

# Big Valley Groundwater Basin Advisory Committee (BVAC)

## Unapproved Meeting Minutes

### BVAC Members:

**Lassen County BVAC** – Aaron Albaugh, Board Representative; Jeff Hemphill, Alt. Board Representative; Kevin Mitchell, Public Representative; Duane Conner, Public Representative  
**Modoc County BVAC** – Geri Byrne, Board Representative; Ned Coe, Alt. Board Representative; Jimmy Nunn, Public Representative; John Ohm, Public Representative

---

Wednesday, December 2, 2020

4:00 PM

Adin Community Center  
605 Highway 299  
Adin, CA 96006

---

BVAC Convene in Special Session.

Present: Committee Members: Albaugh, Byrne, Mitchell, Ohm, and Nunn.  
Absent: Committee Member: Conner (subsequently arrived at 4:49)

Also in attendance: BVAC staff Gaylon Norwood  
BVAC staff Tiffany Martinez  
BVAC Recorder Brooke Suarez  
Modoc County Counsel Sean Cameron  
Facilitator Judie Talbott

BVAC Chairman Albaugh called the meeting to order at 4:18 p.m.

**Flag Salute:** Chairman Albaugh requested Geri Byrne lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**General Update by Secretary:** Gaylon Norwood informed the committee that another letter was sent to Governor Gavin Newsom requesting a response to the request for an extension on the due date of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

**Matters Initiated by Committee Members:** None

**Correspondence** (unrelated to a specific agenda item): None

**Approval of Minutes (November 4, 2020) –**

**A motion was made by Representative Mitchell to approve BVAC meeting minutes from November 4, 2020. The motion was seconded by Representative Ohm. The motion was carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Albaugh, Mitchell, Ohm, and Nunn.

**Abstained:** 1 - Byrne

**SUBJECT #1:**

Introduction of Revised Draft Chapter 6 (*Water Budget*) of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

1. Receive report from the BVAC Secretary, Staff, and/or Consultant.
2. Receive public comment.
3. Accept and “set aside” Revised Draft chapter 6 for future inclusion into the Draft GSP.

David Fairman presented the Revised draft Chapter 6 with a Power Point presentation (Exhibit A). Chapter 6 is the last technical chapter that needs to be officially stamped by a licensed hydrologist. A tentative schedule for the remaining chapters was recapped with the acknowledgement that the stakeholders would be more in the driver’s seat now that the more scientific chapters have been drafted. It was GEI’s job to prepare the scientific chapters and share the knowledge with everyone so that they have the information required to proceed.

D. Fairman went on to state that Chapter 6 agricultural irrigation map was updated with more precise identification of the irrigation sources used. At the previous meeting committee members updated an agricultural irrigation map by pointing out irrigation water sources. GEI also looked at the Pit River and Ash Creek judgements as to where surface water rights could be used for irrigation. GEI also determined surface water irrigation areas by looking at well drilling records and aerial imagery. The percentage breakdown between groundwater or surface water used for irrigation is 60-65% groundwater and 35-40% surface water. D. Fairman also noted where other refinements were made to the water budget. Chapter 6 was updated using the Department of Water Resources climate change model as this model has more precipitation. With all the adjustments made, the water budget overdraft amount calculated in this draft Chapter 6 is 5,227 acre feet per year. The water budget presented does not include any increase in irrigation in the area or irrigation efficiency improvements in the future. Any future decisions by the committee regarding changes to the water budget could be made to the current model.

Meeting was recessed from 5:25 to 5:35 due to loss of internet connection and online audience could not participate. Representative Nunn, who was present via the internet stated that using the internet for the meeting is not working. It is hard to hear and the internet keeps cutting out and that participation will be hard to get with this set up. Chairman Albaugh requested that another letter be sent to the state requesting an extension due the disadvantage of the area’s internet quality.

Gaylon Norwood handed out the comment matrix for Chapter 6. Chairman Albaugh requested that the word “estimated” be added in front of all in-flow statements in the GSP. He wants to see the wetland wildlife irrigation wells be added to the agricultural irrigation map. D. Fairman stated it was identified under the wetland part of the water budget but could be added to the agricultural portion also. Discussion was held regarding the wells in the wetland area and how to obtain the data pertaining to these wells. Representative Mitchell would like to see an overlay of the agricultural irrigation map with the basin boundary map.

Chapter 6 is to come back at the February meeting as the last item on the agenda.

**Public Comment:** None

**SUBJECT #2:**

Update and discussion on stream gage project on the Pit River for the Big Valley Groundwater Basin.

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

1. Receive reports from the BVAC Secretary, Staff, and/or Consultant.
2. Receive public comment.

Tiffany Martinez gave an update on the Pit River stream gage project. T. Martinez had arranged a tour of the possible sites earlier in the day. Several of the committee members as well as a DWR representative went on the tour. A summary of the two locations, the Stone Co. site and the Shaw Pit site, was given. Though the Stone Co. site is a physically better site, it is closer to the Canby gage site. The Shaw Pit site is further down river which allows the inflow water sources between the Stone Co. site and the Shaw Pit site to be included in the measurements. Six to eight measurements at the sites will need to be taken to get an accurate flow rate.

The Shaw Pit site is presenting as the best choice. It has an acceptable stream bed, easy access, and the gage could be mounted on the bridge. The cons regarding this site include: (1) the need to get the land owner's approval, (2) the stream bed might not allow for good high flow readings, (3) readings would have to be taken more often at this site and costs after the grant is over must be taken into consideration, and (4) water has flowed over the bridge in the past and thus it might damage any gage attached to the bridge. Representative Nunn questioned if the possible bridge overflow eliminates the site as a possible choice.

A tour of the Muck Valley diversion was taken. They have detailed readings regarding water flow in that area since 1988. T. Martinez will look into the possibility of obtaining water flow information from them.

Ian Espinoza of DWR commented that there is assistance available through DWR for training and maintenance of the gages. Laura Snell of the UC Cooperative Extension would not only like for a water gage be purchased, but also movable water flow measuring equipment to be able to get measurements in more places. She also stated there will be costs associated with training as the measurements will need to be interpreted into useful information. She estimated that a conservative cost per year to keep taking measurement readings after the grant is completed is \$5,000.00.

Chairman Albaugh asked who will own the equipment after it has been purchased and asked if the equipment could be leased. Tiffany Martinez responded that the term of the grant agreement will determine who the owner of the equipment is and she will look into the leasing of equipment. T. Martinez stated that since the committee is only looking at one site, only one gage

would be purchased for that site and possibly a second gage will be purchased as a replacement. She also reiterated that there are currently gages on Ash Creek and Willow Creek.

**Public Comment:** An online comment was that there are 9 miles between the Canby gage and the Stone Co. site. There are 6 miles between the Stone Co. site and the Shaw Pit site.

### **SUBJECT #3**

Introduction of proposed new schedule for regular meetings of the Big Valley Groundwater Basin Advisory Committee (BVAC).

#### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

1. Receive reports from the BVAC Secretary, Staff, and/or Consultant.
2. Receive public comment.
3. Approve new regular meeting schedule.

A tentative GSP process and schedule handout (Exhibit D) was presented to the committee. Discussion was held on the necessity of the Public Outreach meeting to be held in January of 2021. Representative Byrne stated that Tiffany Martinez regularly gives the Modoc Board of Supervisors an update on the GSP and that Lassen County Board of Supervisors should receive regular updates also so that they are informed at the final vote needed to pass the GSP. By updating the Boards of Supervisors, they will have time to ask questions and provide input prior to the final presentation of the GSP.

**A motion was made by Representative Nunn to approve the new regular meeting schedule. The motion was seconded by Representative Byrne. The motion was carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Albaugh, Byrne, Mitchell, Conner, Ohm, and Nunn.

**Public Comment:** None

**Matters Initiated by the General Public** (regarding subjects not on the agenda): None

**Establish next meeting date:** February 3, 2021 at 4:00 pm. Place to be determined.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, Chairman Albaugh adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.