



1 **Meeting Brief**

- 2 ➤ The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on June 15, 2021.
- 3 ➤ **Monitoring Networks Draft Chapter & Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Chapter:**
- 4 The SHAC received an overview presentation of the public comments received to date,
- 5 discussed and reviewed the Draft Monitoring Networks Chapters, Draft SMC, and
- 6 Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDE) Appendix, and made recommendations to the
- 7 Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Board of Directors. The public had an
- 8 opportunity to provide comment [Access [Public Release Draft Chapters, SMC Summary Table,](#)
- 9 [and Presentation on Draft Monitoring Networks Chapters, Draft SMC, and GDE Appendix](#)].
- 10 ➤ **Next Meeting:** The SHAC will meet again via video conference on July 20, 2021, from 9:00-
- 11 12:30.

12 **Action Items**

Item	Lead	Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connect with Bruce Smith regarding digitized well logs. 	Christina Buck, Butte County	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise and upload approved Vina SHAC notes (5/18/21) to the website. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Here]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and ensure consistency in GDE maps and figures (Figure 4 and Figure 6) 	Butte County	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post June SHAC meeting recording on the website. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Here]

13 **Summary**

14 The Vina SHAC met on June 15, 2021, via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. Participants

15 included Vina SHAC members, GSA member agency staff, technical consultants, representatives

16 from the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR), and members of the public. Below is a

17 summary of key themes and next steps discussed at the meeting. This document is not intended

18 to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the group’s

19 discussions. The video-conference meeting recording is available on the Vina GSA website

20 [\[Access Here\]](#).

21

22 1. **Introductions & Agenda Review (0:00:00)**

23 The SHAC members, facilitator, technical consulting teams, and staff introduced themselves. The

24 facilitator gave a brief overview of the agenda.

25

26 2. **Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (0:06:06)**

27 *SHAC Comments:*

- 28 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) shared an update that Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID)
- 29 recently turned on their Tuscan Aquifer pumps [for a 25,000 acre-feet supplemental](#)



1 [groundwater program](#). He asked whether GCID has been in communication with the Butte
 2 County Department of Water and Resource Conservation, [as this would be a key example of](#)
 3 [the importance of inter-basin coordination](#). [P. Gosselin \(Butte County\) shared GCID had not](#)
 4 [provided the Department an update at that time.](#)

- 5 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) and B. Smith (business rep) expressed disappointment with
 6 DWR’s response not to extend the GSP deadline. Further, they would like greater emphasis
 7 placed on investments to expand storage and increase desalination plants, as part of the
 8 state’s infrastructure investment.
- 9 • S. Goepf (domestic well user) shared concern with the state’s use and management of
 10 water storage and water transfers, as well as the lack of regional benefits from the water
 11 bond, beyond low-flow fixtures.

12

13 *Public Comments:*

- 14 • A member of the public shared an update on a report received during the last Board of
 15 Supervisors’ meeting related to Oroville Dam, which highlighted concerns related to DWR’s
 16 handling of the SGMA process and the quality of technical information related to domestic
 17 wells.

18

19 **3. Meeting Notes (00:15:00)**

20 The Vina SHAC reviewed and approved the 5/18/21 SHAC meeting notes.

21

22 *SHAC Comments:*

- 23 • S. Lewis (ag representative) would like to ensure consistency in the Vina SHAC process
 24 (e.g., conduct a vote before extending the meeting time, keeping public comment to 3
 25 minutes) and in the meeting notes (e.g., attribute all comments to individual SHAC
 26 members).
- 27 • B. Smith (business rep) asked for access to digitized well log information and provided
 28 edits to P. 2 Line 28 in the meeting notes to properly describe the information he
 29 received.

30

31 The Vina SHAC voted on the approval of the 5/18/21 SHAC meeting notes, pending the minor
 32 changes made. The meeting notes were approved.

33

Yes	A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, G. Sohnrey, B. Smith, C. Chastain, G. Barber,
Abstain	C. Madden, S. Lewis, S. Goepf

34

35 **4. Monitoring Networks Draft Chapter & Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Chapter**
 36 **(0:23:00)**

37

38 C. Buck (Butte County) provided an overview presentation of the public comments received to
 39 date. The SHAC discussed and reviewed the Draft Monitoring Networks Chapters, Draft SMC, and



1 GDE Appendix, and had an opportunity to make recommendations to the Vina GSA Board of
 2 Directors. The public had an opportunity to provide comment. P. Gosselin clarified the GSP
 3 chapters will remain in draft form until the entire GSP is adopted in December [Access [Public](#)
 4 [Release Draft Chapters, SMC Summary Table](#), and [Presentation on Draft Monitoring Networks](#)
 5 [Chapters, Draft SMC, and GDE Appendix](#)].
 6

7 *a. Sustainability Goal (00:23:35)*

8 “To ensure that groundwater is managed to provide a water supply of adequate quantity and
 9 quality to support rural areas and small communities, the agricultural economic base of the
 10 region, and environmental uses now and in the future.”
 11

12 *Comments & Recommendations*

- 13 • S. Goepf (domestic well user) expressed his concern that water quality and pollution
 14 from the homeless community residing by waterways is not emphasized enough. He
 15 would like to ensure groundwater quality remains front and center. P. Gosselin (Butte
 16 County) shared that under SGMA the GSA is not responsible for water quality impacts
 17 from human activities, other than those related to groundwater pumping.
- 18 • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) stated water quality can be addressed elsewhere. Further, the
 19 sustainability goal statement as presented is too restrictive, leaving out large
 20 communities and other businesses besides agriculture. The goal should be inclusive of
 21 all communities and users. G. Barber echoed those concerns and suggested not
 22 mentioning “the agricultural economic base of the region” and maintaining broader and
 23 more inclusive language.
- 24 • S. Lewis (ag representative), S. Geopp (domestic well user), and G. Sohnrey (ag.
 25 representative) would like to retain language valuing agriculture’s economic contribution.
- 26 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) suggested removing the word “small” to be inclusive of
 27 all communities.
- 28 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) felt unsure about including the word “now,” since it may
 29 imply the basin will be sustainable from January 2022 on.

30
 31 Vina SHAC members voted on a recommendation to delete the word “small” and retain, for the
 32 time being, “now and in the future.”
 33

34 “To ensure that groundwater is managed to provide a water supply of adequate
 35 quantity and quality to support rural areas and ~~small~~ communities, the agricultural
 36 economic base of the region, and environmental uses now and in the future.”
 37

Vote	SHAC Members
Yes	C. Madden, A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, G. Sohnrey, B. Smith, C. Chastain, G. Barber, S. Lewis
Yes, tentatively	S. Goepf (in favor of removing small but would also like to remove now and in the future)



1
2
3

b. Groundwater Levels SMC (00:38:48)

Definition	An Undesirable Result is experienced if sustained groundwater levels are too low to provide a water supply of adequate quantity and quality to support rural areas and small communities, and the agricultural economic base of the region, or if significant and unreasonable impacts to environmental uses of groundwater occur.
Identification	Two RMS wells within a management area reach their MT for two consecutive non-dry year-types.
Minimum Thresholds	S. Vina: 15th percentile of shallowest domestic wells within a 3-mile radius of the RMS well. N. Vina: Elevation protective of sustainably constructed domestic wells within the polygon associated with the RMS well.
Measurable Objectives	The groundwater level based on the groundwater trend line for the dry periods (since 2000) of observed short-term climatic cycles extended to 2030.

4
5

Undesirable Results (UR) Definition

SHAC Comments & Recommendations

- 7 • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) expressed concern with tying the SMC to water year type (dry or
- 8 critically dry year), given that drought is in a way “the new normal.” P. Gosselin (Butte
- 9 County) shared this language is in alignment with the regulatory language.
- 10 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) believes the MOs and MTs are not protective enough to
- 11 protect streams, vegetation, and well elevations; therefore, he is highly concerned about
- 12 the UR statement.
- 13 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) would like to remove “non-dry year,” so it is just “two
- 14 consecutive years.” She is concerned with sustained drought conditions and the impacts
- 15 on the groundwater levels. The MT does not feel protective enough.
- 16 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) would like to maintain “non-dry year” for the moment,
- 17 and he asked to refrain from making formal recommendations until the SHAC has
- 18 reviewed the public comments received. In response, P. Gosselin shared the public
- 19 comment period ends on Friday and asked the SHAC for initial or tentative
- 20 recommendations to bring to the board in July.
- 21 • S. Goepf (domestic well user) asked for examples of unreasonable impacts to the
- 22 environment. C. Buck (Butte County) clarified that what is unreasonable is determined
- 23 locally by the GSA. Focus for this SMC has been related to domestic well users and the
- 24 impacts on GDEs are captured in the depletion of interconnected surface water SMC.
- 25 • G. Cole (ag representative) shared concerns on the definition and determination of year
- 26 type (state level, region, etc.). He suggested adding definitions and details about year
- 27 types in the chapter. C. Buck (Butte County) indicated the chapter describes the definition
- 28 of year type which comes from DWR. More details on the index can be included in the
- 29 chapter.



- 1 • S. Lewis (ag representative) would like to make formal recommendations after reviewing
- 2 public comments and ensure the basin remains as flexible as possible to avoid state
- 3 intervention.
- 4 • C. Madden highlighted the distinction between acute and chronic. He is supportive of
- 5 including non-dry year types, but proposed adding additional language:
- 6 ○ “Two non-dry year types or one non-dry year type if proceeded by two dry year
- 7 types if aquifer does not show recovery in non-dry year type years.”
- 8 • P. Gosselin shared the GSA could add language to trigger a Board Review prior to reaching
- 9 the MT.
- 10 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) is concerned with the possibility of multiple years of
- 11 drought not triggering a response to reverse the trend. P. Gosselin responded that the
- 12 triggers would come in the five-year updates and annual reports. She would like to add
- 13 language that shows a commitment to action and urgency if the MT is approaching.
- 14 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) echoed A. Dawson’s concerns. He suggested switching the
- 15 emphasis towards the MO not the MT in the UR statement to signal concern prior to
- 16 enforcement mechanisms.
- 17 • S. Lewis (ag representative) would like to maintain flexibility in the MT to avoid state
- 18 intervention. She would not like to make significant changes to the language at this time.
- 19 • G. Stone (ag representative) suggested addressing multiple factors beyond year type,
- 20 such as a significant water transfer by an adjacent subbasin.

22 *SHAC Poll on removing “dry-year type” from UR Statement*

Vote	SHAC Members
Remove “dry-year type”	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, G. Cole, and J. Brobeck
Retain “dry-year type”	G. Barber, S. Lewis, S. Goepf, G. Sohnrey
Other suggestion	C. Madden (“Two non-dry year types or one non-dry year type if proceeded by two dry year types if aquifer does not show recovery in non-dry year type years.”)

24
25 **Approach to setting the Minimum Threshold**

26 C. Buck (Butte County) asked for the SHAC’s preference on the two approaches to setting the MT,

27 described in the chapter. Specifically, the Management Committee would like input on how to

28 identify the set of domestic wells associated with a given representative monitoring well (polygon

29 vs 3-mile radius) and the statistical approach used to set the MT. For Vina North, the proposal is

30 to use a graphic method to capture and be protective of domestic wells within a polygon, while

31 acknowledging ground surface elevation changes and there may be outliers. In Vina South and

32 Vina Chico, the approach is to use the 15th percentile of shallowest domestic wells within a 3-

33 mile radius of the RMS wells.



1

2 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- 3 • B. Smith (business rep) would like clarification on the dots indicated as “bottom of well.”
- 4 C. Buck stated each of the dots represents wells associated with a given RMS well and the
- 5 distribution of their depths. Wells drilled prior to 1980 are not included.
- 6 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) asked for clarification on the anticipated impacts on the
- 7 eastern part of the subbasin P. 28 and P. 31 of the SMC chapter. He asked whether the
- 8 technical team anticipates those wells to go dry first and the potential impacts of
- 9 increased pumping on the western side of the subbasin on the eastern wells. C. Buck
- 10 (Butte County) shared impacts on the western side of the basin could impact the eastern
- 11 part of the region with significant gradient changes.
- 12 • B. Smith (business rep) would like to know which RMS wells are monitored hourly.
- 13 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) is in favor of the polygon approach, as it is much easier to
- 14 understand. She asked for more information on how the approach for Vina North was
- 15 developed. C. Buck (Butte County) shared that following the SMC Joint Board workshop,
- 16 the Management Committee worked closely with the Rock Creek GSA to refine the
- 17 approach and address their concern with the domestic well database. Other subbasins,
- 18 such as the Butte Subbasin, are following the polygon approach. The Management
- 19 Committee decided to put out both approaches for public input.
- 20 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) asked why the document states the GSA Board has
- 21 recommended and approved a certain percentile. She would prefer using the 10%
- 22 percentile not 15% but recognizes differing viewpoints. P. Gosselin (Butte County)
- 23 clarified that the language has not been finalized and the document will remain in draft
- 24 form and open to changes and edits based on the GSA Board’s decision.
- 25 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) shared his perspective related to the groundwater
- 26 dependent ecosystems (GDEs), specifically on pages 39 and 70, as levels are 80 ft. below
- 27 root depth for upland valley oaks. In addition, he believes the operational ranges seem
- 28 too wide and not sustainable for the MTs on pages 47 and 51-57. He’s concerned these
- 29 MTs would negatively impact perennial streams. He would like to avoid a continued
- 30 downward trend of groundwater levels, particularly given climate impacts. He believes
- 31 that the focus should be on demand management to minimize impacts.
- 32 • B. Smith (business rep) would like to know additional well characteristics and well
- 33 locations to evaluate the water sources and assess the impacts.

34

35 *Public Comment:*

- 36 • D. Rice (Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA) provided context from RCRD’s experience
- 37 using polygon approach, due to elevation changes. This approach reduced duplication of
- 38 counting wells and can be adapted along the way.

39



1 *SHAC Recommendations: MT approach to set of domestic wells associated with a given*
 2 *representative monitoring well*

- 3 • S. Lewis (ag representative) supports a consistent approach across the basin. She would
 4 lean towards the polygon approach.
- 5 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) would support the polygon approach and would like to
 6 minimize impacts to domestic wells by potentially following a percentile approach
 7 (prefers 10th percentile).
- 8 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) asked for clarification related to “sustainably constructed
 9 wells.” C. Buck (Butte County) shared the partial intent is to describe wells that meet
 10 certain well construction standards, recognizing the MT is not meant to protect all existing
 11 wells, including very old, shallow wells.
- 12 • C. Madden (Butte College) prefers the polygon approach since the wells can be grouped
 13 closer together by elevation. He also acknowledged the benefits of the three-mile radius
 14 approach.
- 15 • G. Cole (ag representative) would prefer the polygon method. He would like to ensure
 16 accurate representation in the eastern border by adding another monitoring well.
 17 Further, he would like to see the polygons drawn for Vina South before offering a
 18 recommendation.
- 19 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) prefers the polygon approach.
- 20 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) abstained from making a recommendation. He remains
 21 concerned whether either approach can adequately capture impacts to domestic wells.

23 *Public Comment:*

- 24 • A member of the public suggested adding defining “sustainably constructed well” in the
 25 glossary.

27 *SHAC Poll on Polygon Approach*

Vote	SHAC Members
In support	A. Dawson, S. Lewis, G. Barber, S. Goepp, G. Sohnrey
Uncertain, leaning towards polygon approach	B. Smith, C. Chastain, G. Cole
Uncertain	J. Brobeck, C. Madden

30 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations on direction to set MTs and MOs*

- 31 • G. Cole (ag representative) shares A. Dawson’s concern about the percentage of domestic
 32 wells not in the 15th percentile range. He also echoed J. Brobeck’s concern with oak valley
 33 rooting depth and would like greater consideration for environmental impacts.
- 34 • S. Goepp (domestic well user) is still absorbing the information provided.
- 35 • S. Lewis (ag representative) does not have any suggested changes.
- 36 • G. Barber (CalWater) is in support of the current direction, acknowledging the plan can
 37 be adapted and revised along the way.



- 1 • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) generally in support of the direction but would prefer the MT
- 2 closer to the 10th percentile.
- 3 • B. Smith (business rep) echoed concerns related to the environmental and domestic well
- 4 impacts.
- 5 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) comfortable with approach and would like to review
- 6 progress along the way. He would like to have opportunities to evaluate and modify the
- 7 GSP on a yearly basis.
- 8 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) concerned with tying GDEs solely to interconnected
- 9 surface water. He feels uncomfortable with the approach to establish the MT and
- 10 frustrated with the technical consultants’ insufficient consideration and follow up related
- 11 to urban canopy. The GDE maps are too narrowly focused on riparian habitat, leaving out
- 12 areas dependent on shallow groundwater levels. The operational range is in his
- 13 perspective too broad and not protective enough of the natural environment.
- 14 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) in favor of the 10th percentile and consider revisiting the
- 15 threshold with improved information. As a domestic well representative, she is very
- 16 concerned with drought impacts. A recent PPIC study estimates many wells going dry this
- 17 year. The plan should consider climate impacts on groundwater conditions. Further, she
- 18 recommends investing in an assessment of domestic wells and newly constructed wells
- 19 to have an accurate depiction of current domestic wells in the subbasin.
- 20 • C. Madden (Butte College) supports the current approach for MOs. Consider establishing
- 21 specific thresholds for areas with GDEs and other specific conditions that require lower
- 22 operational flexibility and more stringent MTs.

23 *Public Comment:*

- 24 • A member of the public asked for clarification related to what circumstances would
- 25 trigger state intervention. The MT must be tied to one of the groundwater users. The Vina
- 26 GSA chose domestic wells as the indicator for undesirable results in the subbasin. The
- 27 state could come in if the GSA violates the undesirable results statement, which is tied to
- 28 the groundwater elevation established as the MT. Further, the state may act if the basin
- 29 is not meeting interim milestones as established in the GSP. This member of the public
- 30 expressed serious concern with potential irreversible environmental impacts if the
- 31 subbasin reaches the MT, as proposed.
- 32 • Two members of the public suggested clarifying the definition for “reasonable or
- 33 unreasonable impacts to environmental uses,” anticipating future legislation. There are a
- 34 series of ambiguous terms added to the SGMA terminology, for example, section
- 35 “suitable habitat” in sections 3.4.

36
37 *c. Interconnected Surface Water SMC (2:50:54)*

38

Definition	Avoiding significant and unreasonable depletion of surface water flows caused by groundwater pumping that significantly impacts beneficial uses
-------------------	---



Identification	Groundwater Level SMC are used by Proxy: Two RMS wells reach their MT for two consecutive non-dry year-types.
Minimum Thresholds	Groundwater Level MTs are used by proxy
Measurable Objectives	The groundwater level based on the groundwater trend line for the dry periods (since 2000) of observed short-term climatic cycles extended to 2030.
Data Gap	Data needed to develop this SMC includes: definition of stream reaches and associated priority habitat, streamflow measurements to develop profiles at multiple time periods, and measurements of groundwater levels directly adjacent to stream channels, first water bearing aquifer zone, and deeper aquifer zones.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

The GDE Appendix released for public comment will be included in the Basin Setting Chapter. C. Buck (Butte County) shared that many of the data gaps associated with the surface water SMC are related to the data gaps tied to GDEs.

SHAC Comments & Recommendations on Interconnected Surface Water SMC and GDEs

- C. Buck (Butte County) will make changes consistent with the modifications made for Groundwater Levels SMC.
- J. Brobeck (environmental rep) expressed concern with not including enough areas as GDEs. The current approach is too restrictive to riparian areas, along streams, and are not inclusive of urban canopy and upland forests. C. Buck (Butte County) clarified that the coupling of this SMC and GDEs relate to the data gaps that apply to both.
- B. Smith (business rep) suggests labeling all “potential GDEs” as GDEs to avoid future removal from the plan. The plan should acknowledge existing available data sources.
- S. Lewis (ag representative) highlighted inconsistencies in Figure 4 and Figure 6, particularly related to whether her property is considered a GDE or not. Butte County staff will review and confirm. Both maps should be consistent since they are derived from the same data source.
- J. Brobeck (environmental rep) would like further information on the location and intervals of well screening for the representative monitoring wells, which seems like a data gap for the urban forest areas.

SHAC Vote on approach and framework to address data gaps

Vote	SHAC Members
In support	G. Barber, S. Lewis, S. Goepf, C. Madden, G. Cole, A. Dawson, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, B. Smith,
Uncertain	C. Chastain

25



1 *Public Comment:*

- 2 • A member of the public requested that Butte County include addressing the data gaps
3 above mentioned in the general plan update.

4
5 *d. Water Quality SMC (3:12:00)*

6

Definition	An Undesirable Result is experienced if groundwater pumping compromises the long-term viability of rural areas and small communities, the agricultural economic base of the region, and environmental uses for suitable habitat.
Identification	Two RMS wells exceed their MT for two consecutive non-dry years.
Minimum Thresholds	The upper limit of the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (1,600 µS/cm) for specific conductance based on the State Secondary Drinking Water Standards.
Measurable Objectives	The recommended Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (900 µS/cm) based on State Secondary Drinking Water Standards

7
8 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations on Water Quality SMC*

- 9 • SHAC members would like to make sure the SMC consistently refer to the sustainability
10 goal, removing the word “small” from the definition.
- 11 • G. Barber (CalWater) highlighted the need to mention water contamination plumes and
12 the movement of those plumes through groundwater pumping in the plan. P. Gosselin
13 (Butte County) shared that those plumes are incorporated in the Basin Setting Chapter.
- 14 • B. Smith (business representative) echoed the need to emphasize the need to monitor
15 the movement of existing plumes in the GSP.
- 16 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) asked whether there are agencies monitoring the plumes.
17 G. Barber (CalWater) shared they work with the Department of Toxic Substance Control
18 (DTSC) and other agencies to monitor and clean existing plumes.
- 19 • S. Lewis (ag representative) would like to highlight the contamination by the City of Chico.
20 She would like to continue this conversation as part of the PMA discussion and consider
21 shifting the City of Chico to surface water, in her perspective, could solve the issue. G.
22 Barber (CalWater) clarified CalWater operations help clean up existing plumes.
- 23 • G. Cole (ag representative) asked whether the water quality wells selected represent
24 domestic water wells. C. Buck (Butte County) shared that the goal for the monitoring wells
25 is to be able to trace potential upwelling of saline water. Further, G. Cole highlighted
26 concern with “non-dry years.”

27
28 *SHAC Vote on approach to Water Quality SMC*

29

Vote	SHAC Members
-------------	---------------------



In support G. Barber, S. Lewis, S. Goepf, C. Madden, G. Cole, A. Dawson, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, B. Smith, C. Chastain

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Public Comment

- A member of the public asked about monitoring the movement of existing plumes, which are monitored by DTSC.

e. Groundwater Storage and Land Subsidence SMC (3:29:00)

	Groundwater Storage SMC	Land Subsidence SMC
Definition	An Undesirable Result is experienced if sustained groundwater storage volumes are insufficient to support rural areas and small communities, the agricultural economic base of the region, and environmental uses for suitable habitat.	An Undesirable Result is experienced if groundwater pumping leads to changes in the ground surface elevation severe enough to disrupt critical infrastructure, development of projects that enhance the viability of rural areas, small communities, and the agricultural economic base of the region.
Identification	Two RMS wells reach their MT for two consecutive non-dry year-types.	Occurs when two RMS wells reach their MT for two consecutive non-dry year-types.
Minimum Thresholds	Groundwater Level MTs are used by proxy	Groundwater Level MTs are used by proxy
Measurable Objectives	The groundwater level based on the groundwater trend line for the dry periods (since 2000) of observed short-term climatic cycles extended to 2030.	The groundwater level based on the groundwater trend line for the dry periods (since 2000) of observed short-term climatic cycles extended to 2030.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

SHAC Comments & Recommendations on Land Subsidence and Groundwater Storage

- G. Sohnrey (ag representative) would like to remove the words “severe enough to disrupt critical infrastructure.” In his perspective, any land subsidence in the subbasin is an issue.

Public Comment

- A member of the public echoed concerns with land subsidence and called for close monitoring to understand causes.

Next Steps

The SHAC will meet again via video conference on July 20, 2021, from 9:00-12:30.



1 **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
Sam Goepp	Domestic well user	Y
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	Y
Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Representatives		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Paul Gosselin	Butte County	Y
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Erik Gustafson	City of Chico	Y
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Darren Rice	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
Technical Consultants		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y
Amer Hussain	Geosyntec	Y
Kristin Reardon	Geosyntec	Y
Other Representatives		
Debbie Spangler	CA Department of Water Resources	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Stephanie Horii	Consensus Building Institute	Y

2 Approximately five members of the public attended the meeting.

3