

## **Periodic Evaluation Annotated Outline (DRAFT 3.3.2026)**

This is a working document based on the annotated outline provided in the DWR Guidance Document: “Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation: A Guide to Annual Reports, Periodic Evaluations & Plan Amendments”

*Blue italicized text is added to indicate content specific to the Vina Subbasin.*

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The executive summary of the Periodic Evaluation's written assessment is intended to provide a high-level overview of GSP implementation activities, address whether implementation is on track for reaching the basin's sustainability goal and provide an overview of significant new information received and included in the assessment.

Content to consider for inclusion in the executive summary:

- Period of time the Periodic Evaluation covers (evaluation cycle).
- Is the Periodic Evaluation accompanied by an amended Plan? If yes, identify the month and year the Plan was amended and describe the Plan re-adoption process, if applicable.
- Updated GSA information [if applicable]:
  - Modifications to GSAs and their member agencies.
  - Changes to governance structure.
- If there were recommended corrective actions (RCAs) provided by the Department in the most recent determination of the Plan, summarize what they were, whether they were addressed and whether they led to a Plan Amendment.
- Describe the basin's sustainability goal and whether the implementation of the GSP is on track to meet the basin's sustainability goal.
- Include a general statement on how GSA activities are progressing within the basin, which should be supported by the content presented in the written assessment.
- Summarize any significant new information and data that were acquired during the evaluation cycle and present how that information or those data were used in preparing the Periodic Evaluation.
- Describe the efforts taken to engage with interested parties. Provide a high-level summary of public comments received during GSP implementation or while preparing the Periodic Evaluation.

## 2 NEW INFORMATION COLLECTED

---

The Periodic Evaluation should provide a description of any new information, including significant new data, that the GSA has acquired during the evaluation cycle. The discussion should include whether new information warrants changes to any aspect of the Plan, including the evaluation of the basin setting, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, or the criteria defining undesirable results. Additionally, this section should evaluate whether those changes associated with the new information led to a Plan Amendment.

Table 1 below provides an example of a method of summarizing the types of significant new information collected and how to reference that information in the applicable sections. Table 1 is meant to summarize information that has become available since the last Periodic Evaluation (or Plan Adoption or Plan Amendment) which has informed the GSA’s decisions and approaches to implement its GSP. Table 1 should indicate whether the new information warrants changes to any aspect of the Plan.

Table 1. Summary of New Information Since Periodic Evaluation

Significant New Information (e.g., new monitoring data, reports, coordination with other agencies, data provided by the Department)	Description	Aspects of Plan Affected (e.g., Basin Setting, Sustainable Management Criteria, Projects and Management Actions, Monitoring Network, Coordination Agreement)	Warrant Change to Any Aspects of the Plan (Yes/No) If yes, include section of the Plan or Section of Periodic Evaluation

*Initial list of new information to be incorporated:*

- *Inter-basin Coordination (IBC) analysis work: Sacramento River Corridor IBC Tech Memo (TM)- Joint Evaluation of GSPs, IBC TM on C2VSimFG1.5 Regional results*
- *Larry Walker Associates (LWA) Assessment of Monitoring Networks and Identification of new well locations (previous memos in meeting packets)*
- *T. Greene (Chico State) analysis/report using AEM data to refine the Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model and evaluate monitoring network.*
- *Butte County Evaluation of Monitoring Network Memo*

- *LWA Domestic well inventory refinement and risk assessment (upcoming)*
- *Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem assessment TM (upcoming)*
- *Butte Basin Groundwater Model (BBGM) updates- TM on BBGM Refinements*
- *LWA Interconnect Surface Water (ISW) Data Gathering and Evaluation (isotope data collection, evaluation of available shallow groundwater in relation to streams, use of BBGM results, hydrographs of shallow wells near ISW) (upcoming)*
- *Draft Butte County Drought Resilience Plan (upcoming)*
- *Butte County 2025 Water Quality Monitoring Tech Memo*
- *North Sac Valley ISW Work Plan (upcoming)*
- *IBC North Sac River Corridor Work Plan (upcoming)*

### 3 GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS RELATIVE TO SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT CRITERIA

---

This section sets the stage for evaluating the GSAs' progress towards achieving groundwater sustainability in their basin. The GSA should evaluate current groundwater conditions for each applicable sustainability indicator relative to sustainable management criteria established in the GSP (i.e., measurable objectives, interim milestones, minimum thresholds, and undesirable results) and describe, with supporting data, whether implementation of the GSP is effective. If the evaluation indicates that GSP implementation has not been effective in making progress toward achieving the sustainability goal, this section should include an explanation of the potential reasons and provide a description of how the GSA intends to get the basin back on track to achieving sustainability. The written assessment should also forecast the likelihood of achieving interim milestones or measurable objectives within the next evaluation cycle. This section may include discussion of hydrologic or climatic extremes and how the associated conditions and/or emergencies have impacted GSP implementation, as well as the adaptive management strategies used to keep the basin on track, or to get the basin back on track, to achieving sustainability.

If the Department provided recommended corrective actions related to sustainable management criteria, the GSA should include a discussion of how those were addressed. If the recommended corrective actions were addressed with a Plan Amendment, the GSA should provide that explanation and indicate where the changes can be found in the amended GSP.

For **each applicable sustainability indicator**, consider the following discussion points:

- Did the previous determination of the Plan by the Department include a recommended corrective action related to this sustainability indicator? How was it resolved?
- Describe current conditions relative to the minimum thresholds, interim milestones, and measurable objectives.
- Are the current conditions in the basin achieving the interim milestones?
- Describe if undesirable results are occurring or have occurred over the evaluation cycle. Were there minimum threshold exceedances that did not constitute undesirable results as quantitatively defined in the GSP?
- Evaluate progress made (including challenges encountered, if applicable), describe any adaptive management approaches employed to address minimum threshold exceedances, whether GSP implementation is effective thus far, and any other pertinent information related to progress towards achieving sustainability.

- Have basin conditions and GSP implementation affected beneficial uses and users? For example, were there any reported dry wells during the evaluation cycle?
- Are other sustainability indicators being impacted?
- If significant new information is leading to a change in sustainable management criteria, describe these changes and compare the previous sustainable management criteria to the adjusted management criteria.
- If changes are made, did they warrant a Plan Amendment?

## 4 STATUS OF PROJECTS AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

---

The purpose of this section is to summarize the GSA implementation activities related to projects and management actions that took place over the course of the evaluation cycle. The summary should include descriptions of ongoing projects that have carried over during the evaluation cycle and projects that broke ground but have not become operational. In addition, significant new information should be discussed, such as whether a GSP project was considered no longer necessary and was dropped, a new project was added, or a project has been delayed. New information that affects project development, such as hydrologic changes relative to a drought or wet year should be described. The description should include anticipated projects to be developed over the next evaluation cycle(s). The discussion of the projects should include evaluations and reporting on the quantified benefits of each project and anticipated benefits of the projects that broke ground or were completed during the evaluation cycle.

A GSA should summarize how it is tracking and administering the various projects and management actions within its basin. The summary should describe interactions with the project proponents and member agencies implementing the projects. Table 2 shows an example of this summary.

Table 2. Project and Management Action Summary Table

Project or Management Action Name	Project or Management Action Description	Targeted Sustainability Indicator	Project Status	Expected Schedule	Benefits Observed to Date or Anticipated Benefits	Estimated Accrued Benefits at Completion

A GSA should assess the projects and management actions outlined in the original GSP and explain whether those are still relevant and feasible, including estimates of cost and potential funding sources and whether permitting and CEQA requirements need to be met. The Periodic Evaluation should describe if there is a need to revisit or re-evaluate the priority of certain projects. Additionally, for the various projects and management actions outlined in the GSP, the GSA should describe the process for public notice and engagement of interested parties.

For projects and management actions that are currently ongoing or have already been completed, the Periodic Evaluation should provide an evaluation and status update including realized benefits, expected benefits, and benefits and impacts to beneficial uses and users. The description should include how these projects and management actions are helping the basin achieve sustainability through the assessment of the groundwater conditions in relation to the measurable objectives for the relevant sustainability indicators. A description of the monitoring network and data related to projects and management actions that are showing progress toward sustainability, and documentation that the project is not impacting nearby beneficial users, should be included.

For projects and management actions that have yet to begin or are still conceptual, assess the need for those based on the current conditions and expected outcomes of the existing projects and management actions. Describe the potential timeline to get those projects and management actions implemented or what may be needed to take them from the conceptual or as-needed phase to the “shovel ready” phase.

The GSA should describe the challenges or setbacks that have prevented or delayed implementation of projects and management actions. If a planned project is not going to be implemented, the GSA should consider re-evaluating projected water budgets and groundwater conditions without the project.

## 5 BASIN SETTING BASED ON NEW INFORMATION OR CHANGES IN WATER USE

---

This section provides an evaluation of the basin setting based on new information or changes in basin water use. GSAs should explain the major cause of any significant new changes in the understanding of the basin setting, such as changes attributed to water use and supply, climate variations, successes and failures of projects and management actions, or significant new information and data that causes changes in model assumptions and results. A suggested outline to discuss the basin setting is provided below:

### 5.1 Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model

- Summarize any new applicable data and analysis and how it informs a revised understanding of the basin's hydrogeologic conceptual model (e.g., Airborne Electromagnetic surveys and other basin characterization and data gap filling actions)
- If the previously identified data gaps were not filled, discuss why or what prevented these from being filled and discuss what is required to fill these data gaps

### 5.2 Groundwater Conditions

- Indicate new understanding of regional groundwater conditions based on new sources, applications, or tools such as California Groundwater Live, InSAR, Dry Well Reporting System, etc.
- Include new information that affects evaluation of groundwater quality such as:
  - Changes to regulatory water quality standards affecting sustainable management criteria
  - New constituents of concern or emerging contaminants that may become apparent in the basin
- Include new information on interconnected surface water and groundwater dependent ecosystems.

*Description of new information based on Evaluation of shallow groundwater data, Isotope sampling/Analysis, GDE assessments, BBGM results.*

### **5.3 Water Use Changes and Associated Water Budget**

- Describe water use for the evaluation cycle, compared to historical, current, and projected water budgets in GSP.
- Describe changes to land use or cropping patterns that could affect water use.
- Describe whether changes to surface water supply reliability will affect water budget assumptions.
- Provide updated current and projected water budgets.
- Describe updates to the sustainable yield and changes in storage.
- If basin is experiencing overdraft, describe the evaluation and quantification of those conditions. Provide an assessment of measures to mitigate the overdraft including how the projects and management actions described in the Periodic Evaluation may affect overdraft.

### **5.4 Model Updates**

- Briefly describe if and how the model was updated for the water budget development.
- How has GSP implementation informed model revisions, if any?
- Note that model updates may indicate where more monitoring is needed, and the quality of the existing monitoring informs the model revisions.

## 6 MONITORING NETWORKS

---

The purpose of this section is to provide an assessment of the GSP's monitoring network for each applicable sustainability indicator. GSAs submitting an amended GSP with their Periodic Evaluation should include any discussions related to the assessment and improvement of the GSP's monitoring network in the amended GSP. GSAs should reference the sections of the amended GSP in the Periodic Evaluation rather than replicating the same information in the Periodic Evaluation.

This section should include the GSA's findings from the evaluation of the GSP's monitoring networks for each sustainability indicator. It is suggested that this section includes the following topics, information, and data:

- Provide an overall summary of changes to monitoring networks since the last GSP or Periodic Evaluation.
- Describe whether identified monitoring network data gaps have been filled. If the previously identified data gaps were not filled, explain why or what prevented these from being filled and discuss what is required to fill these data gaps.
- Discuss any new data gaps that have been identified since the previous GSP.
- Assess the functionality of the water level monitoring network and whether any existing GSP monitoring network locations are no longer viable. The following information should be included and referred to in this section of the evaluation:
  - Identify each monitoring location on a map including the wells used to monitor each specific principal aquifer.
  - If a well is damaged or dry, determine whether the site is necessary to evaluate basin conditions, and if so, propose a plan to replace it.
  - Review sustainable management criteria relative to well construction, and if the monitoring point is not capable of measuring the sustainable management criteria (i.e., is not deep enough), propose an alternative monitoring approach or well replacement plan.
- For other sustainability indicators, perform a similar monitoring network functionality assessment in light of appropriateness of location of sites, accessibility and viability of sites, and any corrections needed.
- Describe remaining actions necessary to improve the monitoring networks.

- Summarize any adjustments made to monitoring frequency and density of monitoring sites.
- Summarize any changes to the GSP's monitoring network as highlighted in the Periodic Evaluation or Plan Amendment.
- Verify that any updates to the GSP's monitoring network are reflected in the Monitoring Network Module

## **6.1 Groundwater Level and Groundwater Storage**

## **6.2 Groundwater Quality**

## **6.3 Land Subsidence**

## **6.4 Interconnected Surface Water**

## 7 GSA AUTHORITIES AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

---

The Periodic Evaluation should describe any new authorities the basin's GSAs have gained, established, or exercised since the last GSP submittal and summarize what has been implemented to advance groundwater sustainability. Authorities could pertain to relevant actions related to regulations and ordinances applicable to the Plan. In addition, GSAs should provide information describing any enforcement or legal actions taken in the basin to further the sustainability goal. This could include any new significant information such as funding and fee actions, installing volumetric measuring devices on wells (i.e., flow meters), or collecting other data related to allocation programs and pumping reductions. Demonstrating how these components of GSP implementation will help GSAs reach sustainability is important.

Some considerations for this section are listed below:

- Provide a summary of GSA regulations or ordinances related to the Plan [Water Code 10725, 10726, 10730, and 10731].
- Describe GSA enforcement or legal actions [Water Code 10725.4, 10730, and 10732].
- Describe activities advancing other regulations and orders outside of SGMA that are related to SGMA implementation, if applicable (e.g., legislation such as Senate Bill 552<sup>26</sup> [Drought Planning for Small Water Suppliers and Rural Communities], well moratoriums, and land use zoning).
- Describe how Plan implementation has been affected by external regulatory requirements or executive orders issued by the Governor, if applicable.

## 8 OUTREACH, ENGAGEMENT, AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

---

During GSP implementation it is important to continue to build on the outreach, engagement, and communication efforts established during initial Plan development across multiple entities. GSAs should notice and engage the public on the draft Periodic Evaluation in a manner similar to initial Plan adoption. This section should describe, as appropriate, the coordination efforts and activities that occurred between multiple GSAs in a single basin, GSAs in hydrologically connected basins, and land use agencies, as well as federal, state, and local agency coordination that was related to SGMA implementation. Specifically, GSAs should consider the various audiences they need to communicate and interact with during GSP implementation activities.

### 8.1 Outreach and Engagement

GSAs are responsible for engaging interested parties, the public, and beneficial users to provide updates on basin conditions during annual reporting, regularly share groundwater management information, solicit feedback on projects and management actions prior to and during implementation, and collect public comments during Periodic Evaluation and Plan Amendment drafting. GSAs should demonstrate these responsibilities in the following ways:

- Provide an assessment of public comments submitted to the GSA after the initial Plan submittal or during evaluation cycle. The assessment should include a discussion of how the GSA responded to the comments and implemented relevant changes (i.e., incorporating components into the Periodic Evaluation or Plan Amendment).
- Describe public engagement efforts including activities that help the implementation of project and management actions, such as project siting and construction, water conservation, and participation in recharge, recycled water use, land repurposing, or domestic well monitoring and reporting programs. Identify and describe how the GSA will address potential impacts on beneficial users documented through public engagement efforts.
- Evaluate and verify that the methods described in the Plan for outreach and engagement activities are relevant to implementation and are being maintained and updated.

*The Vina GSA Stakeholder Communications and Engagement Plan will be evaluated.*

### 8.2 Responsibilities of GSA Boards

Keeping GSA board members engaged and ensuring they understand GSA responsibilities for Periodic Evaluation development and decisions on Plan Amendment needs is crucial to ensure a successful implementation program. The Periodic Evaluation should provide a summary of GSA board, technical advisory committee, and other related meetings since the last Periodic Evaluation, including notifications to the list of interested persons [23 CCR § 351(p); Water Code § 10723.4, 10723.2, 10723.8, and 10727.8].

### **8.3 Coordination with Other Agencies**

Multiple layers of inter-agency coordination are needed periodically during GSP implementation, such as:

- Coordinating with other agencies in the same basin or county during implementation efforts that have land use, well permitting and water management responsibilities (e.g., neighboring GSAs in same basin).
- Coordinating with GSAs in hydrologically connected basins to understand implementation activities and potential effects across basin boundaries, and to share data.
- Reaching out to tribal, federal, state, and other local agencies, as needed, to facilitate implementation activities.
- Indicate if any new inter-agency agreements and efforts are under way.
- Provide a summary of inter-agency coordination efforts, coordination with local well permitting and land use planning agencies, state and federal agencies, and non-governmental organizations (e.g., coordination efforts related to impacts to drinking water wells, mitigating subsidence before infrastructure damage, or water quality impairment). Document if any changes were made to the GSP in response to new local requirements by these agencies.

## 9 OTHER INFORMATION

---

GSA's may decide to include any additional information in the Periodic Evaluation that helps describe progress made toward achieving the sustainability goal for the basin. The Department also has the authority to request supplemental information from a GSA to conduct the Periodic Review, as necessary. A list of potential additional information is provided below.

### 9.1 Consideration of Adjacent Basins

The GSP Regulations require the Department to review the potential impacts a Plan may have on adjacent basins (23 CCR § 355.4(b)(7)). Other sections in the GSP Regulations request this information from the GSA's (23 § CCR 354.38). Therefore, it is important to provide that information in the Periodic Evaluation to give the Department a complete overview, such as:

- Describe relevant interbasin coordination efforts.
- Discuss how the proposed management of the Basin (including minimum thresholds and measurable objectives) aligns with the management of adjacent basins.
- Describe potential impacts from adjacent basins and/or to adjacent basins due to Plan implementation.
- Assess whether Plan implementation is affecting the ability of an adjacent basin to achieve its sustainability goal.

*This section to describe North Sacramento River Corridor IBC group efforts and reference meeting summaries etc. (available [North Sacramento River Corridor Inter-Basin Coordination | Butte County, CA](#)). Tech Memo on Joint Evaluation of GSPs will also be relevant.*

### 9.2 Challenges Not Previously Discussed

The Periodic Evaluation process provides the GSA's with an important opportunity to highlight technical and financial challenges the Department should be aware of. Allowing the Department to understand these challenges may inform future assistance and services. Below are a few example items that could be added to the Periodic Evaluation:

- Identify the most significant challenges and assistance needs for the Plan implementation.
- Assess how the Plan may affect relevant city and county general plans related to water resources management or other natural resources and land use planning programs.
- Other general considerations include technical and financial resource limitations, Proposition 218 and other funding stream efforts, other aspects of basin governance.

### **9.3 Legal Challenges**

GSA's should consider providing a discussion on legal matters, especially if GSP implementation is affected or may be affected by any legal challenge or adjudication.

## **10 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED OR COMPLETED REVISIONS TO PLAN ELEMENTS**

---

This section summarizes the key take-aways from the Periodic Evaluation. In addition, this section should end with a brief overview of next steps and how the GSAs intend to use this evaluation to continue moving the basin towards their sustainability goal.

### **10.1 Proposed Revisions to Plan Elements**

If the GSA decides a Plan Amendment is necessary, the GSA should describe proposed revisions to relevant Plan elements. This section should also provide the rationale for developing a Plan Amendment and the necessary actions the GSA will take to complete the amendment, including outreach and engagement to interested parties.

**The Periodic Evaluation must provide specific explanations of what was amended, why, and the effects of those amendments on the implementation of the Plan (e.g., adapting the management program, adjusting projects and management actions).**