storage changes over months and years, which is the relevant issue for GSPs. Calibration of groundwater models provides estimates of transmissivity for the full thickness of each model layer and estimates of storativity corresponding to time scales of interest for management. If model calibration indicates unusual conditions in some location—such as a rapid change in apparent transmissivity—testing one or more wells in that location might be worthwhile.

p. 5, 1st top-level bullet. It is unclear whether the text is committing SVBGSA to drilling exploratory boreholes or installing monitoring wells down to the depth of the Deep Aquifer, which is an expensive proposition (especially compared to the root zone monitoring wells!). This needs to be clear.

p. 10, bullet list. The bullets provide welcome acknowledgement of the need to evaluate various modes of reservoir reoperation individually and in combination with other projects such as CSIP injection wells and the interlake tunnel. This is an improvement over the discussion in Chapter 9.