

Meeting Brief

- **Overview:** Staff representatives from Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Sutter, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, and Yolo subbasins held the fifth inter-basin coordination meeting. Subbasin staff met with the goals of reflecting on shared learnings in inter-basin efforts and priorities moving forward, providing updates on their GSP development status, and sharing key takeaways from adjacent subbasin technical meetings.
- **Next Steps:** Staff and consultants will continue compiling water budget results into the information-sharing template, and possibly other useful outputs and figures emerging from their Basin Setting chapters as available that contribute to a shared regional understanding of basin conditions. Subbasin representatives will provide regular inter-basin coordination updates at their respective public venues and gather public input related to the direction of current efforts and desired priorities for inter-basin coordination during GSP development and beyond.
- **Next meeting:** The facilitation team will work on scheduling the next meeting in the spring (between February-April 2021).

Action Items

Item	Lead	Completion
<input type="checkbox"/> Update inter-basin coordination documents (i.e., information-sharing template and presentation).	CBI	Ongoing
<input type="checkbox"/> Continue compiling information on cross-boundary flows, stream-aquifer interactions, and common hydrogeologic understanding.	Consulting Teams	As water budgets are finalized
<input type="checkbox"/> Coordinate with technical consulting teams to determine what other model outputs and figures are needed to better understand and characterize inter-basin flows and stream-aquifer interactions at boundaries.	Christina Buck	Ongoing
<input type="checkbox"/> Update inter-basin coordination website.	Christina Buck (Butte County)	Ongoing Access Here
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide inter-basin coordination updates to advisory boards and relevant public meetings. Share key questions and concerns at next meeting.	CBI and subbasin representatives	Ongoing
<input type="checkbox"/> Include Yolo in upcoming Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Mary Fahey	Feb 17 meeting

Summary

1. Meeting Purpose and Introduction

This was the fifth meeting of staff to support the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) inter-basin coordination effort. The aim of this meeting is to receive updates and reflect on efforts so far, including shared learnings and desired next steps as NSV subbasins continue developing their Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs).

2. Meeting Summary

Participants confirmed the previous meeting summary (12/1/20).

3. GSP Development Status

- Vina and Wyandotte Creek Subbasins:** Advisory committees in both of these subbasins have discussed an approach to establishing Minimum Thresholds (MT) and Measurable Objectives (MO) based on depths of domestic wells in the vicinity of representative monitoring wells for Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) for groundwater levels, groundwater storage, and land subsidence. Approaches for water quality and stream depletions have also been presented and discussed. The GSA boards have been briefed and a GSA Board public workshop is planned in February in both subbasins for public discussion and input on the draft SMC approach. In the next couple of months, the subbasins will tackle the monitoring network chapter and discuss management areas. Also, solicitations for Projects and Management Actions (PMAs) are upcoming, and revisions to the Basin Setting chapters based on received public comments are underway.
- Butte Subbasin:** GSA managers in the Butte Subbasin are discussing components of the SMC and Projects and Management Actions (PMA) portions of the plan. The next Butte Advisory Board meeting to discuss these topics is scheduled for February 25. GSA managers are beginning to coordinate on writing the General information and Administrative Chapter. Revisions to the Basin Setting chapter based on received public comments is underway in the next couple of months as well.
- Sutter Subbasin:** The subbasin is entirely within Sutter County, which holds regular bi-weekly public meetings on Thursdays from 1 pm – 2 pm. The next meeting will be held February 4th. Sutter subbasin is using the Alternative as the backbone to our GSP and are gathering additional information and developing our groundwater model information. The website: <http://suttersubbasin.org> has been established to keep interested parties updated on important information within the subbasin. Sutter held its first Public Workshop on December 14th and will be hosting the second Public Workshop on February 8th from 4 pm - 6 pm.
- Yolo Subbasin:** Yolo has recently posted the Introduction Chapter to their website for comments. The GSA completed the Basin Setting draft chapter and hope to post it to the website soon. Yolo is currently working through SMC development and drafting the SMC chapter. The GSA has drafted MT/MOs for water levels and water storage and are referencing existing water quality programs for degradation of water quality. They have started their analysis for land subsidence and depletion of interconnected surface water. The immediate interbasin coordination concern is to talk with Sutter and Colusa about the approach to land subsidence. Yolo hopes to have public workshops in March 2021 that will review the draft chapters available for public review and update the public on the SMC development.
- Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff Subbasins:** Tehama County and its technical consultants, Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), recently released drafts of Chapter 1: Introduction for the Bowman, Antelope, Red Bluff, and Los Molinos Subbasins for public review. Chapters can be reviewed on the [Groundwater Sustainability Plans](#) page. GSA staff are reviewing the Basin Setting chapter and are close to calibrating the model, based on a two primary aquifer system. They will have modeling results in the next weeks. Tehama County is planning to hold a public meeting in April followed by public comment and public workshops. They submitted a Technical Support Services (TSS) application for groundwater monitoring wells in the western side of the subbasin around Thomas Creek.
- Corning Subbasin:** The Corning Subbasin is moving forward with GSP development and recently released the draft Introduction, Plan Area, Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model, and Groundwater Conditions sections of the GSP for public review. Following Basin Setting discussions, the subbasin is tackling SMC development. In addition, the Technical Support Services (TSS) multicompletion monitoring well is underway and will provide

valuable insight for stream-aquifer interactions and inter-basin flows, as it is located close to the Colusa-Corning boundary.

- Colusa Subbasin:** Colusa does not have chapters out for public review yet, but GSP development is moving along. The draft Basin Setting chapter is expected to be released this month. The Corning and Colusa Joint Technical Advisory Committee continues to meet regularly and is discussing management areas, considering analyzing water budgets by subareas within the subbasin, and exploring different approaches to set SMC. Colusa is soliciting PMAs online and is developing consistent strategies for public outreach and communication. Lastly, the Colusa subbasin will be sending a letter to the governor to request an extension for the GSP, given the public engagement challenges due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

For more information, visit the subbasins' websites in the table below.

Subbasin	Website
Antelope	Website
Bowman	Website
Butte	Website
Los Molinos	Website
Red Bluff	Website
Corning	Website
Colusa	Websites (Glenn) (Colusa)
Sutter	Website
Vina	Websites (Vina) (RCRD)
Wyandotte Creek	Website
Yolo	Website

4. Adjacent Subbasin Meeting Updates

C. Buck (Butte County) provided an update from a recent meeting with consultants from adjacent subbasins (ex. Butte, Colusa, Corning, and Vina). They met to better understand the methods and assumptions used in the different models and identify ways to compare and communicate information on cross-boundary flows, and stream-aquifer interactions at boundaries with the public. They distinguished between information-sharing and coordination related to modeling (water budget comparison) and broader GSP coordination as GSPs develop SMC and beyond. Due to model development timing for GSP development, subbasins were not able to coordinate modeling efforts; however, there is opportunity to better coordinate model updates and refinements in the future as part of GSP implementation post 2022 submissions. Subbasins are in the early stages of SMC development so there is some opportunity for coordination on that topic—Regional coordinating related to monitoring would also be very valuable.

Information-Sharing Template: The technical teams discussed the value of different visuals to compare model outputs and get a better understanding of basin conditions at boundaries. These images, some already available as part of the Basin Setting chapters, could help paint a more comprehensive picture to communicate with the public. C. Buck showed example figures like contour maps and timeseries graphs that may be helpful ways to

understand groundwater conditions being represented by differing model tools and how they compare to measured data. Subbasins want to be able to answer questions like:

- How are the models representing the system? Are they telling a similar story?
- Are the models showing similar trends? Is the system responding similarly to drought?
- What do contour maps (both from monitoring data and modeling results) suggest about direction of groundwater flow?

Discussion:

- The goal of the technical information-sharing effort is to **identify major discrepancies** that may cause an issue moving forward. Identifying these differences may help subbasins prepare and avoid problems along the road.
- Subbasin representatives like the idea of **using existing outputs** from the Basin Setting and minimizing additional work for consultants, given budget implications.
- It will be important to **manage expectations**. While the subbasins are coordinating to analyze model results, they will probably not have the ability to address discrepancies during GSP development. The goal is to compare efforts, anticipate problems, and set up a framework for coordination during implementation.

Outcomes | Next Steps

- + Christina Buck will continue working with technical consulting teams to identify what other model outputs and figures might help better understand and characterize inter-basin flows and stream-aquifer interactions at boundaries.
- + CBI will continue coordination with technical consulting teams to continue compiling information on cross-boundary flows, stream-aquifer interactions, and common hydrogeologic understanding.
- + The full group will continue to compile technical information as water budget results become available (between March-April 2021).

5. Reflection on Inter-basin Coordination Efforts

Participants engaged in small group and plenary conversations focused on reflecting on inter-basin coordination efforts so far, shared learnings, and desired objectives moving forward. Highlights from the conversation are summarized below.

Shared Learnings

- It is not necessary for all the model results to match perfectly. Rather, it is important to acknowledge discrepancies and understand why the differences exist.
- Despite work done so far, there are still many unanswered questions.
- There is more public interest in inter-basin coordination than previously expected.
- Subbasins share similar outreach concerns in light of Covid-19.
- Inter-basin coordination is a marathon not a sprint. Efforts so far continue to pave the path for long-term collaboration.
- Public concerns in some subbasins trickle into others.
- Subbasins can take advantage of 5-year updates to address discrepancies.
- Representatives want to honor the differences among subbasins, while still show coordination across boundaries.

What are we trying to achieve?

- Have clear and consistent message and expectations
- Establish a framework for continued dialogue and a venue to address issues and discrepancies
- Maintain trust and credibility with DWR and with the public
- Balance objectives: provide enough information but in a clear and accessible manner
- Leverage existing agreements and arrangements (NSV IRWM, ACWA Groundwater, NCWA)
- Find ways to show coordination and measure success

How to involve the public?

- Share and educate the public on what is in the various GSPs, the inter-basin coordination requirements in SGMA, and efforts underway
- Share takeaways from today's reflection and ask for public input
- Continue to provide continuous updates in board and public meetings
- Have public discussion regarding the nexus between IRWM and SGMA in the NSV IRWM Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Existing public outreach materials:

- Inter-basin Coordination Website [[Access Here](#)]
- Inter-basin Coordination Flyer [[Access Here](#)]
- Inter-basin Coordination Presentation [[Access Here](#)]
- Compiled Modeling Tools Highlights [[Access Here](#)]

Outcomes | Next Steps

- ✦ Efforts will pivot toward developing a framework for ongoing inter-basin coordination and dialogue.

Meeting Participants

Participant	Representation/Affiliation	Subbasins
Staff		
Christina Buck	Butte County	Butte, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek
Paul Gosselin	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
Ryan Teubert	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Antelope, Bowman, Corning, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff
Nichole Bethurem	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Antelope, Bowman, Corning, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff
Anjanette Shadley	Western Canal Water District	Butte
Kristin Sicke	Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Yolo
Guadalupe Rivera	Sutter County	Sutter
Facilitation Team		
Tania Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	
Mariana Rivera-Torres	Consensus Building Institute	