



1 Meeting Brief

- 2 ➤ The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on October 19, 2021 [[Access](#)
3 [Recording Here](#)].
- 4 ➤ **Chapter-by- Chapter Discussion of Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)**
5 Staff summarized key themes and topics from public workshop comments on draft GSP for
6 SHAC discussion. SHAC provided chapter-by-chapter comments on draft GSP and considered
7 recommendations to the Vina GSA Board of Directors. The public had an opportunity to
8 provide comment [[Access Presentation](#)].
- 9 ➤ **GSA Staff Proposed changes to GSP and Requested SHAC Input**
10 Staff provided Groundwater Level Measurable Objective Alternatives, proposed a new
11 Project and Management Action (PMA), the Interim Milestone Action Plan Proposal (IMAP),
12 and suggested PMA Chapter Revisions in Paragraph in Section 5.1.
- 13 ➤ **Next Meeting:** The SHAC will meet again via video conference on November 4, 2021, from
14 1:30-4:30.

15 Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
• Provide hydrographs for Groundwater Level Measurable Objective Alternative 1 (levels from 2010-2020) for SHAC to consider on November 4th	Management Committee	
• Provide language for Interim Milestone Action Plan Proposal for SHAC to review on November 4th	Management Committee	
• Review and edit GSP Chapters to ensure accuracy, particularly responding to comments provided by T. Greene	Management Committee in coordination with Geosyntec	
• Post SHAC meeting recording on the website.	CBI & Management Committee	[Access Here]

16 Summary

17 The Vina SHAC met on October 19, 2021, via video conference, because of COVID-19. Participants
18 included Vina SHAC members, GSA member agency staff, technical consultants, representatives
19 from the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR), and members of the public. Below is a
20 detailed summary of key themes and next steps discussed at the meeting. This document is not
21 intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the
22 group's discussions. The video-conference meeting recording is available on the Vina GSA
23 website [[Access Here](#)].



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

2 The facilitator introduced the three new SHAC members, Joanne Parsley, Evan Markey, and Todd
3 Greene. All SHAC members introduced themselves. The facilitator gave a brief overview of the
4 agenda.

5

6 2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda (0:11:15)

7 *Public Comments:*

- 8 • A member of the public asked if water rights are taken into account when determining
9 inputs and outputs in the water budget.
- 10 • C. Buck (Butte County) responded that in the Butte Basin Groundwater Model (BBGM), the
11 DWR land use maps are used to identify water source (irrigation source), so it's more
12 looking at it from a water supply or water source perspective, which is related to water
13 rights, but doesn't take a close look at which water rights are behind the potential surface
14 water supply. Water rights are documented in the integrated water resources plan of the
15 county, the inventory analysis report from 2001, and in an appendix from the 2016 report.
16 There is a drought Request For Proposals (RFP) out for a drought analysis study, and that
17 includes a task to look at riparian water rights.

18

19 3. Meeting Notes (00:14:30)

20 The Vina SHAC reviewed and voted on the approval of the 8/17/21 meeting notes. The meeting
21 notes were approved. [Access [Here](#)].

22

Yes	G. Sohnrey, S. Lewis , A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, B. Smith,
Abstain	J. Parsley, E. Markey, T. Greene

23

24 4. Chapter-by-Chapter Discussion of Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP): (0:16:58)

25 The SHAC received a presentation of a high-level overview of GSP chapters and summary of the
26 of key comments received at the public workshops. The Management Committee informed the
27 SHAC that while they are submitting comments as an entity, they are also welcomed to submit
28 comments as individuals. The deadline for the public comment period on the draft GSP is October
29 19, 11:59 p.m.. At the November 4th SHAC meeting, the SHAC will have an opportunity to review
30 all public comments on the Draft GSP and to provide final recommendations on the GSP to the
31 Vina GSA Board. [Access [Presentation](#)]

32 *GSP Public Comments by Chapter*

33 C. Buck summarized key themes taken from public comments made at the GSP Public
34 Workshops on October 4th and October 13th.

35 ➤ **Chapter 1 - Plan Area, and Chapter 2 – Basin Setting:** Key themes were around the
36 importance of inter-basin coordination with regard to monitoring and water budgets,
37 monitoring tools, cross sections. AEM and well log data should be utilized to the maximum
38 extent possible.

39 ➤ **Chapter 3 - Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC), and Chapter 4 – Monitoring
40 Networks:** Key themes were that the groundwater Minimum Threshold is too low, the



1 groundwater Measurable Objective is too low, and a weak justification exists for how the
2 MT is set coincident with when the undesirable results would begin to occur. Also, the
3 importance of shallow groundwater and its role for GDE's, the Chico Urban Forest, and
4 streams.

5 **► Chapter 5 – Projects and Management Actions:** Key themes were around the ownership
6 of recharged water, specifically, the legal implications of recharge. Preference from some
7 to emphasize conservation as a key strategy and to prioritize projects accordingly.
8 Concern about timing of projects, in that some could take years.

9 **► Chapter 6 – Implementation:** An overall lack of clarity as to when the GSA will act. What
10 groundwater level conditions will spur on what type of actions by the GSAs?

11
12 5. GSA staff identified the following proposed changes to the GSP and requested SHAC input:
13 (0:24:41)

- 14 1. Consideration of Groundwater Level Measurable Objective Alternatives
- 15 2. Interim Milestone Action Plan Proposal (IMAP)
- 16 3. PMA Chapter Revisions in Paragraph in Section 5.1

17
18 *Consideration of Groundwater Level Measurable Objective (MO) Alternatives*

19 Currently: "Groundwater level based on groundwater trend line for dry periods (since 2000) of
20 observed short-term climatic cycles extended to 2030."

21
22 Conceptual Alternatives:

- 23 1. Average available historical groundwater levels from 2010-2020
- 24 2. Fall 2020 groundwater level

25
26 *SHAC Discussion (31:45)*

- 27 • S. Lewis (ag representative) asked if SHAC would learn about the alternatives in greater depth
28 at the November 4th meeting. C. Buck (Butte County) shared that they are waiting to find out
29 whether the group is interested in considering an alternative, indicating that if there wasn't
30 sufficient interest, the Management Committee would not 'crunch numbers' and that the
31 team wanted to wait for input from the SHAC on that question first.
- 32 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) reflected that he did not understand why they would make this
33 change at such a late date. He noted that it, 'seemed like a waste of time,' in that much time
34 was spent generating the MO in the past and that there was not likely enough time at the
35 November 4th SHAC meeting to reconsider the MO.
- 36 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) acknowledged that he was new and had not been in
37 past discussions, but that his new set of eyes on this in combination with seeing the public
38 not happy led him to want to revisit the MO. He shared that he believed it was set too low.
39 He expressed a desire to learn why the GSA had set the desired outcome at the lowest
40 historical number, that it didn't make sense to him. He expressed feeling shocked when he
41 first saw how low the MO was set. Regarding the interim milestone action plan, he noted that



1 it would take a lot of work and wondered when that work would have to be done. C. Buck
2 (Butte County) answered the timing question, saying that the Interim Milestone Action Plan
3 could be added to the GSP, and that it would be just a paragraph describing the action plan,
4 but the plan itself would be developed during implementation. The first step would be to get
5 the plan adopted, and then afterwards tackle the development of an action plan.

- 6 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) stated that the hydrographs in the draft GSP are problematic
7 on many levels, and that one of his main concerns was that he didn't believe the hydrographs
8 had ever been presented to the SHAC. The graphs he recalled were all whisker graphs that
9 had to do with deciding how many shallow domestic wells they were willing to sacrifice in the
10 name of setting the MO. J. Brobeck further requested clarification on whether groundwater
11 levels would be measured during the spring or fall. Last, he wanted to recognize that water
12 code explains that an agency may establish MOs that exceed the reasonable margin of
13 operational flexibility for the purpose of improving overall conditions in the basin, and failure
14 to achieve those objectives would not be grounds for finding inadequacy in the plan. He
15 stated therefore that there was no reason not to set optimistic and progressive MOs. He
16 expressed a desire to have more detailed discussions illustrating the MO and Minimum
17 Threshold (MT) and stated that he did not think they had been properly vetted through the
18 SHAC.
- 19 • A. Dawson (domestic well user representative) explained that when MTs were originally
20 established it was with the view of a different data set that was solely based on the number
21 of domestic wells that would potentially go dry, and it felt to her that the hydrographs in the
22 draft GSP had been presented to the board and immediately passed without review by SHAC.
23 She expressed that it felt demoralizing. She spoke with concern about the Valley Oaks that
24 will not be sustained by the water depths, naming that those trees on her property have been
25 there since the 1950s and have never been watered, and that the thought of losing all of
26 those trees is devastating. She wants to review the data with some criterion like how many
27 valley oaks can be saved. A. Dawson noted that this available data is new and that she would
28 therefore push to review it and to have the alternatives C. Buck presented to be added to the
29 graphs. C. Buck addressed the Valley Oaks issue, noting that there is a disconnect between
30 using these wells and the observed water levels in them and then making that jump to
31 whether those water levels are representative of the shallow aquifer conditions and are
32 below the 80 ft and serve valley oaks. The wells were selected to be representative for
33 monitoring domestic wells, but that doesn't necessarily provide information about the
34 shallow aquifer, and there is a data gap there.
- 35 • B. Smith (business rep) noted that the hydrographs are very useful, but they don't tell us
36 where they are screened or how much water is coming in and from where. He emphasized
37 the importance of well logs. He shared that he had looked at 40-50 wells in the area, as well
38 as the data library from DWR, and that he did not like that the MTs are so far below where
39 the lows and highs are on these hydrographs, noting, "I think it's disastrous." He also



1 expressed concern that adjacent subbasin GSAs would look at what exists and if their MTs
 2 are higher than it could lead to significant issues. He reiterated that the MOs and MTs are far
 3 too low and that enough time hasn't been spent talking about them.
 4

5 Interim Milestone Action Plan Proposal presented by Kamie Loeser (Butte County)
 6 (00:49:03):

- 7 • Interim Milestone (IM) Action Plan
 - 8 ○ IM is a target value representing measurable groundwater conditions in increments
 9 of five years to demonstrate progress towards sustainability
 - 10 ▪ Show how the GSAs anticipate moving from a downward trending condition
 11 to an upward trending condition
- 12 • The Interim Milestone Action Plan (IMAP) would identify:
 - 13 ○ Local Triggers
 - 14 ▪ Determine conditions that trigger the implementation of specific PMAs that
 15 address each Sustainability Indicator
 - 16 ▪ X number of multiple dry year conditions,
 - 17 ▪ Project: Establish a reporting system (for dry wells, sediment in wells etc.)
- 18 • Projects and Actions:
 - 19 ○ Implementation of specific PMAs (with description of the MO that will benefit and
 20 move toward upward trending IM condition)
 - 21 ○ Short-term projects vs. long-term projects
 - 22 ▪ “Emergency” Drought response, i.e., drought
 - 23 ▪ County / GSA collaboration and interface during drought/emergency
 24 response

26 PMA Chapter: Paragraph in Section 5.1 Revisions received from Vina GSA and RCRD GSA
 27 Counsel Section 5.1 presented by C. Buck (Butte County)
 28 (Italics indicate additions to paragraph)

29 “The objective and purpose of the GSP is to achieve groundwater sustainability in the Vina
 30 Subbasin. *This will require projects and management actions aimed at avoiding undesirable*
 31 *results, achieving measurable objectives, and responding to changing conditions in the basin.*
 32 ~~This will require projects aimed at increasing water supplies and decreasing groundwater~~
 33 ~~dependence, as well as management actions designed to reduce groundwater demand.~~ The
 34 Vina GSA and the RCRD GSA have identified projects and management actions tailored to
 35 benefit the Vina Subbasin’s groundwater supply and quality for the benefit of rural areas,
 36 communities, agricultural users and the environment. The approach targets both *identifying*
 37 and increasing *alternative sources of supply* and reducing *groundwater demand*. The GSP
 38 identifies groundwater monitoring programs to monitor groundwater conditions, investigation
 39 of additional water sources to supplement the use of groundwater, and conservation and
 40 educational programs to reduce groundwater demand.

41
 42 SHAC Discussion (57:23)



- 1 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) asked how the IMAP would differ from what is already in place
2 according to SGMA, which is the requirement to update the GSP every five years. K. Loeser
3 (Butte County) responded that while this is in place, the IMAP would add more detail for the
4 interim milestones, so that specific triggers could be identified. K. Loeser likened it to the
5 Basin Management Objectives (BMOs), which had warning stages. This would be similar,
6 where certain triggers would be identified to ensure they are not continuing in a downward
7 trending line.
- 8 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) wanted to second what B. Smith said about needing to
9 know the screens of the monitoring wells. He noted that there isn't any useful screen
10 information for the entire North Vina Management Area, and that this information for such
11 a huge area is important. He added that especially if one of the objectives is to use the AEM
12 data, one must know the depth in question, and not just the depth of the wells but also the
13 screen depth. He added that he may have been mistaken, but that still, there exist only 2
14 wells with useful information for screens for the entire area. T. Greene also raised the issue
15 of water budget analysis and noted that the climate models being used both predict more
16 precipitation in the future. He wondered about the scenario where there is less precipitation
17 in the future and pointed out that this is not being considered. He also noted that there are
18 issues with the tables and the actual numbers. He called '10,000 acre feet/year' the magic
19 number and noted that it's a very significant number, in that people are putting a lot of weight
20 on it. He stated his hope is that there is justification for why that number is being used. T.
21 Caralone thanked T. Greene and asked the SHAC about their willingness to explore either
22 proposed alternatives for resetting the MO.
- 23 • J. Turner (Geosyntec) shared that the 10,000 acre feet number is not derived solely from the
24 model, but that it came from an average of many things, including groundwater levels going
25 down and considering where things would be in 2042 if nothing is done. J. Turner emphasized
26 that it would be incorrect to say that the number is derived solely from the model, and he
27 reminded the group that there was a presentation with the board to review different
28 scenarios and that's where the number was decided upon. S. Lewis (ag representative)
29 remembered that when the number 10,000 was discussed, C. Buck (Butte County) had said
30 that it was due to climate change and urban growth, and she reminded the group not to
31 forget about considering the role of urban growth.
- 32 • T. Caralone (facilitator) asked what information the SHAC would need in order to be able to
33 have a robust conversation at the November 4th meeting and come to a clearer
34 recommendation?
- 35 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) acknowledged that this should be addressed but expressed
36 concern about it being done at the November 4th meeting because of how long these
37 discussions would need to be. He reminded the SHAC that they had spent a great deal of time
38 already over many meetings. He also reminded SHAC that this is a work in progress and that
39 the purpose of the next few years would be to continue to look at what comes up over time.



1 He noted that there were varying views on climate change, and that while T. Greene thinks it
 2 will be drier and hotter, others think it might be cooler and more snow, with a higher water
 3 table. He concluded that the group would not be able to agree to this by November 4th.

- 4 • J. Brobeck (environmental representative) reflected that was having a difficult time with the
 5 question and shared that when he sees the hydrograph having a slow overall decline, he
 6 assumes that valley-wide water levels are dropping. He stated that he was grateful to now
 7 have Dr. Greene involved and wished he had been involved from the beginning. He expressed
 8 concern that the SHAC is spending so much time on the MOs and MTs, which he would like
 9 to see set higher, but doesn't see how to control that if the water levels continue to go
 10 downward.
- 11 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) expressed that he would like to entertain the idea of
 12 moving the MOs up and that he likes Alternative 1 because it is more in line with Butte
 13 Subbasin and also because it makes more sense to him as the desired level, which is the way
 14 it is defined for SGMA. He also acknowledged that he knew the 10,000 acre-foot number
 15 didn't only come from modeling but appreciated the acknowledgment that it partly did.
- 16 • S. Lewis (ag representative) stated that according to her understanding of SGMA, what the
 17 SHAC had done by setting the MO according to the 2030 made logical sense. She stated that
 18 comparing Vina to the Butte subbasin was not compelling because there many GSAs all doing
 19 things differently, and it would be best to stick to how the law was written.
- 20 • B. Smith (business representative) shared that because Butte Subbasin is the neighboring
 21 subbasin and buts up almost to Chico, it is particularly relevant. He cautioned that if Vina's
 22 MOs are too low and water comes to the contaminated plumes, the plumes could migrate.
 23 He expressed that he would want to raise the MO and look at new information. He
 24 reiterated that he wants to know where the wells are screened and which have available
 25 logs. He would need to know that information prior to the Nov 4th meeting. He has asked
 26 for that information many times. C. Buck (Butte County) responded that the information is
 27 available in Table 4-5 on page 132 of the plan. She noted that regarding the well logs, she
 28 has put it down as a top priority. While she cannot promise it will be available, she agrees
 29 that it is important information.

30
 31 SHAC voted on whether to leave MO where it is currently or examine MOs presented at the
 32 November 4th Meeting (1:26:23)

Yes	A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, Bruce, T. Greene
No	G. Sohnrey, S. Lewis, J. Parsley, Evan, C. Madden

33 *SHAC Discussion While Casting Votes*

- 34 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) expressed his wish to leave it because it's not something
 35 that can be accomplished by Nov. 4th.
- 36 • S. Lewis (ag representative) expressed her wish to leave it. She reiterated that one cannot
 37 compare Vina to Butte; it's apples to oranges.



- 1 • J. Parsley (ag representative) expressed that if it is a fluid document that can be changed
2 later, it would be better to get the document submitted and have more time to get
3 necessary information.
- 4 • A. Dawson (domestic well user representative) remained unconvinced that it is as flexible of
5 a document that they might wish. She expressed that there would be great resistance to
6 changing things once in place and that she would like to see more information on
7 Alternative 1 and wanted to see how it would look on the remainder of the hydrographs.
- 8 • J. Brobeck (environmental representative) asked a clarifying question, would the MO
9 measurement be taking place at the top or the bottom of the hydrograph? In other words,
10 would the measurement take place in the spring, summer, or fall? C. Buck (Butte County)
11 answered that she preferred spring measurements because they are more stable on a
12 flatter portion of the hydrograph after recovery that occurs in the fall and through the
13 winter. J. Turner (Geosyntec) agreed with C. Buck that the level desired is after the recharge
14 occurs, which is in the spring. He concluded that they would be looking at both because
15 over the course of the year, he would want to ensure that the levels stay around the right
16 mark, but that the spring would be more important than the fall. C. Buck explained that the
17 reason they hadn't created total clarity around whether spring or fall was because it would
18 never land right on the line, but would be above and below during different seasons, but
19 she agreed that creating clarity would be helpful.
- 20 • J. Brobeck (environmental representative) affirmed that he was in favor of revisiting the MO.
21 • B. Smith (business rep) voted that he wished to raise the MO to Alternative 1, and he added
22 that he assumed whatever would be written in the GSP would be difficult to change later.
23 • E. Markey (Cal Water) stated that J. Parsley had articulated his stance perfectly, and that
24 because it is a living document, there would be opportunity to change it moving forward.
25 • C. Madden (Butte College) agreed that it should not be changed from 2030, but he added a
26 caveat that he agreed with much of what was said. He thought it would be important at the
27 5-year review to look at the effect of the MO selected on the overall aquifer capacity, and
28 that depending on that, he may want to move it up to Alternative 1 or 2.
29 • T. Greene expressed desire to raise the MO to Alternative 1.
30 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) noted that one of the PMA's S. Lewis had submitted
31 suggested that farmers could take up to two years to replant their orchards, and in light of
32 that, it occurred to her that if she were a farmer, she would want to know in the fall if there
33 were some kind of problem, maybe with a trigger being instituted, so that she could plan for
34 the spring.
35 • S. Lewis (ag representative) responded by asking A. Dawson to please not confuse her
36 proposed project for being indicative of how farmers plant. She explained that it takes years
37 of planning to remove an orchard and to replace the orchard. One must order multiple years
38 in advance in order for nurseries to be able to grow the trees, so farmers planting in the spring
39 wanting to know by the fall would not make any sense. Farmers actually need to know



1 multiple years in advance if they are going to plant because it takes that long to grow trees in
2 a nursery and to order them.

- 3 • T. Carlone (facilitator) announced that the vote was 5 – 4, with 5 who feel it's best to leave it
4 where it is, and 4 who would like to further explore it and would like to Alternative 1. She
5 turned to the Management Committee, noting that there were SHAC members who wanted
6 to look at the numbers, and proposing that maybe it would be good to provide more
7 information so SHAC could have another look at this on November 4th. T. Carlone reminded
8 C. Buck (Butte County) that it is not a majority rule body, so perhaps what would make sense
9 is to bring the information to the November 4th meeting, do a roll call to hear what people
10 have to say, and then bring that to the Vina GSA board.
- 11 • S. Lewis (ag representative) asked how SHAC is not a majority rule body, and also asked what
12 would be the point of bringing this question back on November 4th for more discussion just
13 to have another 5-4 vote. T. Carlone (facilitator) reminded her that they could amend the
14 charter if the SHAC wished to change their decision-making rule.
- 15 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) stated that he too believed it was majority rule.
- 16 • S. Lewis (ag representative) requested that legal counsel weigh in the question of whether or
17 not it is a majority rule body, citing that a vote is taken every time on whether to approve
18 meeting minutes. T. Carlone (facilitator) explained that minutes are approved through
19 consensus, not majority rule, and that when someone proposes a change to the minutes, they
20 work to reflect the change to get it to a level of accuracy and acceptance by the whole group.
- 21 • S. Lewis (ag representative) reminded the group that this is a Brown Act body, stating that a
22 Brown Act body cannot be run through consensus and that it is a majority rule group.
- 23 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) expressed agreement with S. Lewis. K. Loeser responded,
24 reminding the group that the Brown Act is about noticing responsibilities, specifically public
25 noticing. K. Loeser recalled that the idea of voting in the SHAC was so that if the board wanted
26 to reflect back to see how the SHAC was leaning on one issue or another, they could see it
27 based on “a vote,” but it was not for the purpose of making the SHAC a majority voting body.
28 K. Loeser (Butte County) emphasized that it was not written up that way, but that it could be
29 changed in the future. She noted that with regard to examining an Alternative, it would be
30 important to take into consideration the public comments on the document, specifically the
31 many concerns expressed about the MO. K. Loeser also offered to verify the questions raised
32 with legal counsel.
- 33 • S. Lewis (ag representative) reiterated that if SHAC is committed to this process, they should
34 adhere to that 5-4 decision, and it should be presented to the GSA for the GSA to make the
35 decision about whether to pursue staff time for looking at it. She recalled that in the past, the
36 process has been to send SHAC's thoughts to the GSA for the GSA to make a decision, but
37 now what is happening is we are making a decision and then it will go back to us for a decision
38 before it goes to the GSA. That's not the process.



- 1 • T. Carbone (Facilitator) suggested that we return to who wanted the GSA to consider changing
2 the MO and asked if they felt that their views had been well enough expressed with enough
3 information for it to be adequately considered by the board.
4 • B. Smith (business rep) answered that he wished to see more hydrographs because he would
5 need to see how the current MO is on the other graphs and how the proposed is. He noted
6 that this is aside from the need to have access to those electric logs, which is separate issue,
7 regardless of whether the MO is changed. He expressed a need to at least review the
8 information, in order to make an informed recommendation to the board.
9 • J. Parsley (ag representative) stated that more information would not lead her to change her
10 mind. She clarified that this did not mean that things should not be looked at, but she did not
11 like the idea of trying to gather a great deal of information to only talk about it for three
12 hours.
13 • A. Dawson (domestic well user representative) stated that she probably would not change
14 her mind either, but that she did feel it was very important to see more information. She
15 emphasized that the whole plan hinges on the MT and the MO, and that four of the
16 undesirable results are based on that. There is so much new information that has come out
17 since these decisions were made and the group never sat down to review those hydrographs.
18 She requested the information in an email so that they could review it and send in their
19 opinion, so that they wouldn't have to talk about it in the meeting, and she apologized to S.
20 Lewis for presuming to tell her about her business, clarifying that it was not her intent. She
21 stated that she is a believer in, 'forewarned and forearmed,' and hoped she would accept her
22 apology.
23 • T. Carbone (facilitator) responded that since SHAC is an advisory committee seated by a board,
24 even if it is a short item, they would need to agendize it at the next meeting so that they could
25 weigh in in a public forum, but it would not need to take up the three hour meeting. T. Carbone
26 reminded the group that is a public information effort and that having those hydrographs
27 available could be very beneficial to people's understanding of this plan and how
28 groundwater is going to be managed.
29 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) stated that his opinion would not change, but did think
30 they needed to do the hydrographs again. He pointed out that it wouldn't be a lot of work;
31 it's a relatively simple statistical exercise. Once that was done, he believed the board would
32 have more than enough information. He suggested that the board knows how the public feels
33 and knows that the SHAC is split.
34 • J. Brobeck (environmental representative) stated that he looked forward to another
35 opportunity to try to convince his colleagues who think that these MOs are reasonable. He
36 wanted to remind them that SGMA water code said that margin of flexibility can be set to
37 improve the conditions and there is no penalty for failing to meet those objectives. He does
38 not see any downside to setting them high. He believes the SHAC needs to respond to the



1 public's concern about these unreasonably low MOs, set below historic lows. He hopes for an
2 opportunity to talk about the MTs as well.

- 3 • Darrin Rice (Rep from Rock Creek Reclamation District) weighed in that the MOs and MTs
4 took hundreds of hours of consideration and are responsible. He believes that changing the
5 MO to historic levels beyond 2015 levels would be very expensive. He added that there are
6 data gaps that could be filled in, but he would like the plan to stay the way it is.
- 7 • T. Carbone reminded the group that this is the last day of the public comment period. On
8 November 4th the SHAC would see a compilation of the public comments received on the
9 draft GSP and would not be able to spend the three hours on the MO because it will be
10 important to look at the comments. This would therefore be a short item and could be an
11 opportunity for the public, this body, and the board to see more information. Then the SHAC
12 could go through the roll call again, and if it remains the same, all that would have happened
13 is the SHAC would all have been provided with more information. T. Carbone reiterated that
14 in her role she is doing her best to listen to everyone and to find a common pathway to move
15 forward. C. Buck responded that this seemed reasonable and that they would work up the
16 hydrographs.

17 SHAC votes on whether to review draft language of new PMA: Interim Milestone Action Plan on
18 November 4th (2:05:25)

Yes	A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, B. Smith, T. Greene, E. Markey, C. Madden
No	G. Sohnrey, S. Lewis
Abstain	J. Parsley

19 *SHAC Discussion While Casting Votes*

- 20 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) voted no because it is already in the plan, and he does not
21 want to bring up the Interim Milestone Action Plan on Nov 4th because there is too much to
22 bring up as it is.
- 23 • S. Lewis (ag representative) voted no because it would just be repeating what is already in
24 the document.
- 25 • J. Parsley (ag representative) voted to abstain because she did not know enough to say yes
26 or no.
- 27 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) voted yes.
- 28 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) noted that much can happen in one year, and five years may
29 be too long. He said that in general, he would be inclined to vote yes and was curious to hear
30 from T. Greene.
- 31 • B. Smith (business rep) voted yes.
- 32 • E. Markey (Cal Water) voted yes.
- 33 • C. Madden (Butte College) voted yes.
- 34 • T. Greene (CSU Chico) voted yes.

35 SHAC Votes on Proposed Revisions to PMA Chapter (2:10:00)



- 1 • First, Aidan Wallace (Legal Counsel), provided background, noting that the first sentence
 2 added comes directly from the SGMA regulations and is probably more in line with what DWR
 3 is looking for. He also noted that they added a few words to more explicitly state that you
 4 have the demand knob and the supply knob.

Yes	G. Sohnrey, S. Lewis, J. Parsley, A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, B. Smith, E. Markey, C. Madden, T. Greene
-----	---

Abstain	J. Brobeck
---------	------------

5 *SHAC Discussion While Casting Votes*

- 6 • B. Smith (business representative) asked if “reducing groundwater demand,” refers to this
 7 area or from the entirety of California?

8 *Public Comment (2:13:15)*

- 9 • A member of the public noted that in general she supported the Interim Milestone Action
 10 Plan because it speaks to her concern that there was no statement about what kind of actions
 11 would be taken if a downward trend was occurring toward the MT. She stated her full support
 12 for raising the MT. She also spoke to the question of the fluidity of the document, noting that
 13 Amer Hussein (Geosyntec) had referenced that topic and said that even in districts already in
 14 severe overdraft, it has been relatively impossible to get those numbers changed. She
 15 emphasized that many people in the public workshops spoke in opposition to that MT, and
 16 she wondered if there is a count of how many letters have been received and whether there
 17 was a calculation of how many people objected to that number. T. Carlone (facilitator)
 18 answered that since today is the last day of public comment, the staff would be compiling all
 19 the comments and bringing them to the SHAC at the next meeting on November 4th.

20 6. *Public and SHAC Comment on Items Not On Agenda (2:20:43)*

- 21 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) noted that on line 308, he wished to add the word “possibly”
 22 in front of “required” because it’s an estimate, and the 10,000 acre feet number could go up
 23 and down. He also asked a clarifying question, in the paragraph in lines 313-318, does it refer
 24 to groundwater pumping for domestic or agricultural use? C. Buck (Butte County) responded
 25 that even though it is wetter from a precipitation standpoint, the changed climate is
 26 expected to have higher Evapotranspiration rates (ET) so that drives a higher agricultural
 27 groundwater demand even with increased water efficiency.
- 28 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) emphasized that there is a lot in this plan that is based on
 29 climate change which is not everybody’s point of view. Also, in line 5206, he noted a possible
 30 error of a zero instead of a comma.
- 31 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) noted that in figure ES-10, it says there are supposed
 32 to be 17 wells in the map, he noted only 16. On page 30, line 1423, it says “in figure 2-6, the
 33 reddish colored area represents out crops,” but the figure doesn’t have a reddish colored
 34 area.



- 1 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) added that some of the features about the Chico
2 Monocline are incorrect and that he would add that in a follow up email. Some of the bigger,
3 more significant issues, like I mentioned about the water estimate in the water budget,
4 referring to table 2-7, “water budget summary” – those numbers don’t equal the total
5 inflow. For example, the surface water inflows, that is an accumulation of everything that is
6 underneath it, outside diversions all the way to applied water returns. Also, in table 2-8, the
7 total number 838-acre feet per year, it wasn’t clear how that number was derived. C. Buck
8 (Butte County) responded that they were working with some old tables that were supposed
9 to be traded out and thanked T. Greene for pointing out the inaccuracies.
- 10 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) added that for the MTs, the language states two
11 consecutive non-dry years, which means if there weren’t two consecutive non-dry years,
12 there wouldn’t be a trigger. It read a little bit like a loophole. C. Buck (Butte County)
13 responded that this topic had been discussed extensively and revisited it with the GSA
14 boards, and that is the direction they’ve given at this point.
- 15 • T. Greene (CSU Chico representative) suggested that the uncertainty with the water budgets
16 is not adequately addressed in the GSP. He does not know how uncertain the numbers are
17 that are presented or which factors are causing the most uncertainty. He would appreciate
18 having a percentage. He also raised the issue of the data gaps around the need for the
19 shallow wells. He referenced that the groundwater quality monitoring locations for the
20 entire North Vina Water Management area is one well and he wondered whether that was
21 enough and asked about that well’s screening information? He wondered if that was enough
22 information about water quality for the entire Management Area? He also pointed out a
23 discrepancy between the text and the figures in 5-1 and 5-2.
- 24 • A. Dawson (domestic well user representative) added concern that she does not understand
25 how the MT was established for North and South Vina Management Areas. Was there a
26 percentage of wells included in that? She noted that if she cannot figure it out, how would
27 a member of the public sort that out? She pointed out line 275 in the executive summary
28 table 1, in conjunction with the appendices, the margin of operational flexibility in North
29 Vina is around 80 ft in several of these wells, and she stated that it seems excessive and that
30 if they were to get anywhere close to that, she could not imagine how they would remediate
31 impacts. Last, she noted that in the Vina Chico Management Area well numbering, the
32 numbers in table ES-1 are different from the numbers in appendix 3A, and she asked if these
33 were different wells. C. Buck (Butte County) responded that she identified that discrepancy
34 as well. The intent is to have 4 Cal Water wells and 1 other monitoring well. C. Buck said that
35 they would fix the error.
- 36 • J. Brobeck (environmental representative) pointed out that the MT, the quantitative
37 threshold for sustainability indicator, is defined as ‘when the undesirable results may begin
38 to occur.’ He expressed his opinion that the designated MTs are the most egregious violation
39 of common sense in the whole GSP. He explained that undesirable results begin to occur



1 even before these historic low levels, such as domestic well failures, destruction at
2 ecosystems, and more.

- 3 • B. Smith (business representative) said that when he read about the two consecutive non-
4 dry years, he noticed the same problem, in that it provides a loophole. He also noted how
5 helpful it was to have the plan printed out and expressed appreciation to whomever did
6 that.

7 *Public Comment (2:45:03)*

- 8 • A member of the public noted that she sees the same names on the Butte County Board of
9 Supervisors as she does on the Vina GSA, as well as other agencies, and that it seems heavily
10 slanted in favor of agricultural interests. She says it feels like things are just getting pushed
11 through.
- 12 • A member of the public expressed that she remains concerned that information has not
13 been thoroughly vetted and then presented to the Vina GSA Board for voting. It happened
14 previously when the hydrology maps were changed and there were different measurements
15 used, and that was never vetted through the SHAC. She is also concerned about the MTs and
16 MOs being too low. She is concerned about the 10,000 acre feet water budget, how that was
17 arrived at. She is also concerned about the undue influence of the Rock Creek Reclamation
18 District on the Vina GSA Board when joint meetings are held, and even today when Mr. Rice
19 was allowed to speak, she is not sure in what role he was speaking, but she believes it should
20 be as a member of the public. She stated that she would like to have that clarified. She
21 remains concerned that there are no triggering conditions to initiate conservation or
22 demand reduction. She is also concerned that the drought has had no forbearance on this
23 process because what happens in 2 years or even 1 year if there is still drought? She remains
24 concerned about the lack of current well data and its timeliness. She believes there needs
25 to be better coordination between agencies and that more information is needed about
26 water rights and SGMA credits, as in, who is receiving them now and how does it work? She
27 remains concerned that there is no mention of the groundwater markets that are being
28 discussed throughout the state, and that there is no mention of this in the GSP.
- 29 • K. Loeser clarified on behalf of the Management Committee, with regard to participation
30 from Rock Creek and asking for Darren's opinion, that was because the thought was for the
31 SHAC to get a sense of Rock Creek's position, which would help understand the influence on
32 some of the decisions at the board level, since both boards need to approve the plan.
- 33 • K. Peterson added that both public workshop recordings from 10/4 and 10/13 are available
34 online.
- 35 • C. Buck (Butte County) added that the SHAC will meet again on 11/4. There will be a joint
36 meeting of the Rock Creek and Vina and GSA boards on 11/15. Between 11/15 – 12/15, any
37 final revisions will be made to the plan, and then they will consider a resolution to approve



1 the final GSP at a joint board meeting on 12/15, and it will all be submitted to DWR by the
2 January 31, 2022 regulatory deadline.

3 **Next Steps**

4 The SHAC will meet again via video conference on November 4th from 1:30-4:30, and the
5 following meeting after that will be February 15, 2022

DRAFT



1 Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) Members		
Anne Dawson	Domestic well user	Y
Bruce Smith	Business representative	Y
Christopher Madden	Butte College	Y
Evan Markey	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	Y
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Joanne Parsley	Agricultural well user	Y
Sam Goepp	Domestic well user	N
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	Y
Todd Greene	CSU Chico	Y
Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Representatives		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Kamie Loeser	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Erik Gustafson	City of Chico	N
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	N
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Darren Rice	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
Technical Consultants		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y
Other Representatives		
Pat Vellines	CA Department of Water Resources	Y
Aiden Wallace	Vina GSA attorney	Y
Facilitator		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y

2 Approximately 13 members of the public attended the meeting.