



1 Meeting Brief

- 2 ➤ The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on April 20, 2021.
- 3 ➤ **Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) & Representative Monitoring Chapter:** The SHAC
- 4 received a brief overview of the SMC chapter content and next steps for public review.
- 5 ➤ **Projects & Management Actions (PMAs):** The SHAC discussed priority areas for PMAs based
- 6 on SMC at the Management Area scale, provided input on PMA draft criteria, and considered
- 7 potential PMAs for consideration, focused primarily on Management Actions. Further, the
- 8 SHAC reviewed next steps in the PMA process [[Access PMA Presentation](#) | [PMA Graphs](#) |
- 9 [PMA Submissions Table](#) | [PMA Submission G.Cole](#) | [PMA Submission L.Cole](#)].
- 10 ➤ **Next Meeting:** The SHAC will meet again via video conference on May 18, 2021 from 9:00-
- 11 12:00.

12 Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send link to the Brown Bag Seminar: <i>Perspectives on Butte County Land Use Changes Brown</i>, held on March 10, 2021. 	CBI & Management Committee	Access Presentations and Meeting Recording Here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share and review DWR Bulletin 118 with SHAC members. 	CBI & Management Committee	Access Bulletin 118 Highlight Document Here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add more detail to the website and PMA submittal form, including criteria and requirements. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access PMA Webpage Here]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share highlights and/or meeting recording from Butte County Environmental Health's presentation on the well-permitting process to the Groundwater Commission. 	Management Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share key takeaways from Butte County's Drought taskforce presentation at the next SHAC meeting. 	Management Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share Butte Subbasin PMA spreadsheet for SHAC consideration. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Butte Subbasin Draft PMA Matrix Here]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up with Bruce Smith on electric log data availability. 	Christina Buck and Kelly Peterson, Butte County	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post April SHAC meeting recording on the website. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Video Access Audio]

13 Summary

14 The Vina SHAC met on April 20, 2021 via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. Participants

15 included Vina SHAC members, Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) member agency staff,

16 technical consultants, representatives of the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR), and

17 members of the public. Below is a summary of key themes and next steps discussed at the



1 meeting. This document is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main
 2 points covered during the group's discussions. The video-conference meeting recording is
 3 available at the Vina GSA website [[Access Video](#) | [Access Audio](#)].
 4

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

6 The SHAC members, facilitator, technical consulting teams, and staff introduced themselves. The
 7 facilitator gave a brief overview of the agenda.
 8

9 **2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (0:05:38)**

10 J. Brobeck (env. representative) noticed inter-basin coordination updates are not on the agenda
 11 and expressed concern with current drought conditions. Changing reservoir operations in Shasta
 12 may impact water deliveries to Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (GCID), which may have short
 13 term and long-term implications on regional groundwater conditions. P. Gosselin (Butte County)
 14 suggested the SHAC may not be the venue to address these concerns. Butte County will bring a
 15 comprehensive update on drought conditions to the Water Commission in May, including
 16 information about reservoir releases. P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared the region is probably
 17 entering a critically dry year. As subbasins develop their Basin Setting chapters, the Vina GSA can
 18 get a better understanding of how other subbasins are characterizing drought conditions as part
 19 of their Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs).
 20

21 S. Lewis (ag. representative) would like the Land IQ findings to be presented at a future meeting.
 22 P. Gosselin (Butte County) pointed the SHAC to the Brown Bag Seminar, "Perspectives on Butte
 23 County Land Use Changes" hosted by Butte County on March 10, 2021. During the Seminar, Joel
 24 Kimmelshue presented the Land IQ report findings [[Access Presentations and Meeting Recording](#)
 25 [Here](#)]. P. Gosselin highlighted that while the Management Committee wants to be responsive to
 26 requests, the GSAs are working on a tight timeline for GSP development.
 27

28 A member of the public encouraged further discussions about the implications of drought and
 29 neighboring subbasin actions on the Vina Subbasin. P. Gosselin shared that while it is still early
 30 to know how agencies will manage dry conditions, bringing in key information on the long-term
 31 implications of decisions will be very important. Given the amount of information and work the
 32 SHAC needs to cover, the group may want to consider extending the meetings to be longer than
 33 three hours. For the time being, the Management Committee will report back the key themes
 34 and outcomes from Butte County's Drought Committee meeting, which will be held on May 18.
 35

36 Lastly, G. Cole (ag representative) suggested sharing and DWR Bulletin 118 with SHAC members
 37 [[Access Bulletin 118 Highlight Document Here](#)].
 38

39 **3. Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) (0:24:39)**

40 Geosyntec, the technical consulting team, shared a brief presentation with the SHAC focused on
 41 identifying priority areas for PMAs based on SMC at the Management Area scale, draft PMA
 42 criteria, and potential PMAs for consideration. SHAC members provided input and discussed



1

2 **Discussion:**

- 3 • A. Dawson (domestic well rep) asked whether the number identified in the supporting
4 materials when identifying priority areas for PMAs indicates annual deficit. Further, she
5 would like to know how these numbers relate to the Basin Setting. J. Turner clarified that the
6 quantity indicates overall deficit in a “business as usual” scenario by 2032. C. Buck clarified
7 that the projections were based on actual data from the last 20-years, which corresponds to
8 the period in which the subbasin has seen greatest declines. The Basin Setting chapter was
9 based on model projections. Some of the changes in storage that the model captured are
10 coming from changes in the shallow system that responds to very wet and dry years. Overall,
11 J. Turner’s estimates are within a reasonable range of the model projections. The goal for the
12 map is to illustrate relative differences and highlight the main priority areas the GSA will need
13 to focus PMAs to achieve sustainability. C. Buck shared that the numbers do not exactly match
14 because it is like comparing apples to oranges. J. Turner’s polygons did not cover the entire
15 subbasin and compared the lowest trend line with the Measurable Objective (MO) to
16 estimate the projected difference. Meanwhile, the Basin Setting calculated the average
17 annual change in storage over a historical period.
- 18 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked whether the consulting team had specific PMAs in
19 mind when identifying priority areas. T. Carlone (CBI) shared that the maps were not
20 developed with specific PMAs in mind. Rather, the intent behind the presentation was to
21 frame the PMA discussion and give a sense of priority areas in the subbasin to target PMAs.
- 22 • S. Lewis (ag. representative) asked whether areas to the south of Vina were having an impact
23 on the hotspots identified in the map, particularly related to the conversion of rice fields to
24 orchards. C. Buck (Butte County) shared that the Butte Subbasin tends to receive water from
25 Vina (NE), based on contour maps. Declines in Vina South could adjust contours, so that less
26 water may flow into the Butte Subbasin. In sum, pumping in Vina tends to affect conditions
27 in Butte. S. Lewis shared that water exports in the 1990s had an impact on the Vina Subbasin
28 and encouraged more inter-basin coordination. C. Buck clarified that it may be a difference
29 of scale: at a regional groundwater scale, there is more pumping in the Vina Subbasin than
30 the Butte Subbasin.

31

32 **Draft PMA Criteria (0:40:00)**

33 Geosyntec shared a list of PMA requirements that need to be included in the plan, as well as
34 some lessons learned through past experience with DWR evaluating projects for funding from
35 Proposition 68 Implementation Grants ([link](#)). A. Hussein shared that the GSA could include very
36 specific projects (e.g., a specific recharge basin, canal improvement, stormwater capture, etc.)
37 with detailed evaluation and analysis. Another option is to list potential opportunities and
38 projects that could be implemented in the future, without getting into very specific details. DWR
39 tends to prefer as many specific details as possible. The idea is to rank projects in terms of priority
40 for the subbasin.

41

42 A. Hussein shared the following lessons learned:



- 1 • **Have very clear prioritization criteria:** DWR prioritized subbasins with clear criteria.
- 2 • **Benefit to Underrepresented Communities (URs):** DWR emphasized benefits and
- 3 outreach efforts to underrepresented communities (URs).
- 4 • **Keep it simple:** The more complex the application, the harder for DWR to score it. For
- 5 subbasins that submitted more than one project, DWR scored each project individually
- 6 and then averaged them all.
- 7 • **PMA's in GSP are eligible for State funding.**

9 *Lessons Learned from Implementation Grant*

10 A. Hussein shared lessons learned from his work in the last round of Proposition 68
 11 Implementation Grants ([link](#)). DWR had very tight scoring criteria and gave priority to subbasins
 12 with very specific prioritization. The second round will be available in January 2022 with an
 13 anticipated \$77 million available for medium-and high priority basins. It will be key to submit a
 14 proposal.

16 *Project Criteria Initial Assessment:*

- 17 1. Project addresses one or more of the Undesirable Results
- 18 2. Project is implementable with respect to technical complexity, regulatory complexity,
- 19 institutional consideration, and public acceptance
- 20 3. Project is implementable within the SGMA timeframe
- 21 4. Project benefits Underrepresented Communities (URCs)
- 22 5. Project has an identified Funding Source
- 23 6. Project is in an area where water quality is suitable for use

25 *Project Categories:*

Planned Projects	Potential Projects	Conceptual Projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Projects planned to be operational prior to 2042 and the projected supply is considered as offsetting the projected 2042 supply imbalance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Projects in the planning stages and are likely to move forward when funding becomes available. •Potential Projects represent a “menu of options” for the Subbasin to achieve long term sustainability and offset the remaining imbalance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Projects in the early conceptual planning stages requiring additional work to implement.

27 *Requirement for Each Project*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 28 ✓ The benefitted measurable objective | 32 ✓ Timetable for initiation and completion |
| 29 ✓ Expected benefits | 33 ✓ Permitting and regulatory processes |
| 30 ✓ How the project will be accomplished | 34 ✓ Estimated costs and plans to meet costs |
| 31 ✓ Legal authority | 35 ✓ Public outreach |

36



1 A. Hussein shared some example management actions for discussion purposes and encouraged
 2 the SHAC to think about the management actions the GSA, in conjunction with partners, can
 3 begin to implement. Examples include updating existing well ordinances, policies to encourage
 4 projects, credits to recharge facilities, credits for on-farm recharge, credits for fallowing,
 5 incentives for pumping outside of designated areas or depths, incentives for conservation, and
 6 protection of riparian and stream corridors.

7
 8 Geosyntec asked for the SHAC's feedback on the project criteria and the requirements presented.

9
 10 **SHAC Feedback on Project Criteria:**

- 11 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) would like to add a requirement to consider legal
 12 consequences related to water rights and aquifer operations to account for credits
 13 earned. P. Gosselin shared that legal implications are embedded in some of the specified
 14 considerations (i.e., expected benefits, legal authority, etc.). A. Hussein shared issues
 15 related to credits and accounting are very important to consider thoroughly. Specifically,
 16 it will be key to develop policies that outline a credit system that is acceptable for that
 17 specific subbasin. The GSP can list some of the broader categories with an understanding
 18 that the details can be sorted out moving forward. J. Brobeck shared he is concerned with
 19 the momentum gained along the way and would like the legal and operational
 20 consequences to be considered in advance, particularly as they relate to accumulating
 21 credits.
- 22 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) also encouraged distinguishing what he characterized as
 23 theoretical benefits versus scientifically proven benefits. Further, he would like to identify
 24 projects to fill data gaps, including flow patterns and connectivity between aquifer strata.
 25 Staff indicated the SHAC will discuss data gaps soon. Further, when looking at the data
 26 and scientific foundation presented by PMA proponents, the GSA may require additional
 27 studies needed if the evidence for claimed benefits is weak.
- 28 • A member of the public asked for further clarification about the specific term
 29 underrepresented communities. T. Carlone shared DWR now uses the term
 30 "underrepresented communities" which has replaced "disadvantaged communities"
 31 (DAC).
- 32 • S. Lewis requested uploading the materials with sufficient time ahead of the meetings to
 33 allow SHAC members to carefully review and provide feedback. In addition, she suggested
 34 adding additional details (i.e., project criteria) to the online PMA form and website.
- 35 • A. Hussein encouraged SHAC members to submit PMAs before the deadline (April 30).
 36 Even if project proponents do not have answers to every question, the technical team can
 37 help identify additional information to meet the requirements.
- 38 • A member of the public suggested identifying priorities and critical areas for the GSA
 39 (areas with greatest decline). C. Buck (Butte County) shared this was the intention behind
 40 J. Turner's (Geosyntec) presentation, in which the technical consultants looked at the
 41 representative monitoring wells to identify areas with greatest groundwater level decline.
 42 Stabilizing levels is considered the focus, as it is tied to other key values and elements of



1 the basin's health. Further, this is more practical and inexpensive. Meanwhile, supply
2 augmentation is more complicated, costly, and time intensive.

- 3 • Another member of the public asked how the PMAs would be coordinated among
4 adjacent subbasins. What happens if a neighboring subbasin invests in a PMA that is in
5 opposition to Vina's interests? P. Gosselin noted that PMA coordination is defined as a
6 priority for inter-basin coordination moving forward. This would include identifying PMAs
7 that could be detrimental to the subbasin and coordinating on mutually beneficial PMAs,
8 such as addressing data gaps and shared costs. A. Hussein (Geosyntec) shared that some
9 PMAs will require coordination at a regional level. Further, A. Hussein emphasized that
10 consultants are coordinating as much as possible and subbasins will continue to explore
11 opportunities for ongoing coordination.

12
13 **SHAC Feedback on Potential Management Actions (01:25:30)**

- 14 • Some SHAC members shared they have submitted ideas using the online form. P. Gosselin
15 (Butte County) suggested looking at PMAs per type of strategy (demand reduction and
16 supply augmentation) and consider a phased approach.
- 17 • A member of the public expressed support for P. Gosselin's suggestion. Demand
18 reduction strategies can be more practical, affordable, and buy time for supply
19 augmentation projects that require permitting and long-term investment.
- 20 • A. Dawson would like a PMA to review domestic well data. Further, she suggested
21 investing in water supply reliability for disadvantaged communities and ensuring
22 communities have upgraded systems since they will be the hardest hit financially. In
23 addition, she suggested modifying Butte County's well-permitting to account for drought.
24 A. Dawson is concerned the current well-permitting process feels piece meal and
25 disjointed. She wonders if there is a way to establish a county-wide well-permitting
26 process, with GSA oversight and control to have an overall picture. With the current
27 process, it takes 3-4 months to get new project approval when a domestic well goes dry.
28 She suggested speeding up the permitting process and/or guaranteeing additional
29 supplies. P. Gosselin shared that under SGMA, Counties retained sole authority to permit
30 wells. The Butte County Water Commission received a presentation on well permitting
31 process. The presentation will be provided to the SHAC. Lastly, P. Gosselin highlighted
32 the County is in the process of updating its General Plan and could consider these
33 suggestions as a part of that process. A. Hussein (Geosyntec) stated that while land use
34 authority stays within the counties and cities, other GSAs have set up notification systems
35 to track where new wells are placed, expand existing database, and increase
36 understanding of groundwater use in the subbasin. GSAs can explore streamlining the
37 relationship between Environmental Health & GSAs through a notification system.

38
39 **Outcomes & Next Steps | PMAs**

- 40 a. CBI will coordinate with the Management Committee to update the PMA form and
41 website to include additional information (i.e., project criteria).



- 1 b. SHAC members and members of the public were strongly encouraged to submit PMA
 2 ideas via the Vina GSA Website's [PMA submission page](#).
 3 c. The Management Committee will continue to reach out to various groups (e.g., Fire Safe
 4 Council, Resource Conservation Districts, etc.) and will include a wide array of projects
 5 that capture issues discussed. Further, the Management Committee will include relevant
 6 PMAs from General Plan Updates and Urban Water Management Plans that could
 7 enhance groundwater sustainability.
 8 d. Geosyntec will begin an initial evaluation of PMAs submitted and bring ideas back a
 9 summary of key themes to the SHAC for review and consideration.

10

11 4. Meeting Notes Review & Consideration (1:50:35)

12 The SHAC reviewed and approved the March 16, 2021 Meeting summary.

13

14 Discussion:

- 15 a. B. Smith followed up on pages 39-42, related to electric logs availability. He would like to
 16 conduct analysis of groundwater flows and conductivity but needs that information to do
 17 so. This analysis will be key for PMA analysis, particularly related to groundwater
 18 recharge projects. C. Buck and K. Peterson will follow up with B. Smith on specific data
 19 requests.

20

21 5. Vina GSA Management Committee Reports (1:50:35)

22 K. Peterson (Butte County) gave a brief update on the Vina GSA Board Meeting (4/14). The Board
 23 discussed PMAs, interbasin coordination, and other general business. P. Gosselin added Butte
 24 County sent out 3,000 postcards to all parcel owners to encourage them to sign up for the
 25 interested parties list and to become involved in GSP development. Further, the Management
 26 Committee has not heard back from the State regarding the request for GSP submittal extension.
 27 However, AB 754 is a bill that was introduced to extend the deadline by one year, which is in
 28 committee review. Lastly, K. Loeser mentioned she sent information for an ethics training and
 29 encouraged SHAC members to respond to the scheduling poll. Attendance to the training would
 30 fulfill SHAC members' ethics requirement.

31

32 6. Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) & Representative Monitoring Chapter (02:00:00)

33 The SHAC received a brief overview of the SMC chapter content and next steps for public review.
 34 The Management Committee shared the chapter will call out specific areas for input and will be
 35 released with a cover letter and a spreadsheet for public comments. Further, C. Buck (Butte
 36 County) led a discussion with the Vina GSA Board on the process for SMC development. The
 37 intent is to be protective of most domestic wells, recognizing the uncertainty with current
 38 domestic well data from the DWR database. While the database includes well depth, date drilled,
 39 and the location specific to one mile by one mile section, the GSA does not have a lean dataset
 40 with exact location and depth of active domestic wells.

41



1 The Management Committee is also working with Rock Creek Reclamation District (GSA), who
 2 has good recommendations on the Minimum Threshold (MT). The SMC chapter will present
 3 both approaches. This area will be highlighted for public comment, specifically on the public’s
 4 preference on both approaches. The technical consulting team has received very helpful
 5 recommendations and comments. Feedback will be incorporated into the SMC chapter that will
 6 be released soon for public input. Lastly, the Representative Monitoring System (RMS) chapter
 7 will be building on the Monitoring Network Chapter and will describe the rationale behind the
 8 selection of wells and how they are representative of subbasin conditions.

9
 10 **Next Steps**

11 The SHAC will meet again via video conference on May 18, 2021 from 9:00-12:00.

12 **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	N
Christopher Madden	Butte College	Y
Gary Cole	Agricultural well user	Y
Tavis Beynon (sub for David Kehn)	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	N
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Sam Goepf	Domestic well user	N
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	N
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Darren Rice	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
Hal Crain	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
Technical Consultants		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y
Bob Anderson	Geosyntec	Y
Amer Hussain	Geosyntec	Y
Kristin Reardon	Geosyntec	Y
Other Representatives		



Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
Debbie Spangler	CA Department of Water Resources	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	Y

- 1 Approximately seven members of the public attended the meeting.

DRAFT