



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service



AGENDA

SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, January 31, 2013, 2:00 p.m.

Agricultural Commissioner's Office/UCCE Conference Room
1710 Soscol Avenue, Napa CA

Committee Members

Michelle Benvenuto
Tucker Catlin
Alan Galbraith
Don Gleason
Dave Graves
Michael Haley
Peter McCrea
Charles Slutzkin
Steve Soper
Marilee Talley
Bill Trautman
Jim Verhey
Susanne von Rosenberg
Duane Wall
Dale Withers

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLLCALL
2. WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS
(Staff, Consultant, Committee)
3. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS (10 min)
(Staff, Consultant, Committee)
 - a. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
 - b. ADOPTION OF 2013 REGULAR MEETING CALENDAR
 - c. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES & MEETING SUMMARY
 - d. REVIEW MEETING AGENDA AND PROCESS

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

In this time period, anyone may comment to the Committee regarding any subject over which the Committee has jurisdiction, or request consideration to place an item on a future Agenda. No comments will be allowed involving any subject matter that is scheduled for discussion as part of this Agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation. No action will be taken by the Committee as a result of any item presented at this time. (Chair)

5. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

COMMITTEE REVIEW, DISCUSSION & DIRECTION

- a. CONSIDER ADOPTION OF THE GROUNDWATER MONITORING INFORMATIONAL BROCHURE AND OUTREACH MATERIALS (20 min) (Michael Haley/Ad-Hoc Committee)
 - REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
 - REVIEW RECOMMENDED FINAL DRAFT BROCHURE & OUTREACH MATERIALS
 - Q&A - DISCUSS GRAC QUESTIONS
- b. CONSIDER ACCEPTANCE OF THE NAPA COUNTY GROUNDWATER MONITORING PLAN AND RECOMMEND PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (20 min) (Vicki Kretsinger Grabert (LSCE))
 - REVIEW FINAL DRAFT GROUNDWATER MONITORING PLAN
 - Q&A - DISCUSS GRAC QUESTIONS

804 First Street,
Napa, CA
94559

Tel: 707-259-8600
Fax: 707-259-8619

5. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS: (cont'd)

➤ COMMITTEE BREAK (CHAIR TO CALL)

c. REPORT ON UPDATED HYDROGEOLOGIC CONCEPTUALIZATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CONDITIONS (90 min) (*Vicki Kretsinger Grabert/LSCE, and Lee Bergfeld/MBK*)

- OVERVIEW OF REPORT
- PRESENTATION ON GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AND STREAM/AQUIFER INTERCONNECTIVITY
- Q&A - DISCUSS GRAC QUESTIONS

6. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. UPDATE ON GROUNDWATER DATA MANAGEMENT & DISCLOSURE GUIDANCE DOCUMENT (5 min) (*Phil Miller, Deputy Director/Public Works; Patrick Lowe, Natural Resources Manager/Public Works*)
- b. UPDATE ON DWR GRANT APPLICATION FOR GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELLS (5 min) (*Patrick Lowe, Natural Resources Manager/Public Works*)

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. UPCOMING EVENTS OR ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF (5 min)

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Discuss the Board of Supervisors Update/Presentation

9. ADJOURNMENT to the NEXT REGULAR MEETING (*Chair*)

- Meeting Date: Thursday, February 28, 2013 – 2:00PM

Note: Where times are indicated for agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed. If requested, the agenda and documents in the agenda packet shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Please contact Greg Morgan at 707-259-8621, 804 First St., Napa CA 94559 to request alternative formats.





Napa County

Groundwater Resources
Advisory Committee

A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

2013 Meeting Calendar

Members:

- Michelle Benvenuto**
- Tucker Catlin**
- Alan Galbraith**
- Don Gleason**
- Dave Graves**
- Michael Haley**
- Peter McCrea**
- Charles Slutzkin**
- Steve Soper**
- Marilee Talley**
- Bill Trautman**
- Jim Verhey**
- Susanne von Rosenberg**
- Duane Wall**
- Dale Withers**

Staff:

Patrick Lowe,
Natural Resources
Conservation Mgr
Water Resources/Flood Control
Dept. of Public Works

Phillip Miller,
Deputy Director
Water Resources/Flood Control
Dept. of Public Works

Janice Killion,
Legal Counsel
County Counsel's Office

Meeting Details

Time:
2:00 PM

Location:
Ag. Commissioner's Office
UCCE Conference Room
1710 Soscol Ave., Napa CA

Pubic attendance is
welcome

NOTE: Meeting time and location may change as directed by the Committee

January

S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
			1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
27	28	29	30	31			

February

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28		

March

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

April

S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
28	29	30					

May

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

June

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

July

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

GRAC/WICC
Joint Meeting

August

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

September

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

October

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

November

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

December

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

- Regular Meeting Dates

(Blank page inserted for 2-sided printing)



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service



ACTION MINUTES

**NAPA COUNTY GROUNDWATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
October 25, 2012**

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC) met in regular session on Thursday, October 25, 2012 with the following members present:

Alan Galbraith; Don Gleason; Michael Haley; Chair Peter McCrea; Charles Slutzkin; Steve Soper; Marilee Talley; Bill Trautman; Jim Verhey; Susanne von Rosenberg; Duane Wall; and Dale Withers. Michelle Benvenuto and Dave Graves arrived during Item 3.c; and Vice-Chair Tucker Catlin arrived during item 5.a.

2. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Not formally discussed.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

a. REVIEW MEETING AGENDA AND PROCESS

Dorian Fougères, Ph.D., Mediator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS, briefly reviewed the background and purpose of each agenda item.

b. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES AND MEETING SUMMARY

Action Minutes and Meeting Summary of the August 23, 2012 regular meeting approved.

MB	TC	AG	DG1	DG2	MH	PM	CS	SS	MT	BT	JV	SVR	DW1	DW2
X	X			X										

c. REVIEW ACCOMPLISHMENTS & ADOPT UPDATED WORK PLAN/SCHEDULE

Dorian Fougères, Ph.D., Mediator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS, went over a large printout of a timeline that coincides with the work plan included in the agenda packet. The printout charts the GRAC’s accomplishments since October 2011 to date and the tasks that will be carried out in the future. Some of the highlights of the past year’s work include adoption of the Mission Statement; working on the characterization of groundwater conditions; an ad hoc subcommittee’s work to further refine the priorities and objectives of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan; and adoption of a communication and education plan as a working document. Goals for next year include finalization of the data disclosure outline and outreach materials (January); adoption of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan (January/February); work on outreach efforts and the Groundwater Ordinance (February/June); report to the Board of

Item 3.c...Continued

Supervisors on the GRAC's work plan, accomplishments to date, and upcoming outreach efforts (February); and a joint meeting with the Watershed Information Conservancy and Center (July). The focus for 2014 will be on the GRAC's charge of developing sustainability objectives and incentives. Patrick Lowe, Natural Resources Conservation Program Manager, Public Works, stated the GRAC would receive a smaller version of the printout via email. The work plan was adopted as presented.

MB TC AG DG1 DG2 MH PM CS SS MT BT JV SVR DW1 DW2
X

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

5. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. GROUNDWATER MONITORING DATA

Phil Miller, Deputy Director-Flood Control and Water Resources, presented a PowerPoint presentation on an outline that would be referred to as a data management and disclosure guidance document. The outline provides goals and objectives; intended audiences; the voluntary and non-voluntary groundwater monitoring programs used for data collection; the types of data collected; the manner in which the County processes the data; and how the County and other agencies will publish the data and how it would be used. Appendices to the guidance document include data management procedures, reference to the relevant State Water Code sections, public website addresses, and a sample Right of Entry agreement. Along with a revised version of the outline that was provided in the agenda packet, Mr. Miller distributed a handout that displayed the level of program participation according to County and State groundwater monitoring programs in a tabular format. Discussion arose on how confidentiality is addressed in the outreach materials, as well as the clarity of information. Chair Peter McCrea suggested the comments made could be reviewed by the ad hoc subcommittee for further revisions to the materials. Tom Adams, Senior Counsel, Dickenson Peatman & Fogarty, presented a PowerPoint presentation of his own perspective based on his experience in dealing with landowners on water rights and land issues and their typical concerns. Examples of some concerns are the necessity of groundwater monitoring, what are the benefits of groundwater monitoring and being proactive, and how much information is enough. Other more specific concerns pertain to confidentiality, groundwater monitoring data being used against the landowner, and the next steps that may impact landowners.

b. DRAFT NAPA COUNTY GROUNDWATER MONITORING PLAN

Vicki Kretsinger Grabert, Principal Hydrologist, LSCE, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the most recent draft of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan and noted the GRAC's previous reviews of Sections 1 through 3 in June and Sections 1 through 6 in August. A redlined version that showed the most recent revisions less the appendices and the complete clean version were included in the agenda packet. The most recent revisions pertained to clarifying tables and the definitions of

Item 5.b...Continued

acronyms, groundwater balance, additional background on quality issues, and simplifying Section 5. Ms. Kretsinger Grabert responded to previous questions on how the Groundwater Monitoring Plan would address mining and wastewater, which would apply only if a local/environmental health department recognized a site-specific interest to be of concern and if broader, non-point kinds of land uses were occurring at a recycled water use area near an area of interest. Topics of discussion included the most recent revisions to the Groundwater Monitoring Plan; a recap of objectives, priorities and areas of interest for groundwater level and quality monitoring; and the next steps. Groundwater balance and how the inflows and outflows affect storage was also discussed. It was recommended that the groundwater reporting by the County doesn't have to occur annually. The next steps focused on identifying the 18 areas of interest – how they relate to the education and outreach program and how there are some potential wells that might become the focus of volunteer participants. Although most of the areas of interest contain wells located within the same area where LSCE has conducted extensive geologic work, there are six areas of interest outside of the LSCE geologic work area that have unlocated wells. The information received from drillers' reports doesn't provide information on the current owner. A goal would be to link the located wells to the current owners and to locate the unlocated wells and then link to those owners. The Groundwater Monitoring Plan will be finalized and brought back to the GRAC at their January meeting. The draft report on Updated Hydrogeologic Characterization and Conceptualization will also be presented to the GRAC at their January/February meetings. Hillary Gitelman, Director, PBES, suggested that any GRAC members who have additional comments on the draft Groundwater Monitor Plan to submit them to staff via email.

c. REVIEW OF THE COMMUNICATION & EDUCATION VOLUNTARY GROUNDWATER LEVEL MONITORING INFORMATIONAL BROCHURE AND OUTREACH MATERIALS

Member Michael Haley requested the GRAC provide general comments about the brochure and inserts during the meeting, whereas Patrick Lowe, Natural Resources Conservation Program Manager, Public Works, would send an email to the GRAC asking for more specific comments. Many of the GRAC members concurred that the outreach materials should address the purpose and goal of groundwater monitoring, as well as list the possible risks. Mr. Haley stated the subcommittee will look at possibly rearranging some of the content of the brochure to give other subjects higher priorities and that confidentiality needs to be clear. Mr. Lowe added the intent of the brochure is to act as a framing piece while the inserts provide additional information that focus on different aspects of the Groundwater Monitoring Program and allow the GRAC members flexibility on what best to share with property owners. Chair Peter McCrea, Vice-Chair Tucker Catlin, and members Michelle Benvenuto and Susanne von Rosenberg volunteered and were appointed to the existing ad hoc subcommittee.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Review of Updated GRA Committee Workplan
- Review/possible finalization of Groundwater Monitoring Plan
- Finalize education and outreach materials
- Recruit members for outreach efforts

Chair Peter McCrea asked when staff would be reporting to the Board of Supervisors. Patrick Lowe, Natural Resources Conservation Program Manager, Public Works, replied that staff was planning for February since the Groundwater Monitoring Plan would hopefully be wrapped up in January, and it would be a good time to update the Board at that point on where the GRAC is at in terms of the work plan, what has been accomplished, and that the GRAC is beginning outreach efforts.

9. ADJOURNMENT to the NEXT MEETING

The regularly scheduled meeting of Thursday, December 13, 2012 has been cancelled. Adjourned to the next special meeting of the Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee on Thursday, January 31, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

PETER McCREA, Chairperson

ATTEST:

PATRICK LOWE, Secretary

By: _____
GREG MORGAN, Supervising Office Assistant

Voting Key

If not unanimous, member votes will be tallied (N = No; X = Excused; A = Abstained) using the following Committee Member abbreviations:

MB = Michelle Benvenuto; TC = Tucker Catlin; AG = Alan Galbraith; DG1 = Don Gleason; DG2 = Dave Graves;
MH = Michael Haley; PM = Peter McCrea; CS = Charles Slutzkin; SS = Steve Soper; MT = Marilee Talley;
BT = Bill Trautman; JV = Jim Verhey; SVR = Susanne von Rosenberg; DW1 = Duane Wall; DW2 = Dale Withers

Example Key:

MB TC AG DG1 DG2 MH PM CS SS MT BT JV SVR DW1 DW2

MEETING SUMMARY

Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee Meeting October 25, 2012

Produced by the Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS

Meeting Synopsis

The Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC) held its eighth meeting on October 25, 2012. The Committee adopted an updated work plan for 2013, including solicitation of voluntary groundwater monitoring program participants and groundwater ordinance updates. Mr. Phil Miller, Napa County Public Works, presented an updated outline for data management and disclosure. Discussion focused on the associated communication and outreach materials. The County and Ad Hoc Communication & Education Committee (CEC) will refine materials based on comments. Guest speaker Mr. Tom Adams, Dickenson Peatman & Fogarty, presented likely concerns that landowners might have about the monitoring activities and voluntary monitoring program. This included explaining the necessity of collecting data, and the potential impact that misuse of data could have on landowners in the future. The County and Ad Hoc/CEC will incorporate these issues in the revised communication and outreach materials.

Ms. Vicki Kretsinger Grabert, Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), presented the updates to the final draft of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan. This included refined objectives and priorities for groundwater level and quality monitoring, and the location of the areas of interest (AOIs) for monitoring. Mr. Michael Haley, Ad Hoc/CEC, presented the revised Communication and Education brochure and associated inserts. The Committee emphasized that the purpose, existing information foundation, and landowner risks should be more clearly stated, and must be presented concisely and candidly. The Ad-Hoc/CEC added four new members and will meet in November to address comments and direction provided by the Committee. The Committee agreed to move its next meeting from December to Thursday, January 31, 2013, and then resume its regular bi-monthly meeting schedule beginning on February 28, 2013.

Please see the GRAC's webpage (www.countyofnapa.org/bos/grac) for copies of the October 25, 2012, presentations and handouts.

Table of Contents

Meeting Synopsis	1
Action Items	2
1. Call to Order & Roll Call	3
2. Welcome & Opening Remarks.....	3
3. Organizational Items	3
a. Review Meeting Agenda and Process.....	3
b. Approval of Action Minutes & Meeting Summary	3
c. Review Accomplishments & Adopt Updated Work Plan/Schedule	3
4. Public Comment	3
5. Presentations and Discussion Items	4
a. Groundwater Monitoring Data.....	4
Groundwater Data Management & Disclosure	4
What participation means for well owners	6
b. Draft Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan (Plan)	8
Groundwater Data Management & Disclosure	Error! Bookmark not defined.
c. Review of Communication & Education Voluntary Groundwater Level Monitoring Informational Brochure and Outreach Materials.	13
6. Other Business	15
7. Announcements	15
a. Upcoming Events or Items of Interest from the Committee and Staff	15
8. Future Agenda Items.....	15
9. Adjournment to the Next Meeting	16
Attendees.....	16

Action Items

1. **ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS** to review outreach materials and provide any additional comments to Patrick Lowe.
2. **COUNTY STAFF** to consider relationship between groundwater data and CEQA, and follow up with David Graves and GRAC.
3. **COUNTY STAFF** to distribute a copy of the timeline graphic.

4. **PATRICK LOWE** to send email reminder to Committee to provide any remaining feedback on outreach materials.
5. **AD HOC COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE** to revise outreach materials based on GRAC comments.
6. **PATRICK LOWE** will send an email around with date options for the Ad Hoc Communication Committee to meet.

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

All members of the Napa County Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC) were in attendance.

2. Welcome & Opening Remarks

Chair Peter McCrea opened the session.

3. Organizational Items

a. Review Meeting Agenda and Process

Chair McCrea and Facilitator Dorian Fougères reviewed the agenda.

b. Approval of Action Minutes & Meeting Summary

No corrections were suggested to the August 23, 2012 meeting minutes and meeting summary.

AGREEMENT: The August 23, 2012 meeting minutes and meeting summary were unanimously approved.

c. Review Accomplishments & Adopt Updated Work Plan/Schedule

Mr. Fougères reviewed the GRA Committee Work Plan, updated for October 25, 2012. The work plan was also displayed as a timeline graphic.

Several committee members observed that a lot of progress has been made, and thanked the ad hoc and communication committees for their work.

AGREEMENT: The GRAC unanimously adopted the Work Plan/Schedule as presented.

4. Public Comment

Chair McCrea invited public comments. No public comments were provided.

5. Presentations and Discussion Items

a. Groundwater Monitoring Data

Groundwater Data Management & Disclosure

Phil Miller, Deputy Director/Public Works-Flood, presented the “Data Management and Disclosure Guidance Document Outline.” The outline was updated from the one sent in the mail packet, and was provided as a hand-out. The presentation outlined the data collection, data processing, and data and results publication procedures. This newer version of the outline was based on the GRAC’s August discussion about confidentiality and incorporates input received from committee members.

Particular attention was given to two graphics in the presentation. These were the “Groundwater Data Collection, Management, Use & Reporting” graphic (sheet 9 of the presentation) and the “Publication of Data Results” graphic (on sheet 14 of the presentation). On request of the committee the latter graphic was also represented in tabular format.

Mr. Miller asked for feedback on how to improve the graphics for use when explaining the process and programs. The newest version of the “sample right of entry” form was also presented.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- **Groundwater Quality.** Question: Why is the GRAC collecting groundwater quality data, where does this come from and why is it in the volunteer program? Answer: Collecting data on groundwater quality comes from the charge from the Board of Supervisors, and has been in all drafts of the Groundwater Monitoring Plan (and previous monitoring program related documents). Whether such data is actually gathered will depend on the availability of County funds.
 - **Charge of the work group.** Question: It appears that collecting the groundwater quality data is already being done by the Department of Health. So how does measuring that fit in the scope of our work with levels of groundwater levels? The previous answer was reiterated. (Note: additional comments are found in agenda item 5.b.)
 - **Liability issue when County handles pump/well equipment to do testing.** Concern: Groundwater quality testing procedures as outlined entail more than measuring only the groundwater levels, and may not be necessary. Well equipment could be also damaged during testing.

- **Alerting landowner that his specific data has been requested.** Question: Can the County set up a mechanism in which a participant of the programs is alerted when the public makes a request for his/her data? Answer:
 - The County will look into this possibility. Additionally, the information resides in a confidential database, so the only way someone could access it is by asking the County and taking legal action. If the County were forced to disclose the information, all participants would have been notified earlier of the suit.
- **Naming of document.** Recommend calling the document a “manual”, rather than “guidance”. The General Plan is the guidance. Answer: This document is not a “how to” document, which generally a manual is; instead, this is a “what we do” document involving procedures. The naming can be worked out later.
- **Outreach materials.** A number of comments concerning the graphics and the inserts were provided. (Note: additional comments are found in agenda item 5.c.)
- **ACTION ITEM: ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS** to review outreach materials and provide any additional comments to Patrick Lowe.

General Feedback from Committee concerning graphics and documents:

- Comment: The “Publication of Data & Results” graphic actually shows the confidentiality of data and results. It does not show “low” to “high”, but shows “lack of” confidentiality. It shows that there is no confidentiality at all at the state level. Response: It depends on how you interpret it. Some people see a “high” risk involved with full disclosure, others don’t see a risk associated with that. This choice of “high” and “low” was made for this graphic.
- Comment: The graphic “Groundwater Data Collection, Management, Use, & Reporting” (sheet 9 of the presentation) is particularly useful.
- Comment: The Table: “Data Management and Disclosure Procedures” is a good back-up for the bar chart “Publication of Data Results”.
- Comment: The flow chart, “Groundwater Data Collection, Management, Use & Reporting” graphic, gives the impression that all data is equally confidential. This graphic would not be accessible to a landowner.
- Comment: The text in “Data Management and Disclosure” is helpful.

- Comment: The graphics and documents seem to be a number of different version displaying the same information. The “Data Management and Disclosure Procedures” table most clearly identifies the implications are of taking part in the programs, although may not be complete.
- Comment: The materials that go out should be streamlined to display the effort that this committee is charged with. Materials need to be clear and simple in the message concerning the voluntary program. In this manner the interaction with landowners could be more focused on the voluntary program and the risks involved with this program, rather than on all possible programs. Peripheral pieces could include information about other programs such as CASGEM so that landowners know how those programs relate to the voluntary program. This could also be used at those specific locations where gaps in the data for CASGEM need to be filled, but otherwise omitted.
- **General Feedback from the public:** Comment: There are other groundwater programs that the County and GRAC should be aware of, if programs are going to be listed in the plan. For example, there is a GRACE (Gravity Recovery and Climate Exchange) program, which is a partnership between EPA and NOAA. It does groundwater level monitoring using satellite imagery.
- **Relationship between County Groundwater Data and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review:** Question: The data gathered is going to be used to prepare a bigger picture of what is going on with groundwater in the county. In what way could this information be used for a CEQA process for a use permit, for example, while being confidential enough to protect the concerns of the landowners? How much of the groundwater information can be disclosed to prove that the data is reliable without compromising the confidentiality?
- **ACTION ITEM: COUNTY STAFF** to consider relationship between groundwater data and CEQA, and follow up with David Graves and GRAC.

What participation means for well owners

Tom Adams, Senior Counsel, DP&F, presented his perspective of the concerns that landowners may have about groundwater monitoring. His presentation characterized questions that landowners may have and may want answered. The intent of this presentation was not to debate the questions, but to better anticipate some of these concerns in outreach materials.

Mr. Adams raised the following concerns:

- Is data that is deemed critical truly essential, or does it serve a different purpose? For example, he noted ongoing debates about instream flow standards, frost protection, and endangered fish species that involved the state.
- Will six groundwater/surface water wells be sufficient to characterize groundwater in the valley? The nexus between these water levels may not appear as obvious to the landowners as it does to the County and consultants.
- What is the relationship between this monitoring effort and the 2050 Napa Valley Water Resources Study and its conclusions? Is that a reference point or driver for this work?
- Why does the County feel the need to initiate this program?
- What are the potential future risks and impacts for landowners who participate in the program?

Mr. Adams recommended that the County be clear and honest about possible consequences of participating in the program.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- **2050 Napa Valley Water Resources Study.**
 - **Comment:** The results of the 2050 NVWR study were striking and questionable, which is why the County is now focusing time and attention on groundwater measuring and monitoring. The first phase of LSCE’s work, the consultant, demonstrates that the 2050 NVWR conclusions for 2020 were inaccurate. The County seeks to clarify where concerns are legitimate.
 - **Comment:** The shortcomings and need to improve upon the 2050 NVWR study need to be communicated in outreach efforts.
- **Outreach materials.** (These comments are also relevant for agenda items 5.c.)
 - **Comment:** We will need to set up an educational component in which we explain the connection between groundwater and surface water.
 - **Comment:** The County needs to be clear on why it is making this effort.
 - Our main brochure only includes “what” we’re doing.
 - The agricultural sector should be nervous not about the County, but about the state. The County needs to have sufficient factual information to respond to what the state proposes about regulations and to be able to properly represent the agricultural sector in the county.

- **Comment:** The County needs to be careful not to argue either side of the case in the educational material. The County wants to identify concerns and provide full disclosure. It would be good if a simple statement can explain what is proposed.
- **Comment:** The County needs to acknowledge the risk that a landowner may one day lose groundwater. Landowners must be well informed about whether they want to support this effort.
- **Comment:** It appears that the landowners are going to be afraid that they will be regulated individually. Outreach materials need to acknowledge this and communicate that policies and regulations are county-wide; they do not apply to single individuals.
- **Comment:** There is a fine line between identifying risks and scaring people away. The County needs to find a balance between informing people and encouraging them to participate. The challenge is to fine-tune language and messaging without misleading people.
- **Disclosing confidential information.** Mr. Charles Slutzkin gave an example of where the Resource Conservation District and agricultural community worked together to respond to a research request without disclosing confidential information.

b. Draft Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan (Plan)

Vicki Kretsinger Grabert of Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE) reviewed the updated draft Plan, which included the revisions made based on the Committee comments and questions from the August 2012 meeting. Significant revisions included: Section 5 has been streamlined; tables have been clarified; a short discussion about water “balancing” and water “budgeting” has been included to clarify why that topic is important (see section 2.3.3.); and a brief statement was included about how the plan addresses mining and waste water (see section 4.2.2.5). Concerning water quality, the intent of the plan is not to cover local water quality issues but to look at broader geographical trends.

Ms. Kretsinger Grabert recapped the objectives and priorities of groundwater level and groundwater quality monitoring, and the location of the areas of interest (AOIs) for monitoring. The draft also addresses how to implement the Plan and what information can be gathered from the data. This data will serve as a “snap shot indicator” of groundwater levels, as well as input for analysis of the trends in the Groundwater

Balance that take place from season to season, from year to year and over a longer period of time. The data will help understand the response of the groundwater system to climate and other factors, including level fluctuations at the water table and also water level responses deeper in the aquifer system.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

- **Surface water and Groundwater Quality.**

- Question: There is a perception that the surface water/groundwater interaction is a county-wide phenomenon that is not relevant to a particular parcel or well. Answer: It can be viewed from the county scale, which is the driving interest of being better informed about the actual physical conditions and knowing how those water levels are connected or not. The monitoring program could tie surface water with groundwater and could help show where in the area such interactions do or do not exist. In that manner we can make sure that we do not jump to the “wrong” conclusions about certain trends that are observed in wells.

For clarity, landowners will not be asked to participate and volunteer their wells for this portion of the monitoring program. These wells will be ones located on public property. Regardless, the County will still need to make mention of these wells in the communication documents.

- **Depth of Surface Water/Groundwater wells.**

- Question: How deep are the Surface/Groundwater wells going to be? Answer: At a single borehole (site) there will be two shallow wells that will be separated by a seal so that there is no connection between the two wells through the gravel envelope. The relatively deeper one will be up to about 60 feet deep.
- Comment: It was mentioned that the data from the those wells would be collected more frequently than daily in order to understand seasonal change, the degree of that change per season, and to be able to relate that to what is going on deeper in the aquifer system. It appears that the resulting information would be a local conclusion, so what is the degree of confidence for the larger area? Response: The wells are spread through the valley floor. The new data will be coupled with what is known about the geology of the subsurface, and with the data from the 81 current sites, in order to generalize from those wells. In January 2013 LSCE hopes to have a presentation about the complexity of the hydrogeology in the valley.

- **Groundwater Level Monitoring**

- Comment: The tables that are in the Plan (sheets 8, 12 and 13 of the presentation) summarize why there is a need for monitoring in a sub-area, what the objectives are, what is known about the overall condition, trends, etc.
- Comment: The 18 areas of interest (AIOs) are located in the relatively higher priority areas. County-wide, however, there are more areas where there is not a lot of data and also not a lot of groundwater development. Yet if there is interest from the public to volunteer their wells and they have the drillers report for their well, then those wells could be considered for inclusion if it also happens to be in an area where there is that additional data interest.

- **Groundwater Quality Data**

- Comment: Through the monitoring program it would be possible to achieve a baseline of what is naturally occurring. It could be of interest for the public to know what minerals and metals already occur in their water naturally, based on the gathered monitoring data.
- Comment: It was recently learned that USGS had been doing some groundwater quality sampling in Napa and Sonoma Counties. The County is trying to learn more about the wells where testing was done, to the extent possible under confidentiality clauses, because those landowners have already shown interest and may be beneficial for our program as well. It would be beneficial to identify the connection between those wells and what the County is doing.
- Question: What would the costs be of analyzing a sample of the water from those wells? Does that mean that when a landowner indicates they want a free water sample test, that the County pays for that? Answer: The costs are quite high. If there is sampling interest the County will have to evaluate whether the full suite of metals and minerals need to be tested, which depends on location, and to determine what the potential is of dovetailing that sampling with other programs. For example, DWR had indicated earlier that they may have funds for sampling.
- Mr. Steve Lederer, Director, Public Works Department: To answer the earlier question about how groundwater quality monitoring fits in the committee scope of looking at groundwater levels; it is in the Resolution stating:

“WHEREAS, Action Item CON WR-8 further requires the County to use monitoring data ‘to determine baseline water quality conditions, track groundwater levels, and identify where

problems may exist' and work collaboratively with property owners and other stakeholders where there is a demonstrated need for actions to address groundwater problems;"

- Question: There is already a lot of data on groundwater quality, from when the wells are drilled and from all the other programs. Why would the County then make it possible for landowners to get their quality tested and to spend money on testing the quality? Answer: Just because there is a possibility for landowners to indicate that they would want water quality testing, does not necessarily mean that it will be tested. Testing may take place depending on whether the well is located in an area in which the County would be willing to have a sample tested. Secondly, some changes have been observed in the water quality of the wells in the county. It would therefore be worthwhile to measure the water quality trends.
- **Drillers' reports:** Comment: In sheet 23 a table is shown that indicates the number of "unlocated wells." A number of wells were "located" for geological purposes. These "unlocated" wells are situated in or near the areas of interest and are wells for which the County has drillers' reports. They are not part of the program right now because the County hasn't started the outreach yet. The County will need to determine whether these unlocated wells could be potential outreach opportunity based on drillers' reports and historical information and current information.
- **Suggestions for additions to Plan:**
 - Comment: Section 6 should be expanded upon. A number of suggestions for additions and changes are:
 - include a data report, such as a water management report, that is sent out;
 - include recommendations, particularly in reference to the monitoring network in the Plan;
 - make a connection and share information with other plans, for example by including a section on "County/Regional wide reporting." In the goals the plan states that the County will work together with the cities, the Urban Water Management Plan, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans, Basin Plans, etc. In its reporting the County could characterize the conditions of groundwater levels and quality and communicate our information with these other programs/stakeholders;
 - in 6.3 make clear that reporting on "county-wide groundwater

conditions” means reporting on groundwater levels and quality;

- include a progress report. Since the County is talking about recommended additions to the program network, in the subsequent years a progress report could help keep track of the recommendations that have been made.
- **Sub area specific information.** Question: What was the specific objective of the Area of Interest in Pope Valley? Answer: There wasn't a high priority to include Pope Valley, but it became an area of interest because of DWR's CASGEM interest in that area.
- **Comment:** For outreach purposes there are three places in the Plan document that contain information about the objectives of monitoring:
- **Communication and educational materials.**
 - Rather than communicating that information is going to be shared with “other bureaucrats,” the County should make clear what the actual outputs of the process are going to be. This should include:
 - What we are going to do;
 - The level of detail of information that will be shared;
 - For whom our information will become available, and what they will/can do with it;
 - What has happened over the years, i.e., trends;
 - Indication of whether or not we should be concerned, and why; and
 - What will happen when data shows results of concern.
 - Comment from the public: The public is interested in the indicators -- particular numbers for a particular measure -- not all the specific well data. Similarly, at the moment a lot of groups and communities -- surface water or groundwater related -- in the county are going to establish their sustainability objectives and indicators.
 - Comment: The County is trying to establish “baselines and trends”, which are related to indicators. It needs to be made clear what a baseline or a trend is.
 - Request to Committee: Please give all scribbled comments to staff (i.e. - Hillary Gitelman or Patrick Lowe via email).

- **ACTION ITEM (REPEATED): ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS** to review outreach materials and provide any additional comments to Patrick Lowe.
- **ACTION ITEM: COUNTY STAFF** to distribute a copy of the timeline graphic.

COMMITTEE BREAK

None; Committee members took breaks individually, as needed.

c. Review of Communication & Education Voluntary Groundwater Level Monitoring Informational Brochure and Outreach Materials.

Mr. Michael Haley (and other members of the Ad-Hoc Committee), Ms. Deborah Elliott (Water Resources Specialist, Napa County) and Mr. Patrick Lowe (Natural Resources Conservation Manager, Napa County) presented the Communication and Education brochure and additional handouts/inserts for use with the brochure. These included the Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Areas of Interest (18), Data Management & Disclosure, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), and other summary/outreach information. All materials incorporated comments and direction received to date from the Committee.

A number of these documents were already discussed earlier in the meeting. Rather than wordsmithing, Committee members were asked to provide general feedback, which the Ad Hoc Committee would then consider when revising the documents. Any feedback provided after the meeting was asked to be sent to Patrick Lowe for sharing with the Ad Hoc Committee.

- **ACTION ITEM: PATRICK LOWE** to send email reminder to Committee to provide any remaining feedback on outreach materials.
- **ACTION ITEM: AD HOC COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE** to revise outreach materials based on GRAC comments.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION:

The following comments and suggestions were given during this agenda item. (Note that additional suggestions and comments were given earlier during agenda items 5.a and 5.b.)

- **General Comments:**
 - It should be made clear which materials are to be used as reference for GRAC members during specific outreach activities, and which materials are to be used for communication with the general public.

- The brochure should be brief yet informative, and all extra and more detailed information placed in inserts or other documents.
- **Comments concerning the brochure:**
 - The brochure has been greatly improved upon.
 - The brochure still needs to be revised to be simpler, less repetitive, and not misleading. It should become the “talking piece” and help explain what the County is trying to accomplish.
 - The brochure is missing the overall purpose of the monitoring program.
 - It needs to start out with the context -- what is the County doing? why is the County doing it? -- and then follow with what the County already knows.
 - The brochure misses the point that the County needs information to respond to state regulations.
 - The brochure does not clearly acknowledge and respond to likely landowner questions and concerns.
- **Comments concerning inserts:**
 - The inserts should help during the outreach and include various information depending on specific outreach goals.
 - A full discussion of confidentiality may not be necessary in the main brochure, and could instead be included as an insert.
 - There is still a little confusion about what the confidentiality actually is.
 - The inserts need to be adjusted to make clear whether it is specific for outreach purposes or for general purposes.
 - Details that are still on the inserts now need to be removed where applicable, such as the numbers and details on the map on the “Proposed Groundwater Monitoring Areas of Interest” insert.
 - The insert “Questions Asked” was provided to Bill Trautman for use in the fall newsletter for Silverado Property Owners Association.
- **More specific comments:**
 - On page 2 of the brochure in the last paragraph (“Groundwater and its importance in Napa County”), the list “agricultural, commercial and residential water demands” should also include “environmental water demands.”

- The risk topic needs to be addressed specifically. The County needs to make sure that the information in the brochures and inserts helps the public feel secure.
- The original Report from Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), for example, has a lot of good and positive information in it, which the County should stress as well.
 - The original report or its conclusions should be mentioned somewhere in the outreach documents. It is the baseline for the County's program.

AGREEMENT: Mr. Peter McCrea, Ms. Susanne von Rosenberg, Ms. Michelle Benvenuto, and Mr. Tucker Catlin will join the Ad Hoc Communication Committee and help to incorporate the comments and suggestions of GRAC members from today's meeting and written feedback provided subsequently to the County.

ACTION ITEM: **PATRICK LOWE** will send an email around with date options for the Ad Hoc Communication Committee to meet.

6. Other Business

No other business needed to be attended to.

7. Announcements

a. Upcoming Events or Items of Interest from the Committee and Staff

- An update on the Committee's progress and the start of outreach will be provided to the County Board of Supervisors at a February 2013 meeting.
- A joint GRAC-Watershed Information Center and Conservancy will be held in July 2013. Volunteer outreach should be completed by that time.

8. Future Agenda Items

A final draft Groundwater Monitoring Plan will be reviewed in the January meeting, as will the outreach information. The Committee will decide whether the Plan can be adopted at that time. At the January meeting, the Committee will also discuss how to divide the outreach labor so that the outreach process can start in February.

9. Adjournment to the Next Meeting

Meeting Cancelled: Thursday, December 13, 2012 – 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Special Meeting: Thursday, January 31, 2013 – 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting: Thursday, February 28, 2013 – 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

All meetings will be held at the Agricultural Commissioner's Office/UCCE Conference Room, 1710 Soscol Avenue, in Napa.

Attendees

Groundwater Advisory Committee Members

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Michelle Benvenuto | 9. Steve Soper |
| 2. Tucker Catlin | 10. Marilee Talley |
| 3. Alan Galbraith | 11. William Trautman |
| 4. Donald Gleason | 12. James Verhey |
| 5. David Graves | 13. Susanne von Rosenberg |
| 6. Michael Haley | 14. Duane Wall |
| 7. Peter McCrea | 15. Dale Withers |
| 8. Charles Slutzkin | |

Public Attendees

- | | |
|------------------|----------------------|
| 16. Warren Flint | 17. Nancy Gressinger |
|------------------|----------------------|

Guest Presenters

18. Tom Adams, Senior Counsel/DP&F

County Staff Members and Consultant Attendees

- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 19. Deborah Elliott | 25. Patrick Lowe |
| 20. Dorian Fougères, CCP | 26. Phil Miller |
| 21. Hillary Gitelman | 27. Greg Morgan |
| 22. Vicki Kretsinger Grabert, LSCE | 28. Jeff Sharp |
| 23. Steve Lederer | 29. Martine Schmidt-Poolman, CCP |
| 24. Daisy Lee | 30. Rick Thomasser |