



Meeting Brief

- The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on August 18, 2020, due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.
- SHAC members reviewed and approved the meeting notes from the previous meeting, made suggested modifications to the Vina SHAC Charter to incorporate clarification of the process for SHAC members to include items on their meeting agendas and to require a quorum of SHAC members when making internal decisions and when making recommendations to the Vina Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Board.
- The Vina GSA Management Committee provided an update on Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development status and an [Overview Presentation](#) of the tasks and schedule for the GSP completion. Most portions of the Basin Setting and Monitoring Network portions of the GSP have been drafted and published online and are available for public review through September 8th [[Access draft portions of the GSP here](#)]. Next steps include delving into the GSP Completion Project (2020-2021), which will cover all remaining portions of the GSP, such as the Monitoring Networks, Sustainable Management Criteria, Projects and Management Actions (PMA) and Interbasin Coordination etc.
- The SHAC received an overview of the proposed PMA Process and asked clarifying questions. PMA discussions will continue at the next SHAC meeting.
- The SHAC decided to make a recommendation to the Vina GSA Board that the Board should request an extension for GSP submittal, due to current public engagement challenges and limitations.
- Butte County staff provided an update regarding the document “Identifying and Managing the Legal Implications of Artificial Recharge.” The Vina SHAC had the opportunity to provide input and ask clarifying questions.
- The SHAC will meet again via video conference on **September 15, 2020 from 9am-12pm.**

Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
Meeting Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize June Meeting summary and post on the Vina GSA website. • Add numbers to the headings in meeting notes to correspond to the agenda. 	CBI	Upon completion
Vina SHAC Charter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include provision for adding items on the agenda. • Include provisions for requiring a quorum. 	CBI	By September SHAC meeting
Project Management & Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring in more detailed concepts for discussion with the SHAC. • Include an initial online public outreach effort, soliciting public comments and preliminary ideas for PMAs. 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion



<p>GSP Deadline Extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring SHAC recommendation to the Vina GSA Board to submit a letter to DWR, the legislature, the governor, the Butte County Board of Supervisors to request an extension for GSP submittal. 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion
<p>Identifying and Managing the Legal Implications of Artificial Recharge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate legal implications into PMA discussions (water rights, ownership over time, etc.). 	Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion
<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add discussion of data gaps into future meeting agendas, particularly related to inter-basin flows, groundwater dependent ecosystems, and vertical flow patterns. 	CBI and Vina GSA Management Committee	Upon completion

Summary

The Vina SHAC met on August 18, 2020 via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. In total, 25 participants attended, including Vina SHAC members, GSA member agency staff, a technical consultant, state agency representatives, and members of the public.

1. Introductions & Agenda Review

The SHAC members, facilitator, and staff introduced themselves. The facilitator gave a brief overview of the [agenda](#).

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Vina SHAC members requested adding an additional item to the agenda to consider petitioning the Department of Water Resources (DWR) for an extension to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) deadline [[go to section](#)]. One SHAC member raised concerns that questions regarding process and basin hydrogeological setting remain unanswered, including inter-basin flow estimate discrepancies pertinent to project management and actions. Virtual meeting format, has not allowed for proper public engagement in the opinion of some SHAC members. Since the Vina subbasin is not in critical overdraft conditions, the SHAC would like to request a timeline extension to allow the GSP to be properly formed and vetted.

A member of the public asked the SHAC to consider making a recommendation to the Vina GSA Board regarding the format utilized for public meetings. The platform used in Vina SHAC meetings (Zoom) is more amendable to public participation, allowing participants to see who attended the meeting, raise hands and provide input, when appropriate. The commenter suggested considering using Zoom for future GSA Board meetings, due to limitations with Webex at the previous Board meeting.

Outcomes & Next Steps | Public Comments



- The Vina GSA Management Committee acknowledged concerns and intends to transition meetings to Zoom, following the Vina SHAC format, for future GSA Board meetings.
- Butte County staff will gather information and do some outreach to help guide the SHAC's recommendation for a GSP deadline extension.

3. Vina GSA Management Committee Reports

The Vina GSA Management Committee provided timely updates to the SHAC. The Vina GSA Management Committee has released portions of the Basin Setting of the GSP, including the Hydrogeological Conceptual Model, Groundwater Conditions, and Water Budgets, as well as portions of the Monitoring Network for public review. The drafts are available on the Vina GSA website for a 30-day public review period, through September 8th [[access here](#)]. The GSA posted a tracking sheet [[click here to download](#)] to guide public comment submission, referencing line numbers in the documents. Comments can be emailed to: VinaGSA@gmail.com or mailed to: Vina GSA, Department of Water and Resource Conservation Attn: Dr. Christina Buck, 308 Nelson Avenue, Oroville CA 95965. Comments will be compiled and presented at the next Vina SHAC meeting. At the last GSA Board Meeting on August 12th, the Board approved a new annual calendar through June 2021. The Board will be meeting more frequently, moving from quarterly to monthly meetings.

4. Meeting Notes Review & Consideration

The SHAC reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting notes from the 6/16/20 SHAC Meeting [[access here](#)]. SHAC members asked clarifying questions and made comments regarding the content and level of detail in the documents. A SHAC member asked for the reason behind calling the document meeting summary or notes, rather than minutes. The facilitator clarified the meeting notes are used by the Management Committee to create staff reports to the Vina GSA Board. The document is not intended to be a transcription, rather a synthesis of main discussion themes, outcomes, and recommendations. The name, whether it is minutes or notes, is less important than ensuring they reflect the SHAC's desired level of detail. The facilitator's goal is to ensure these documents are as useful as possible, accurately characterizing the discussion and sharing the main takeaways with the Vina GSA Board.

Outcomes & Next Steps | Meeting Notes Review & Consideration

- The SHAC unanimously approved and finalized the 6/16/20 SHAC Meeting Summary. The final meeting summary will be posted on the website.
- The document will continue to be called "meeting notes."
- SHAC members would like to maintain the level of detail and add numbers to the headings to correspond to meeting agenda items.

5. Vina SHAC Charter

The facilitator shared a revised version of the Charter [[access here](#)], based on SHAC recommendations from the previous discussion during the last meeting. The SHAC suggested



making two potential modifications to the charter, including: (1) adding language specifying how items are placed on future agendas by SHAC members, and (2) an additional provision to include requiring a quorum when internal decisions and recommendations to the Vina GSA Board are made.

Discussion

- **Agenda Items:** SHAC members would like to add a provision to the Charter specifying how items can be placed on meeting agendas by SHAC members. The agreed-upon process establishes that all SHAC members can add items to the agenda by sending a request to the management committee at least 48 hours before materials are posted on the website, which corresponds to at least five business days before the SHAC meeting takes place. The public can suggest items during public comment period for the SHAC’s consideration, but only SHAC members can request additions. All nine SHAC members in attendance approved this recommendation.

Voting Results

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

- **Chair and Vice-Chair:** Some SHAC members suggested changing the SHAC’s charter to adopt a more traditional model of operation, with an established Chair and Vice-Chair (selected by the SHAC). Butte County staff indicated that the Vina GSA currently has professional facilitation through DWR’s Facilitation Support Services (FSS) Program, set to expire by the end of the December 2020. The GSA would like to continue with FSS, due to the level of time and effort needed to prepare for the meetings, even if the SHAC decides to adopt a traditional model. If a Chair and Vice-Chair were selected, they could work with the facilitators to prepare materials and coordinate logistics. Without a facilitator, the Management Committee’s staff would take on that extra work. After thorough discussion, all nine SHAC members in attendance unanimously decided to table the discussion about adding a Chair and Vice-Chair as long as there is funding available for professional facilitation.

Voting Results

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

- **Quorum:** The SHAC decided to include required for a quorum, whenever the SHAC makes a decision or recommendation. The quorum would be defined as the majority of seated members (in this case 6 people), regardless of the number of SHAC members in attendance. The meeting notes would include the number of Yes and No votes, even when there is consensus. All nine SHAC members in attendance approved this recommendation.

Voting Results

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, and S. Lewis.
No	NA



Outcomes & Next Steps | Charter Review

- Recommendations to the GSA Board include adding: (1) provisions for agenda items, and (2) a requirement for a quorum for each internal SHAC decision or recommendation to the GSA Board.
- The SHAC will table a decision about selecting a Chair and Vice-chair, as long as there is funding available for professional facilitation.

6. Overview of Tasks & Schedule for GSP Completion

Paul Gosselin, Butte County, provided an overview presentation of the task, budget, and schedule for GSP completion [[access slides here](#)]. Gosselin reviewed the status of GSP development and upcoming steps.

The GSA has released the draft Basin Setting Project (2018-2020). The public review process, currently in place for the Basin Setting Chapters, will be standard for subsequent chapters throughout GSP development. Chapters will not become final until the entire GSP is completed and adopted by the Vina GSA Board. The next step is to delve into the GSP Completion Project (2020-2021), including the following chapters: Administrative Information, Interbasin Coordination, Monitoring Networks, Sustainable Management Criteria, and Projects and Management Actions etc.

- **Administrative Information:** this section will be mostly completed by staff.
- **Interbasin Coordination:** efforts are under way with other subbasins in the North Sacramento Valley, focused on preliminary discussions regarding model coordination and technical information-sharing.
- **Monitoring Networks:** There is good baseline information on the network and protocols, but work on representative monitoring tied to measurable objectives is still needed.
- **Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC):** SMC are the enforceable criteria that will be used to guide the GSA towards sustainability. This will be an iterative process, establishing a sustainability goal, minimum thresholds and measurable objectives to avoid undesirable results (i.e., Lowering Groundwater Levels, Reduction of Storage, Seawater Intrusion, Degraded Quality, Land Subsidence, and Surface Water Depletion). SMCs will be Management Area specific.
- **Projects and Management Actions (PMA):** PMAs will show how the GSA will achieve sustainability (as indicated below). Economic analysis will be key during this process, due to funding requirements.

The Vina GSP completion work will occur over the next 8 months (September 2020-April 2021). Public participation will be key in determining community values and priorities. It will be an iterative process, in coordination with the Vina SHAC, the Vina GSA Board, technical consultants, and the public. From April to September 2021, the GSA will focus on document preparation and adoption. Once the complete package is ready, it will undergo another public comment review period. The GSA will undergo an official consultation process with the land-



use planning agencies, as required by SGMA. From September to December of 2021, the GSA will prepare the GSP elements, undergo a Vina GSA Board hearing process, and accommodate changes and modifications. The final Vina GSP will be submitted to the DWR portal by January 30, 2020, the state-mandated deadline for GSP submittal. The submission of the GSP is just the start, setting out the path to sustainability, and identifying important data gaps. Plan implementation will require significant investment and coordination, as well an annual reporting and five-year updates, as required by SGMA.

Discussion

- **Timeline:** Vina SHAC members reemphasized the need to request an extension for GSP development. This letter would describe how Covid-19 is delaying the process. Vina SHAC participants hold differing views regarding the need for an extension. Some SHAC members thought the process should continue on the existing timeline but ultimately, all SHAC members supported the recommendation to the Vina GSA Board, as the current circumstance is inhibiting the SHAC’s ability to solicit public input from their constituents. Gosselin added that not only has Covid-19 impacted GSP completion, but since SGMA was approved, the County has experienced three crises: the Oroville Dam crisis in 2017, many devastating fires including the Campfire and the Butte Lightning Complex, and now Covid-19.
- **Budget:** A SHAC member requested clarification on whether the Grant Administration quantity (\$49,640) was enough to cover for Butte County staff’s work on GSP development. Gosselin clarified that those funds only covers activities for Proposition 1 grant administration over the three-year period (quarterly reports, invoicing, etc.). Butte County administers the grant for the three subbasins (Vina, Wyandotte Creek, and Butte) on behalf of all the GSAs. Facilitation services had been funded through the Proposition 1 grant prior to 2020. Currently, professional facilitation is funded through DWR’s Facilitation Support Services (FSS) Program.

Outcomes & Next Steps | Charter Review

- The Vina SHAC agreed unanimously (9 members present) to submit a recommendation for the Vina GSA Board to submit a letter to the DWR, the legislature, and the Butte County Board of Supervisors to request an extension for GSP submittal.

Voting Results

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

7. Overview of the Projects and Management Action Process

Gosselin presented a proposed Project and Management Action (PMA) process, outlining requirements and requested the SHAC’s input [[access slides here](#) and [document here](#)]. The PMAs comprise efforts to achieve sustainability goals, by either increasing recharge or reducing



pumping. PMAs can include regulatory and non-regulatory actions. The GSA Board has authority to take certain actions, may accept projects or actions proposed by project proponents (e.g., Member Agencies, water purveyors, associations), and must meet criteria prescribed in the regulations.

- **Requirements:** PMAs must include a timeline, expected benefits, and a process to evaluate those benefits. The GSP must include an explanation of how the PMA will be accomplished, what legal authority will carry out the PMA, as well as the estimated costs and the plan to meet those costs. PMAs also need to include a description of the measurable objectives expected to benefit from the initiatives (e.g., groundwater levels, etc.), how they will help the GSA meet interim milestones, in exceedance of minimum thresholds. It should highlight where undesirable results are imminent, the circumstances and criteria that would trigger implementation and termination, and the summary of regulatory and permitting processes required. Feasibility studies are not necessarily required.
- **Implementation:** PMAs have a 20-year planning horizon, and do not need to be implemented by GSP submittal. All PMAs are subject to 5-Year Progress Reports. Adopted PMAs should include contingencies in case they do not meet Interim Targets, and should include stringent regulatory backstops (i.e., pumping limits) if other PMAs are insufficient.
- **Development:** PMAs need to include a matrix for: planned projects (meet the acceptable criteria, have adequate planning and are scheduled to be completed by 2042); potential projects (meet acceptable criteria but are in early planning stages but possible completed by 2042); and conceptual projects (in early planning stages).
- **Initial Criteria:** Some considerations for selection include, are the PMAs: cost-effective; multi-beneficial; linked to measurable objectives and management areas; socially acceptable; beneficial to the public, etc.?
- **Types of PMAs:** Some examples: conservation, recharge, recycling, pumping allocations, etc.
- **Process and Schedule:** The Vina GSA would like to convene public processes through the Vina SHAC, public workshops, and the Vina GSA Board (See preliminary schedule below).

August 2020	<i>Vina SHAC</i> – Overview of requirements and initial brainstorming
November 2020	<i>Public Workshop</i> – Overview of requirements, presentation of preliminary ideas, and solicitation for other concepts.
December 2020	<i>Vina SHAC</i> –Review workshop results and draft PMAs
January 2021	<i>Vina GSA Board</i> – Draft matrix of potential PMAs (unranked), seek direction
February 2021	<i>Vina SHAC/Workshop</i> –review and possible recommendations
April 2021	<i>Vina SHAC</i> – Review and possible recommendations on PMAs
June 2021	<i>Vina GSA Board</i> –Presentation of potential PMAs for incorporating into GSP



Discussion

- A Vina SHAC member inquired about the potential for including projects after 2021, considering innovation and technology. Gosselin clarified that the 5-year review process will allow for updates with additional knowledge, information, and innovative ideas.
- Vina SHAC considered including an early public outreach component to request for ideas through an online submittal process, in order to allow for initial input and a broader range of possibilities. This would allow SHAC members to reach out to their constituents and solicit ideas. A similar process has been followed in Chico with the Climate Action Alliance, and it is going well to help preface draft recommendations.
- Another SHAC member suggested including a process to request additional information to guide input on specific ideas and decision-making (e.g., greywater reuse).

Outcomes & Next Steps | Projects and Management Action Process

- Staff will build upon initial ideas, bring in more detailed concepts, and further discussions for the SHAC.
- Discussions were held about engaging in initial public outreach efforts first to solicit public comments and ideas prior to presenting ideas.

8. Identifying and Managing the Legal Implications of Artificial Recharge

Paul Gosselin (Butte County) and Valerie Kincaid shared perspectives on comments received thus far. Because of concerns about out-of-basin transfers and other implications of artificial recharge, the Vina GSA Board put together a process to flesh out the legal process and provide recommendations. Due to funding restrictions, the process has been delayed to November or December of this year; however, in the meantime, preliminary conversations can begin regarding potential projects and public concerns about those projects. Some concerns include ownership of recharge, use of recharge and out-of-basin transfers. The GSA could move forward crafting recommendations, analyzing concerns, and taking preventative measures.

Discussion:

- One of the key concerns is the impact on existing overlying water rights, during drought, and the desire to protect overlying groundwater rights.
- Another concern relates to the broader DWR goal to increase integration of groundwater supplies into the overall state water supply and foster groundwater substitution processes that would benefit users outside of Butte County, without properly addressing local impacts and fully understanding flow patterns.
- Flow patterns are included in legal rules to determine recharge project duration, regulations, limitations, and detailed considerations. Legal and technical considerations must be aligned and inform each other to have an effective and beneficial recharge project.
- A member of the public asked Valerie Kincaid if there is decisive law on taking water from one basin and transferring into another, as with surface water. Valerie Kincaid explained that there is a common body of law exists, treating "imported water" differently from "native, common groundwater."



Outcomes & Next Steps | Identifying and Managing the Legal Implications of Artificial Recharge

- Include legal implications during PMA discussions (water rights, ownership over time, etc.). All nine SHAC members supported that recommendation.

Voting Results

Yes	A. Dawson, B. Smith, C. Chastain, C. Madden, G. Cole, G. Barber, G. Sohnrey, J. Brobeck, and S. Lewis.
No	NA

Next Steps & Correspondence

- **Future agenda topics:** SHAC members suggested adding discussion of critical data gaps in areas of high concern (e.g., GDEs, inter-basin flows, vertical flow patterns) to future meeting agendas. Christina Buck (Butte County) stated that one of the deliverables of GSP development is an evaluation of data gaps and needs, which will potentially be available for the next meeting.
- **Future meetings:** Will continue in a virtual setting for the time being and all correspondence received will be compiled and provided in SHAC agenda packets.
- **The meeting summary and meeting recording will be posted on the website.**
- The next meeting will be held on **September 15, 2020 from 9am-12pm.**



Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) Members		
Anne Dawson	Domestic well user	Y
Bruce Smith	Business representative	Y
Cheri Chastain	CSU Chico	Y
Christopher Madden	Butte College	Y
Gary Cole	Agricultural well user	Y
George Barber	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	Y
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Joshua Pierce	Domestic well user	N
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	Y
Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Staff		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Paul Gosselin	Butte County	Y
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	N
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	N
Legal Advisors		
Valerie Kincaid	O’Laughlin & Paris LLP	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	Y

Approximately eight members of the public attended the meeting.