



## 1 Meeting Brief

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

## 18 Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
• Upload approved Vina SHAC notes (4/20/21) to the website.	CBI & Management Committee	
• Consider providing a Prop 218 process presentation for the SHAC.	Management Committee	
• Coordinate inclusion of additional PMAs from the Urban Water Management Plans.	George Barber (CalWater) and Amer Hussein (Geosyntec)	
• Release Draft SMC and Draft Monitoring Networks Chapters for public review and share with the SHAC members.	CBI & Management Committee	Done <a href="#">[Access Here]</a>
• Post May SHAC meeting recording on the website.	CBI & Management Committee	<a href="#">[Access Here]</a>

## 19 Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Meeting Notes

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

Votes

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



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

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

8

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

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

15

16 *Presentation Highlight*

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

26

27 *Vina GSA Board Discussion*

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

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

38

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



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

11  
12 **Discussion:**

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

38  
39  
40 **GSP Implementation (00:52:20)**

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



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

3

#### 4 **Costs**

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

7

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

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

16

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

21

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

34

#### 35 **Discussion:**

36 • G. Barber (CalWater), B. Smith (business rep), and G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) shared that  
37 until the GSA has selected PMAs and have a budget associated with those projects, then it is  
38 difficult to have public discussions about potential fees.

39 • P. Gosselin (Butte County) shared this is an initial discussion regarding the implementation of  
40 the plan prior to drafting the chapter and sharing it for public review. The goal would be to,  
41 at a minimum, establish a sustainable funding source for the administration of the agency  
42 operations. These costs would be in addition to the costs to develop and implement the



1 PMAs. T. Carlone (CBI Facilitator) shared part of this conversation is to determine the role the  
 2 agency wants to have in the implementation of the plan.

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

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

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

16 **3. Data Gaps**

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

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



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

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

6  
7 **Discussion:**

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

22  
23 **Proposed PMAs**

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

31  
32 **Discussion:**

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



- 1 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked whether a GSA can initiate an adjudication process  
2 through the courts if they considered another subbasin's activities were impacting their  
3 ability to achieve sustainability. P. Gosselin (Butte County) clarified that an adjudication  
4 is focused within the basin through the court and shared that if one adjoining subbasin's  
5 GSP implementation impacts another subbasin's ability to implement their plan, the  
6 subbasin could try to resolve this through inter-basin coordination and if that does not  
7 work, the subbasin can go through an appeals process through DWR. Brobeck shared his  
8 concern is that the major threats to the subbasin's sustainability are not within the Vina  
9 Subbasin.
- 10 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) asked about the CSU Chico Center for Water and the  
11 Environment's target audience (rural or urban user) for the outreach and education  
12 project. P. Gosselin shared that the concept remained general targeting the broader  
13 public. Further, J. Brobeck asked whether the upper watershed management seems more  
14 related to surface water rather than groundwater, based on isotope studies he has  
15 evaluated. He would advocate for improved rangeland management to promote fire  
16 resilience and prevent urban sprawl.
- 17 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) inquired about the FloodMAR proposal mentioned, and  
18 whether having an agency as project proponent would ameliorate some of the SHAC's  
19 concerns about the legal implications of recharge projects. P. Gosselin responded that if  
20 the Vina or Rock Creek GSAs can determine and dictate the terms of the recharge program  
21 within their respective jurisdictions, then the subbasin could use those flows to promote  
22 sustainability.
- 23 • J. Brobeck (env. representative) also highlighted the PMA he submitted in name of Friends  
24 of Butte Creek aiming to keep water in Butte Creek to protect the winter/spring runs of  
25 Chinook salmon, as a table A allocation. P. Gosselin shared that Friends of Butte Creek  
26 may have funding available to purchase water.
- 27 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) would like to ensure FloodMAR projects are located in  
28 areas that would benefit the aquifer and consider legal implications. Regarding domestic  
29 well mitigation, he suggested finding ways to avoid taxpayers paying for individual  
30 homeowners' wells. He was against the idea of groundwater allocations. Lastly, he  
31 highlighted that irrigation efficiency also leads to decreases in recharge.
- 32 • G. Barber (CalWater) would like to keep groundwater allocations in the plan, since he  
33 anticipates the subbasin is probably not properly anticipating the climate change impacts  
34 to local groundwater conditions. Lastly, he would like to ensure there are some PMAs  
35 related to groundwater quality considerations in the plan. There are a few plumes in the  
36 Chico area that CalWater deals with every day and are already taking action to address  
37 plumes e.g. per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).
- 38 • B. Smith (business rep) echoed G. Barber's concern with water quality, particularly related  
39 to recent groundwater transfers. One key concern with increased pumping during  
40 drought conditions could be mobilization of water contaminants.
- 41



Stream Augmentation - Potential to Increase Stream Flow

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

Agricultural Irrigation Efficiency- Review Irrigation Practices

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

FloodMAR Evaluation

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

Rangeland Management and Water Retention

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

Watershed Health- Upper Watershed Recharge

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

Domestic Well Mitigation & Evaluation

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

Community Water Education Initiative

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

Landscape Ordinance

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

Groundwater Allocation

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



1 Outcomes & Next Steps | PMAs

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

7

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

9 P. Gosselin (Butte County) is expecting to release the Draft SMC Chapter, the draft Monitoring  
10 Networks Chapter, and sections of the Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) shortly for  
11 public input [[Access Here](#)]. Further, Butte County's Drought Taskforce will be meeting May 18<sup>th</sup>.  
12 after this SHAC meeting. The Vina GSA Board and Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA will hold  
13 a joint special meeting in July to review the various chapters released for public review, including  
14 SHAC recommendations.

15

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

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

21

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

30

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

35

36 *Developing an Inter-basin Coordination Framework*

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

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



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  
41

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

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

*Next Steps*

CBI and GSA staff are drafting a report outlining the framework for inter-basin coordination. GSA staff are soliciting input and will share back at the following staff-level meeting. Upcoming elements for further discussion include a potential issue resolution process, the scale and timing for the elements outlined above, and pathways to foster communication among GSA decision-making bodies. Once ready, CBI will bring the draft report to the SHAC and other GSA public venues to solicit public input on its content.

*Butte County Perspective on Inter-basin Coordination*

C. Buck (Butte County) shared key take-aways from recent dialogues among staff, the public, and decision makers. Butte County staff gave presentations on inter-basin coordination efforts to date and asked for input on the pillars of the coordination framework, including presentations to the Butte County Water Commission (April 7), Vina GSA Board (April 14), and Butte County Board of Supervisors (April 27).

In terms of scale, inter-basin coordination will need to be more focused around specific boundaries. While there are some commonalities throughout the region, the details will be specific to each neighbor pair. Some boundaries may need more coordination than others, and



1 some aspects of implementing SGMA require and benefit more from coordination. Proposed  
2 coordination groups focused on boundaries with a river or creek include:

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

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

16  
17 CBI and Butte County staff encouraged SHAC members' feedback regarding the questions below.

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

22  
23 **Discussion:**

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



1 communication among GSA decision-makers. Lastly, P. Gosselin (Butte County)  
 2 emphasized that the inter-basin coordination framework is focused on the long-term  
 3 coordination, beyond the current short-term drought conditions.  
 4 • G. Sohnrey (ag. representative) encouraged Butte County staff reaching out to  
 5 neighboring subbasins to inquire about recent water transfers and increased pumping  
 6 proposed.  
 7 • A member of the public encouraged staff to notify SHAC members about upcoming  
 8 meetings. Further, when GCID presented to the Water Commission, the details presented  
 9 did not align with the most up-to-date information. P. Gosselin invited the SHAC to  
 10 participate in the upcoming Drought Taskforce meeting, where Thad Bettner (GCID) will  
 11 be presenting additional information and will be available for questions. Lastly, this  
 12 member of the public would like to know how many people in the subbasin will be in  
 13 compliance with SB80.

15 **Next Steps**

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

17 **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	N
Gary Cole	Agricultural well user	Y
George Barber	California Water Service	Y
Greg Sohnrey	Agricultural well user	Y
James Brobeck	Environmental representative	Y
Sam Goepp	Domestic well user	Y*
Samantha Lewis	Agricultural well user	N
<b>Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) Member Agency Representatives</b>		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Y
Paul Gosselin	Butte County	Y
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Y
Linda Herman	City of Chico	Y
Erik Gustafson	City of Chico	Y
Jeff Carter	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Kamie Loeser	Durham Irrigation District	Y
Colin Klinesteker	Mechoopda Indian Tribe	Y
Darren Rice	Rock Creek Reclamation District GSA	Y
<b>Technical Consultants</b>		
Joe Turner	Geosyntec	Y



Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Present
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
Stephanie Horii	Consensus Building Institute	Y

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

DRAFT