

## Meeting Brief

- **Overview:** Staff representatives from Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek subbasins held their eleventh inter-basin coordination meeting. Subbasin staff provided updates on their Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development updates, announcements, and anticipated adoption schedule. Staff also reported on the GSP adoption process by subbasin, and lessons learned.
- **Next Steps:** CBI will inform Stantec that the Inter-Basin Coordination Group is not requested ongoing facilitation support at this time. The group will be self-organizing for the foreseeable future. CBI will finalize Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) comparative table and coordinate with Butte County to publish on webpage, in addition to a statement about this initial regional effort during GSP development closing.

## Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
<input type="checkbox"/> Review and send any final comments on the Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) table to CBI.	Subbasin Staff	January 21
<input type="checkbox"/> Update inter-basin coordination website with finalized SMC and note the effort's completion.	CBI Christina Buck	January 31 <a href="#">Access Here</a>

## Summary

### 1. Meeting Purpose and Introduction

This was the eleventh meeting of staff to support the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) inter-basin coordination effort. The goal of this meeting was to share updates on GSP development, the adoption process, finalize and agree to publicize the SMC table, and determine next steps for the group.

### 2. GSP Development Status Updates

Subbasin staff provided updates on their GSP development status and adoption. For updated information, please see the websites below.

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

#### Discussion

- GSP adoption process was quite smooth in virtually all subbasins. Boards did not offer significant feedback. Now subbasins are compiling final submissions to meet the regulatory deadline of January 31, 2022.
- In the Vina subbasin, where there had been significant comments on the GSP, the process went relatively smoothly. The GSAs decided to keep the SMC as it was. The hope is that those with concerns will continue to participate in the Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SHAC) as the process moves into implementation.
- In the Colusa subbasin, there was more conversation on approval day than expected. The City of Orland was concerned with Minimum Thresholds (MT) because of potential drought issues and dry wells. There is clearly more work to be done with this group to keep them informed and engaged. Their representatives voted no on the plan approval. It appeared they simply wanted their disagreement to be registered on the record but knew the GSP would move forward to adoption.
- The first step for the implementation stage is exploring and deciding on funding strategies, such as well registration, and other similar tools that are not required and not necessarily popular.
- Questions remain about funding. How do you fund the funding process?

### 3. Refinement of NSV Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

Subbasin staff discussed plans to publicize the NSV SMC table that compiles SMC from each of the subbasins.

#### Discussion:

- Subbasin staff will revisit the NSV SMC table to ensure that the information is accurate.
- Staff had no concerns around making the SMC table public.

- Subbasin staff will review the data for their respective subbasins and will respond to CBI with any changes by Friday, January 21<sup>st</sup>.
- CBI will coordinate with Butte County to post SMC table on the website.
- Posted SMC table will include a note about the closure of this initial regional process.

#### 4. NSV Inter-Basin Coordination Facilitation Support Services (FFS)

Subbasin staff discussed whether continued FSS would be needed going forward. The consensus was that at least for this year, FSS would not be required.

##### Discussion:

- C. Buck noted that GSAs will need this year at least to determine what their priorities are and to anticipate grant applications. There is potential for inter-basin coordination, but it will probably be limited to conversations about specific shared boundaries between subbasins, and this group would likely not be useful for these kinds of conversations.
- The group raised NACWA as an example of a group that has organized a monthly call with consultants coordinating on GSPs. Perhaps that call could serve a role in larger inter-basin coordination discussions.
- A. Shadley suggested that there is a role for facilitation, both for this inter-basin coordination group and for the subbasins themselves. In the subbasins, facilitation could be important to help GSAs understand their priorities and implementation. For inter-basin coordination, the group shares borders, shares rivers, and shares aquifers, and therefore the subbasins will have to come together to wade through the issues.
- C. Buck reminded the group that the Vina stakeholders and GSA boards has been quite sensitive to the transparency of the NSV inter-basin coordination staff-level group. She would want more specific direction from the stakeholders on their wishes for coordination with neighboring subbasins and their subbasin's participation in a group like this. That's why she is hesitant about continuing to meet. She wants the stakeholders to determine what should be prioritized when it comes to inter-basin coordination.
- T. Carlone responded that Vina has been the place where there has been the most discussion about inter-basin coordination. Inter-basin coordination does seem to be a priority for them, and some stakeholders stated that it would be a good idea to move forward with coordination agreements. However, that kind of coordination might not need to take place until further in the future.
- C. Buck responded that even if Vina stakeholders wish for inter-basin coordination, she isn't certain that the coordination lives here in this group. They may need facilitation support working out things with their neighbors but that doesn't belong in this group.
- T. Carlone reiterated what A. Shadley had expressed about desire for inter-basin coordination, and pointed out that the question is: Where will that coordination live? Could it live within Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) context? It's been suggested that perhaps it could, but it's also been suggested that maybe it should not?
- C. Buck answered that she believes the group needs to hear more from the IRWM board on their relationship to SGMA. Her impression is that some members do not wish to be involved, while others do want the opportunity to collaborate.
- L. Hunter stated that she feels conflicted about when the right time is for this group to continue thinking about capacity to meet as a group. She noted that she could envision the group taking a break and focusing on neighbor-to-neighbor actions if needed. She could see the group reengaging at the regional level in six months to check in and share what each has learned and can share from this next stage. It would be useful to share what pitfalls each has come across, so that others can avoid them. She noted that this kind of sharing has been very helpful.

## NSV INTER-BASIN COORDINATION MEETING (1/12/2022)

- T. Carlone reminded the group that Stantec holds the contract with DWR, and asked what the group wanted her to report to them. She shared that she wanted to accurately represent the group’s interests.
- L. Hunter suggested that the group could meet quarterly and that they could self-organize, as this is not a high conflict group. This could at least take place for the immediate to intermediate term.
- A. Shadley posed the question of who would ensure that there is accountability on what was just discussed and how to move forward. She offered that her administrative assistant could be tasked with sending out the meeting calendar invitation, but she would not be able to create the agenda, take meeting notes and track action items.
- L. Hunter stated that she did not think the group would need minutes and notes because it would simply be a staff meeting, without using grant funding. If administrative staff can be used to simply keep the meetings scheduled, that would work, and the group could assign a point person.
- A. Shadley offered Western Canal’s administrative staff to lead on scheduling. The group agreed that April would be a good time for another staff check-in.
- T. Carlone confirmed that she would tell Stantec that the group did not wish to continue facilitation support at this time for inter-basin coordination, and that this group would be a self-organizing staff group in the meantime.
- L. Hunter requested that T. Carlone pass along to Stantec that these inter-basin coordination meetings with the facilitation support were very useful. Others echoed this sentiment.

### **Outcomes & Next Steps:**

- ✦ Staff representatives will review data for in SMC Table for their respective subbasins and ensure it reflects data in GSP. Staff will respond to CBI with changes by Friday, January 21<sup>st</sup>.
- ✦ CBI and Butte County will post SMC Table on website as soon as possible.
- ✦ CBI will inform Stantec that no future FSS will be needed by the NSV and that the group will self-facilitate.
- ✦ Staff will meet again in April and will self-schedule and self-organize that meeting.

### Meeting Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Subbasins
Staff		
Nichole Bethurem	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, Red Bluff
Christina Buck	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation	Butte, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek
Lisa Hunter	Glenn County and Glenn Groundwater Authority	Butte, Colusa, and Corning
Justin Jensen	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, Red Bluff
Kamie Loeser	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation	Butte, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek
Anjanette Shadley	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation	Western Canal Water District
Facilitation Team		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	
Dorit Price-Levine	Consensus Building Institute	

