



## Meeting Brief

- The Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) met virtually on July 20, 2021 [[Access Recording Here](#)].
- **Projects and Management Actions (PMAs):** The SHAC received an overview and provided input on the PMA draft chapter. SHAC members provided recommendations to the Vina GSA Board on project ranking and PMAs for inclusion in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The public had an opportunity to provide comment [[Access PMA Draft Chapter Here](#); [Access PMA Presentation](#)].
- **Implementation Chapter:** The SHAC discussed the draft Implementation Chapter outline and considered recommendations on implementation components [[Access Slides Here](#)]. The public had an opportunity to provide comment. The Management Committee will hold a special meeting to discuss the inter-basin coordination framework and make recommendations on inter-basin coordination priorities for the Vina Subbasin.
- **Next Meetings:** The SHAC will reconvene for a special meeting on August 2, 2021, focused on inter-basin coordination. The SHAC will meet again on August 17, 2021, from 9:00-12:30.

## Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
• Revise June Vina SHAC notes, incorporating SHAC input.	CBI & Management Committee	
• Maintain the period for public comment for items not on the agenda at the beginning of future meetings.	CBI & Management Committee	Ongoing
• Share a map of underserved communities in the Vina Subbasin.	Management Committee	
• Share information on the PMAs pursued in the Colusa Subbasin related to new well construction.	CBI & Management Committee	
• Schedule special meeting on Inter-basin Coordination.	CBI & Management Committee	<a href="#">[Access recording and materials here]</a>
• Share with the SHAC information related to land-use to be included in the GSP Chapters Further, they asked about how much information related to land-use will be included in the chapter.	Linda Herman, City of Chico	
• Revise draft implementation timeline and release draft Implementation Chapter for review by the end of July.	Technical Team & Management Committee	
• Post July SHAC meeting recording on the website.	CBI & Management Committee	<a href="#">[Access here]</a>



## 1 Summary

2 The Vina SHAC met on July 20, 2021, via video conference, as a result of COVID-19. Participants  
3 included Vina SHAC members, GSA member agency staff, technical consultants, representatives  
4 from the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR), and members of the public. Below is a  
5 summary of key themes and next steps discussed at the meeting. This document is not intended  
6 to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the group's  
7 discussions. The video-conference meeting recording is available on the Vina GSA website  
8 [\[Access Here\]](#).

9

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

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

13

### 14 *SHAC Comments*

15 Some SHAC members would like to maintain the period for public comment for items not on the  
16 agenda at the beginning of meeting agendas, instead of at the end. The facilitation team and  
17 Management Committee will ensure said public comment period is incorporated at the top of  
18 future meeting agendas. In addition, the facilitator will continue to include public comment  
19 periods following each agenda item.

20

### 21 2. Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) Draft Chapter Overview & Recommendations 22 (00:13:02)

23 A. Hussain (Geosyntec) provided an overview and input on the PMA draft chapter. SHAC  
24 members drafted recommendations to the Vina GSA Board on project ranking and PMAs for  
25 inclusion in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The public had an opportunity to provide  
26 comment [\[Access PMA Draft Chapter Here\]](#); [Access PMA Presentation\]](#).

27

28 The PMA Chapter first describes the process to identify projects, the expected benefits, how  
29 those projects would be measured, how the projects contribute to the Measurable Objectives  
30 (MO), existing regulatory processes, proposed timing and schedule, legal authority, costs, and  
31 funding availability. The level of detail included in the chapter depends on the amount of  
32 information submitted by the project proponents. In addition, A. Hussein emphasized the role of  
33 the GSA may vary by project; for example, the GSA may be leading a project or just provide  
34 coordination and oversight.

35

36 The table below outlines the proposed project prioritization, as presented during the meeting. It  
37 includes project description, proponent, anticipated acre-feet of annual water gains, and status  
38 (planned, potential, or conceptual). The ranking of projects was included due to existing funding  
39 requirements; yet, the proposed ranking may change with evolving circumstances, such as  
40 funding availability or changing conditions.

41



1 Table 1. Project ranking as presented during the 7/20 meeting

Priority	Project Description	Proponent	Acre-Feet	Planned/Potential
1	Agricultural Irrigation Efficiency	Vina GSA, AGUBC, Farm Bureau	4,000	Planned
2	Flood-MAR	Vina GSA, RCRD GSA	3,000	Planned
3	Residential Conservation	California Water Service	100	Planned
4	Paradise Irrigation District Intertie Project	Paradise Irrigation District (PID)	5,000	Planned
5	Additional Water to Creeks and Streams	Vina GSA	1,000	Planned
6	Agricultural Surface Water Supplies	Vina GSA	2,000	Potential
7	Extend Orchard Redevelopment	Vina GSA	2,000	Potential
8	Recharge from the Miocene Canal	Butte County	2,000	Potential
9	Recycled Wastewater	City of Chico	5,000	Potential
10	Community Education Initiative	CSU	TBD	Potential
11	Rangeland Management	CSU	TBD	Potential
12	Fuel Management for Watershed Health	Chico State Enterprise	TBD	Potential
13	Removal of Invasive Species	Chico State Enterprise	TBD	Potential
<b>Total</b>			<b>24,100</b>	
<b>Total Planned</b>			<b>15,000</b>	

2  
3 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- 4
- 5 • S. Lewis (ag representative) wondered how the anticipated water gains were predicted or calculated, particularly related to item #3 Residential Conservation. A. Hussain (Geosyntec) shared estimates come from the project proponents. D. Kehn (CalWater) clarified the anticipated savings comes from past data and estimates, devices handed out, and projects implemented. S. Lewis suggested changing the prioritization and move project #9 Recycled Wastewater to the top of the Potential Project list.
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10 • D. Kehn (CalWater) pointed out discrepancies between the table above and the draft chapter:
  - 11
  - 12 ○ Project #4 Paradise Irrigation District Intertie Project should be listed as potential;
  - 13 further, in the table PID is listed as the proponent, while the chapter lists CalWater



- 1 as the proponent. The entity listed as proponent could impact funding  
 2 opportunities.
- 3 ○ Supports prioritizing large projects but would like to maintain “low-hanging fruit”  
 4 project listed (e.g., tightening outdoor residential consumption).
- 5 ○ Supports moving #9 Recycled Wastewater upward and suggested listing the Vina  
 6 GSA as the proponent.
- 7 ○ Suggests only ranking planned projects and not proposed or conceptual projects.
- 8 • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) offered various recommendations:
- 9 ○ Supports moving #9 Recycled Wastewater to the top of the proposed projects  
 10 (above #6).
- 11 ○ Ensure the proponent for #10 Community Education Initiative and #11 Rangeland  
 12 Management is correctly listed as CSU Chico.
- 13 ○ Include stronger language to indicate responsible party for leading the project,  
 14 and then include additional stakeholders or partners.
- 15 ○ Exclude the community monitoring program (6.2.5) from chapter, since it is  
 16 duplicative and can fall under the umbrella of #10 Community Education Initiative.
- 17 ○ Many recommendations outlined in #10 are not technically within the subbasin.
- 18 K. Peterson (Butte County) clarified the intent of the project is to follow a molecule  
 19 of water throughout its course from the upper watershed until it infiltrates into  
 20 the groundwater within the subbasin boundaries. C. Chastain supports the idea if  
 21 stakeholders in those areas are also engaged.
- 22 ○ Suggests reaching out to the Rangeland Management project proponents to  
 23 ensure the strategies also fall within the subbasin boundary. The Management  
 24 Committee clarified that the GSA can support projects outside subbasin, as long  
 25 as the GSA shows the value to the subbasin.
- 26 • S. Goepf (domestic well user) emphasized the amount of water released from the Chico  
 27 wastewater facility into the Sacramento River could instead be treated and reused. A.  
 28 Hussain shared that all projects need a proponent for inclusion in the plan. K. Loeser  
 29 (Durham Irrigation District) appreciated the innovative approach and highlighted the  
 30 wastewater treatment plan has to discharge a certain amount of water back into the  
 31 Sacramento River per contract. Further, L. Herman (City of Chico) shared it would be  
 32 expensive to transport treated water back to the city and the facility would need to be  
 33 upgraded to tertiary treatment.
- 34 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) raised concerns with all recharge projects, including  
 35 projects #2 Flood-MAR, #4 Paradise Irrigation District Intertie Project, #6 Agricultural  
 36 Surface Water Supplies, and #8 Recharge from the Miocene Canal. He is concerned with  
 37 the legal consequences of recharge, particularly since he has been following closely the  
 38 development of the Tuscan Water District, which could plan to account for and claim the  
 39 supplemental recharged water.
- 40 ○ Would like the SHAC to receive additional information regarding the development  
 41 and intent behind the formation of the Tuscan Water District, which will be based  
 42 on a per-acre voting system.



- 1           ○ Would like to remove the PID project from the plan, as it is very controversial. He
- 2           expressed concern with potential negative impacts (e.g., further aquifer
- 3           exploitation, depressurization, and potential leakage) and believes experimental
- 4           recharge projects may provide false hopes if not backed up by science.
- 5           ○ Suggests prioritizing the projects that do not have such serious legal consequences
- 6           and would like to move #7 Extend Orchard Redevelopment higher up in the list.
- 7       • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) shared not all projects may be prioritized at this stage,
- 8       without further discussion with the project proponents and potential beneficiaries. He
- 9       has seen the recharge strategies outlined in the plan work in the past, such as bringing in
- 10       surface water supplies during wet years to minimize groundwater use and maximize
- 11       recharge. He suggested making decisions based on research and evaluation.
- 12       • S. Lewis (ag representative) offered various suggestions:
  - 13           ○ Move away from identifying which strategies to approve/disapprove, and instead
  - 14           outlining conditions and considerations per project. The SHAC had previously
  - 15           shared their preference to move away from projects with complex legal
  - 16           implications where issues of ownership may be affected.
  - 17           ○ Concerned with urban growth and would like to strengthen management actions
  - 18           to discuss pathways for growth without increasing water consumption.
  - 19           ○ Ensure the introduction to the chapter accurately characterizes the SHAC had
  - 20           discussions related to PMA ranking during the July meeting, not June.
- 21       • G. Cole (ag representative) would like recharge projects to be prioritized less and
- 22       emphasize the intent to evaluate legal implications. He stated #8 is still very preliminary
- 23       and has the potential to bring water in from Feather River to new parts of the subbasin.
- 24       The 2,000 acre-feet may not be accurate, and the GSA should further evaluate its benefits.
- 25       • B. Smith (business rep) was confused with the inconsistencies between the table and the
- 26       chapter and would like to include additional model updates and model runs. C. Buck
- 27       (Butte County) clarified those updates will be part of the Implementation Chapter.

**1. Recommendation to GSA Board: The SHAC recommends not prioritizing potential projects.**

Vote	SHAC Members
In support	<i>G. Sohnrey, S. Lewis, G. Cole, S. Goepf, D. Kehn, C. Chastain</i>
Abstain	<i>A. Dawson, J. Brobeck, B. Smith, C. Madden, and B. Smith</i>

**Some SHAC Members would like to outline detailed concerns and considerations for individual projects to the Board.**

- 33       • A. Dawson (domestic well user) suggested adding a blanket recommendation to ban all
- 34       projects that would lead to out-of-basin water transfers. She would like to move items
- 35       #10 Community Education Initiative, #11 Rangeland Management, #12 Fuel Management
- 36       of Watershed Health, and #13 Removal of Invasive Species higher up
- 37       and suggested removing the PID project, due to concerns related to water transfers.
- 38       • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) suggested revisiting this recommendation with more time.



- 1 • C. Madden (Butte College) agreed the discussion would require more time and  
2 particularly would like the legal implications clearly outlined in the chapter. The SHAC  
3 could invite project proponents to present details, answer questions, and address  
4 concerns.
- 5 • D. Kehn (CalWater) worried that without more specific information about the project and  
6 scope, the SHAC may get trapped in endless hypotheticals. He suggested removing the  
7 PID project from the table, since it is in initial stages of planning and may not be relevant.
- 8 • B. Smith (business rep) would like additional time to look at the hydrogeologic makeup of  
9 the subbasin to identify concern and considerations.
- 10 • G. Cole (ag representative) would like to have legal counsel's perspective and would not  
11 like to move forward without a clear understanding of the implications of pursuing  
12 recharge projects.
- 13 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative) highlighted all projects need to be evaluated in detail. He  
14 would like to have the proponent participate in SHAC meetings to inform the discussion.  
15 He expressed concerns regarding the SGMA process in general, as SHAC members have  
16 been asked to digest too much information at once and make decisions without sufficient  
17 time to fully comprehend the implications.
- 18 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) encouraged a more detailed discussion with legal counsel  
19 present. He is concerned with accounting for changes in groundwater conditions. Further,  
20 J. Brobeck raised concerns with the discrepancies between the information presented in  
21 the chapter and the table, particularly related to the expected benefits from the orchard  
22 redevelopment (the table in the presentation states 2,000 acre-feet, while the chapter  
23 lists 4K-8K acre-feet).
- 24 • S. Goepf (domestic well user) did not feel the discussion would be worthwhile without  
25 more detailed information. He supports the idea of developing certain conditions.
- 26 • S. Lewis (ag representative) encouraged public engagement and would like to continue to  
27 be part of the process as the conversations evolve and projects are developed.

#### 28 **Public Comments:**

- 29 • A member of the public complemented SHAC for rich discussion. He echoed concerns that  
30 the PID project was inaccurately characterized as planned. The correct description would be  
31 listed as potential. He would like the chapter to better characterize the criteria followed to  
32 analyze and prioritize projects. Lastly, he supports the recommendation to only rank the  
33 planned projects, not the potential.

#### 34 **Management Actions (01:40:10)**

35 Geosyntec presented the table of proposed management actions below and asked for the SHAC's  
36 feedback. Particularly, the consulting team and Management Committee sought SHAC's  
37 recommendations to the Vina GSA Board of Supervisors on whether all the proposed  
38 management actions should be included as well as on the proposed prioritization. C. Buck (Butte  
39 County) emphasized staff would like greater clarity regarding the top priorities the SHAC would  
40 like to pursue after adoption.



1

Priority	Action	Lead Agency
1	Update Butte County & City of Chico General Plan	Butte County
2	Domestic Well Mitigation	Vina GSA and RCRD GSA
3	Amend the Well Permitting Ordinance	Butte County
4	Landscape Ordinance	Butte County & City of Chico
5	Prohibit Ski Lakes	Butte County & Vina GSA
6	Promote expansion of service area of water purveyors	Vina GSA
7	Large Well Moratorium	Butte County
8	Groundwater Allocation	Vina GSA & RCRD GSA

2

3 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- 4 • G. Sohnrey (ag representative):
  - 5 ○ Would like to review amendments to the well permitting ordinance.
  - 6 ○ Supports including domestic well mitigation.
  - 7 ○ Does not support including the large well moratorium in the list, as it seems
  - 8 intrusive on landowners’ rights. From his experience, some orchards use larger
  - 9 wells than others, without necessarily using more water. It is often more efficient
  - 10 to use one larger well, instead of three smaller wells.
  - 11 ○ Suggests removing groundwater allocations.
- 12 • D. Kehn (CalWater) had questions regarding #6 the expansion of service area, since Chico
- 13 is already fully on groundwater. K. Peterson (Butte County) clarified the management
- 14 action would provide more reliability to domestic well users that are currently not
- 15 connected to municipal service providers. So, that domestic well owners relying on
- 16 vulnerable or shallow wells could access a different supply if needed.
- 17 • A. Dawson (domestic well user) had a few suggestions:
  - 18 ○ Include #6 as a component of #2, Domestic Well Mitigation to include a survey to
  - 19 identify domestic wells that may be better served by other water supplies/water
  - 20 providers.
  - 21 ○ Consider additional regulations for swimming pools (e.g., maximum volume,
  - 22 requirements for automatic pool covers to avoid evaporation).
  - 23 ○ In terms of the large-scale moratorium, focus instead on improving well
  - 24 permitting, including strategies used in other counties (i.e., requiring test wells to
  - 25 be dug to assess how a new well is going to impact existing wells).
  - 26 ○ Concerned with requiring domestic well owners to dig wells below the MT would
  - 27 place undue economic burden on them, particularly given the MT approved by the
  - 28 GSA Boards was 20, 30 ft below the ones originally reviewed by the SHAC.
  - 29 ○ Tighten language regarding domestic well mitigation and be more specific about
  - 30 plans to evaluate which vulnerable domestic wells are active or not. Clarify what
  - 31 is meant by “sustainable wells” with data and information.



- 1           ○ Include engagement with underserved communities, which would make the
- 2           subbasin more eligible for state funding.
- 3       • C. Chastain (CSU Chico) supports A. Dawson’s suggestion to embed #6 into #2 and offer
- 4       additional suggestions:
- 5           ○ Reword #6, as it is not necessarily reducing groundwater extractions.
- 6           ○ Define the diameter for the large production wells under #7 and focusing on
- 7           reevaluating the permitting process. C. Buck clarified large diameter wells are
- 8           defined as 8 inches or more and the amendments mentioned would be included
- 9           under item #3. C. Chastain (CSU Chico) would be in favor of removing #7.
- 10          ○ The general plan updates need to be the top priority, especially because the city
- 11          of Chico and the County are currently in the process of making some general
- 12          updates, which include climate adaptation and resiliency strategies. Water is
- 13          going to be a key climate strategy.
- 14       • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) highlighted recent experiences in Glenn County regarding
- 15       their large well moratoriums.
- 16           ○ Appreciated G. Sohnrey’s comments regarding the challenges with using large well
- 17           moratoriums as an effort to manage groundwater use.
- 18           ○ Encouraged strategies to prevent the expansion of irrigated agriculture into
- 19           grazing land.
- 20           ○ Concerned with requiring well drillers to install well screens below the depth
- 21           specified in the Minimum Thresholds (MT) and lowering the required depth for
- 22           wells screens, given what happened in the San Joaquin Valley with wells screened
- 23           at multiple layers of the aquifer. Once the lower aquifer was depressurized, the
- 24           upper layers leaked into the lower screens. Thus, J. Brobeck suggested pursuing
- 25           scientific investigations to prevent similar issues from occurring in the subbasin.
- 26       • S. Lewis (ag representative):
- 27           ○ Some management actions (e.g., moratoriums or groundwater allocations) may
- 28           lead to unintended consequences and may lead people to rush to increase their
- 29           pumping or convert rangelands into irrigated land before restrictions get
- 30           implemented.
- 31           ○ Need to clarify the difference between disadvantaged communities versus
- 32           unrepresented communities.
- 33           ○ Outline specific details to incorporate into the well ordinances.

*Recommendations*

**Recommendation 2: Remove #7 Large Well Moratorium**

Vote	SHAC Members
In support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G. Sohnrey</li> <li>- S. Lewis</li> <li>- G. Cole – address concerns in #3 Amend the Well Permitting Ordinance</li> <li>- Dawson – address concerns in #3, ensure limits are set</li> <li>- S. Goepf – only if limits are set for water districts to prevent them from drying up wells</li> </ul>



- J. Brobeck – would like to add limits to expanding irrigated agriculture in grazing lands/open space
- Smith – add limits to transfers out of the subbasin
- Kehn – if #3 includes analysis of the size of the well, beyond screen levels, to better reflect sustainability and impact of large wells on neighboring wells
- Madden – including a hybrid of D. Kehn and J. Brobeck’s suggestions. Biggest concern: conversion of surface water agricultural land into irrigated orchards, using groundwater. It is more about regulating the amount of water, not the shape of the well.
- C. Chastain –if well permitting ordinance verbiage is expanded to include C. Madden and D. Kehn’s suggestions.

Not in support      NA

1  
2 **Recommendation 3:** Broaden language to #3 well-permitting ordinance to 1) reference using  
3 AEM Data and hydrogeologic considerations for amending ordinance, 2) add considerations for  
4 well impacts on each other (wells spacing), and 3) expand beyond domestic wells.

Vote	SHAC Members
------	--------------

In support	C. Chastain, A. Dawson, D. Kehn, B. Smith, G. Cole C. Madden – suggested referring to Glenn County’s new well ordinance for domestic, ag, and industrial wells.
------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Not in support	S. Geopp, S. Lewis & G. Sohnrey – would like to review details
----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

5 **Recommendation 4:** Limit and control the expansion of irrigated agriculture into areas that are  
6 currently unirrigated open space areas.

Vote	SHAC Members
------	--------------

In support	J. Brobeck
------------	------------

Not in support	G. Sohnrey – reference Land IQ report findings & emphasis on landowners’ choice. S. Lewis – concerned with limits to urban development, particularly related to increased water use tied to residential units. If limits to orchard expansions are set, urban growth restrictions should be considered as well. G. Cole – concerned about groundwater use rights S. Geopp – in alignment with S. Lewis’s concerns B. Smith D. Kehn G. Cole
----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Abstain	A. Dawson –need more information C. Chastain
---------	-------------------------------------------------

7  
8 **Recommendation 5: Remove #8 Groundwater Allocation**

Vote	SHAC Members
------	--------------

In support	S. Lewis – reconsider at 5-year update if needed S. Geopp
------------	--------------------------------------------------------------



	<i>J. Brobeck – remove for now and consider later</i>
	<i>B. Smith</i>
	<i>C. Madden</i>
	<i>G. Cole – concerned about legal rights for groundwater use. Groundwater allocation may need to be mentioned in Butte County’s General Plan. Needs further consideration during the first update.</i>
Not in support	<i>A. Dawson – would like to retain, does not trust the GSA process to restrict ag. pumping</i>
Abstain	<i>D. Kehn – listed as worst-case scenario; not enough confidence in groundwater model</i>
	<i>C. Chastain</i>

1 **Public Comments:**

- 2 • A member of the public emphasized the GSA cannot manage something they cannot
- 3 measure. They highlighted the use of technologies to measure groundwater use
- 4 electronically, which could be discussed in the future. Further, they asked about how much
- 5 information related to land-use will be included in the chapter. L. Herman (City of Chico)
- 6 will get back to the group with that information.

7 **Outcomes & Next Steps | Projects & Management Actions**

- 8 • The Management Committee will share Vina SHAC recommendations with the Vina GSA
- 9 Board. The revised chapters will include direction from the board.
- 10 • The technical consultants and Management Committee will carefully review the chapter to
- 11 ensure consistency in the way projects are listed. They will also show how the subbasin will
- 12 meet the annual 15 thousand-acre-feet target and include a narrative to show how
- 13 additional evaluation will take place.
- 14 • The Management Committee will share information on the PMAs pursued in the Colusa
- 15 Subbasin related to new well construction.
- 16 • The Management Committee will share a map of underrepresented communities in the
- 17 subbasin.

18 **3. Implementation Draft Chapter Overview & Recommendations (00:13:02)**

19 The SHAC discussed the draft Implementation Chapter outline and considered recommendations

20 on implementation components [[Access Slides Here](#)]. The public had an opportunity to provide

21 comment.

22 **Inter-basin Coordination**

23 The Management Committee suggested holding a special meeting to discuss the inter-basin

24 coordination framework and make recommendations on inter-basin coordination priorities for

25 the Vina Subbasin [Access [Inter-basin Coordination Framework Presentation](#); Access [Inter-basin](#)

26 [Coordination Framework Report with Cover Memo](#)].

<b>Vote</b>	<b>SHAC Members</b>
In support	<i>J. Brobeck, G. Cole, C. Chastain, B. Smith, D. Kehn, C. Madden, S. Lewis, G. Sohnrey</i>
Not in support	<i>A. Dawson</i>
Abstain	<i>S. Goepf – would like to consider meeting in person</i>



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  
40

**Draft Implementation Chapter**

A. Hussain (Geosyntec) provided a brief overview of the draft Implementation Chapter that will be released for public review at the end of the month, as well as a draft implementation timeline.  
C. Buck (Butte County) asked for feedback related to the implementation schedule presented.

*Chapter Outline:*

- Estimate of GSP Implementation Costs
- Identify Funding Alternatives
- Schedule for Implementation
- Schedule for Project Implementation
- Schedule to Address Data Gaps
- Annual Reporting
- Inter-basin Coordination
- Periodic Evaluations

*SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- B. Smith asked a clarifying question related to recent Glenn County Irrigation District (GCID) pumping. He tried to find most recent data available and couldn't access most recent monitoring data. He is especially concerned with the short-term impacts of increased pumping during dry conditions. Related to inter-basin coordination, he wanted to know how other groups and pumpers across the subbasins engage in inter-basin coordination efforts. While it is important for staff to collaborate, he would like to know more information regarding oversight.
- D. Kehn would like to suggest removing the PID project from the timeline and ensure project implementation is tied to the interim milestones to ensure the plan is matching the schedule.

**Public Comment**

- A member of the public asked why stream flow augmentation is starting so late. A. Hussain (Geosyntec) assumed decisions around permitting would need to be made in the interim before moving forward with logistical issues. The technical team could make changes to show that project starting earlier. This member of the public highlighted the multiple benefits derived from that project, particularly to specific stakeholders. K. Peterson (Butte County) highlighted the chapter shows the project timeline as 2020-2025.

**Outcomes & Next Steps | Draft Implementation Chapter**

- The technical team will make corrections to the timeline, including defining the Stream Flow Augmentation Project timeline (2020-2025).
- The Draft Implementation Chapter is expected to be released by the end of July, including the updated schedule.



- 1 • The Facilitation Team will reach out to schedule a special Vina SHAC meeting focused on  
2 inter-basin coordination.  
3

#### 4 4. Vina GSA Management Committee Reports (03:08:02)

##### 5 **Meeting Venues & Logistics**

6 K. Peterson (Butte County) shared the Management Committee has been discussing  
7 transitioning to in-person or potential hybrid meetings. For the moment, they are looking into  
8 specific venues in Chico. CBI and the Management Committee would conduct test runs to  
9 ensure the venue and technology works smoothly. L. Herman (City of Chico) shared the venue  
10 that the SHAC used to meet at is no longer available; staff will continue doing additional  
11 research and provide more details in future meetings.  
12

##### 13 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- 14 • S. Lewis (ag representative) suggested avoiding the City Chambers due to poor acoustics.  
15 She would like to continue holding hybrid meetings if possible.  
16

##### 17 **Vina GSA Board Updates**

18 K. Peterson (Butte County) provided a brief update from the past joint meeting of the Vina GSA  
19 and Rock Creek Reclamation District Boards to make decisions related to the Sustainable  
20 Management Criteria. Additional information and the meeting recordings can be found online at  
21 the Vina GSA website [[Access Here](#)]. Further, the Management Committee will bring the Tuscan  
22 Water District application to the SHAC next month. The Vina GSA has been approached to  
23 comment as an agency by mid-September. The intention is to bring in legal counsel as well to  
24 weigh in on the discussion.  
25

#### 26 5. Meeting Notes Review & Consideration (03:13:02)

27 The SHAC briefly reviewed the 6/15/21 SHAC meeting notes [[Access Here](#)].  
28

##### 28 *SHAC Comments & Recommendations*

- 29 • J. Brobeck (environmental rep) requested adding additional background information and  
30 details to his comment regarding GCID's 25,000 acre-feet supplemental groundwater  
31 program, during the public comment period for items not on the agenda.  
32

##### 33 **Outcomes & Next Steps | Meeting Notes**

- 34 • The Facilitation team will make suggested revisions and bring it back to the SHAC at the  
35 upcoming meeting.  
36

##### 37 *Next Meeting*

38 The SHAC will reconvene for a special meeting on August 2, 2021, focused on inter-basin  
39 coordination. The SHAC will meet again on August 17, 2021, from 9:00-12:30.



1 **Participants**

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
<b>Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) Members</b>		
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
David Kehn	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	Y
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Sam Goepf	Domestic well user	Y
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	Y
<b>Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Representatives</b>		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Erik Gustafson	City of Chico	N
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	N
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Darren Rice	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
<b>Technical Consultants</b>		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y
Amer Hussain	Geosyntec	Y
Kristin Reardon	Geosyntec	Y
<b>Other Representatives</b>		
Debbie Spangler	CA Department of Water Resources	Y
<b>Facilitator</b>		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Y
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	Y

2 Approximately four members of the public attended the meeting.

3