



1 **Meeting Brief**

- 2 ➤ The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on September 15, 2020, due
 3 to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.
 4 ➤ The SHAC received an update from the Vina GSA Management Committee, reviewed and
 5 approved the previous meeting notes and came to agreement on recommended
 6 modifications to the Vina SHAC Charter.
 7 ➤ The SHAC received an overview of the Draft GSP Basin Setting Chapter and a summary of
 8 the public comments received, and discussed potential Basin Setting recommendations for
 9 consideration in future discussions.
 10 ➤ The SHAC briefly discussed desired next steps in the Projects and Management Actions
 11 (PMA) process to inform a more in-depth PMA discussion at the October SHAC meeting.
 12 ➤ The SHAC will meet again via video conference on October 20, 2020 from 9:00-12:00.

13 **Action Items**

Item	Lead	Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Materials: Share PDF version of documents with track-changes for participants without access to Microsoft Word. 	CBI	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Notes (8/18/20): Post finalized document on the website. 	CBI/ Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Notes: Add line numbers to the document and letter bullet points to allow SHAC members the ease of referencing when providing feedback. 	CBI	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vina Charter: Management Committee will transmit to the Vina GSA board the SHAC’s suggested modifications to the Charter. 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Basin Setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Share model assumptions used in the Butte Basin Groundwater Model (BBGM) for calculating agricultural water demand in future scenarios. ○ Share with the SHAC legend for the figures showing groundwater and surface water interactions. ○ Follow up with an explanation for difference in current vs. historic western boundary water outflow estimates. 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Recording: Post meeting recording on the Vina GSA website. 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion

14
15



1 **Summary**

2 The Vina SHAC met on September 15, 2020 via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. In
3 total, 26 participants attended, including Vina SHAC members, GSA member agency staff, a
4 technical consultant, state agency representatives, and members of the public. Below is a
5 summary of key themes and next steps discussed at the meeting. This document is not
6 intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the
7 group’s discussions.
8

9 **1. Introductions & Agenda Review**

10 The SHAC members, facilitator, and staff introduced themselves. The facilitator gave a brief
11 overview of the agenda.
12

13 **2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

14 No items
15

16 **3. Vina GSA Management Committee Reports**

17 Vina GSA board met on September 9, 2020. The board is now meeting via Zoom rather than
18 Webex, following previous recommendations. The Vina Management Committee provided an
19 update of Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development for the Vina Subbasin, including a
20 written report on the Vina SHAC meetings. The Vina GSA board considered and approved the
21 SHAC’s recommendation to submit a letter to the governor requesting a two-year extension for
22 GSP completion. In addition, the Vina GSA board discussed the Memorandum of Understanding
23 (MOU) between Butte County and Rock Creek Reclamation District (not signed yet), and received
24 an update on the Tuscan Water District application. The Vina GSA board will meet again on
25 November 18, 2020.
26

27 **4. Meeting Notes Review & Consideration**

28 The SHAC reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting notes from the 8/18/20 SHAC
29 Meeting [[access here](#)]. SHAC members requested adding line numbers and lettering the bullets
30 to allow greater ease of referencing when providing feedback on meeting notes.
31

32 **Voting Results**

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

33

34 **Outcomes & Next Steps | Meeting Notes Review & Consideration**

- 35 a) The SHAC approved meeting notes.
- 36 b) The facilitation team will finalize and post meeting notes (8/18/20) on the website.
- 37 c) The facilitation team will add line numbers and lettered bullet points in future summaries.



1 5. Vina SHAC Charter
 2 SHAC members reviewed changes to the SHAC Charter and sought agreement on recommended
 3 revisions to the Vina GSA Board. The suggested modifications to the charter include clarification
 4 of the process for SHAC members to include items on their meeting agendas and the requirement
 5 of a quorum of SHAC members when making internal decisions and recommendations to the
 6 Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Board.

7
 8 Discussion:

- 9 a) A SHAC member had difficulty viewing track changes in the modified charter in the Microsoft
 10 Word version. The facilitation team will also include a PDF version in the future.
 11 b) A SHAC member asked if the Amendments clause in the charter has an expiration date. The
 12 facilitator clarified the amendment does not expire, allowing the SHAC and the Vina GSA
 13 Board to revise and adapt the charter as needed.
 14

15 Voting Results: Approving Recommended Changes to the Vina Charter for the GSA Board

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

16
 17 Outcomes & Next Steps | Charter Review

- 18 a) The modifications will be sent to the Vina GSA Board for consideration.
 19 b) The facilitation team will share a PDF version of future documents with track changes.
 20

21 6. Draft GSP Basin Setting Public Review– Highlights and Discussion

22 Christina Buck (Butte County) provided a quick overview of the Draft GSP Basin Setting Chapter
 23 documents, highlighted key differences from previous material presented, summarized public
 24 comments received, and opened up the conversation for questions and comments [Access full
 25 presentation [here](#), and public comment staff report [here](#).
 26

27 6.1 Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs)–

28 Kelly Peterson (Butte County) is leading effort regarding GDEs in the Vina Subbasin. GDEs are
 29 ecosystems dependent on groundwater, including rivers, streams, riparian vegetation, seeps,
 30 wetlands, etc. GDEs are considered environmental beneficial water users. Although GDEs have
 31 not been included in the Draft Basin Setting Chapters so far, they will be incorporated in the
 32 future.
 33

34 Work is underway regarding GDEs. The first step was to identify GDE locations. GSA Managers
 35 from all three subbasins used an online database and web mapping application developed by The
 36 Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Department of Water Resources (DWR), and the CA Department
 37 of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to identify potential GDEs. Managers from the Butte, Vina, and
 38 Wyandotte Creek subbasins have been participating in a series of workshops and independent
 39 work efforts since Fall 2019 to study those areas and applying a set of criteria to determine which
 40 are actually dependent on groundwater. Further, the GSAs formed a GDE working group, with a



1 few members from the SHAC, Vina Management Committee members, professors from Chico
 2 State University, DWR staff, and representatives from the Butte Environmental Council to get
 3 feedback on the approach. The Management Committee will then provide the results of the
 4 analysis to the consulting team (Geosyntec) for their consideration when developing the
 5 Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC).

6
 7 Discussion:

8 a) A Vina SHAC member asked which Chico State faculty has been involved in the GDE working
 9 group. K. Peterson clarified it is Dr. Colleen Hatfield (Biological Sciences) and Dr. Jeff Davids
 10 (Water Resources and Agricultural Engineering). Note: Kamie Loeser is also faculty at CSU
 11 Chico (Geography and Planning).

12
 13 6.2. Airborne Electromagnetic (AEM) Survey–

14 C. Buck highlighted the AEM Survey, which is included in the Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model
 15 (HCM) portion of the Basin Setting Chapters. AEM data helps understand the large-scale
 16 structure of the aquifer system by measuring variation in the electrical resistivity of materials
 17 underground to depths of more than 1000 feet to understand what zones are “course
 18 dominated” (sand and gravel) vs. “fine dominated” (silts and clays). This AEM Survey aimed to
 19 improve the hydrogeologic conceptual model by refining the understanding of the aquifer system
 20 (delineations of major aquifers and aquitards, spatial distribution of clay-rich layers, connectivity
 21 between upper and lower portions of the system, etc.) and improve groundwater modeling tools
 22 in the long-run [Access more information [here](#)]. The findings were largely consistent with
 23 previous understanding but provided a better picture of areas where shallow and deep aquifer
 24 systems are separated by lower conductivity zones (dominated by fine grained materials such as
 25 silt and clay). However, the vertical connectivity between these zones remains a question. C. Buck
 26 suggested having a presentation by the two professors involved in the study, CSU Chico Professor
 27 Dr. Todd Greene and Dr. Rosemary Knight of Stanford University to answer questions in greater
 28 detail.

29
 30 Discussion

- 31 a) Overall, Vina SHAC members were very interested in the AEM Survey results.
 32 b) A SHAC member asked whether the black lines in the cross-section correlated with fresh
 33 and saline water. Buck clarified that the black lines represent the different aquifer layers,
 34 but she is not sure if there is a relationship with fresh and saline water. There are portions
 35 of the aquifer that can be saline, but it is not consistent across the basin. One would need
 36 samples to figure out the water quality; so far samples have not found saline water.
 37 c) Joe Turner (Geosyntec) highlighted the figure showing that the cross-section also
 38 identifies an old paleo channel, corresponding to the area where Butte Creek enters the
 39 valley and used to be, which now corresponds to an area of course dominated material.

40
 41 6.3 Water Budget–



1 **Change in Groundwater Storage:** The graph showing groundwater change in storage shows
2 significant changes in groundwater pumping from wet years to dry years, as well as a cumulative
3 decrease in water storage. Although shifts in crop types impact demand, wet-year and dry-year
4 cycles have the greatest impact on water pumping and cumulative groundwater storage. Vina is
5 highly dependent on groundwater, but there is some surface water used in the subbasin, mainly
6 from Butte Creek, which is also impacted by wet-dry year cycles.

7
8 **Water Budget Summary Table:** Corrections were made to the water budget totals.

9
10 **System Response to Climate Change (as simulated):** The model calculates a slight increase in
11 subsurface inflows, more deep percolation coming from additional groundwater pumping, stable
12 seepage from streams, decreased outflows to surrounding basins, increased groundwater
13 pumping (driven mainly by increased irrigation), and decreased net outflow at the western
14 boundary which includes interactions with the Sacramento River. Further, under climate change
15 conditions, the model estimates a slightly greater decline in cumulative groundwater storage.

16
17 **Surface-Groundwater Interactions warrant greater discussion and evaluation:** Streams gain or
18 lose water to the groundwater system (gaining and losing) depending on water levels. The Butte
19 Basin Groundwater Model (BBGM) simulates each individual stream. Most or all of the time the
20 streams modeled are not connected with the groundwater system meaning groundwater does
21 not move from the groundwater system to the streams (gaining conditions). The exception to
22 this is for reaches of streams near the western boundary where groundwater levels are shallow,
23 and most significantly for the Sacramento River which is gaining most of the time. Uncertainty
24 remains and the connection between streams and groundwater in the subbasin warrants further
25 evaluation.

26 27 [6.1 Summary of Public Comments Received](#)

28
29 Public Comments received largely relate to the HCM and have implications for expansion of
30 monitoring to address identified data gaps. Other themes include a better understanding of
31 inter-basin flows and greater consideration of climate extremes (e.g. multidecadal drought) in
32 the water budgets. For more information on public comments received, access the staff report
33 [here](#) and the compiled table of public comments [here](#).

34 35 36 Discussion/Questions

- 37
38 a) *Groundwater-Surface Water:* a SHAC member would like to have more information on
39 the timing of gaining and losing streams during different seasons and the implications
40 for habitat, particularly to rearing habitat. Further, this SHAC member requested
41 including the legend for the figures shown.



- 1 b) *Current vs. Historical Water Budgets*: A SHAC member asked for an explanation for why
 2 the water budget shows the current total western boundary net outflows as 20,000
 3 acre-feet per year more than the historic western boundary net outflows. C. Buck will
 4 follow up with this information. Further, a couple SHAC members asked for clarification
 5 regarding the time period used for the historic and current scenarios. C. Buck clarified
 6 that the current time period uses land use data from 2015 and 2016 for land use
 7 footprint and 2015-2018 for urban demands. However, the numbers derived for the
 8 water budget represent an average annual estimate over a 50-year period. For the
 9 most recent available water budget, see the column for water year 2018 in Table A-2 in
 10 Appendix A.
- 11 c) *Climate change scenarios*:
- 12 1) A SHAC member suggested expanding the range of climate conditions to include
 13 wetter scenarios, in addition to drier scenarios. Buck clarified staff would like
 14 direction from the SHAC and GSA Board regarding what type of climate scenarios
 15 and conditions the SHAC would like to explore during the planning process.
 - 16 2) Another SHAC member highlighted paleoclimatology records of megadrought in
 17 the past millennia of up to 100-200 years of drought. These situations may be
 18 exacerbated by climate change, due to increases in average temperatures.
 - 19 3) Another SHAC member asked whether climate scenarios considered changing
 20 crop patterns and more efficient irrigation technologies when projecting future
 21 water demands. The BBGM does not attempt to guess the impact of changing
 22 technologies, rather it illustrates how changing climate conditions may affect
 23 agricultural water demand for a set ag footprint.
 - 24 4) One SHAC member currently serves as the Chair of the City of Chico's Climate
 25 Action Commission [access [here](#)]. In 2018 the City conducted a climate
 26 vulnerability assessment [access [here](#)], using a tool called Cal-Adapt to predict
 27 future climate scenarios [access Cal-Adapt tool [here](#)]. The vulnerability
 28 assessment predicted Chico would be impacted by increased frequency,
 29 intensity, and duration of extreme heat days and waves, increased flooding,
 30 decreased snowpack and water supply, and increased wildfire events.
 - 31 5) Another SHAC member expressed concern with the current sustainable yield
 32 estimate. She asked if it is possible to update the time period with newer
 33 information, since she believes Vina would be better to prepare in the future by
 34 considering a less optimistic scenario. Buck specified that staff will be continually
 35 updating the timeframe as well to maintain the 50-year period. Following up, the
 36 SHAC members asked if the model could also run the model on a shorter
 37 timeline (20- or 30-year timeline), so that the most recent information has a
 38 bigger effect on the cumulative groundwater storage deficit. Buck clarified that
 39 the beauty of modeling is that once it is run and calibrated, staff can take an
 40 average of the 20 years or 30 years if desired. However, one of the advantages of
 41 using a 50-year period is capturing the hydrological variability of those years,
 42 while mapping on top of that the current demand.

Commented [CLCI]: Change this link to this one:
<https://chico.ca.us/climate-action-commission>



- 1 6) A SHAC member asked whether the scenarios are adjusted to correlate with
 2 earlier runoff and decreased snowpack. Buck explained that the model accounts
 3 for those changes, adjusting the inputs for streamflow based on climate model
 4 data.
- 5 d) *Domestic Wells*: A SHAC member expressed concern regarding lack of consideration of
 6 domestic wells so far: where they are and how they are impacted. She suggested
 7 making a commitment to increase domestic well monitoring data, as this information
 8 will come into play when setting minimum thresholds. Butte County has not laid out
 9 the landscape of domestic or agricultural well locations yet, but this information is
 10 forthcoming.
- 11 e) *Agricultural Demand Projections*: A SHAC member expressed concern with the
 12 assumptions used to project agricultural demand and land use in climate scenarios.
 13 Further, she would like to see more information on the impact of population growth in
 14 urban water demand (e.g. City of Chico). She requested a consistent approach for the
 15 assumptions used for calculating agricultural and urban use. Another SHAC member
 16 clarified that estimates for urban use are derived from urban water management plans,
 17 which utilize local government land use plans to assess projections for future demands.
 18 Assumptions for agricultural demand are well documented in the BBGM, which will be
 19 posted on the website. Further, Butte County updated the model in 2016, including
 20 estimates for land, soil, and irrigation thresholds. Butte County ran many of those
 21 numbers by grower groups.
- 22 f) *Recharge programs in pressurized zones*: A SHAC member highlighted the importance
 23 of exploring the different efficacy of recharge programs in different zones (confined vs.
 24 unconfined aquifers) and addressing this issue in inter-basin coordination efforts.
- 25 g) *Subsidence*: a SHAC member stated that existing land subsidence monitoring may not
 26 be capturing land subsidence in Vina, due to the size of monitoring grids. His main
 27 concern relates to the frequency and nimbleness of satellite monitoring to capture
 28 initial stages of land subsidence. DWR is expanding its subsidence monitoring;
 29 however, the geology in the basin (mostly Tuscan formation full of sandstone) is not
 30 very conducive to subsidence. Long-term, the GSA could set criteria based on the best
 31 available knowledge and reevaluate criteria during the 20-year implementation period.
 32 Land subsidence could be identified as a data gap, but that would require setting up a
 33 schedule and implementation plan to collect the data. Since there is not a lot of
 34 subsidence, it may not be warranted.

35
 36 Outcomes & Next Steps | Draft Basin Setting Chapters

- 37 • Butte County staff will share the legend for the figures showing groundwater and surface
 38 water interactions.
- 39 • Butte County staff will follow up with an explanation for difference in current vs. historic
 40 western boundary water outflow estimates.
- 41 • Vina GSA Management Committee will post on the website the model assumptions used in
 42 the BBGM to estimate agricultural demand in future scenarios.



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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

7. Basin Setting Recommendations Options

During this section, the SHAC discussed potential Basin Setting suggested revisions or other recommendations to consider in the 5-year mandatory update or to support the upcoming Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) conversations. The following section summarizes the main topics discussed.

Shallow Monitoring Networks

- a) G. Barber and G. Cole support developing a shallow monitoring network (as a potential data gap) to understand the impacts on domestic agricultural users. He would recommend focusing that network around the clusters of houses dependent on domestic wells, putting monitoring wells in critical locations to make sure the GSA is supporting as many domestic wells as possible. It would be extremely important to communicate with owners to increase awareness and understanding.
- b) J. Brobeck proposed implementing a survey or census of existing large diameter wells that would be pumping out of the Tuscan Aquifer, in coordination with other subbasins to go beyond the Sacramento River to the West. This effort would aim to understand what infrastructure is out there tapping the foundation of the aquifer system, which should be taken into account meaningfully for management actions. Key questions: how many wells are out there, how much and when are they pumping, how were they constructed and screened (to show leakages between multiple screens, which impacted shallow aquifers). In Butte County, domestic wells have a 50-foot seal before the screen. However, there is an increasing number of large gravel wells connecting different aquifer zones, which may produce connectivity among them. This information may inform a future decision to change existing rules requiring sealing large wells. While B. Smith suggested including some monitoring wells in the middle layers as well, A. Dawson would like to prioritize shallow wells.
- c) C. Buck (Butte County) clarified that DWR well categories are shallow (less than 200 ft), intermediate (100-600 ft), and deep (+600 ft). However, the cross-sectional data in the Basin Setting questions previous classification and suggests refining these categories per area (e.g. defining the shallow zone in a particular area, based on how it related to the hydrogeologic characteristics of a particular area). Dr. Todd Greene is working to categorize the current monitoring well network this way.
- d) J. Turner (Geosyntec) stated that during the next process, the Vina GSA can characterize undesirable results (e.g. x% of wells going dry), and then set up monitoring networks at certain depths. The SHAC can advise the GSA board on what levels are important, based on local conditions. If data is lacking, this could be identified as a data gap.
- e) G. Sohnrey stated that setting up a big network, might be cost prohibitive. He cautioned against setting expectations that every domestic well can be protected. Some wells may be too shallow, and the GSA may not be able to protect them. J. Turner stated there is some data already available through DWR showing average minimum and maximum well depths per agricultural production and section of the area. This data does not include screening



- 1 depths. T. Carlone (CBI) also clarified that if the GSA specifies this as a data gap, the DWR
- 2 provides technical support services and could be addressed in 5-year GSP updates. A.
- 3 Dawson would like to have a better idea of how domestic users will be impacted by the
- 4 GSA decisions. That information will be important when setting minimum thresholds and
- 5 choosing Project and Management Actions (PMAs) to perhaps remediate the impacts.
- 6 f) S. Lewis stated that Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) such as streams and oak
- 7 tree health can be good indicators for shallow aquifer conditions. If understanding the
- 8 shallow zone is important, there may be different ways to monitor. C. Buck stated the next
- 9 step would be to define monitoring approaches (e.g., vegetation monitoring, surface water
- 10 monitoring, etc.) beyond the use of monitoring wells.
- 11 g) S. Lewis and B. Smith suggested using active monitoring data from contaminated site wells
- 12 to understand shallow monitoring data. Further, they expressed concern with the
- 13 emphasis on monitoring for agricultural nutrients and toxins and not mentioning other
- 14 urban contaminants. They suggest potentially adding other contaminants into the Basin
- 15 Setting.
- 16 h) J. Turner clarified that wells are regulated by other state programs in terms of water
- 17 quality. Under SGMA, the GSA has to develop a plan to avoid making conditions worse.

18
19 **Climate Change**

- 20 a) G. Barber and C. Chastain would like to align the approach used for climate change with
- 21 other local initiatives, such as the City of Chico’s Climate Action Plan, and making sure
- 22 PMAs and models are in alignment with projections of climate futures. C. Chastain stated
- 23 Chico is updating the Climate Action Plan, conducting public outreach in Oct-Nov 2020, and
- 24 finalizing the plan for presentation to City Council by March 2021.
- 25 b) A. Dawson asked clarifying questions about the approach used for the climate change
- 26 scenarios. C. Buck clarified the model analyzed two scenarios (2030 and 2070), but they
- 27 reviewed five different climate data sets and selected the models that showed central
- 28 tendency.

29
30 Outcomes | Potential Recommendations to the Vina GSA Board

- 31 1. Understanding the shallow zone is important. The SHAC is interested in establishing
- 32 monitoring networks (well, vegetation, stream monitoring, etc.) as a data gap. The SHAC
- 33 discussed making sure that shallow domestic wells are protected, as a potential priority,
- 34 while maintaining clear expectations with the public.
- 35 2. It is important to consider the climate change analysis being done by other local efforts (e.g.
- 36 City and County Climate Action Plans) to ensure consistency and alignment between and
- 37 among those efforts, when possible. Note: the SHAC would like to review those plans
- 38 (assumptions and information) before recommending incorporating set analysis into the
- 39 GSP. However, the SHAC reached high level agreement that it is important to align with and
- 40 reference other relevant planning efforts taking place.



- 1 3. It is important to have a survey, collecting well construction data of large wells and
- 2 potentially incorporating inter-basin coordination discussions to include wells outside the
- 3 Vina subbasin boundary to the West (Sac River).
- 4 4. Make sure that potential undesirable results associated with water quality incorporate all
- 5 information (beyond only toxins and nitrates related to agriculture).

6
7 **8. Planned Projects and Management Actions (PMA)**

8 The SHAC briefly discussed desired next steps in the PMA process, using a virtual black board
9 tool (access [here](#)). The SHAC’s feedback will define the approach taken during the October
10 meeting. The following list describes approaches discussed:

- 11 a) **General brainstorming discussion** – The SHAC could discuss some PMA concepts that they
- 12 would prefer and types that they do not. Based on the brainstorming ideas, focused
- 13 discussions would occur at the next meeting. J. Brobeck and S. Lewis would like to start
- 14 with this approach and include expected budget per concept.
- 15 b) **List of PMAs from other GSPs** - A general list of the types of PMAs from other GSPs would
- 16 be presented for discussion. The SHAC would discuss which ones would warrant more in-
- 17 depth discussion at the next SHAC meeting and which ones should be put in the “parking
- 18 lot”. G. Sohnrey and C. Chastain liked this idea and suggest providing the SHAC the list in
- 19 advance.
- 20 c) **Prioritization/Acceptance Considerations** - A discussion of the types of considerations that
- 21 the Vina GSA should take into consideration for prioritization or acceptability of PMAs (e.g.,
- 22 cost/benefit, multi-benefit, level of complexity, potential unintended consequences, etc.)
- 23 d) **Vina GSA Rules** – The SHAC could discuss and create a list of potential unintended
- 24 consequences of certain PMAs (e.g., control over recharge water, transfers, loss of
- 25 groundwater rights, etc). The Management Committee would work with Legal Counsel to
- 26 develop rules and ordinances to prevent the unintended consequences. Subsequent
- 27 discussions would occur on the types of PMAs with greater assurance that the Vina
- 28 subbasin would not be harmed.
- 29 e) **Other Topics:** G. Cole would like the SHAC to clearly establish goals. G. Sohnrey would like
- 30 the SHAC to stay within well-defined boundaries and scope. Other SHAC members
- 31 requested more information about Management Areas (who administers them, how
- 32 should they be considered during PMA discussions, etc.).

33 **Next Steps**

- 34 a) The SHAC will continue PMA discussions on October 20, 2020. The Vina GSA Management
- 35 Committee will take their feedback in consideration when designing the agenda.



Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) Members		
Anne Dawson	Domestic well user	Y
Bruce Smith	Business representative	Y
Cheri Chastain	CSU Chico	Y
Christopher Madden	Butte College	Y
Gary Cole	Agricultural well user	Y
George Barber	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	Y
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Joshua Pierce	Domestic well user	N
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	Y
Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Staff		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Paul Gosselin	Butte County	N
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Technical Consultants		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	Y

Approximately eight members of the public attended the meeting.