



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

---

CORRESPONDENCE

VINA STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [jimb@aqualliance.net](mailto:jimb@aqualliance.net)

**Subject:** **Re: Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee Agenda Materials for December 15, 2020**


**Date:** December 11, 2020 at 1:29:13 PM PST

**To:** [bcwater@buttecounty.net](mailto:bcwater@buttecounty.net), Tania Carlone <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>

Dear Tania and Christina,

Will you please have the attached image on hand to share during our discussion of item 6 on the agenda?

Thanks,



Original message

---

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>

**Subject:** Fwd: Sustainable Management Criteria GDE considerations

**Date:** December 15, 2020 at 1:28:34 PM PST

**To:** Joe Turner <JTurner@geosyntec.com>, Bob Anderson <banderson@geosyntec.com>, Amer Hussain <ahussain@Geosyntec.com>

**Cc:** "Gosselin, Paul" <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>, Christina Buck <cbuck@buttecounty.net>, Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>

Joe, Bob, and Amer,

Find correspondence and attachments from Jim Brobeck, SHAC member.

Best,

Tania

Tania Carlone

Consensus Building Institute

510/684.0504 (cell)

[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org) | [www.cbi.org](http://www.cbi.org)

Watch our new video on CBI's work: <https://youtu.be/RniP-Q5fpPw>

—

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Tania Carlone <tcarlone@cbi.org>

**Subject:** Re: Sustainable Management Criteria GDE considerations

**Date:** December 15, 2020 at 1:07:28 PM PST

**To:** jimb@aqualliance.net

**Cc:** BCWater <BCWaterFrontDeskHG@buttecounty.net>, Colin Klinesteker <cklinesteker@mechoopda-nsn.gov>, Christina Buck <cbuck@buttecounty.net>, Erik Gustafson <Erik.Gustafson@chicoca.gov>, "Gosselin, Paul" <PGosselin@buttecounty.net>, Jeff Carter <jeff@jjcarterlaw.com>, Kamie Loeser <kamie@kamieloeser.com>, "Thomas, Autum" <AThomas@buttecounty.net>, Mariana Rivera-Torres <mrivertorres@cbi.org>, Linda Herman <linda.herman@chicoca.gov>, "Peterson, Kelly" <kpeterson@buttecounty.net>, almondfarmer@msn.com, jonlavy@comcast.net

Thank you, Jim. I will forward your message and the attached documents to Geosyntec.

Best,

Tania

Tania Carlone

Consensus Building Institute

510/684.0504 (cell)

[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org) | [www.cbi.org](http://www.cbi.org)

Watch our new video on CBI's work:<https://youtu.be/RniP-Q5fpPw>

---

**From:** [jimb@aqualliance.net](mailto:jimb@aqualliance.net)

**Subject:** Sustainable Management Criteria GDE considerations

**Date:** December 15, 2020 at 11:07:29 AM PST

**To:** Tania Carlone <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>

**Cc:** BCWater <[BCWaterFrontDeskHG@buttecounty.net](mailto:BCWaterFrontDeskHG@buttecounty.net)>, Colin Klinesteker <[cklinesteker@mechoopda-nasn.gov](mailto:cklinesteker@mechoopda-nasn.gov)>, Christina Buck <[cbuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:cbuck@buttecounty.net)>, Erik Gustafson <[Erik.Gustafson@chicoca.gov](mailto:Erik.Gustafson@chicoca.gov)>, "Gosselin, Paul" <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>, Jeff Carter <[jeff@jccarterlaw.com](mailto:jeff@jccarterlaw.com)>, Kamie Loeser <[kamie@kamieloeser.com](mailto:kamie@kamieloeser.com)>, "Thomas, Autum" <[AThomas@buttecounty.net](mailto:AThomas@buttecounty.net)>, Mariana Rivera-Torres <[mriveratorres@cbi.org](mailto:mriveratorres@cbi.org)>, Linda Herman <[linda.herman@chicoca.gov](mailto:linda.herman@chicoca.gov)>, "Peterson, Kelly" <[kpeterston@buttecounty.net](mailto:kpeterston@buttecounty.net)>, [almondfarmer@msn.com](mailto:almondfarmer@msn.com), [jonlavy@comcast.net](mailto:jonlavy@comcast.net)

Tania, Please forward this message to the Geosyntec consulting team.

The SMC discussion today is too substantial to voice all pertinent comments on-line. The minimum threshold concept is similar to the BMO efforts of the past, but more technically explicit. As the Environmental representative on the SHAC I am responsible for suggesting input on habitat issues. Groundwater levels impact streamflow and terrestrial vegetation including Valley Oak woodlands. The percentile aspect of the Geosyntec presentation seems reasonable. The two "consecutive year" is too long for GDEs which do not have the ability to drill deeper as a mitigation.

The data gaps associated with a need to expand our shallow aquifer monitoring has been identified in past meetings. This excerpt from a DWR report describes the need to expand our monitoring to preserve valued habitat:

Sacramento Valley Water Resource Monitoring, Data Collection and Evaluation Framework  
2007 DWR NCWA et al

### 2.3 Habitat Monitoring

The long-term health of riparian vegetation, wetland species, and number of other native habitat are commonly associated with maintaining a minimum range of groundwater levels and an appropriate level of interaction between surface water and groundwater resources. The lowering of groundwater levels due to natural climatic changes or the interception of groundwater underflow to surface water systems due to the increased groundwater extraction associated with water management programs, have the potential to impact the native habitat areas. Baseline habitat monitoring is an important data collection objective because it allows for a better understanding of the existing water resource requirements of the native habitat and the evaluation of potential impacts associated with potential changes in water resource management practices. In order to identify potential habitat impacts associated with potential changes in water management practices, a program-specific network of shallow monitor monitoring wells should be developed to detect changes in water levels over the shallowest portion of the aquifer. In evaluating impacts to certain wetlands species, it is important to discern both the rate of groundwater level change, as well as the cumulative change over the entire year. Data collection and monitoring frequency should be appropriately selected to support the temporal and long-term evaluations.

Jim Brobeck

—

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Anne Dawson <aakdawson@aol.com>  
**Subject:** Questions re SMC  
**Date:** January 11, 2021 at 9:34:20 AM PST  
**To:** Bob Anderson <BAnderson@Geosyntec.com>

Hi Bob

I am a domestic well representative on the Vina SHAC and I sat in on the Wyandotte meeting last week. I am hoping that you will be willing to answer a few remaining questions that I have. You may email me back or if you'd prefer to talk on the phone my home number is 530-894-8493. My cell reception is poor so I would prefer you call on the landline.

On the Wyandotte presentation I saw that the suggested monitoring wells and their 4 mile radius covered the vast majority of the basin.

Do you know yet how many monitoring wells would be used in the Vina subbasin? At the time of the Vina presentation I had the impression it would be only three.

Do you know how many domestic wells there are in the Vina sub basin?

Do you have a rough estimate of the percentage of these wells that are already dry or abandoned?

I realize I still don't understand the box and whiskers graphic. There is the fat blue box in the middle with a waist. I think the waist represents the median but what do the top and bottom represent? Then there are the short horizontal bars above and below the fat blue box. What are they? Where is the 15th percentile?

Thanks for your help.  
Anne Dawson

—

Subject: 15th percentile

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Gosselin, Paul" <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: 15th percentile  
**Date:** January 13, 2021 at 11:21:50 AM PST  
**To:** 'Anne Dawson' <[aakdawson@aol.com](mailto:aakdawson@aol.com)>  
**Cc:** Tania Carlone <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>, "Mariana Rivera-Torres ([mrivertorres@cbi.org](mailto:mrivertorres@cbi.org))" <[mrivertorres@cbi.org](mailto:mrivertorres@cbi.org)>, 'Joe Turner' <[JTurner@Geosyntec.com](mailto:JTurner@Geosyntec.com)>, 'Bob Anderson' <[BAnderson@Geosyntec.com](mailto:BAnderson@Geosyntec.com)>

Hi Anne

Thank you for the questions about the Sustainable Management Criteria. With the input from the Geosyntec team, I am providing responses to your questions below. I am copying Tania so your questions and response can be put as SHAC correspondence.

Would you mind telling me how you would anticipate we would monitor the 15th percentile if that is adopted?

Monitoring would occur at each of the Representative Monitoring site locations. The monitoring would focus on whether groundwater levels are meeting the Measureable Objective. It would be our intent that the groundwater levels would remain within the Measureable Objective and not approach the Minimum Threshold. The 15<sup>th</sup> percentile is below the Minimum Threshold. The 15<sup>th</sup> percentile is a statistic based on surrounding domestic well depths that defines the Minimum Threshold at one single Representative Monitoring location. We would not “monitor” the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile, but we would recalculate the Minimum Threshold as we gain better information on the surrounding domestic well depths and whether those wells are still active. We would, at a minimum recalculate the Minimum Threshold every 5 years for the GSP update. Adopting the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile as a method for determining the Minimum Threshold at a representative monitoring site simply means we are accepting the fact that some domestic wells are vulnerable if water levels decline further. The proposed Minimum Threshold sets something other than the shallowest nearby domestic well so that we have some “operating space” between the Minimum Threshold and the Measurable Objective as we implement the plan over time.

I am wondering if it would simply be measuring the ground water elevation at each of the monitoring wells, or would it involve reporting and tracking the actual number of dry wells?

We will monitor groundwater levels at each of the Representative Monitoring for compliance. Our performance measure will not be the number of wells that go dry. The performance measure is based on whether groundwater levels in the representative monitoring location meet the Measureable Objective. If the water level in more than one of our representative monitoring locations falls below the Minimum Threshold, that becomes a trigger for more aggressive action to reduce water level declines. This is a metric that is specified in the plan (how many representative monitoring wells can fall below a threshold). The number of dry wells is not a metric we will report to DWR as we implement the plan, but we will keep track of domestic well impacts. There may be a mitigation program in the GSP to support the deepening of shallow domestic wells. The 15th percentile are wells that are vulnerable (not necessarily going dry) based on existing records. Plan can indicate based on records available – but a program could be developed for actual domestic well inventory with implementation schedule. This approach may be a good place to start, since Minimum Thresholds levels are below what has been seen. There is time to further assess this and what actual impacts would be if ever do reach these levels.

Also I am confused about the need to assess contaminants in the ground water. The document that describes best management practices suggests that we should be monitoring for contaminants and plumes etc. I understand that we don't have any regulatory responsibility but who is responsible for checking that no new areas of contamination have appeared as a result of implementing SGMA ?

You are correct, the Vina GSA does not have authority to manage groundwater contaminants. The GSA is obligated to be aware of water quality programs to ensure that projects do not affect existing water quality programs. Our primary water quality objective will be to ensure that groundwater pumping does not introduce saline water into the basin. Saline water is below base of fresh water. However, wells completed in Vina (other than those impacted from contaminated sites) have good quality – and to our knowledge have not seen saline water anywhere near the wells that are used – so not expected to occur. Have drilled to depths greater than 1000 feet in basin – and still see fresh water.

Lastly, are there any disadvantaged communities within the Vina subbasin?  
Yes. I attached the map of Disadvantaged Communities in Butte County.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Thank you.

Paul

**Paul Gosselin, Director**  
*Department of Water and Resource Conservation*  
308 Nelson Ave  
Oroville, CA 95965  
530-552-3590 office  
530-574-7443 mobile

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

From: Anne Dawson <[aakdawson@aol.com](mailto:aakdawson@aol.com)>  
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 9:31 AM  
To: Gosselin, Paul <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>  
Subject: 15th percentile

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

Good morning Paul,

Would you mind telling me how you would anticipate we would monitor the 15th percentile if that is adopted? I am wondering if it would simply be measuring the ground water elevation at each of the monitoring wells, or would it involve reporting and tracking the actual number of dry wells?

Also I am confused about the need to assess contaminants in the ground water. The document that describes best management practices suggests that we should be monitoring for contaminants and plumes etc. I understand that we don't have any regulatory responsibility but who is responsible for checking that no new areas of contaminantion have appeared as a result of implementing SGMA ?

Lastly, are there any disadvantaged communities within the Vina subbasin?

Thanks

Anne

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Mariana Rivera-Torres <[mrivertorres@cbi.org](mailto:mrivertorres@cbi.org)>  
**Subject: Re: Interbasin coordination updates**  
**Date:** January 12, 2021 at 2:03:55 PM PST  
**To:** [jimb@aqualliance.net](mailto:jimb@aqualliance.net)  
**Cc:** [bcwater@buttecounty.net](mailto:bcwater@buttecounty.net), Tania Carlone <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>

Hi Jim,

Thank you for your message and apologies for the delay posting the summary. The document is currently undergoing internal review and will be posted before our Vina SHAC meeting next Tuesday.

I am glad that you were able to talk to Christina and that she pointed you to the "Highlights of Compiled Model Information" document [[Access Here](#)]. I think you may find that document helpful because it delves deeper into the various models used in the Northern Sac Valley. I am not an expert in hydrologic models either, but I think Christina did a wonderful job describing the highlights in the memo attached to the spreadsheet.

Related to the key findings from the information-sharing template, the models document we discussed earlier is the first output. We are still working on establishing a common understanding of cross-boundary flows. To do so, we will continue to compile data (as it becomes available) and reconvene in the Spring (when all water budget information becomes available). We will then communicate the main takeaways with the various public venues in the subbasins (including the SHAC).

In terms of our coordination priorities, you'll notice our efforts are closely aligned with the regulations [§ 357.2. Interbasin Agreements Regulations Requirements](#). As you mentioned, the motivation behind this effort is to coordinate as much as possible during GSP development. Whether or not neighboring subbasins craft voluntary agreement(s) will be decided down the road by the respective GSAs.

We are trying to provide concise, transparent, and useful updates to the SHAC and other public venues and are open to your feedback on how to do so more effectively.

Thank you again Jim for your questions, and please feel free to reach out with any other questions in the future.

Best regards,

Mariana

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



**From:** jimbo@aqualliance.net  
**Subject:** Interbasin coordination updates  
**Date:** January 12, 2021 at 12:10:25 PM PST  
**To:** mriveratorres@cbi.org, bcwater@buttecounty.net

Hi Mariana,

I talked with Christina Buck to find out about the "Interbasin coordination update" that is listed on all the recent regional water meetings. But the updates are not up to date. She let me know that she posted the "Highlights of Compiled Model Information" that resulted from the December meeting and suggested that I contact you about the "Meeting Summary" for that meeting.

Since I am not an expert in designing or running the various Integrated hydrologic models I cannot technically analyze the accuracy of the different models. But the preliminary results have significant divergence in results pertaining to cross boundary flows. The discussions on these discrepancies that must occur of great interest.

The Northern Sacramento Valley Interbasin Coordination Group recognizes the dynamic hydrologic connection between SGMA sub-basins. While "general coordination" and "technical coordination" are obvious and necessary first steps in the process it is clear that interbasin conflicts are possible, if not inevitable. The Consensus Building Institute explains that a "Conflict Resolution Process" is the third step in interbasin coordination and optimistically predicts that "Voluntary Agreements" will suffice in resolving incompatible water management policies. This optimism is warranted only if the coordination process is transparent from beginning to end. I have been assured by consultants that there is a record of the interbasin coordination meetings to date and that public outreach will be extended to include public participation in future interbasin coordination meetings. Slide 5 shows the CBI timeline expected that public outreach and communication strategies would be discussed before 2021. Were outreach and communication strategies discussed during the Dec meeting? When is the next meeting? Will members of the public or advisory committees be invited to participate? Has a common understanding of cross-boundary flows been established?

The last summary published was for the August meeting. As of January 12, 2021 the summary notes for Meeting #4, December 1, 2020 have not been published. Slide 7 promises that "Key findings will be presented to the public for an opportunity to ask questions and provide input."

Jim Brobeck, VGSA SHAC member

—  
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Buck, Christina" <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>

**Subject:** RE: Management Areas

**Date:** January 12, 2021 at 3:55:32 PM PST

**To:** "'Kehn, David'" <[dkehn@calwater.com](mailto:dkehn@calwater.com)>

Cc: 'Tania Carlone' <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>, "Gosselin, Paul" <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>

Hi David,

The three management areas in the Vina subbasin are described in the JPA of the Vina GSA, but it also indicates that they are preliminary and subject to change. I've attached a description drafted for the Basin Setting chapter that outlines the reasoning behind the creation of these three management areas. However, as the SMC work continues in the subbasin, the topic of management areas will be revisited and will be a topic of discussion at a future SHAC meeting.

Since this is relevant to future SHAC discussions, I've copied Tania Carlone so that she can include it as correspondence for the SHAC packet.

Best,  
Christina

**From:** Kehn, David <[dkehrn@calwater.com](mailto:dkehrn@calwater.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 11:40 AM  
**To:** Buck, Christina <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** Management Areas

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

Christina,

The Colusa GSA is having quite a bit of conversations about utilizing Management Areas. In Vina, I believe we are utilizing 3 Management Areas; North, Chico, and South. What is the primary reason for utilizing these? Or has it yet to be formally accepted that we'll proceed with Management Areas?

I'm trying to gain some context for the discussion on the other side of the river and any input is appreciated.

Thank you!

**David Kehn**  
**Superintendent**  
**California Water Service**  
**Chico District**  
**Work: (530) 893-6333**  
**Cell: (530) 966-3131**



**Quality. Service. Value.**

[calwater.com](http://calwater.com)

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain California Water Service Group proprietary information and is confidential. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this e-mail and then deleting it from your system.

—

On Jan 13, 2021, at 11:41 AM, Mariana Rivera-Torres <[mrivertorres@cbi.org](mailto:mrivertorres@cbi.org)> wrote:

Good morning Sam,

Thank you for your message. We will work on getting the notes out sooner. However, it would probably be closer to 10-14 days, since after we develop the draft document it goes through an internal review process with the GSA Management Committee.

Best,

Mariana

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

<eebe6451-c1cd-4307-b74a-92c5822bc752.png>

On Jan 13, 2021, at 11:27 AM, Sam Goepp <[samgoepp@gmail.com](mailto:samgoepp@gmail.com)> wrote:

Minutes take a month to compile ? I would suggest that minutes be sent out within 5 days of meeting while info is fresh—30 days later is not beneficial

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Mariana Rivera-Torres](#)

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 11:05 AM

**Cc:** [Tania Carlone](#); [Gosselin, Paul](#); [Peterson, Kelly](#); [Linda Herman](#); [Erik Gustafson](#); [Kamie Loeser](#); [Jeff](#)

[Carter; Colin Klinesteker](#)

**Subject:** [For Review] December Vina SHAC Meeting Notes

Dear Vina SHAC,

Please find the draft meeting notes from our Vina SHAC Meeting (12/15) attached for your review and input. We welcome your feedback and suggested edits in writing by **12pm, Wednesday 1/13**. You will also have the opportunity to provide input during our meeting on Tuesday, January 19.

We look forward to hearing your thoughts,

Best regards,

Mariana

—

**From:** "Kehn, David" <[dkehn@calwater.com](mailto:dkehn@calwater.com)>  
**Date:** January 13, 2021 at 9:11:48 AM PST  
**To:** "Buck, Christina" <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>  
**Cc:** Tania Carlone <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>, "Gosselin, Paul" <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: Management Areas

Christina,

Clarifying my initial question, it's the Glenn Groundwater Authority Board and Technical Advisory Committee that are exploring the concept of Management Areas. The Colusa Groundwater Authority may be as well, but my participation is with the aforementioned groups.

Thanks again.

-David Kehn

**From:** Kehn, David  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 13, 2021 8:25 AM  
**To:** Buck, Christina <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>  
**Cc:** 'Tania Carlone' <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>; Gosselin, Paul <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: Management Areas

Thank you Christina, this is very helpful.

-David Kehn

**From:** Buck, Christina <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 3:56 PM  
**To:** Kehn, David <[dkehn@calwater.com](mailto:dkehn@calwater.com)>

**Cc:** 'Tania Carlone' <[tcarlone@cbi.org](mailto:tcarlone@cbi.org)>; Gosselin, Paul <[PGosselin@buttecounty.net](mailto:PGosselin@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: Management Areas

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. Stop and think before clicking a link or opening attachments.  
Hi David,

The three management areas in the Vina subbasin are described in the JPA of the Vina GSA, but it also indicates that they are preliminary and subject to change. I've attached a description drafted for the Basin Setting chapter that outlines the reasoning behind the creation of these three management areas. However, as the SMC work continues in the subbasin, the topic of management areas will be revisited and will be a topic of discussion at a future SHAC meeting.

Since this is relevant to future SHAC discussions, I've copied Tania Carlone so that she can include it as correspondence for the SHAC packet.

Best,  
Christina

**From:** Kehn, David <[dkehr@calwater.com](mailto:dkehr@calwater.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 11:40 AM  
**To:** Buck, Christina <[CBuck@buttecounty.net](mailto:CBuck@buttecounty.net)>  
**Subject:** Management Areas

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

Christina,

The Colusa GSA is having quite a bit of conversations about utilizing Management Areas. In Vina, I believe we are utilizing 3 Management Areas; North, Chico, and South. What is the primary reason for utilizing these? Or has it yet to be formally accepted that we'll proceed with Management Areas?

I'm trying to gain some context for the discussion on the other side of the river and any input is appreciated.

Thank you!

**David Kehn**  
Superintendent  
California Water Service  
Chico District  
Work: (530) 893-6333

Cell: (530) 966-3131



**Quality. Service. Value.**

[calwater.com](http://calwater.com)

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain California Water Service Group proprietary information and is confidential. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this e-mail and then deleting it from your system.

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain California Water Service Group proprietary information and is confidential. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this e-mail and then deleting it from your system.