

## Meeting Brief

- Representatives from Vina, Butte, Wyandotte Creek, Corning, Colusa, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos subbasins held a staff-level meeting to kick off inter-basin coordination activities.
- Each subbasin gave an update on its current GSP development status.
- Participants reviewed and made suggested revisions to the documents CBI compiled: (1) NSV Inter-basin Coordination Directory, and (2) NSV Inter-basin Coordination Scope.
- Basin staff clarified inter-basin resources available through DWR grant awards and programs (e.g., Proposition 1, Proposition 68, Facilitation Support Services [FSS]).
- Participants discussed benefits of crafting an inter-basin coordination agreement and implementing coordinated regional efforts (technical, outreach, and communication).
- **Areas of concern:** developing a shared understanding on hydrogeologic conditions, surface-groundwater interactions, inter-basin flows, groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs), public outreach and communication strategies, and broader water management concerns.
- **Priorities and desired outcomes:** participants plan to focus on technical requirements for inter-basin coordination on (1) cross-boundary groundwater flow, (2) stream-aquifer interactions, (3) water budgets, and tackle (4) sustainable management criteria in the future [Refer to [Article 8 §357.2 \(b\) \(1\) through \(4\)](#)].
- **Next steps:** Participants agreed to keep these meetings staff-only for the moment and bring in technical consultants and facilitators when appropriate, including when addressing GDEs.
- Next meeting: 6+ weeks from May 13, 2020

## Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
Integrate changes in the inter-basin coordination documents	CBI	Ongoing
Follow up with Butte County about information for Geosyntec contact information	CBI	As soon as possible
Follow up with Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba to complete inter-basin directory.	CBI	By next inter-basin meeting
Follow up with Colusa Subbasin (outreach and coordination funding) to estimate costs for inter-basin coordination.	Mary Fahey (Colusa), Lisa Hunter (Glenn) and CBI	By next inter-basin meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Draft a work plan framework (working draft) for staff review that might become a schedule that aligns with <a href="#">Article 8. Interagency Agreements (Section 357.2 Interbasin Agreements)</a> (anticipated inter-basin coordination activities, actions, milestones, and schedules).</li> </ul>	CBI	Before next inter-basin coordination meeting

Item	Lead	Completion
Research and compile example voluntary inter-basin coordination agreements	CBI	Before next inter-basin coordination meeting
Draft of 2-pager for inter-basin coordination	CBI	

## Summary

### Meeting Purpose and Introduction

This was the first meeting of the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) inter-basin coordination group. The group aims to foster improved and coordinated groundwater management across NSV subbasins. GSA representatives from NSV subbasins – Vina, Butte, Wyandotte Creek, Corning, Colusa, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos – met for the purposes of:

- Sharing the statuses of GSP development for the various subbasins
- Identifying each subbasin’s funding support available for inter-basin coordination
- Obtaining contact information NSV GSAs/subbasins
- Identifying and considering the need for and opportunities to support inter-basin coordination

### Meeting Materials

1. Draft NSV Inter-basin Coordination Directory
2. Draft NSV Inter-basin Coordination Scope

These documents are intended to help GSAs share information to facilitate identifying and leveraging resources across the NSV

### GSP Development Status

Each subbasin gave an update on its current GSP development status. Staff from other basins had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

- **Los Molinos, Antelope, Red Bluff, and Bowman Subbasins** started their GSP development process in February with Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE). The Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FCWCD) serves as the GSA for these subbasins. The Consensus Building Institute (CBI) is in the lead for community outreach and engagement and has been developing a Communications and Engagement (C&E) Plan with the GSA’s Groundwater Commission ad hoc group. Tehama County FCWCD is also in the process of setting up meetings for other ad hoc groups comprised of 3-4 Groundwater Commissioners each on topics such as outreach and engagement, modeling, Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs), and Data Management System (DMS).
- **Corning Subbasin** recently hired Montgomery & Associates for GSP completion. There are two GSAs in the subbasin – the Tehama County FCWCD overlying the Tehama County portion of the subbasin, and the Corning Subbasin GSA overlying the Glenn County portion of the subbasin. The two GSAs entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to collaborate on the development of a single GSP for the subbasin. The MOU created the Corning Subbasin Advisory Board (CSAB), which

the consulting team facilitates. The consulting team is working with the CSAB on draft chapters and the Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (HCM). The CSAB started meeting in April, and meets on the first Wednesday of month from 1:30-3:30 (virtual for now). For meeting information, presentations, and agendas go to [www.corningsubbasingsp.org](http://www.corningsubbasingsp.org).

- **Colusa Subbasin** is working on the Basin Setting portion of GSP development. Davids Engineering is under contract for basin setting and GSP completion. Colusa has been calibrating the model and is beginning discussions around minimal thresholds, measurable objectives, and sustainability goals. Colusa Groundwater Authority (CGA) and Glenn Groundwater Authority (GGA) recently held a joint board meeting to continue exchanging information. The CGA and GGA each have a Technical Advisory Committee which generally meet jointly and will likely be meeting monthly over the next year. The CGA and GGA finalized an MOU clarifying how they will collaborate on the development of the Colusa Subbasin GSP.
- **Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek Subbasins (Butte County reps)** are working on the Basin setting portion of each subbasin's plan. The Basin Setting contract ends 6/30/20. Draft results are in the process of being revised and presented to the Butte Subbasin Advisory Board (4/23/20), the Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committees (5/19/20), and at a Wyandotte Creek public workshop scheduled for 6/23/20. Draft Basin Setting chapters will be available for public review and comment in July. Contracts for GSP completion are pending with Geosyntec for Vina and Wyandotte Creek Subbasins and Davids Engineering for Butte Subbasin. Execution of these contracts is anticipated in late May.

## Scope and Budget for Coordination

Each subbasin gave an update on their resources available for inter-basin coordination. Staff from other subbasins had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

Note the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) allocates resources for its Facilitation Support Services (FSS) on an annual basis to assess and develop task orders accordingly. Further, there is a caveat for the FSS contractor Stantec's process—subbasins can only utilize facilitators that are part of the DWR-Stantec roster.

- **Los Molinos, Antelope, Red Bluff, and Bowman Subbasins** recently received a DWR grant for FSS for Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos Subbasins that includes support for inter-basin coordination. Although Bowman Subbasin is designated as very low priority, DWR and Tehama County FCWCD allowed resources to be used since prior to the last round of basin reprioritization, it had been prioritized as "medium priority" and subject to SGMA. LSCE is working on finalizing its scope of work, which will be completed in the second half of June.
- **Corning Subbasin** is working on how resources will be defined or allocated for inter-basin coordination. Their overall budget for outreach and engagement activities allows for flexibility. Corning also included funding for technical support for inter-basin coordination in its contract with Montgomery and Associates (M&A).
- **Colusa Subbasin** did not allocate outreach funds specifically for inter-basin coordination; they agreed to discuss with their consultant team to develop an estimate for inter-basin coordination. The Colusa representative would like its facilitators (Dave Ceppos, CSUS CCP) to be involved in this inter-basin coordination process. Depending on how the group decides to move forward, the subbasin's facilitator may spearhead the process.

*Suggestion:* Potential periodic facilitator check-ins.

- **Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek Subbasins:** The inter-basin coordination funding is currently through DWR's Facilitation Support Services (FSS) Program. The specific tasks in each subbasin's consultant contracts with Davids Engineering and Geosyntec remain pending.

## Discussion: Other Opportunities for Coordination

The group discussed potential opportunities and the need for additional coordination outreach and/or technical work. Participants indicated the NSV inter-basin coordination group should begin to think about what type of work gets done individually by subbasin vs. what tasks can follow a more centralized effort. Attendees suggested assessing what needs to be done, at what scale, and what mechanisms to utilize.

## Inter-basin Coordination Requirements, Key Issues, & Approach

To help explore key coordination issues to address, the group referred to the [GSP Emergency Regulations, Article 8: Interagency Agreements](#) (§357.2).

### Voluntary Inter-basin Coordination Agreement

Participants discussed potential benefits of preparing voluntary inter-basin coordination agreement as a part of GSP development. A voluntary agreement would be beneficial for DWR and the public to understand how the GSAs coordinate, and it would allow the group to coordinate in areas of uncertainty or concern. It would be important to delineate a process and document technical discussions, particularly regarding the well-documented surface water and groundwater interactions in the North Sacramento Valley. CBI could work on gathering this information and creating a draft agreement. Butte County and Tehama County FCWCD expressed they support drafting this agreement.

### Coordination Moving Forward

Representatives from the various subbasins identified three types of inter-basin coordination efforts needed moving forward: technical coordination and outreach and engagement.

- **Technical.** This type of coordination, outlined in Article 8 (§357.2) includes discussions related to (1) cross-boundary groundwater flow, (2) stream-aquifer interactions, (3) water budgets, and (4) sustainable management criteria and monitoring network. Butte County staff indicated these first three technical pieces could be easily described and included in the GSPs, which would help demonstrate high-level coordination for NSV subbasins. However, Butte County described some limitations of its Butte Basin Groundwater Model particularly pertaining to inter-basin flow along the Sacramento River. Inter-basin coordination could help close that data gap. Tehama County stated it will likely use the SVSim model. Colusa is using the C2VSim Beta2 model (2019 release); Corning is considering this model as well. M&A collecting data and presented the information to the CSAB on June 3, 2020. The CSAB recommended moving forward with the C2VSim model.
- **Outreach and engagement.** Some representatives suggested developing a regional education and engagement project. For example, the NSV could implement a regional workshop or outreach meeting, building on past regional outreach projects starting with Basin Setting updates. The group could create a consolidated 2-3-page short and accessible pamphlet or newsletter for interested parties. This document could be accompanied by a more comprehensive document or could link to existing websites. Since Tehama County needs a couple extra months to get Basin Setting results, and Butte County will be working with advisory groups on GSP chapter development through the fall, the group could explore the possibility of convening an event in the Fall (e.g., October

workshop). In that way, the funding could be utilized before December. There was some concern about level of effort, available time, and resources needed to implement this idea. A regional workshop may require obtaining additional capacity and funding. Moreover, all subbasins already publicly share information through their websites, and the group could tap into existing regional venues (e.g., the IRWM group).

## Brainstorm: Key Issues/Areas of Concern for Inter-Basin Coordination

Subbasin representatives identified a series of issues and areas of concern including:

- **Inter-basin geology and hydrology.** Establishing common understanding of the geology and hydrology of the basins per §357.2 (b)(3).
- **Inter-basin flows.** Estimating groundwater flow across basin boundaries, including consistent and coordinated data, methods, and assumptions. Implications for beneficial users and how to communicate with stakeholders. It is helpful that most are working with overlapping consulting firms.
- **Groundwater Transfers.**
- **Groundwater-surface water.** Estimating surface-groundwater interactions (stream-aquifer) at subbasin boundaries and impacts on surface water supplies.
- **Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems.** Coordinate in the analysis of the river ecosystems between all subbasins along the Sacramento River.
- **Stakeholder concerns.** Addressing broader water management issues from environmental and groundwater stakeholders, particularly in Butte County (i.e., high anxiety in Vina Subbasin and some in Butte).
- **Different Regulations and Conditions.** Addressing concerns and mistrust in Corning (GCID). Constituents who own land in multiple basins (or are interested in purchasing land) are concerned about different regulations.
- **Public Outreach and Communication:** Debunking misinformation, explain basin setting, etc. could be regional education and communication project.

## Priorities and Desired Outcomes:

The group decided to initially focus on the first three technical coordination requirements – §357.2 (b)(1) through (3); then later focus on §357.2 (b)(4) – sustainable management criteria (SMC).

GSA representatives shared other specific priorities, including:

- **Butte County.** Their first priority would be to finalize water budget numbers, which includes understanding inter-basin flows and interactions at basin boundaries. The NSV inter-basin group should work together to obtain and consolidate that data to understand inter-basin flows. Information is fairly available for Colusa, Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek. Corning Subbasin expects it will be ready relatively soon. Butte County's longer term GSP priority is developing its Sustainable Management Criteria. Depending on how SMC evolve, making significant changes might require a regionally coordinated modeling effort.
- **Corning Subbasin.** Representatives were not ready to share much about their priorities for inter-basin coordination yet. They conveyed that their priorities resonated with Butte County's statements. They would like to make sure water budgets/stream interactions are coordinated consistently across subbasins. Since the consultant working in Corning is different from the

consultant in Tehama County's other basins, there was some expressed concern about data management systems (DMS) matching with DMS' developed in other subbasins. They indicated public outreach efforts should be coordinated and aligned across subbasins. They also expressed interest in a regional outreach and participation strategy, prompting representatives to think about ways to refine inter-basin coordination and communication.

- **Colusa Subbasin.** The GSA representative indicated this was a helpful preliminary discussion and would like to get feedback from their respective GSA consultants and boards. The representative conveyed interest in exploring joint stakeholder communication and outreach efforts. For instance, the GSAs could develop a 2-page document briefly describing all the subbasins in the region working together (brief description of the GSAs, website information for each subbasin, and the stages and approach for GSP development); this document could be distributed at meetings and posted on various websites.

## Future Discussions

The group identified future focused topics for discussion, including:

- Determining how to move towards comparing and synchronizing water budgets across the basins (consultants/technical level).
- Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) (technical level coordination) –
  - Mechanism question: would it be beneficial to bring technical team together?
  - Concerns: meetings are highly intensive in terms of resources and time. Ideas:
    - Provide template to consultants and organize how to **harvest information**
    - Avoid time and resource intensive conversations
    - **Develop template/framework** to aid discussions

## Next Steps

(Refer to the Action Items section for specific next steps)

- Tehama County suggested their technical consultant could contact the Butte County technical consultant (Christina) and share a quick update on modeling.
- Representatives agreed they would like to keep inter-basin coordination efforts contained to staff, with periodic meetings at key milestones. They would like to potentially include technical consultants when discussing water budgets and stream-aquifer interactions. Tehama County indicated they expect they will be ready to bring in technical consultants approximately in July or August.
- Next meeting: **Participants agreed that the next inter-basin coordination meeting should occur in approximately 6 weeks, around the end of June.**

**GSP Development Status Update and Support of Inter-Basin Coordination**

(Refer to the NSV Inter-basin Coordination Directory document for more information on subbasins and point-of-contacts)

Subbasin	Adjacent Subbasins	Governance	GSP Status	Consultants & Coordination Support
<b>Bowman</b>	Anderson, S Battle Creek, Red Bluff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[1 GSA]: Tehama County FCWCD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 GSP per subbasin.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical: Luhdorff &amp; Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE)</li> </ul>
<b>Antelope</b>	Red Bluff, Los Molinos, Bend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisory Group: Groundwater Commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Near-Term Work: communication &amp; engagement plan; groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDE), modeling, data management system (DMS); will have basin settings in a couple more months</li> <li>Model: SVSim</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitation: Consensus Building Institute (CBI)</li> <li>Inter-B Coord Support: DWR FSS – distinct allocated funds (for A, LM, and RB subbasins); Funds also for Bowman Subbasin under DWR GSP Development grant</li> </ul>
<b>Los Molinos</b>	Antelope, Red Bluff, Corning, Vina			
<b>Red Bluff</b>	Bowman, Antelope, Los Molinos, Corning, Bend			
<a href="#">County Website</a> (pending)				
<b>Corning</b>	Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Vina, Butte, Colusa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[2 GSAs via MOU]: Tehama County FCWCD and Corning Subbasin GSA (Glenn County)</li> <li>Advisory Group: Corning Subbasin Advisory Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 GSP for whole subbasin</li> <li>Near-Term Work: hydrogeologic conceptual model (HCM); modeling; draft water budgets</li> <li>Model: Proposed: C2VSim Beta2 Model (2019 release)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical and Facilitation: Montgomery &amp; Associates (M&amp;A)</li> <li>Inter-B Coord Support: M&amp;A – distinct allocated funds; DWR GSP Development grant general funding may be available; may pursue other funding</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Website</a>				
<b>Colusa</b>	Corning, Butte, Yolo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[2 GSAs via MOU]: Glenn Groundwater Authority (GGA) and Colusa Groundwater Authority (CGA)</li> <li>Advisory Group: Joint CGA/GGA Tech Advisory Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 GSP for whole subbasin</li> <li>Near-Term Work: model calibration; sustainable management criteria (SMC) components</li> <li>C2VSim Beta2 Model (2019 release)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical: Davids Engineering</li> <li>Facilitation: Sacramento State University</li> <li>Inter-B Coord Support: Non-dedicated outreach funds (working on allocation estimate)</li> </ul>
Websites ( <a href="#">Glenn</a> )   ( <a href="#">Colusa</a> )				
<b>Vina</b>	Los Molinos, Corning, Butte, Wyandotte Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[2 GSAs]: Vina GSA and Rock Creek RD GSA</li> <li>Advisory Group: Vina Stakeholder Advisory Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 GSP per subbasin</li> <li>Near-Term Work: basin setting; water budget scenarios; management area(s) decision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical: Geosyntec [Vina &amp; Wyandotte]; Davids Engineering [Butte]</li> <li>Facilitation: Consensus Building Institute (CBI)</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Website</a>				
<b>Butte</b>	Colusa, Corning, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, Sutter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[11 GSAs via Cooperation Agreement]: Butte County, Richvale ID, Western Canal WD, Butte WD, Biggs West Gridley WD, City of Biggs, City of Gridley, RD 1004, RD 2106, Glenn County, CGA</li> <li>Advisory Group: Butte Subbasin Advisory Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model: Butte Basin Groundwater Model (BBGM) using Interbasin Water Flow Model (IWFM) platform, 2020 update and recalibration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inter-B Coord Support: DWR GSP Development grant – distinct allocated funds</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Website</a>				
<b>Wyandotte Creek</b>	Butte, Sutter, N. Yuba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[1 GSA via JPA]: Wyandotte Creek GSA</li> <li>Advisory Group: none.</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">Website</a>				

## Meeting Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Subbasins
Christina Buck	Butte County	Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek
Kelly Peterson	Butte County	Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek
Paul Gosselin	Butte County	Vina, Butte, and Wyandotte Creek
Mary Fahey	Colusa Groundwater Authority	Colusa and Butte
Lisa Hunter	Glenn County and Glenn Groundwater Authority	Colusa, Corning, and Butte
Ryan Teubert	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, Los Molinos, and Corning
Nichole Bethurem	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, Los Molinos, and Corning
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	Butte, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	Butte, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos