

## Meeting Brief

- **Overview:** Staff representatives from Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek, subbasins held their tenth inter-basin coordination meeting. Subbasin staff provided updates on their Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development status and key takeaways from relevant meetings, including public workshops. In addition, staff shared where the inter-basin coordination framework report is located in their respective GSPs. Last, the staff discussed the table compiling Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) from across the region and discussed timeline for refinement and publication.
- **Next Steps:** SMC Table will be shared with NCWA group working on a similar effort and made public in January. Subbasin staff will continue to provide inter-basin coordination updates and gather public input related to the direction of current efforts and desired priorities, shared concerns, and possible ideas for inter-basin coordination during GSP implementation moving forward.
- **Next meeting:** The next staff meeting will take place in January.

## Action Items

| Item  | Lead                  | Completion                             |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Schedule next inter-basin coordination meeting within the first two weeks of January 2022.         | CBI                   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Share Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) table with NCWA.                                       | CBI<br>Christina Buck | Friday, October 29th                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Share history of relationship with Paskenta Tribe in Corning Subbasin SGMA implementation efforts. | CBI                   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Update inter-basin coordination website.   | Christina Buck        | Ongoing<br><a href="#">Access Here</a> |

## Summary

### 1. Meeting Purpose and Introduction

This was the tenth meeting of staff to support the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) inter-basin coordination effort. The goal of this meeting was to share how the Inter-Basin Coordination Framework Report was used or referenced in each subbasin’s GSPs and to review the compilation of NSV Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC). In addition, staff representatives provided updates on GSP development status, shared takeaways from adjacent subbasin meetings and public workshops, and determined next steps for technical information-sharing efforts.

### 2. GSP Development Status Updates

Subbasin staff provided updates on their GSP development status and anticipated adoption schedule. GSA staff also provided updates on feedback received during public workshops. For updated information, please see the websites below.

| Subbasin   | Website   |
|--|---|
| <b>Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos &amp; Red Bluff</b> | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |
| <b>Butte</b>   | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |
| <b>Corning</b>                                       | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |
| <b>Colusa</b>  | Websites <a href="#">(Glenn)</a>   <a href="#">(Colusa)</a> |
| <b>Sutter</b>  | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |
| <b>Vina</b>  | Websites <a href="#">(Vina)</a>   <a href="#">(RCRD)</a>    |
| <b>Wyandotte Creek</b>                               | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |
| <b>Yolo</b>  | <a href="#">Website</a>                                     |

### Discussion

- Staff representatives asked about requirements for public noticing for GSP adoption public hearings. CBI provided the legal requirement that the public hearing be held at least 90 days notice to cities and counties within the subbasin. Other staff representatives shared that their subbasins were offering more public noticing than what was legally required.
- Staff representatives shared their respective timelines for public workshops, public hearings, and GSP adoption. All subbasins offered at least two public workshops, at least one in-person and one virtual. Final board meetings and hearings will take place in December. Some public comment periods have ended and others will end in mid-November.
- Staff representatives shared themes from feedback: Questions around how GSP implementation will be funded and when these conversations will be had in a public forum. Other feedback relates to expansion of agriculture and how that will affect domestic groundwater users. Also, questions around how SGMA and GSPs address drought. C. Buck explained that the goal is for the public to understand that the GSP is concerned with long term planning more than short term conditions. Other concerns centered on public outreach and engagement. Many from the public suggested better utilizing social media. Multiple staff

representatives echoed that funding and outreach are big themes from the feedback. The plan is to begin discussions on those topics in early 2022.

- One staff representative shared about getting more participation from the Paskenta Tribe in the Corning Subbasin. Tania Carlone offered to provide Lisa Hunter with information about the history of the participation of the Tribe earlier in the process and the outcomes from those discussions.
- The Vina Subbasin has received feedback from the public that the Minimum Threshold (MT) and Measurable Objective (MO) are too low. The GSA staff has proposed an alternate MO that is being examined by the Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee for possible recommendation to the Vina GSA Board.
- Staff representatives suggested that it would be very useful to offer workshops and educational platforms to the GSA boards and stakeholders that would show them to explore the various options for how to access funding for GSP implementation and GSA administration.

### 3. Inter-basin Coordination Approach in Subbasins' GSPs

Subbasin staff shared how the Inter-Basin Coordination Framework Report was used or referenced in each subbasin's GSP and discussed how Inter-Basin Coordination and associated priorities are described in each subbasin's GSP. See Report [here](#).

#### Discussion:

- Staff representative from Colusa shared that the full report is in an appendix. Kamie Loeser shared that a description of the inter-basin coordination effort is described in Chapter 2 of the Colusa GSP, where notice, communication, and public engagement is discussed. T. Carlone reminded staff that including it in chapter 2 describes what has occurred related to inter-basin coordination during GSP development. Including inter-basin coordination efforts in the implementation chapter helps describe what inter-basin coordination will look like moving forward. Colusa GSA staff will raise this question at the next meeting and suggest that the GSA board consider including the report in the implementation section. Vina and Wyandotte Creek GSPs include a description of inter-basin coordination in the implementation chapter and the report as an appendix. The Butte and Corning Subbasins included the report as an appendix to their respective GSPs.

### 4. Compilation of NSV Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

Subbasin staff discussed takeaways and observations from the compiled NSV SMC table. Staff identified possible SMC topics for further discussion during implementation.

#### Discussion:

- Butte County staff noted that in the Vina Subbasin there is downward trending of groundwater levels so the MO was determined by following that downward trend 20 years out and setting the MO there, recognizing that the downward trend will continue before the situation is stabilized. That means the MO is set below historic lows. Staff reflected that it is helpful to look at the region and see that most other plans are not taking that approach.
- Staff representatives decided to share this SMC table with the NCWA working group as an internal draft to check for accuracy.
- Staff discussed that it would be important to consider timing around making table available to the public and determined that it would be best to wait until after the GSPs are adopted to ensure that the table includes the final SMC and to post to the website at the beginning of January.
- Staff representatives requested that CBI facilitate a wrap-up NSV inter-basin coordination staff conversation in the middle of January before the end of CBI's contract.

# NSV INTER-BASIN COORDINATION MEETING (10/28/2021)

## Outcomes & Next Steps:

- + Staff representatives will speak to boards and stakeholders about making Inter-Basin Coordination Framework Report more visible in GSPs.
- + Staff representatives will look into providing educational forums, perhaps bringing in experts, to educate boards and stakeholders about funding options for implementation.
- + CBI/Christina Buck will send NSV SMC table to NCWA for internal review.
- + Staff representatives will make SMC table public in January, after GSPs have been adopted.
- + CBI will facilitate one more NSV staff conversation in the middle of January 2022.

## Meeting Participants

| Participant        | Representation/Affiliation                   | Subbasins                                |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Staff              |  |  |
| Nichole Bethurem   | Tehama County                                | Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, Red Bluff |
| Christina Buck     | Butte County                                 | Butte, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek         |
| Mary Fahey         | Colusa Groundwater Authority                 | Butte and Colusa                         |
| Lisa Hunter        | Glenn County and Glenn Groundwater Authority | Butte, Colusa, and Corning               |
| Justin Jensen      | Tehama County                                | Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, Red Bluff |
| Kamie Loeser       | Butte County                                 | Butte, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek         |
| Facilitation Team  |  |  |
| Tania Carlone      | Consensus Building Institute                 |  |
| Dorit Price-Levine | Consensus Building Institute                 |  |