CGA/GGA Joint Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

MEETING MINUTES

June 22, 2020 | 1:00 p.m.
Due to safety concerns and directives from the Governor and Federal Government related to COVID-19,
This meeting was held remotely ONLY.

---

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:00 p.m.

Dave Ceppos with the Census and Collaboration Program started the meeting and went over some housekeeping and logistical items.

In Attendance:
Committee Members:
GGA: David Kehn, Emil Cavagnolo, Zac Dickens, Mark Lohse, Ron Stilwell

CGA: Darrin Williams, Thad Bettner, Bill Vanderwaal, Brandon Davison (ex-officio)

Others in Attendance: Lisa Hunter (GGA Staff), Mary Fahey (CGA Staff), David Ceppos (Facilitator), Byron Clark (Davids Engineering, Inc.), Tom Charter Jr., Emily James (Davis Ranches), Jim Brobeck, Duncan MacEwan (ERA Economics), Matt (last name unknown), Reza Namvar (Consultant Staff), Jaime Lely, Ben King, Stacie Ann Silva, Denise Carter (CGA Board Member), Lance Boyd (CGA Board Member/GGA Alternate Board Member), Lisa Porta

2. * Approval of Minutes from the May 8, 2020 CGA/GGA TAC meeting

For the CGA, Darrin Williams made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 8, 2020 CGA/GGA TAC meeting. Bill Vanderwaal seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Roll Call Vote
Colusa Groundwater Authority
Thad Bettner: AYE
Bill Vanderwaal: AYE
Darrin Williams: AYE

For the GGA, Zac Dickens made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 8, 2020 CGA/GGA TAC meeting. David Kehn seconded the motion, which passed 4:0:1 abstention.

Roll Call Vote
Glenn Groundwater Authority
David Kehn: AYE

Emil Cavagnolo: AYE
Mark Lohse: AYE
Zac Dickens: AYE
Ron Stilwell: ABSTAIN

3. Period of Public Comment

Jim Brobeck, representing the Vina Subbasin Stakeholder Advisory Committee, commented on coordination of modeling efforts in the region and hopes to see a regional model.

4. Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development:

- **a. * Formalize (1) Approach to Monitoring Network Development, (2) Approach and Assumptions for Water Budget Future Scenarios, and (3) Approach to Establish Minimum Thresholds and Measureable Objectives as Recommended at the May 9, 2020 meeting (Potential Action Item)**
- **b. * Projected Water Budget Scenarios (Potential Action Item)**
- **c. Well Monitoring Pilot Program**
- **d. * Funding Mechanism Evaluation- Task and Budget Review (Potential Action Item)**
- **e. Project and Management Actions- Initial Brainstorming**
- **f. Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems- Proposed Approach**

Mr. Ceppos introduced Item 4.a and mentioned that after discussion, the item would not be put to a vote until after the Projected Water Budget Scenario (Item 4.b). He also noted a typo to be corrected changing May 9 to May 8. Ms. Fahey provided an overview and noted the CGA Board approved this item at the previous board meeting. Ms. Hunter indicated the GGA Board received a TAC report, but not an item for approval of this specific item. The GGA TAC was given authority to guide technical work while policy decisions will be brought back to the GGA Board.

Byron Clark reviewed Item 4.b including criteria for the projected water budgets, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) process to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, the Voluntary Agreements negotiations, the State Board Sacramento River proposal, and potential impacts to the Colusa Subbasin. Mr. Clark discussed the technical challenges to incorporating these processes into the 2022 GSP and requested TAC input to proceed with the development of projected water budget scenarios based on recent historical surface water supplies, or to develop water budget(s) scenarios considering potential reductions in future surface water supplies based on the Bay-Delta processes. David Kehn asked Mr. Clark to describe what other basins have done to incorporate this information. An action item was created to follow up on this request. Thad Bettner indicated he feels it is premature and speculative to include State Board flow proposals or Voluntary Agreement estimates and that it would be better to revisit these items in the five year review. Others agreed with the approach to revisit in the five year review. Stacie Ann Silva noted that she has reviewed many of the submitted 2020 plans and many acknowledged the negotiations, but they are not incorporated into the water budgets.

Item 4.a was revisited and a motion was made by David Kehn and seconded by Zac Dickens for the GGA TAC to approve the item as corrected (change May 9 to May 8). The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Roll Call Vote</u>
Glenn Groundwater Authority
David Kehn: AYE
Emil Cavagnolo: AYE
Mark Lohse: AYE
Zac Dickens: AYE
Ron Stilwell: AYE

Item 4.b was taken back up. There were no public comments. For the CGA, Bill Vanderwaal made a motion to proceed with the development of projected water budget scenarios based on recent historical surface water supplies. The motion was seconded by Thad Bettner and passed unanimously.

<u>Roll Call Vote</u>
Colusa Groundwater Authority
Thad Bettner: AYE
Bill Vanderwaal: AYE
Darrin Williams: AYE

For the GGA, David Kehn made a motion to proceed with the development of projected water budget scenarios based on recent historical surface water supplies. The motion was seconded by Emil Cavagnolo and passed unanimously.

<u>Roll Call Vote</u>
Glenn Groundwater Authority
David Kehn: AYE
Emil Cavagnolo: AYE
Mark Lohse: AYE
Zac Dickens: AYE
Ron Stilwell: AYE

It was decided to move Item 4.c to later in the meeting and Mr. Clark proceeded to review the funding mechanism evaluation task (Item 4.d). He described the background and objectives of the task, the description of the evaluation, and the estimated budget. He noted the task is listed as an optional task in the GSP development contract and is funded through the DWR Proposition 68 grant. Mr. Clark noted Duncan MacEwan from ERA Economics would be leading the task and Mr. MacEwan is available for questions. A question was asked if the evaluation is more abstract or if it actual water budget and pumping data will be used to develop the options. Mr. MacEwan responded that the evaluation is a bit in-between those scenarios. The evaluation will not have the level of detail necessary for a rate study or parcel-level data, but will be working with water budgets and sustainable criteria for planning purposes. Real data would be used to provide scenarios.

For the CGA, a motion was made by Thad Bettner and seconded by Bill Vanderwaal to proceed with the funding mechanisms evaluation as described in the Proposition 68 grant agreement. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Roll Call Vote</u>
Colusa Groundwater Authority
Thad Bettner: AYE
Bill Vanderwaal: AYE
Darrin Williams: AYE

For the GGA, a motion was made by Emil Cavagnolo and seconded by David Kehn to proceed with the funding mechanisms evaluation as described in the Proposition 68 grant agreement. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Roll Call Vote</u>
Glenn Groundwater Authority
David Kehn: AYE
Emil Cavagnolo: AYE
Mark Lohse: AYE
Zac Dickens: AYE
Ron Stilwell: AYE

Mr. Clark proceeded to Item 4.e and discussed initial brainstorming for Projects and Management Actions (PMAs). His presentation reviewed the GSP requirements and the proposed approach to accomplish this task. The approach would begin with preliminary stakeholder engagement and develop an initial inventory. A draft project template has been developed for stakeholder use. Analysis would then take place and screening of the PMAs on the inventory list. Then the team would create and assess combinations of PMAs and evaluate impacts on groundwater conditions. Finally, the PMAs would be ranked, selected for inclusion in the GSP, and final analysis would be performed. The project template is fairly generic and is intended to gather and organize ideas.

Jim Brobeck noted the meeting packet mentioned supply augmentation from Sites Reservoir. Mr. Brobeck has concerns regarding water quality, specifically heavy metals and saline. Mr. Brobeck will forward a document to CGA and GGA Program Managers and Byron Clark outlining his concerns.

There was discussion on the approach, the draft project template to gather PMA ideas, and options to distribute the PMA template. There were comments that supported stakeholder input. It would be helpful to provide context and point out that the stakeholder can fill in what they know, but not all information may be necessary or relevant. It was also noted that it may be difficult to suggest or encourage stakeholders to fill out the form if needs are not known yet. Mr. Clark indicated this is intended to be an iterative process that will continue to be refined. Distribution methods could include a variety of options such as listserv distribution, a webform on the GSA websites, word document distribution, and/or hard copy distributions. Mr. Clark indicated the solicitation for project ideas should not be less than 60 days. 90 days might be a good target; however, it may be best to delay immediate distribution. It was also noted that there will be an ongoing list of PMAs, especially when ideas are brought up at stakeholder meetings. It was asked if there could be an initial cutoff for projects to be considered for plan inclusion, but continue to collect ideas and capture in the list for later use. Mr. Clark

indicated that is possible. There was general support for email distribution and having a link on GSA webpages. There was also an interest in potentially mailing letters. There was a suggestion to make submitted projects viewable on the webpages (project list) in order to have an open forum and to help stakeholders brainstorm ideas. Mr. Clark asked if any information should be considered confidential or sensitive. There was general agreement that all data would be public.

Mr. Clark presented information on Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem (GDE) evaluation under Item 4.f. He reviewed the definition and noted that GDEs must be identified in the Basin Setting chapter of the GSP. Preliminary identification is based on the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset developed by DWR and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). Funding for additional refinements is included in the Proposition 68 grant. Mr. Clark reviewed preliminary GDE mapping and the proposed approach for additional evaluation. He also provided information on the TNC Guidance Document and the approach being taken in Butte County, as a comparison. Mr. Ceppos noted that the stakeholder GDE outreach process could be included in the Communication and Engagement Plan update. There was discussion on the proposed evaluation approach. There was general support for up front analysis to narrow down the number of polygons prior to engaging stakeholders for feedback. There was encouragement to be consistent with the application of criteria by using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis rather than having multiple people reviewing polygons. Form questions and criteria should not be subjective if possible. Ideas for engaging stakeholders included discussion at public meetings, selective communication (still be open to all public, but focused on property owners with potential GDEs), and letters to landowners. One possible scenario would be to go through initial analysis, review by the GSAs, detailed review by landowners, and update maps based on that process. It was further noted that it is important that all involved understand the metrics of what makes a GDE and why it is identified as a potential GDE or not.

Mr. Clark moved to Item 4.c and reviewed the background and objectives of the Well Monitoring Pilot Program. He continued to describe measurement options, data collection options, considerations for selection process, and environmental permitting. There was discussion on the importance of water level data and the value of telemetry. It was mentioned that privacy issues should be addressed in the selection process and that data should be made public. It was noted that many landowners may be hesitant to share data due to privacy issues and others may face challenges based on cost of implementation. There was discussion on the primary purpose being extraction measurements, which could be expanded if needed. Mr. Clark noted it is anticipated that flow meters and water level sensors would be part of the program. Further discussion indicated that many wells are already metered and many farmers are dependent on knowing the flow rate of their systems; however, many of the devices are not installed properly. This program should be geared toward bringing others in. There were additional questions about the ability to leverage funding from other programs, although it may be difficult to qualify and programs are not widespread. Overall, there was support for the program.

5. Schedule Next Meeting

Ms. Fahey noted the ultimate goal is to set regular monthly meetings. In the meantime, it is suggested to set a meeting date during the week of July 20. Staff will communicate with TAC members to set the meeting date.

6. Topics for Next Meeting

Mr. Clark noted further topics might include a draft projected water budget based on today's discussions, initial draft on Minimum Thresholds and Measureable Objectives, Projects and Management Actions updates, and Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem approach updates.

It was requested for TAC members to submit any items to include on the next meeting by June 29, 2020 at 5:00 pm. The request should be submitted to Mary Fahey, Lisa Hunter, and Byron Clark.

7. Member Reports and Comments

None

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Byron Clark to investigate how other basins, particularly Critically Overdrafted Basins, are handling the unimpaired flows, voluntary agreements, and other related discussions in GSP water budgets
- Lisa Hunter, Mary Fahey, Dave Ceppos, and Byron Clark to have a meeting regarding outreach activities to include discussion on GDE specific outreach
- TAC member feedback on topics for next meeting by June 29, 2020 at 5:00 pm

Staff Report

To: CGA-GGA Joint TAC

Agenda Item: 4. Discussion and Possible Action: Selection of TAC Member from the GGA and the CGA to provide regular TAC meeting updates at Board Meetings

Date: August 14, 2020

Background

At the July 13, 2020 GGA Board meeting, the Board requested that the TAC appoint a representative or a spokesperson to report to the Board and be available to answer questions. The Board emphasized the importance of TAC reports, especially given the authority provided to the committee to guide consultant work on technical components of the planning process. The Board indicated its desire to be kept informed of the technical work and have the ability to continue to guide the committee.

Although this topic has not been requested by the CGA Board, it would be helpful to maintain a consistent process and ability to provide streamlined reporting from the TAC to the Board.

The purpose of the discussion is to select a member from the GGA TAC to provide regular reports to the GGA Board and, if agreed-to by the CGA TAC members, select a member from the CGA TAC to provide regular updates to the CGA Board. If desired, selection could also include an Alternate member.

Schedule

Reporting will begin at the next meetings of the GGA and CGA Board meetings and continue through GSP development.

Proposed Recommendation

Select one member and one alternate from the GGA TAC to report to the GGA Board and select one member and one alternate from the CGA TAC to report to the CGA Board.

Attachments

None.

Staff Report

To: CGA-GGA Joint TAC

Agenda Item: 5.a. Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development – Projected Water Budgets Update

Date: August 14, 2020

Background

Preparation of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Colusa Subbasin requires development of water budgets quantifying all inflows to and outflows from the basin, as well as change in storage. Water budgets must be quantified for three separate time frames:

- Historical, based on at least 10 past years
- Projected, based on
    - 50-years historical hydrology
    - Most recent land use and crop coefficient information
    - Projected changes in land use planning, population, and climate
    - Projected surface water supply based on the most recent water supply information

Draft projected water budgets have been developed for the Colusa Subbasin using DWR's C2VSim Fine Grid integrated hydrologic model for the Central Valley, a tool intended by the state to support GSAs in developing water budgets for their GSPs.

At the 6/22/2020 Joint TAC meeting, the consultant team was authorized to proceed with the development of projected water budgets based on the following assumptions:

1. Historical hydrology from 1966 to 2015 (50-year hydrologic period)
2. Recent historical land use, mapped to curtailment/noncurtailment years
3. Urban demands based on projected population and per capita use
4. Climate change based on central tendency scenarios developed by DWR for SGMA, centered around 2030 and 2070
5. Water supply based on recent historical use, mapped to curtailment/non-curtailment years

Following the 6/22 meeting, water budget scenarios based on the assumptions listed above have been developed, along with updates to the C2VSim model inputs. Draft results of projected water budgets under scenarios with and without climate change will be presented for review and discussion.

The purpose of this discussion is to review draft projected water budgets and receive input on potential additional refinements to water budget assumptions affecting the water budget for the basin.

Schedule

Development of historical water budgets and preparation of datasets for projected water budget scenarios are underway with completion of a draft GSP chapter planned in late 2020/early 2021.

Attachments

Davids Engineering Technical Memorandum dated 6/26/2020: Summary of Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Approaches to Consider Potential Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Impacts on Surface Water Availability

Technical Memorandum

To: CGA/GGA Joint Technical Advisory Committee

From: Davids Engineering

Date: June 26, 2020

Subject: **Summary of Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Approaches to Consider Potential Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Impacts on Surface Water Availability**

This technical memorandum TM summarizes approaches by Central Valley groundwater subbasins subject to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) that are also potentially impacted by the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan update process to address these potential impacts in GSPs prepared to date.

Merced Subbasin

For the Merced Subbasin GSP, impacts of the Bay-Delta Plan update are mentioned as a source of potential cause of undesirable results, but not explicitly considered in the development of water budgets due to uncertainty. The following is an excerpt from the GSP, shown in italics with underlining added to pertinent statements.

Potential Causes of Undesirable Results (Section 3.3.1)

The Subbasin is currently considered to be in a state of critical overdraft per the DWR Bulletin 118 Interim 2016 Update. Projections of water levels based on the GSP implementation plan do not show groundwater levels triggering undesirable results. However, the chronic lowering of groundwater levels could cause localized or basin-wide undesirable results if GSP implementation does not achieve sufficient pumping reductions. In addition, regulatory, permitting, and funding constraints may influence implementation timing for groundwater management programs and projects in the Subbasin.

Other potential causes could be external factors such as increased groundwater outflow from the Merced Subbasin to adjacent groundwater subbasins as a result of imbalances in groundwater pumping between the subbasins. <u>Additionally, state- or federally-driven regulatory programs could dedicate surface water resources to environmental uses in the San Joaquin River or in downstream waterbodies such as the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, thus reducing water available to the Merced Subbasin. For example, increased flow requirements described by the Substitute Environmental Document (SED) for the Lower San Joaquin River and Southern Delta Bay-Delta Plan Update would likely cause impacts to groundwater levels.</u>

East San Joaquin Subbasin

For the East San Joaquin Subbasin GSP, impacts of the Bay-Delta Plan update are mentioned as a source of potential undesirable results and uncertainty, but not explicitly considered in the development of water budgets. The following are excerpts from the GSP, shown in italics with underlining added to pertinent statements.

3.2.2.1.3 Potential Causes of Undesirable Results

While reduction of 23 MAF within the SGMA planning horizon of 2040 is highly unlikely, an event of a catastrophic nature or prolonged and exaggerated increases in the mining of groundwater due to extreme and severe drought or major changes in groundwater management over time could cause a reduction of groundwater storage to a significant and unreasonable level.

Section 7.4.4 references factors that could affect the availability of surface water, including State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) plans to reduce flows available for use by 40-60 percent as part of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Plan).

7.4.4 Data Gaps and Uncertainties

The ESJGWA acknowledges that there are many factors that could affect the availability of surface water, including the SWRCB plans to reduce flows available for use by 40-60 percent as part of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta Plan). Such regulations will need to be evaluated by GSAs in the implementation of projects. The process of providing annual reports to DWR and of GSAs self-reporting to the ESJGWA will allow the ESJGWA to update the Plan and adjust the implementation course as needed based on changing conditions. The GSP allows project implementation to be updated as needed, and it is currently too speculative to say what the impact will be from the proposed Bay-Delta Plan Update regulation, as the SWRCB has not yet determined how the regulation will be been implemented.

North and South Yuba Subbasins

For the Noth Yuba and South Yuba subbasins, the Bay Delta process is not mentioned.

Other Subbasins

GSPs for other subbasins potentially impacted by the Bay Delta process are currently under development. As a result, it is uncertain whether and how the Bay Delta process will be addressed and incorporated.

Staff Report

To: CGA-GGA Joint TAC

Agenda Item: 5.b. Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development – Preliminary Refinement of GDE Delineation

Date: August 14, 2020

Background

The identification of groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) as part of GSP development is a required component of the Groundwater Conditions section of the Basin Setting. A related component is the establishment of Sustainable Management Criteria related to depletion of interconnected surface water. The HCM and Water Budget project, currently nearing completion, includes preliminary identification of GDEs based on the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset developed by DWR and released in 2019. This dataset identifies 2,795 polygons in the subbasin as potential GDEs, comprising 17,748 acres.

At the June 22 meeting of the Joint TAC, refinements to the preliminary delineation of GDEs were discussed, including compiling additional data to identify potential GDEs and preparing maps and supporting data to support stakeholder engagement and additional refinements. The consultant team was asked to develop potential additional criteria to refine the classification of potential GDEs based on approaches utilized in other basins and other considerations.

As a result of the discussion, the consultant team has developed an initial approach for refining the delineation of GDEs through spatial analysis using GIS for review and discussion. The initial approach would refine the classification of GDEs as (1) likely GDEs, (2) potential GDEs, or (3) not likely GDEs and considers the following factors:

- Average spring depth to groundwater between 2014 and 2018,
- Proximity to irrigated cropland, and
- Proximity to surface water bodies.

Results of the initial refinement to delineation of GDEs will be presented, including the number of polygons and acreage associated with each classification and maps of the corresponding areas.

The purpose of this discussion is to gather input on the criteria used to refine the delineation of GDEs and to identify next steps for the delineation of GDEs for inclusion in the GSP.

Schedule

Preliminary identification of GDEs has been completed through the HCM and Water Budget project. Refinements to GDE identification and characterization will be initiated in July 2020 and proceed through 2020 and early 2021, with completion in mid-2021.

Attachments

None.

Staff Report

To: CGA-GGA Joint TAC

Agenda Item: 5.c. Colusa Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Development – Well Monitoring Pilot Program Update

Date: August 14, 2020

Background

As part of the Proposition 68 SGM Round 3 grant proposal developed in fall 2019 and recently awarded to the CGA, a task was included based on TAC recommendations to include a well monitoring pilot program. The proposed program includes the following activities:

- Identify selection criteria for participating wells, considering well location, groundwater use, equipment specifications, and other factors as identified.
- Conduct stakeholder outreach to enlist program participants.
- Evaluate options for data collection including periodic field visits and telemetry. Collect information from voluntary participants regarding groundwater extraction and groundwater levels at individual wells.
- Incorporate available data into GSP development process.
- Identify and evaluate options for basin-wide implementation, including estimation of initial and ongoing program costs.

At the meeting of the Joint TAC held 6/22/2020, considerations related to development of the pilot program were presented and discussed, including program objectives, selection criteria, stakeholder outreach, and data collection. Based on input received at the meeting and subsequent evaluation of program options, an updated and refined description of the proposed program has been developed.

The purpose of this discussion is to review refined program characteristics and identify next steps for program development. It is anticipated that guidance will be provided to the consultant team regarding refinements to one or more program components, with the objective of developing a complete program description that can be used to solicit grower/landowner participation by the end of 2020, with implementation prior to the 2021 growing season.

Schedule

Implementation of the well monitoring pilot program began in July 2020 with initial effort focused on program design and selection. Based on the estimated timeline for program design and environmental compliance requirements, it is currently anticipated that data activities will be initiated in early 2021 to allow for incorporation of collected data into the GSP.

Attachments

None.

Staff Report

To: CGA-GGA Joint TAC

Agenda Item: 6. Interbasin Coordination

Date: August 14, 2020

Background

Coordination with GSAs and GSPs in adjacent basins is a critical element for successful SGMA implementation, and is a requirement in the GSP Regulations. It is especially important that neighboring GSAs develop a shared understanding of hydrogeologic conditions, including; (1) cross-boundary groundwater flow, (2) stream-aquifer interactions, and (3) water budgets.

A Northern Sacramento Valley Inter-basin Coordination group has been formed and is being facilitated by Tania Carlone from the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) initially funded through a Butte County Facilitation Support Services contract with DWR. This coordination group includes representatives from: Colusa, Vina, Butte, Wyandotte Creek, Corning, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, and Los Molinos subbasins. Although the adjacent Yolo Subbasin is not included in this group, Ms. Carlone is communicating the NSV Coordination group's efforts with Yolo Staff, and Staff from the Colusa Groundwater Authority has been coordinating with Yolo's SGMA efforts since early in the SGMA planning process.

It has been suggested by a TAC member, that it would be helpful to develop a "Report Card" or matrix that could frame the major technical approaches in the Colusa Subbasin and compare those to the approaches in each adjacent subbasin. As an example, a member of the public recently raised the issue of the importance of coordination of Modelling efforts across basin boundaries. This could be a "Report Card" line item, listing the model being used in the Colusa Subbasin and how our model choice relates to the choices in the adjacent subbasins so that we can identify any potential issues early on. The "Report Card" could include a short description of the Colusa Subbasin approaches to the different technical elements, then, listed under each subbasin there could be simple responses such as Identical, Similar, Problematic, Conflicts, etc.

CBI has created a draft Excel Workbook for the NSV Inter-basin Coordination Group which is intended to capture the different technical efforts in the local subbasins, identify known issues, and document approaches to resolve issues. The document focuses on GSP regulations for Inter-basin Agreements, technical components, and model information. Currently, the technical information contains tracking for groundwater flow across basin boundaries, an estimate of stream-aquifer interaction at boundaries, a common understanding of geology and hydrology

and hydraulic connectivity, sustainable management criteria and monitoring network components. This workbook is being refined by GSA staff and consulting team leads and should be available at a future meeting.

Ultimately, this information sharing document may be sufficient for our needs, or the TAC members may wish to have something that is more focused on the Colusa Subbasin's approach and how it directly relates to the adjacent subbasins.

Proposed Recommendation

Discuss inter-basin coordination as it relates to GSP technical components and discuss need for any additional mechanism to document inter-basin technical approaches. Provide direction to Staff for any follow-up as needed.

Attachments

None