



**Vina Groundwater
Sustainability Agency**
308 Nelson Avenue
Oroville, CA 95965
(530) 552-3592

VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY BOARD MEETING

Meeting Agenda
June 9, 2021, 5:30 p.m.
ONLINE MEETING ONLY VIA ZOOM

Materials related to an item on this Agenda are available for public inspection in the City of Chico Public Works Operation & Maintenance Office at 965 Fir Street, Chico, during normal 8 am to 5 pm business hours or online at <https://www.vinagsa.org/>

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

This meeting is being conducted via teleconference in accordance with Executive Order N-25-20 and N-29-20. Members of the public may virtually attend the meeting remotely using the ZOOM platform.

The public may listen to and/or participate in the Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Board Meetings via landline or mobile telephone or via computer, with both video and audio enabled or audio only. If you wish to comment on an item, but do not wish to participate during the meeting, the public may submit comments prior to the meeting via email to vinagsapubliccomments@chicoca.gov. Please submit emails with the subject line "**PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM NO. ___**". The public is encouraged to not send more than one email per item or comment on numerous items in one email.

ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION:

To access the live meeting, you have the following options:

1. Join Zoom Meeting
 - a. <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86983600705>
2. From a web browser <https://zoom.us/join>
 - a. When prompted, use Meeting ID: 869 8360 0705
3. Directly from your mobile phone you can tap:
 - a. +16699006833, 86983600705# US (San Jose)
4. Dial-in using your landline or mobile phone to:
 - a. 1 669 900 6833
 - b. When prompted, use Meeting ID: 869 8360 0705
5. **If you are having any issues connecting to the meeting, please call or text Kamie Loeser, Durham Irrigation District, at (530) 680-7222 for assistance.**

Please note that when you access the meeting, ***you will be placed into a waiting room and admitted*** into the meeting by the meeting host

Agenda Prepared: 6/4/2021
Agenda Posted: 6/4/2021
Prior to: 5:30 p.m.



Please contact the City of Chico Public Works Department at (530) 894-4200 if you require an agenda in an alternative format or if you need to request a disability-related modification or accommodation. This request should be received at least three working days prior to the meeting.

1. **VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY (GSA) REGULAR BOARD MEETING.**

1.1. Call to Order - Chair Tuchinsky

1.2. Roll Call

2. **CONSENT AGENDA** - all matters listed under the consent agenda are to be considered routine and enacted by one motion.

2.1. **APPROVAL OF 5/12/21 VINA GSA BOARD MEETING MINUTES.**

Action: Approve minutes of Vina GSA Board meeting held on 5/12/21.

2.2. **APPROVAL OF MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT.**

Action: Approve the Vina GSA Financial Status Report as of 6/03/2021.

3. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT – IF ANY**

4. **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Members of the public may address the Board at this time on any matter not already listed on the agenda; comments are limited to three minutes. The Board cannot take any action at this meeting on requests made under this section of the agenda.

5. **NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS** - NONE

6. **REGULAR AGENDA**

6.1. **APPROVAL OF THE VINA GSA 2021-22 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET.**

The Board will consider the proposed Vina GSA budget for the 2021-22 Fiscal Year. Pursuant to Section 9.3 of the Vina GSA Joint Powers Agreement, approval of the budget requires a supermajority (4/5) affirmative vote.

Recommendation: The Management Committee recommends approval of the 2021-22 budget.

6.2. **UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (GSP).**

Staff will provide a status update and a schedule for the completion of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Vina subbasin. **(Report- Paul Gosselin).**

Recommendation: None, this is an informational item only.

7. **COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS.**

These items are provided for the Board's information. Although the Board may discuss the items, no action can be taken at this meeting. Should the Board determine that action is required, the item or items may be included for action on a subsequent posted agenda.

7.1 Vina GSA Management Committee Updates:

7.1.1 Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee Update **(Written Report -Kelly Peterson)**

8. **ADJOURNMENT** – The Vina GSA Board meeting will adjourn to a joint meeting of the Vina GSA Board and the Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA Board to be held on July 14, 2021.



**Vina Groundwater
Sustainability Agency**
308 Nelson Avenue
Oroville, CA 95965
(530) 552-3592

VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Meeting of
May 12, 2021, 5:30 p.m.
ONLINE MEETING ONLY VIA ZOOM

1. VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY (GSA) REGULAR BOARD MEETING.

1.1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chair Tuchinsky at 5:30 p.m.

1.2. Roll Call

Board Members Present:

Evan Tuchinsky
Jeffrey Rohwer
Raymond Cooper
Debra Lucero (Alternate for Kimmelshue)

Board Members Absent:

Kami Denlay
Tod Kimmelshue

Staff Present:

Paul Gosselin, Christina Buck and Kelly Peterson, (BCDWRC), Kamie Loeser (Durham Irrigation District), Valerie Kincaid (Attorney O'Laughlin & Paris LLP), Colin Klinesteker (non-JPA member representing the Mechoopda Tribe), Erik Gustafson and Linda Herman (City of Chico).

2. CONSENT AGENDA - all matters listed under the consent agenda are to be considered routine and enacted by one motion.

2.1. APPROVAL OF 4/14/21 VINA GSA BOARD MEETING MINUTES.

Action: Approve minutes of Vina GSA Board meeting held on 4/14/21.

2.2. APPROVAL OF MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT.

Action: Approve the Vina GSA Financial Status Report as of 5/04/2021.

Board Member Cooper motioned to approve the consent agenda. Motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Rohwer. Alternate Board Member Lucero abstained from this motion as she was not a residing Board Member at the meeting.

Motion carried as follows:

AYES: Board Member Cooper, Vice Chair Rohwer, and Chair Tuchinsky.

NOES: None

ABSENT: Board Member Denlay and Board Member Kimmelshue

ABSTAIN: Alternate Board Member Lucero

3. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT** – NONE

4. **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Members of the public may address the Board at this time on any matter not already listed on the agenda; comments are limited to three minutes. The Board cannot take any action at this meeting on requests made under this section of the agenda.

Public comments were received from Jim Brobeck.

5. **NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS** - NONE

6. **REGULAR AGENDA**

6.1. **UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VINA GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (GSP).**

Staff provided an update on the development of the required Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Vina subbasin. (**Report- Paul Gosselin**).

Recommendation: None, this was an informational item only.

Public comments were received from Richard Harriman.

6.2. **REVISITATION OF THE GSP BASIN SETTING CHAPTER IN RELATION TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS.**

Staff provided a presentation to revisit key topics from the Basin Setting Chapter and other available information including groundwater level conditions, water budget information, land use trends, and climate change analysis to effectively prioritize and target preferred Projects and Management Actions to include in the GSP. (**Report- Christina Buck**).

Recommendation: Provide input and direction to staff regarding the future level of risk to the subbasin and on the magnitude and targeted areas of need to be addressed by Projects and Management Actions.

Staff asked for Board direction on the following potential basin risk targets that will drive the planning and decision-making process for Project Management Actions in the future:

- a. An optimistic view target of 5,000 Acre Feet (AF)/yr) which would address the estimated imbalance under current conditions.
 - b. A middle of the road view target of 15,000 AF/yr) which would address the potential increased imbalance due to urban growth over the next 10 years.
 - c. A worst-case view target 30,000 AF/yr which would address the imbalance for changed conditions due to urban growth and potential impacts of climate change.
-

Public comments were received from George Barber and Darren Rice.

The Board gave direction to the SHAC to take a “middle of the road” perspective of 15,000AF/year when reviewing and evaluating potential future management actions and projects.

7. COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS.

These items were provided for the Board's information. Although the Board may discuss the items, no action can be taken at this meeting. Should the Board determine that action is required, the item or items may be included for action on a subsequent posted agenda.

7.1 Vina GSA Management Committee Updates:

- 7.1.1 Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee Update (**Written Report -Kelly Peterson**)
- 7.1.2 Update on Assembly Bill 754-Possible Extension (**Verbal Report -Paul Gosselin**)
- 7.1.3 Inter-basin Coordination Update (**Verbal Report -Paul Gosselin**)
- 7.1.4 Vina GSA Board Updates/Reminders (**Verbal Report -Management Committee**)

Staff advised the Board that in-person meetings are being allowed in the Council Chambers again, with a 50% capacity restriction. The Board was asked whether they wanted to resume in-person meetings or continue using the Zoom platform. Because the June 9 meeting will be a joint workshop with Rock Creek Reclamation District Board, that meeting will be held via Zoom.

Future meeting locations/platforms will be discussed again at the June 9 meeting.

7.2 Rock Creek Reclamation District Update (Verbal Report –Darren Rice**)**

- 8. ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m. to the next regular Vina GSA Board meeting on June 9, 2021.



**Vina
Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Agenda Transmittal**

Agenda Item: 2.2

Subject: Vina GSA Financial Report

Contact: Kelly Peterson

Phone: 530-552-3595

Meeting Date: 6-9-21

Consent Agenda

Department Summary: Attached is the financial report for the 2020-2021 fiscal year for the Vina GSA as of 6/3/21.

Fiscal Impact: None

Staff Recommendation: The Management Committee recommends approval of the financial report.



Vina GSA Financial Report FY 2020-2021 (7/1/2020 - 6/30/2021)	Fund Balance:	\$	8,960.78
	Balance Date:		6/3/2021

Expenditures

Budget Item	Date	Amount	Notes
Legal			
O'Laughlin & Paris	8/25/20	\$ 1,785.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	10/6/20	\$ 1,330.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	11/10/20	\$ 630.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	12/15/20	\$ 595.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	1/5/21	\$ 2,065.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	1/19/21	\$ 770.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	2/19/21	\$ 1,260.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	3/9/21	\$ 2,065.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	4/20/21	\$ 980.00	
O'Laughlin & Paris	6/1/21	\$ 630.00	
Total Legal Spent		\$ 12,110.00	
Legal Budget		\$ 16,000.00	
% of Legal Budget Spent		76%	
Insurance			
Golden State Risk Management Authority	7/7/20	\$ 1,800.00	GSA insurance
Total Insurance Spent		\$ 1,800.00	
Insurance Budget		\$ 1,800.00	
% of Insurance Budget Spent		100%	2020 fees increased by \$300
Audit			
Total Audit Spent		\$ -	
Audit Budget		\$ 2,000.00	
% of Audit Budget Spent		0%	
Contingency			
Ca. Newspaper Partnership (Chico ER)	4/20/21	\$ 618.51	SHAC Ad
Ca. Newspaper Partnership (Chico ER)	4/27/21	\$ 618.50	GSP Meeting Ad
Total Contingency Spent		\$ 1,237.01	
Contingency Budget		\$ 1,080.00	
% of Contingency Budget Spent		115%	
Website			
Digital Deployment		\$ 240.00	Website Hosting Services
Total Website Spent		\$ 240.00	
Website Budget		\$ 240.00	
% of Website Budget Spent		100%	
All Expenditures		\$ 15,387.01	
Total Budget for Expenditures		\$ 21,120.00	
% of Budget Spent		73%	



Vina GSA Financial Report
 FY 2020-2021 (7/1/2020 - 6/30/2021)

Revenue

Budget Item	Date	Amount	Notes
Member Agency Contributions			
City of Chico	7/28/20	\$ 5,000.00	
Durham Irrigation District	9/17/20	\$ 1,000.00	
Durham Irrigation District	9/17/20	\$ 1,000.00	
Durham Irrigation District	9/29/20	\$ 1,000.00	
Durham Irrigation District	10/29/20	\$ 1,000.00	
Durham Irrigation District	11/30/20	\$ 1,000.00	Final Payment
Butte County	5/12/21	\$ 5,000.00	Contribution for FY 21-22
Total Member Agency Contributions Received		\$ 15,000.00	Note: Butte County's FY 20-21 contributions (\$7K) were posted in previous FY and included in carry over balance
Total Member Agency Contributions Budget		\$ 15,000.00	
% of Member Agency Contributions Budget Received		147%	Includes the Butte County contribution made for FY 20-21 and FY 21-22
Interest			
	7/1/20	\$ (168.80)	Unrealized Gain/Loss last FY
	7/1/20	\$ 41.99	Interest-4th quarter FY20
	10/15/20	\$ 36.55	Interest-1st quarter FY21
	1/15/21	\$ 30.41	Interest-2nd quarter FY21
	4/1/21	\$ 30.13	Interest-3rd quarter FY21
Total Interest Received		\$ (29.72)	
Total Interest Budget		\$ 120.00	
% of Interest Budget Received		-25%	
All Revenue		\$ 14,970.28	
Total Budget for Revenue		\$ 15,120.00	
% of Budget Received		145%	Includes the Butte County contribution made for FY 20-21 and FY 21-22
Fund Balance			
Starting Balance 7/1/2020	\$		9,377.51
Expenses	\$		15,387.01
Revenue	\$		14,970.28
Fund Balance 6/3/21	\$		8,960.78



**Vina
Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Agenda Transmittal**

Agenda Item: **6.1**

Subject: Vina GSA 2021-2022 Fiscal Year Budget

Contact: Kelly Peterson

Phone:530-552-3595

Meeting Date: 6/9/21

Regular Agenda

Department Summary:

The Vina GSA is required to approve a budget annually according to section 15.2 of the JPA. The upcoming 2021-2022 fiscal year spans the time period of July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022. The attached draft budget is based on past and future forecasted expenses and revenues. Approval of the budget requires a supermajority vote of the Vina GSA Board of Directors, which is four or more Directors according to section 9.3 of the JPA.

Fiscal Impact: No fiscal impact.

Staff Recommendation: The Management Committee recommends approval of the draft budget for fiscal year 2021-2022.



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

Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Budget – Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Final Approved *Month date, year*

Fund: 2092

Expenditures	Account	Amount	Notes
GSP Development		*	Prop 1 Grant
GSA Administration		*	In-kind staff assignments
Legal Services	539020	\$10,000	
Insurance	526000	\$ 1,787	
Audit	539020	\$ 2,500	
Contingency	580010	\$ 600	
Website	533000	\$ 240	
Total Expenditures		\$15,127	

Revenue	Account	Amount	Notes
Member Agency Contribution – City of Chico	473012	\$ 5,000	
Member Agency Contribution – County of Butte	473012	\$ 5,000	
Member Agency Contribution – Durham Irrigation District	473012	\$ 5,000	
Interest	441000	\$ 127	
Total Revenue		\$15,127	

*No direct cost to the GSA, costs covered by Prop 1 grant paid through Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation and member agency in-kind staff assignments.



**Vina
Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Agenda Transmittal**

Agenda Item: 6.2

Subject: Groundwater Sustainability Plan Schedule

Contact: Paul Gosselin

Phone: 530-552-3590

Meeting Date: June 9, 2021

Regular Agenda

Summary: The Management Committee will provide the Board with an overview of the status and schedule for the Vina Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The schedule is attached. All draft chapters will not be final until the completed GSP is adopted in December.

Fiscal Impact: None

Action Requested: None.

**Vina Groundwater Sustainability Plan
Status and Schedule
June 9, 2021**

- *Basin Setting Chapter* – Final Draft
- *Sustainable Management Criteria Chapter, Monitoring Network Chapter and Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem* (appendix)
 - Draft release for public comment ending on June 18th. Drafts and comment portal can be found at <https://www.vinagsa.org/sustainable-management-criteria>.
 - June 15th – SHAC will review and make recommendations to the Vina Board
 - **July 14th – Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA Board meeting**. Staff will present public comments, SHAC recommendations and key issues. The Boards will consider approval of the chapters as a final drafts.
- *Projects and Management Actions Chapter*
 - June 15th – SHAC preliminary review PMAs and strawman prioritization. Will provide input to the Management Committee on the development of the draft PMA chapter
 - June – Draft PMA chapter released for public comment
 - **July 14th – Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA Board meeting**. Staff will provide an informational summary of the draft PMA Chapter
 - July 20th – SHAC reviews and makes recommendations to the Vina Board on the draft PMA chapter
 - **August 11th- Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA Board meeting**. Staff will present public comments, SHAC recommendations and key issues. The Boards will consider approval of the final draft PMA Chapter.
- *Implementation Chapter*
 - July 20th – SHAC discuss and review draft Implementation chapter and provide input to the Management Committee.
 - July – Draft Implementation Chapter released for public comment
 - August 17th – SHAC will review and consider recommendations to the Vina Board on the Implementation Chapter.
 - **Late August/early September – Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District Board meeting**. Staff will present the draft Implementation Chapter, public comments and recommendations from the SHAC. The Boards will consider approving as a final draft the Implementation Chapter.
- *Interbasin Coordination*
 - July – CBI will release the draft Interbasin Coordination report
 - July 20th – SHAC reviews the Interbasin Coordination report and provides recommendations to the Vina Board
 - **August 11th- Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA Board meeting**. Staff will present the Interbasin Coordination report and SHAC recommendations. The Boards will consider the interbasin coordination aspects that will be included in the draft GSP.

- *Vina Groundwater Sustainability Plan*
 - August 17th – SHAC receives a high level overview of draft GSP components.
 - **Late August/early September – Joint Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District Board meeting.** Staff will provide the Boards with an overview of the draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan and request approval to release the draft for a 60 day comment period for land use agencies and the public.
 - September – November – The complete draft GSP will be released for a 60 day comment period for the public and land use agencies.
 - October 19th – SHAC will discuss and review the draft GSP. Staff will present public comments received.
 - **November 10th – Joint Vina GSA and Rock Creek Reclamation District Board Hearing.** The Boards will hold a public hearing to solicit public comments on the draft GSP.
 - November 16th – SHAC will review the draft GSP and make final recommendations to the Vina Board
 - **December 8th – Joint Vina GSA and Rock Creek Reclamation Board meeting.** The Boards will consider adoption of the Vina GSP and direct staff to submit the Vina GSP to DWR. If the Boards do not approve the Vina GPS on December 8th, additional meeting(s) will be scheduled.



Vina
Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Agenda Transmittal

Agenda Item: 7.1.1

Subject: Management Committee Report - Vina GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee Update

Contact: Kelly Peterson

Phone: (530) 552-3595

Meeting Date: June 9, 2021

Regular Agenda

Department Summary: The Vina GSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually last month on May 18, 2021, the draft meeting notes are attached.

At the last meeting, the SHAC:

- Received an overview presentation bringing together the Basin Setting and the Land IQ report findings to provide context for ongoing PMA discussions
- Discussed implementation costs associated with GSA administration, data gaps, and PMAs and explored possible funding mechanisms
- Received an overview of submitted Vina GSA PMAs and engaged in preliminary evaluation of PMAs
- Received a verbal update from the Vina GSA Management Committee regarding the status of the Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) draft chapter
- Received a presentation on inter-basin coordination efforts in the Northern Sacramento Valley and provided input

SHAC membership details, meeting materials, detailed meeting notes and recordings of the meetings are on the Vina GSA website: <https://www.vinagsa.org/>. All SHAC meetings are open to the public and scheduled for the third Tuesday of each month from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. however, the June and July 2021 meetings will be running an extra 30 minutes until 12:30 pm. in an online format using Zoom. The SHAC will meet again via video conference on June 15, 2021 at which time they will consider in addition to other items, approval of the draft May 2021 meeting summary, discuss and review Draft SMC Chapter and Draft Monitoring Networks Chapter and provide recommendation to the GSA Board; review public comments received to date during comment period, discuss drought implications and connection to SGMA and funding opportunities, discuss and review preliminary summary of PMAs and strawman of PMA prioritization; and provide direction to the Management Committee on the development of the PMA Chapter.

Fiscal Impact: None

Staff Recommendation: Accept as an information item.



1 **Meeting Brief**

- 2 ➤ The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on May 18, 2021.
- 3 ➤ **Projects & Management Actions (PMAs):** The SHAC received an overview presentation
- 4 bringing together the Basin Setting and the Land IQ report findings to provide context for
- 5 ongoing PMA discussions. SHAC members discussed implementation costs associated with
- 6 GSA administration, data gaps, and PMAs and explored possible funding mechanisms. Lastly,
- 7 the SHAC received an overview of submitted Vina GSA PMAs and engaged in preliminary
- 8 evaluation of PMAs [[Access Vina GSA Board of Directors 5/12/21 presentation \(reference](#)
- 9 [document\)](#) | [Geosyntec PMA Presentation](#) | [Access PMA Table](#)].
- 10 ➤ **Vina GSA Management Committee Reports & Inter-basin Coordination Discussion:** The
- 11 Management Committee provided a verbal update, including the status of the Sustainable
- 12 Management Criteria (SMC) draft chapter [[Access draft SMC chapter under public review](#)
- 13 [through June 18, 2021](#)]. In addition, CBI provided a presentation on inter-basin coordination
- 14 efforts in the Northern Sacramento Valley and sought input from the SHAC and from
- 15 members of the public [[Access Inter-basin Coordination Update Slides](#)].
- 16 ➤ **Next Meeting:** The SHAC will meet again via video conference on June 15, 2021 from 9:00-
- 17 12:30.

DRAFT

18 **Action Items**

Item	Lead	Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upload approved Vina SHAC notes (4/20/21) to the website. 	CBI & Management Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider providing a Prop 218 process presentation for the SHAC. 	Management Committee	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate inclusion of additional PMAs from the Urban Water Management Plans. 	George Barber (CalWater) and Amer Hussein (Geosyntec)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Release Draft SMC and Draft Monitoring Networks Chapters for public review and share with the SHAC members. 	CBI & Management Committee	Done [Access Here]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post May SHAC meeting recording on the website. 	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Here]

19 **Summary**

20 The Vina SHAC met on May 18, 2021, via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. Participants

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

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

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

24 meeting. This document is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main

25 points covered during the group’s discussions. The video-conference meeting recording is

26 available at the Vina GSA website [[Access Here](#)]



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

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

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

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (0:09:15)

A member of the public provided an overview of an article in the San Francisco Chronicle about drought conditions in California, reporting the State Water Resources Control Board does not have a full picture of current water conditions in the state [\[Access Here\]](#). This member asked what the Vina GSA’s role and responsibility is to groundwater users and surface water right holders. P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared that all landholders have equal groundwater rights to pump water from their overlying land for beneficial uses. In response, J. Brobeck highlighted surface water purveyors using groundwater substitutions to deliver to users originally bypassed CEQA analysis and now during drought conditions can bypass environmental impact analysis once again.

J. Brobeck (env. representative) provided a comment on modeling plans and inter-basin coordination promises are ineffective when water marketers pass resolutions to increase pumping from shared basins without proper consultation to neighboring subbasins. Particularly, Brobeck referred to the recent Glenn Colusa Irrigation District’s approved resolution to significantly increase pumping to supplement river allocation this summer. In addition, Reclamation District 108 also increased their pumping to respond to “unanticipated restrictions” during drought conditions. He expressed that these actions during drought conditions bypass proper environmental regulation, which in his perspective need to be a fundamental part of inter-basin coordination efforts. More information can be accessed in the Correspondence document [\[Access Here\]](#). P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared the Butte County Drought Taskforce will be meeting that afternoon to discuss some of the comments mentioned.

B. Smith thanked Butte County staff for sharing the information on digitized electric logs that will help the basin understand the connection between basins. B. Smith empathizes with farmers that are concerned about protecting their investment but is concerned with the impacts those actions will have on subbasin conditions.

3. Meeting Notes

The Vina SHAC reviewed and approved the 4/20/21 SHAC meeting notes.

Votes

Yes	G. Cole, J. Brobeck, B. Smith, G. Barber, A. Dawson
Abstain	G. Sohnrey, C. Chastain



1 4. Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) (0:22:53)

2 The SHAC received an overview presentation bringing together the Basin Setting and the Land IQ
 3 report findings to provide context for ongoing PMA discussions. SHAC members discussed
 4 implementation costs associated with GSA administration, data gaps, and PMAs and explored
 5 possible funding mechanisms. Lastly, the SHAC received an overview of submitted Vina GSA
 6 PMAs and engaged in preliminary evaluation of PMAs [Access [Vina GSA Board of Directors](#)
 7 [5/12/21 presentation \(reference document\)](#) | [Geosyntec PMA Presentation](#) | [Access PMA Table](#)].

8
 9 *Revisiting the GSP Basin Setting Chapter in Relation to Projects and Management Actions*

10 C. Buck (Butte County) provided an overview and highlights from the presentation she gave to
 11 the Vina GSA Board on 5/12/21. In sum, C. Buck tied together the Basin Setting findings and how
 12 the findings help the subbasin prepare for the future. Butte County in turn received direction
 13 regarding the future level of risk to the subbasin and input on the magnitude and targeted areas
 14 of need to be addressed by Projects and Management Actions (PMAs).

15
 16 *Presentation Highlight*

- 17 • The Basin Setting shows that for the same period of time (2000-2018), the Historical, Current
 18 Conditions, and Future Conditions-2070 Climate Change scenarios all have a change in
 19 storage of about -20,000 AF/yr.
- 20 • The Land IQ findings indicate that compared to historical conditions, agriculture has a smaller
 21 footprint, irrigation efficiency has increased, users have shifted towards lower water demand
 22 crops, and basin conditions would be worse without these improvements.
- 23 • Lastly, C. Buck emphasized the need to target net recharge, or focusing on the vertical
 24 balance, which includes deep percolation from precipitation and surface water including
 25 stream losses, balanced with groundwater pumping.

26
 27 *Vina GSA Board Discussion*

28 The Vina GSA Board had a rich discussion focused on what future to plan for in the basin. In other
 29 words, this initial policy decision on the risk to the basin will drive the magnitude, scope and
 30 locations of Projects and Management Actions that will have consequences. The board discussed
 31 planning for the following futures:

- 32 a. An optimistic view (target 5,000 AF/yr) would address the estimated imbalance under
 33 current conditions.
- 34 b. A middle of the road view (target 15,000 AF/yr) would address the potential increased
 35 imbalance due to urban growth over the next 10 years.
- 36 c. A worst-case view (target 30,000 AF/yr) would address the imbalance for changed
 37 conditions due to urban growth and potential impacts of climate change.

38
 39 Going from the optimistic view to worst case view would increase the number of complex,
 40 controversial and costly Projects and Management Actions. Connecting this to the Sustainable
 41 Management Criteria, the goal would be to identify the balance needed to flatten the projected
 42 downward trend in groundwater conditions.



1
2 The Vina GSA board provided direction to staff regarding the future level of risk to the subbasin
3 and input on the magnitude and targeted areas of need to be addressed by Projects and
4 Management Actions. **In sum, the Vina GSA Board directed staff to shoot for the middle of the**
5 **road target of 15,000 AF/year.** P. Gosselin (Butte County) added that while the middle of the
6 road does not include projected climate conditions, it does account for climate impacts in the
7 past twenty years. Additionally, staff would advise planning for potentially a higher target (20,000
8 AF/year), since not all PMAs will have the impacts intended initially. The subbasin will evaluate
9 every five years and keep the plan updated to meet future conditions.

10

11 **Discussion:**

- 12 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) asked clarifying questions regarding the middle of the road
13 target and the expected change in storage. C. Buck clarified the current conditions scenario
14 includes 2016 ag footprint and the past two years of urban footprint. The projections
15 anticipate increased demand from increased urban growth over the next 10 years. Further,
16 the basin would need to consider whether it wants to plan for future climate conditions that
17 are expected to increase evapotranspiration (ET) and water demands.
- 18 • B. Smith (business rep) expressed frustration with the process and concern with the lack of
19 consideration of SHAC's input and the time taken to reply to information requests. C. Buck
20 shared that the Management Committee facilitated various conversations with the SHAC
21 related to PMAs. The Board did ask why this conversation had not gone through the SHAC
22 ahead of time. P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared that this is still an open discussion with the
23 SHAC and the GSP is a long-term planning effort.
- 24 • G. Barber (CalWater) shared he listened into the board meeting, which was a respectful and
25 informative conversation that provided useful direction to staff.
- 26 • A. Dawson (domestic well rep) echoed concerns expressed with lack of SHAC input on the
27 direction, prior to the Board presentation. Concerns included perceived bias in some of the
28 presentation slides and the data used to inform decisions at the board. C. Buck replied to the
29 take-home from the conversation and frustration with the lack of time and certainty,
30 alongside the need to make decisions.
- 31 • D. Lucero shared concerns with the timing of the presentation. Further, she would like
32 clarification whether the Land IQ findings are factored into the Basin Setting. C. Buck shared
33 Land IQ findings have not been included in the modeling exercise, since the Basin Setting was
34 finalized prior to the report's release. Lastly, D. Lucero was concerned with the focus on
35 vertical balance, since horizontal issues such as the Sacramento Boundary and foothills area
36 are very important and would like them to be considered.

37

38

39 **GSP Implementation (00:52:20)**

40 Geosyntec, the technical consulting team, shared a presentation focused on GSP
41 Implementation. The presentation included anticipated costs for GSA operations, monitoring and



1 reporting, data gaps (compliance vs. improvements), GSA moving forward, and proposed PMAs
 2 brought through the online submittal form.

3

4 **Costs**

5 J. Turner and P. Gosselin reviewed the various costs to consider for GSP implementation,
 6 including (1) GSA operations, (2) monitoring and reporting, (3) data gaps, and (4) PMAs.

7

8 **1. GSA Operations – Vina GSA Costs**

9 P. Gosselin reviewed the current structure for funding and staffing for the Vina GSA. The GSA was
 10 formed by a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between Butte County, the City of Chico, and Durham
 11 Irrigation District. These agencies formed one Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) with a
 12 board and an advisory committee (SHAC). The JPA has financial terms, including SGMA fee
 13 authority, did not designate employees, and specify possible contracts with engineers and others.
 14 The base operation is achieved through in-kind Member Agency staff support and through
 15 voluntary Member Agency contributions.

16

17 The Member Agencies support the public agency functions including Board meetings, Brown Act
 18 compliance, discloses information in a transparent way through the agency website, as well as
 19 other administrative functions. Staff also helps develop and review GSP chapters and sends
 20 notifications to the public through a designated listserv.

21

22 Member agencies voluntarily contribute \$5,000 per year per Member Agency for a \$15,000
 23 annual budget. This budget is used to fund the Legal Services Contract, insurance, auditing,
 24 website maintenance, and other tasks such as well permitting and advertisement. This budget is
 25 geared towards GSP development but not necessarily implementation. There may be some
 26 things that member agencies are able to carry out, such as GSP implementation actions (e.g.,
 27 annual report, monitoring). However, new responsibilities of the Vina GSA will need a funding
 28 source (e.g., grants, fees). Potential new responsibilities include investigations, projects,
 29 additional data collection (e.g., pumping data), and ordinances. One option to finance the GSA is
 30 to establish a Proposition 218 fee structure in the plan to take on after the plan is submitted to
 31 have a long-term independent funding for the agency that would be more sustainable in the
 32 future.

33

34 **Discussion:**

- 35 • G. Barber (CalWater), B. Smith (business rep), and G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) shared that
 36 until the GSA has selected PMAs and have a budget associated with those projects, then it is
 37 difficult to have public discussions about potential fees.
- 38 • P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared this is an initial discussion regarding the implementation of
 39 the plan prior to drafting the chapter and sharing it for public review. The goal would be to,
 40 at a minimum, establish a sustainable funding source for the administration of the agency
 41 operations. These costs would be in addition to the costs to develop and implement the



1 PMA's. T. Carlone (CBI Facilitator) shared part of this conversation is to determine the role the
 2 agency wants to have in the implementation of the plan.

- 3 • K. Peterson (Butte County) asked if members of the SHAC would like more information about
 4 the Proposition 218 process. G. Barber (CalWater) shared he has significant experience with
 5 the process and suggested providing a presentation to the SHAC about opportunities for
 6 public input in the process and the importance of ensuring a properly executed Prop 218
 7 process. Further, he suggested pursuing a basic operational budget to maintain the GSA's
 8 viability and success in the long term.

9 **2. Monitoring & Reporting (01:13:13)**

10 J. Turner covered potential costs associated with monitoring and reporting. These costs include
 11 annual monitoring, which could be potentially covered by the Butte County Monitoring Project.
 12 Other reporting estimates could range between \$20,000 - \$80,000. Further, the GSA will need to
 13 complete five-year updates. Costs will depend on conditions, ranging from approximately
 14 \$50,000 to \$100,000. Annual monitoring could potentially be covered by Butte County.
 15

16 **3. Data Gaps**

17 J. Turner reviewed data gaps identified, which would be required for compliance, as well as data
 18 improvement opportunities summarized in the table below. Geosyntec reviewed costs
 19 associated with compliance data gaps, as they are short-term priorities.
 20

	Description	Estimated Costs
<i>Compliance Gaps</i>	Stream Aquifer Interactions	Stream gauges and Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream Gauges – Three Staging Areas - \$30,000 - \$50,000 • Monitoring Wells - \$350 - \$450 per foot • One 100 Foot Well - \$35,000 to \$45,000 Assessments - \$20,000 - \$50,000 Development of Appropriate SMCs - \$20,000 - \$40,000
	Domestic Well Depths	Domestic Well Survey - \$20,000-\$50,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify Active Domestic Wells • Evaluate Total Depths and Screen Intervals • Evaluate Maintenance Records • Create Site for Reporting Dry Wells
<i>Data Improvements</i>	Groundwater Monitoring Network Improvements	TBD
	Groundwater Recharge Assessment	TBD
	Further Evaluate Bottom of Subbasin	TBD
	Refine Hydrogeologic Model	TBD



- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AEM Survey • Connectivity between Aquifer Zones | |
|--|--|

1
2 Funding Mechanisms include grants such Technical Support Services grants for wells, Proposition
3 68 Implementation Grants (structures need to be associated with PMAs), other DWR funds, and
4 USDA opportunities. The GSA could also include Fee structures. P. Gosselin asked for the Vina
5 SHAC’s perspective on the funding mechanisms mentioned.

6
7 **Discussion:**

- 8 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) would rather see the GSA pursue as many grant opportunities
9 as possible but would be open to a thorough discussion about potential fees.
- 10 • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) concurred with a preference to pursue grants but would like to
11 consider a base line fee to fund the agency. C. Chastain suggested considering fee structure
12 does not necessarily need to be local to Butte County and the subbasin and could pursue fees
13 to agencies and entities interacting with the subbasin. P. Gosselin (Butte County) clarified that
14 the GSA cannot assess fees outside its jurisdiction.
- 15 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) would also prefer pursuing grants from the state and was
16 concerned with the notion of charging Butte County residents for groundwater management
17 given the state’s heavy reliance on water from the Northern Sacramento Region. Brobeck
18 highlighted his frustration with the consideration of fees given water districts’ engagement
19 in water markets, profiting from surface water allocations, and tapping the shared aquifer.
- 20 • G. Cole (ag. representative) agreed with other SHAC members and suggested bringing
21 additional information and costs to the SHAC about what PMAs are most important to pursue.
22

23 **Proposed PMAs**

24 A. Hussein (Geosyntec) provided a brief overview of some of the PMAs received through the
25 online solicitation form. The GSA will later consider a ranking process to identify the most
26 important and beneficial PMAs to the basin, rather than the order to implement them. PMAs
27 were categorized and grouped by theme. A preliminary list is summarized in the figure below,
28 which includes project proponent, costs, and potential benefit related to the Sustainable
29 Management Criteria (SMC). Further evaluation will be done as part of the draft PMA chapter.
30 The technical consulting team requested the SHAC’s input.

31
32 **Discussion:**

- 33 • G. Barber (CalWater) shared they will be including additional relevant PMAs stemming
34 from the Urban Water Management Plans that are currently undergoing public review.
- 35 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked for clarification regarding the difference between
36 the idea of groundwater allocation and adjudication. P. Gosselin shared that essentially
37 groundwater allocation would focus on setting a level of sustainable yield without
38 necessarily going through a process in court.



- 1 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked whether a GSA can initiate an adjudication process
2 through the courts if they considered another subbasin's activities were impacting their
3 ability to achieve sustainability. P. Gosselin (Butte County) clarified that an adjudication
4 is focused within the basin through the court and shared that if one adjoining subbasin's
5 GSP implementation impacts another subbasin's ability to implement their plan, the
6 subbasin could try to resolve this through inter-basin coordination and if that does not
7 work, the subbasin can go through an appeals process through DWR. Brobeck shared his
8 concern is that the major threats to the subbasin's sustainability are not within the Vina
9 Subbasin.
- 10 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked about the Community Water Education Initiative's
11 target audience (rural or urban user). P. Gosselin shared the concept remained general
12 targeting the broader public. Further, J. Brobeck asked whether the upper watershed
13 management seems more related to surface water rather than groundwater, based on
14 isotope studies he has evaluated. He would advocate for improved rangeland
15 management to promote fire resilience and prevent urban sprawl.
- 16 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) inquired about the FloodMAR proposal mentioned, and
17 whether having an agency as project proponent would ameliorate some of the SHAC's
18 concerns about the legal implications of recharge projects. P. Gosselin responded that if
19 the Vina or Rock Creek GSAs can determine and dictate the terms of the recharge program
20 within their respective jurisdictions, then the subbasin could use those flows to promote
21 sustainability.
- 22 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) also highlighted the PMA he submitted in name of Friends
23 of Butte Creek aiming to keep water in Butte Creek to protect the winter/spring runs of
24 Chinook salmon, as a table A allocation. P. Gosselin shared that Friends of Butte Creek
25 may have funding available to purchase water.
- 26 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) would like to ensure FloodMAR projects are located in
27 areas that would benefit the aquifer and consider legal implications. Regarding domestic
28 well mitigation, he suggested finding ways to avoid taxpayers paying for individual
29 homeowners' wells. He was against the idea of groundwater allocations. Lastly, he
30 highlighted that irrigation efficiency also leads to decreases in recharge.
- 31 • G. Barber (CalWater) would like to keep groundwater allocations in the plan, since he
32 anticipates the subbasin is probably not properly anticipating the climate change impacts
33 to local groundwater conditions. Lastly, he would like to ensure there are some PMAs
34 related to groundwater quality considerations in the plan. There are a few plumes in the
35 Chico Area that CalWater deals with every day and are already taking action to address
36 plumes (e.g., PFAS).
- 37 • B. Smith (business rep) echoed G. Barber's concern with water quality, particularly related
38 to recent groundwater transfers. One key concern with increased pumping during
39 drought conditions could be to mobilize water contaminants.
- 40



Stream Augmentation - Potential to Increase Stream Flow

- Vina GSA, RCRD, Paradise ID, PG&E
- Evaluate the availability of water to augment stream flows
- Yield 1-10K AF
- Costs: TBD
- Benefits: depletion to interconnected streams & GW levels

Agricultural Irrigation Efficiency- Review Irrigation Practices

- Vina GSA
- Adopt irrigation efficiency improvements
- Costs: TBD
- Benefits: GW levels

FloodMAR Evaluation

- Vina GSA & RCRD
- Evaluate potential for FloodMAR
- Costs: TBD
- GW levels

Rangeland Management and Water Retention

- Chico State
- Develop, implement and measure adaptive grazing practices
- Costs: TBD
- GW levels

DRAFT

Watershed Health- Upper Watershed Recharge

- Chico State Enterprises
- Evaluate potential for fuel management projects
- Cost: 2-3K per acre
- Benefits: GW Levels, Reduction of Storage, Water Quality, surface water depletion

Domestic Well Mitigation & Evaluation

- Vina and RCRD GSA
- Develop registry of domestic wells
- Costs: TBD
- Benefits: GW levels

Community Water Education Initiative

- CSU Chico – Center for Water and Env
- Community education
- Costs: TBD
- Benefits: GW levels, Water Quality, etc.

Landscape Ordinance

- Butte County & City of Chico
- Revised ordinance for new development and conservation
- Costs: TBD
- GW levels, water quality, etc.

Groundwater Allocation

- Vina GSA and RCRD
- Evaluate GW allocation
- Costs: TBD
- Benefits: GW levels, Water quality, etc.



1 Outcomes & Next Steps | PMAs

- 2 a. CBI will coordinate with the Management Committee to prepare a Proposition 218
 3 process overview, including demographic information for the Vina Subbasin.
 4 b. The Management Committee will continue to work on and finalize the draft PMA Chapter,
 5 which will be released for public review. The SHAC will have more opportunities to
 6 provide formal recommendations to the Vina GSA Board.
 7

8 5. *Vina GSA Management Committee Reports (2:23:35)*

9 P. Gosselin (Butte County) is expecting to release the Draft SMC Chapter, the draft Monitoring
 10 Networks Chapter, and sections of the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) shortly for
 11 public input [[Access Here](#)]. Further, Butte County's Drought Taskforce will be meeting the
 12 afternoon after the SHAC. The Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA will hold
 13 a joint special meeting in July to review the various chapters released for public review, including
 14 SHAC recommendations.
 15

16 6. *Inter-basin Coordination (2:22:16)*

17 T. Carlone (CBI Facilitator) provided an overview of inter-basin coordination efforts in the
 18 Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV). The Consensus Building Institute (CBI) is funded by DWR
 19 Facilitation Support Services and has been working with staff of GSAs in 13 subbasins since spring
 20 2020.

21 After an initial attempt to compile technical information emerging from the various subbasin's
 22 Basin Setting Chapters to better understand basin conditions at boundaries, staff realized that
 23 differing timelines for the availability of Basin Setting content meant there would not be the time
 24 needed to fully characterize or address major discrepancies during the initial GSP development.
 25 Therefore, the goal for inter-basin coordination efforts shifted towards establishing a framework
 26 for long-term inter-basin coordination and dialogue (post 2022), while informal coordination
 27 discussions amongst staff and consultants between neighboring subbasins continued during the
 28 GSP development process
 29

30 During the presentation, CBI and Butte County provided an update on the process of developing
 31 recommendations for an inter-basin coordination framework, shared Butte County staff
 32 perspective and highlights from related discussions in other venues and received feedback from
 33 the SHAC.
 34

35 *Developing an Inter-basin Coordination Framework*

36 The draft framework began by identifying priorities and desired outcomes during GSP
 37 development, in the near-term (5-year update) and in the long-term (through GSP
 38 implementation). Then, it seeks to establish foundational pillars for inter-basin coordination
 39 framework.

40 GSA staff participating in staff inter-basin coordination meetings bring discussion highlights to
 41 their respective GSA boards and bring back input from their venues back into staff meetings.
 42



1 *Draft Pillars for Long-term Inter-basin Coordination Framework* (as of May 2021)

- 2 **1. Information-sharing (ongoing)**
- 3 ➤ Changed conditions
- 4 ➤ Annual and interim progress reports
- 5 ➤ Data and technical information (work towards shared data across basin
- 6 boundaries)
- 7 **2. Joint Analysis & Evaluation (near and long term)**
- 8 ➤ Compare contents of GSPs
- 9 ➤ Identify significant differences & uncertainties
- 10 ➤ Identify issues of concern
- 11 **3. Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration on Mutually Beneficial Activities**
- 12 **(ongoing, near and long-term)**
- 13 ➤ Examples: joint monitoring, regional modeling, efforts to address data gaps at
- 14 subbasin boundaries
- 15 ➤ Collectively pursue funding and collaborate on mutually agreed upon projects
- 16 ➤ Leverage existing regional collaboratives (e.g., NSV IRWM)
- 17 **4. Communication and Outreach (ongoing)**
- 18 ➤ Collaborate on regional public engagement strategies that promote consistent
- 19 messages, awareness of groundwater sustainability, enhance public trust, and
- 20 establish foundation for long-term collaboration
- 21 **5. Non-binding** – Commitment to honor the individual authorities of GSAs

22

23 *Next Steps*

24 CBI and GSA staff are drafting a report outlining the framework for inter-basin coordination. GSA

25 staff are soliciting input and will share back at the following staff-level meeting. Upcoming

26 elements for further discussion include a potential issue resolution process, the scale and timing

27 for the elements outlined above, and pathways to foster communication among GSA decision-

28 making bodies. Once ready, CBI will bring the draft report to the SHAC and other GSA public

29 venues to solicit public input on its content.

30

31 *Butte County Perspective on Inter-basin Coordination*

32 C. Buck (Butte County) shared key take-aways from recent dialogues among staff, the public, and

33 decision makers. Butte County staff gave presentations on inter-basin coordination efforts to

34 date and asked for input on the pillars of the coordination framework, including presentations to

35 the Butte County Water Commission (April 7), Vina GSA Board (April 14), and Butte County Board

36 of Supervisors (April 27).

37

38 In terms of scale, inter-basin coordination will need to be more focused around specific

39 boundaries. While there are some commonalities throughout the region, the details will be

40 specific to each neighbor pair. Some boundaries may need more coordination than others, and

41 some aspects of implementing SGMA require and benefit more from coordination. Proposed

42 coordination groups focused on boundaries with a river or creek include:



- 1 • **North Sac River Corridor**- Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Corning, Vina, Butte, Colusa)
- 2 • **Feather River Corridor**- Butte, Wyandotte Creek, North Yuba, Sutter
- 3 • **South Sac Corridor**- Colusa, Sutter, Yolo
- 4 • **Stony Creek**- Corning, Colusa
- 5 • **Thomes Creek**- Red Bluff, Corning

6
7 Overall, staff have heard broad support on the framework, highlighting inter-basin Coordination
8 should (1) address actions that impact environmental resources (i.e., Groundwater Dependent
9 Ecosystems), (2) focus on communication between subbasins, especially regarding changed
10 conditions (ie. land use, water use), and (3) assure public participation and involvement of
11 stakeholders. Public input emphasized the importance of coordinated technical analysis,
12 monitoring, and modeling, as well as ongoing concerns about regional groundwater banking and
13 conjunctive use.

14
15 CBI and Butte County staff encouraged SHAC members' feedback regarding the questions below.

- 16 1. What are your thoughts and impressions about the draft pillars for long-term inter-basin
17 coordination?
- 18 2. What are the most important outcomes for inter-basin coordination in SGMA?
- 19 3. What concerns or issues would you like to have considered?

20
21 **Discussion:**

- 22 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) echoed the concerns shared before about water transfers
23 in neighboring subbasins. The pillars mentioned seem very good, but they are brought in
24 question by actions by neighboring subbasins. Further, J. Brobeck raised concern with lack
25 of public participation in the inter-basin coordination meetings, while water agencies are
26 participating in the meetings. T. Carlone (CBI) clarified that the only staff participant from
27 a water agency represents the Butte Subbasin. Further, T. Carlone mentioned that the
28 draft report with additional details will include more information, including potential
29 processes to identify and resolve conflict that may emerge.
- 30 • B. Smith (business rep) would like to make sure inter-basin coordination meetings are
31 transparent to avoid Brown Act violations. T. Carlone (CBI) and P. Gosselin (Butte County)
32 shared that the inter-basin coordination meetings are not Brown Act meetings, instead
33 are staff-to-staff discussion.
- 34 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) suggested allowing GCID representatives to provide their
35 perspective and rationale behind the recent actions taken, before making any additional
36 claims about their intent. J. Brobeck (env. representative) highlighted his concern about
37 lack of information-sharing within the inter-basin coordination meetings to provide
38 notification and communication about important changes to their groundwater pumping.
39 T. Carlone (CBI) highlighted the importance of clarifying the scale and frequency of
40 communication among GSA decision-makers. Lastly, P. Gosselin (Butte County)
41 emphasized that the inter-basin coordination framework is focused on the long-term
42 coordination, beyond the current short-term drought conditions.



- 1 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) encouraged Butte County staff reaching out to
- 2 neighboring subbasins to inquire about recent water transfers and increased pumping
- 3 proposed.
- 4 • A member of the public encouraged staff to notify SHAC members about upcoming
- 5 meetings. Further, when GCID presented to the Water Commission, the details presented
- 6 did not align with the most up-to-date information. P. Gosselin invited the SHAC to
- 7 participate in the upcoming Drought Taskforce meeting, where Thad Bedner (GCID) will
- 8 be presenting additional information and will be available for questions. Lastly, this
- 9 member of the public would like to know how many people in the subbasin will be in
- 10 compliance with SB80.

11
12 **Next Steps**

13 The SHAC will meet again via video conference on June 15, 2021, from 9:00-12:30.

14 **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	N
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	N
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		



Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
Debbie Spangler	CA Department of Water Resources	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Stephanie Horii	Consensus Building Institute	Y

- 1 Approximately seven members of the public attended the meeting.
- 2 * indicates the participant did not participate in the full meeting.

DRAFT