



Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency
308 Nelson Avenue, Oroville, California 95965
(530) 552-3592 • VinaGSA@gmail.com

CORRESPONDENCE

VINA STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joe Turner <JTurner@Geosyntec.com>
Subject: RE: Well ID 21N01E 08K
Date: January 26, 2021 at 1:56:28 PM PST
To: Anne Dawson <aakdawson@aol.com>, Bob Anderson <BAnderson@Geosyntec.com>
Cc: Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>, 'Mariana Rivera-Torres' <mrivertorres@cbi.org>, "Gosselin, Paul" <pgosselin@buttecounty.net>, "Buck, Christina" <CBuck@buttecounty.net>

Anne,

Thank you for your comments regarding the presentation. It is good to get this feedback and we appreciate your input.

Regarding your question for well labeled 21N01E 08K that would suggest issues with the MT in future, we realized the wrong well was placed for this graph. The well used is located west of area shown in figure and is not within the Chico Management Area. The correct well is actually 22N01E29R. We are correcting this graph and will send out in near future and based on initial review of correct hydrograph does not appear to show the same issue with MTs.

Again, thank you for your input and questions like these help us double check what we are doing.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anne Dawson <aakdawson@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:01 PM
To: Bob Anderson <BAnderson@Geosyntec.com>; Joe Turner <JTurner@Geosyntec.com>
Cc: Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>
Subject: Well ID 21N01E 08K

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have any suspicion, please confirm with the sender verbally that this email is authentic.

Hi Bob and Joe

I wanted to thank you both for all the work you put into your presentations to the Vina SHAC. The detailed analysis was much appreciated.

I would like to know a little more about the above well number which is situated in the vina Chico area. It seems to be the region that is going to have the earliest problem if levels fall. Would you be able to tell me where this is and any thoughts on why these wells are so vulnerable?

Thanks

Anne Dawson

Sent from my iPad

--

-----Original Message-----

From: jimb@aqualliance.net <jimb@aqualliance.net>

Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 1:16 PM

To: Buck, Christina <CBuck@buttecounty.net>

Subject: hydrograph request

.ATTENTION: This message originated from outside Butte County. Please exercise judgment before opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying..

Hi Christina,

Please email me the hydrograph record for the multi-completion wells in the Vina sub basin and the adjacent sub basins.

Thanks,

Jim Brobeck

--

----Original Message-----

From: jimb@aqualliance.net <jimb@aqualliance.net>

Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2021 1:33 PM

To: Peterson, Kelly <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>

Subject: GDE maps

.ATTENTION: This message originated from outside Butte County. Please exercise judgment before opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying..

Hi Kelly,

I would like to see how the GDE maps for our region are shaping up. Who is doing a census of Valley Oak Woodlands that are not riparian water dependent? How large of a stand of Quercus Lobata (Valley Oak) is needed to be designated a Woodland.

I have communicated with TNC about including Valley Oak Woodlands

(non-riparian) in their work but they side stepped addressing my concerns by suggesting I take it up with a University Botanist. The USDA citations should be sufficient to identify the species as being GD.

I also feel a lack of traction in my observation that the Chico Urban Forest is GD. The water in the shallow urban wells I monitor are 25-40' BGS (seasonally fluctuations). I will reach out to the Urban Forester to determine their understanding of the transpiration water source for Chico's summer shade trees.

Do you have access to the hydrographs for our regional Cal-water wells?
I am collecting hydrograph data for upcoming SHAC meetings.

Thanks,
Jim

--

From: Peterson, Kelly
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 9:24 AM
To: 'jimb@aqualliance.net' <jimb@aqualliance.net>
Subject: Questions about GDEs

Hi Jim,

I've added responses in blue your questions from your email sent last week. We can bring some of these topics back to the SHAC at some point to weigh in on as well.

Thank you,

Kelly

Hi Kelly,

I would like to see how the GDE maps for our region are shaping up. [Draft maps are still being revised and will be presented to the SHAC once ready.](#) Who is doing a census of Valley Oak Woodlands that are not riparian water dependent? [We are not engaged in a census of VO woodlands. We are analyzing potential GDEs \(iGDEs\) from those provided in the TNC database available online. This dataset does include polygons dominated by Valley Oaks, however all of those identified in the TNC database in the Vina subbasin are near riparian corridors.](#) How large of a stand of Quercus Lobata (Valley Oak) is needed to be designated a Woodland. [This may be a more appropriate question to direct to CDFW.](#)

I have communicated with TNC about including Valley Oak Woodlands (non-riparian) in their work but they side stepped addressing my concerns by suggesting I take it up with a University Botanist. The USDA citations should be sufficient to identify the species as being GD.

I also feel a lack of traction in my observation that the Chico Urban Forest is GD. The water in the shallow urban wells I monitor are 25-40' BGS (seasonally fluctuations). [We are currently analyzing potential GDEs \(iGDEs\) as presented in the TNC database available online. But we will bring this issue up with the consultant team as well. I will reach](#)

out to the Urban Forester to determine their understanding of the transpiration water source for Chico's summer shade trees.

Do you have access to the hydrographs for our regional Cal-water wells? Hydrographs are not available online such as you would find CASGEM wells, however hydrographs for some of the Calwater wells are presented in one of the handouts for the Jan. SHAC meeting https://www.vinagsa.org/files/ccaca82da/02_SHAC+Packet+January+FINAL.pdf on page 4 and 21-26 (simulated). I am collecting hydrograph data for upcoming SHAC meetings. Data is available in the summary sheets in Appendix F of the draft Annual Groundwater Status report found [here https://www.buttecounty.net/waterresourceconservation/Groundwater-Status-Reports/Current-Groundwater-Status-Report](https://www.buttecounty.net/waterresourceconservation/Groundwater-Status-Reports/Current-Groundwater-Status-Report).

Thanks,
Jim

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>
From: Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>
Subject: Re: [For Review] January Vina SHAC Meeting Notes
Date: February 4, 2021 at 8:03:15 AM PST
To: Sam Goepp <samgoepp@gmail.com>

Hi Sam,

Of course! See attached,

Mariana

Mariana Rivera-Torres
Consensus Building Institute
520/528.0498 (cell)
mrivertorres@cbi.org | www.cbi.org

On Feb 4, 2021, at 7:58 AM, Sam Goepp <samgoepp@gmail.com> wrote:

Please send me a copy of the charter--thanks

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Subject: Re: [For Review] January Vina SHAC Meeting Notes
Date: February 3, 2021 at 4:58:00 PM PST

To: Sam Goepp <samgoepp@gmail.com>

Hi Sam,

Thank you for your message. We appreciate the input.

The purpose of the internal review of meeting summaries is to coordinate with the Vina GSA Management Committee and technical consultants to ensure that we capture technical content accurately before distributing the summary for stakeholder review.

The goal of the SHAC meeting notes is to memorialize key discussion points, agreements, the range of opinions when consensus is not achieved, action items and next steps. In the late spring and summer of last year, the SHAC had focused discussions about the level of detail they wished to see in meeting notes as well as their preferences regarding attribution. Where they landed was to distinguish between the types of participants (i.e., SHAC member, member of the public, etc.) without necessarily attributing each comment in general discussion. That said, the SHAC determined that the names and numbers of SHAC members should be documented in the meeting notes when decisions occur including, but not limited to, when making recommendations to the Vina GSA Board.

The SHAC's process is detailed in the Charter: "Following SHAC meetings, meeting notes will be distributed to the SHAC for review and comments after the Management Committee's initial review. The Management Committee in coordination with the Facilitator, if applicable, incorporates into the meeting notes any and all comments received by SHAC members and prepares a draft final version for final review and approval at the subsequent SHAC meeting. The Management Committee/Facilitator then distributes the final, approved meeting notes to the SHAC. The final version of the meeting notes will also be used by the Management Committee to develop staff reports to the Vina GSA board."

We will continue to do our best to prepare and distribute these notes as quickly as we can.

Mariana

Mariana Rivera-Torres
Consensus Building Institute
520/528.0498 (cell)
mrivertorres@cbi.org | www.cbi.org

On Feb 3, 2021, at 2:30 PM, Sam Goepp <samgoepp@gmail.com> wrote:

The minutes taken are interesting—why are shac member comments not attributed to whom made comments ? in one section they are identified and in another section they are not--!!! For the record comments should always be identified by who made the comment—and I am still concerned about the length of time between the meeting and the preparation of minutes—why are they reviewed by committee prior to distribution ?? are they edited ??

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Mariana Rivera-Torres](#)

Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 1:10 PM

Cc: [Gosselin, Paul](#); [Peterson, Kelly](#); [Linda Herman](#); [Erik Gustafson](#); [Kamie Loeser](#); [Jeff Carter](#); [Colin Klinesteker](#); [Darren Rice](#); [Jon Lavy](#); [Tania Carlone](#)

Subject: [For Review] January Vina SHAC Meeting Notes

Dear Vina SHAC,

Please find the draft meeting notes from our Vina SHAC Meeting (1/19) attached for your review and input. We welcome your feedback and suggestions in writing by close of business Tuesday February, 9. You will also have the opportunity to provide input during our next SHAC meeting on Tuesday, February 16.

We look forward to your feedback,

Mariana

—

From: "Gosselin, Paul" <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>

Subject: RE: board and shac agenda items

Date: February 4, 2021 at 1:17:49 PM PST

To: "jimb@aqualliance.net" <jimb@aqualliance.net>, "vinagsa@gmail.com" <vinagsa@gmail.com>, Evantuchinsky <evantuchinsky@outlook.com>, Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>, "Valerie Kincaid (vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com)" <vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com>

Hi Jim

We will discuss PMAs including the legal implications of recharge at the next SHAC meeting. We should have sufficient time for the SHAC to discuss. Following the SHAC discussion, we will report to the Vina GSA board in March.

Thank you

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: jimb@aqualliance.net <jimb@aqualliance.net>

Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:24 AM

To: vinagsa@gmail.com; Evantuchinsky <evantuchinsky@outlook.com>; Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>; Gosselin, Paul <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>; Valerie Kincaid (vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com) <vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com>

Subject: board and shac agenda items

.ATTENTION: This message originated from outside Butte County. Please exercise judgment before opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying..

Dear Colleagues,

I know that tight timelines and packed agendas are challenging your capacity to schedule a comprehensive vetting of the legal consequences of implementing experimental groundwater recharge projects that have been summarized in the Kincaid document. The Kincaid report should be discussed as soon as possible in both a board meeting and a SHAC meeting.

The February Board meeting seems to be fully planned already so it should be on the March agenda. I am requesting that the February SHAC meeting include at least 30 minutes to discuss the issues that are revealed in Kincaid's report and that the full report (not the abridged report that was in the January SHAC packet) be included in the agenda packet.

Jim Brobeck

—

Begin forwarded message:

From: jimb@aqualliance.net

Subject: contour maps

Date: February 4, 2021 at 9:43:50 AM PST

To: Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>

Hi Tania,

Please provide these intermediate aquifer contour maps to the SHAC as we discuss recharge projects in our PMA and legal discussions. I am requesting that our regional GSAs ask DWR to produce contour maps for 2020 as well as deep aquifer contour maps.

Thanks, Jim

—

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>

Subject: Re: [For Review] January Vina SHAC Meeting Notes

Date: February 4, 2021 at 3:38:42 PM PST

To: Cheri L Chastain <cchastain@csuchico.edu>

Cc: Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>

Thank you, Cheri!

Mariana Rivera-Torres
Consensus Building Institute
520/528.0498 (cell)
mrivertorres@cbi.org | www.cbi.org

On Feb 4, 2021, at 1:15 PM, Cheri L Chastain <cchastain@csuchico.edu> wrote:

Hello,

I have only minor suggested edits:

- Pg 4 of document, line 18 & pg 5, line32 – should be CSUC not CSCU
- Pg 4, line 18, 23, and 24 and pg 5, line32 – “Creek” should follow Big Chico

Thanks!

Cheri Chastain
Campus Sustainability Manager
Facilities Management and Services
California State University, Chico
530-898-3875

From: Melissa Rohde <melissa.rohde@TNC.ORG>

Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 11:04 AM

To: jimb@aqualliance.net; Sandi Matsumoto <smatsumoto@TNC.ORG>; Peterson, Kelly <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>

Subject: Re: Questions about GDEs

ATTENTION: This message originated from outside **Butte County**. Please exercise judgment before opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying.

Hi Jim,

Valley oaks are certainly considered a phreatophytic species in California, and are mapped in the NC Dataset where data was available to identify them. If non-riparian valley oak woodlands are present in your basin, not included in the NC dataset, and connected to a principal aquifer (defined under SGMA as “aquifers or aquifer systems that store, transmit, and yield significant or economic quantities of groundwater to wells, springs, or surface water systems” 23 CCR §351(aa)), then they most certainly should be included in the basin’s GDE map.

Perhaps a call would be easier to discuss?

Melissa

Melissa M. Rohde (she/her) | Groundwater Scientist | The Nature Conservancy | 415-281-0489
| GroundwaterResourceHub.org

From: jimb@aqualliance.net <jimb@aqualliance.net>

Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 at 9:36 AM

To: Melissa Rohde <melissa.rohde@TNC.ORG>, Sandi Matsumoto <smatsumoto@TNC.ORG>, Peterson,

Kelly <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>

Subject: Fwd: Questions about GDEs

Hello Melissa,

I serve on the Vina GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee and have participated in the Butte County GDE panel. I have submitted information that clearly indicates upland Valley Oak trees are the keystone species of a non-riparian GDE. Last year I contacted Ms Matsumoto about my observations and she explained you were the point person to contact. I have not seen a response but I continue to lobby my region to give these iconic groves the protection they need to endure dry years. Are you able to expand your GDE database to include these deep rooted GWD trees?

Thank you for a response,

Jim Brobeck, water policy analyst

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Questions about GDEs

Date: 2021-02-02 10:23

From: "Peterson, Kelly" <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>

To: "jimb@aqualliance.net" <jimb@aqualliance.net>

Hi Jim,

We can bring some of these topics back to the SHAC at some point to weigh in on as well.

Thank you,

Kelly

Hi Kelly,

I would like to see how the GDE maps for our region are shaping up. Draft maps are still being revised and will be presented to the SHAC once ready. Who is doing a census of Valley Oak Woodlands that are not riparian water dependent?

We are not engaged in a census of VO woodlands. We are analyzing potential GDEs (iGDEs) from those provided in the TNC database available online. This dataset does include polygons dominated by Valley Oaks, however all of those identified in the TNC database in the Vina subbasin are near riparian corridors.

How large of a stand of Quercus Lobata (Valley Oak) is needed to be designated a Woodland?

This may be a more appropriate question to direct to CDFW.

I also feel a lack of traction in my observation that the Chico Urban

Forest is GD. The water in the shallow urban wells I monitor are 25-40'
I will reach out
to the Urban Forester to determine their understanding of the
transpiration water source for Chico's summer shade trees.

Thanks,

Jim

Links:

[1]

https://www.vinagsa.org/files/ccaca82da/02_SHAC+Packet+January+FINAL.pdf

[2]

<https://www.buttecounty.net/waterresourceconservation/Groundwater-Status-Reports/Current-Groundwater-Status-Report>

--

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Gosselin, Paul" <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>

Subject: RE: February Vina SHAC Agenda

Date: February 10, 2021 at 10:21:10 AM PST

To: 'Samantha Lewis' <psamanthalewis@hotmail.com>, Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>

Cc: "Peterson, Kelly" <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>, Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>, "evantuchinsky@outlook.com" <evantuchinsky@outlook.com>

Hi Samantha

The abridge version of the Legal Implications paper was inadvertently posted to the web and has been corrected. I apologize for any confusion. I attached the correct version of the paper that will be included in the February SHAC agenda package.

At the February SHAC meeting, the main topic of discussion will be Projects and Management Actions including the paper, Legal Implications of Projects and Management Actions. The SHAC will have the opportunity to discuss any project or management action including the examples provided in the paper for potential recommendation to the Vina GSA Board. Whether or not the SHAC makes a recommendation to the Vina GSA Board, a report of the SHAC discussions will be presented to the Vina GSA Board.

I hope that addresses your questions.

Thank you.

Paul

Paul Gosselin, Director

Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation

308 Nelson Avenue

Oroville, CA 95965

Office: (530) 552-3590

Cell: (530) 574-7443

From: Samantha Lewis <psamanthalewis@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 4:28 PM

To: Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>

Cc: Gosselin, Paul <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>; Peterson, Kelly <KPeterson@buttecounty.net>; Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>; evantuchinsky@outlook.com

Subject: February Vina SHAC Agenda

ATTENTION: This message originated from outside **Butte County**. Please exercise judgment before opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying.

Good Afternoon Mariana,

Attached is a pdf of the memo prepared by Valerie Kincaid dated "December, 2020" titled "Legal Implications of Potential Projects and Management Actions" that was provided in the SHAC meeting material packet mailed to us in January. It was also made available to the public on our website as meeting materials for our January agenda.

While the SHAC engaged in a brief conversation about this topic at the very end of our January meeting, we were discussing the one and a half page memo provided rather than the actual four page memo originally prepared by Ms. Kincaid. Since our meeting, it appears that the abridged version has been replaced by the full memo on all of our internet postings.

I am requesting that the complete original (unabridged) version of aforementioned memo dated "December 18, 2020" be distributed to the SHAC members in the packet and added to the agenda of our 2/16/21 meeting. Further, as both the SHAC and GSA Board have been inquiring about this subject for over a year, I believe that this topic is a high priority and should be placed near the beginning of our agenda.

At the end of her memo, Ms. Kincaid provided two specific Potential Management Actions, so I am also requesting that the agenda topic should include language as an action item that would empower the SHAC to consider forwarding formal recommendations to the Vina GSA Board in advance of their meeting scheduled for 3/10/21.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

P. Samantha Lewis, Agriculture Representative
Vina GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee

