Appendix 2-A

Domestic Well In

1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 DOMESTIC WELL INVENTORY DATA SOURCES AND COMPILATION	1
2.1 DWR WCR DATABASE	1
2.1.1 DOMESTIC WELL WCRS	1
2.1.2 WCR DATES	2
2.1.3 WCR LOCATIONS	2
2.2 Well Permit Records	3
2.2.1 DOMESTIC WELL PERMITS	3
2.2.2 LOCATING WELL PERMITS	3
2.3 COUNTY ASSESSOR PARCEL DATA	3
2.4 WATER SYSTEM DATA	4
2.4.1 STATE REGULATED SYSTEMS	4
2.4.2 PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM WELLS	4
3 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	4
3.1 ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC WELL LOCATIONS AND COUNTS	5
3.1.1 DOMESTIC WELL WCRS	5
3.1.2 DOMESTIC WELL PERMITS	5
3.1.3 PARCELS WITH RESIDENTS	6
3.1.4 COMPARISONS OF DOMESTIC WELL LOCATION INFORMATION SOURCES	6
3.1.4.1 Domestic Wells Within PWS Service Areas	6
3.1.4.2 Comparing WCR Locations to Well Permits	6
3.1.5 FINAL DOMESTIC WELL COUNT AND LOCATION ESTIMATES	7
3.1.6 WCR DOMESTIC WELL CONSTRUCTION INFORMATION	7
3.2 PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM WELLS	8
4 REFERENCES	8

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summary of domestic well WCRs by decade, subbasin
---------	---

Table 2Summary of known and inferred wells by subbasin

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Domestic Wells from Well Completion Reports, new construction wells 1980-2020
Figure 2	Summary by Section of Domestic Wells from Well Completion Reports
Figure 3a	Domestic Wells from Well Permits, new construction wells 2013-2020
Figure 3b	Domestic Wells from Well Completion reports, new construction wells 2013-2020
Figure 4a	Summary by Section of Domestic Wells from Well Permits 2013-2020
Figure 4b	Summary by Section of Domestic Wells from Well Completion Reports 2013-2020.
Figure 5a	Total Annual Number of Well Completion Reports and Permits 2013-2020 in Antelope Subbasin
Figure 5b	Total Annual Number of Well Completion Reports and Permits 2013-2020 in Bowman Subbasin
Figure 5c	Total Annual Number of Well Completion Reports and Permits 2013-2020 in Los Molinos Subbasin
Figure 5d	Total Annual Number of Well Completion Reports and Permits 2013-2020 in Red Bluff Subbasin
Figure 6	Parcels with Domestic Wells Inferred from Land Use Codes
Figure 7	Summary by Section of Inferred Domestic Wells
Figure 8	Summary of Known and Inferred Domestic Well Locations
Figure 9a	Community Water Systems and Public Water Supply Well Locations
Figure 9b	Domestic Wells within Community Water Systems or near Public Water Supply Wells
Figure 9c	Domestic Wells within Community Water Systems
Figure 10	Average Domestic Well Depths by Section
Figure 11a	Well Depths by Year in Antelope Subbasin
Figure 11b	Well Depths by Year in Bowman Subbasin
Figure 11c	Well Depths by Year in Los Molinos Subbasin
Figure 11d	Well Depths by Year in Red Bluff Subbasin

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Land Use Codes of Inferred Residential Parcels

1 INTRODUCTION

This appendix documents the available data sources for estimating numbers and locations of domestic wells, domestic well construction details, and occurrence of domestic wells in Tehama County. To prepare this domestic well inventory, approximations of the number, depths, and locations of domestic wells were developed from available data sources. The domestic wells indicated to be present according to multiple data sources were reviewed and compared.

2 DOMESTIC WELL INVENTORY DATA SOURCES AND COMPILATION

Data from a variety of public agencies were assembled for consideration in the project. Compiled datasets included the following.

- Well Completion Report (WCR) Database from California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) Online System for WCRs (OSWCR)
- Tehama County well permit database (records since 2013)
- Tehama County assessor's parcel data
- Public Water System (PWS) service area boundaries and PWS well locations from State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Division of Drinking Water (DDW)

Except for the Tehama County well permit database, all the above-listed datasets were available in geospatial (e.g., GIS) formats. The well permit database was provided as tabular data, which was converted to geospatial information as described below.

2.1 DWR WCR Database

The primary source for well construction data in the subbasin is the CDWR WCR database (CDWR, 2020). Well drillers are required to submit a WCR to DWR for all wells drilled and constructed in the State of California. DWR tabulated information from WCRs for the State, including data from WCRs dating as far back as the early 1900s. The tabulated WCR information include well type and construction characteristics such as the intended use of the well, well depths, and screened intervals along with location, construction date, permit information, and other details. Although completed WCRs commonly include additional notes on borehole lithology and a variety of other types of information, lithology and some other well information included on WCRs is not entered or maintained in the DWR WCR database. It is notable that many well attributes in the WCR database are blank or incomplete because of missing or illegible information provided on the WCRs. Additionally, well locations in the WCR database are commonly only provided to the center of the Public Land Survey System (PLSS) section in which it is located, which translates to a locational accuracy of approximately +/- 0.5 mile.

2.1.1 Domestic Well WCRs

As part of the project, initial quality checks were conducted on the WCR database to identify obvious inconsistencies in well data, including conflicting well locations (e.g., latitude, longitude, PLSS coordinates) and construction (e.g., well depths, top and bottom of screens). Such questionable information and records were flagged for additional consideration during subsequent analyses. For this domestic well

inventory analysis, only WCRs indicated to be domestic water supply wells were included. To limit potential double counting of domestic wells, only WCRs for new well construction (i.e., not well repairs/modification or destruction) were included in the domestic well inventory.

2.1.2 WCR Dates

The typical lifespan of a small water well is estimated to be about 50 years based on the durability and longevity of typical domestic well materials, which are commonly constructed of PVC casing. Using a conservative estimate of a 40-year lifespan, wells drilled prior to 1980 were considered unlikely to still be in operation or nearing the end of their lifespan.

For these reasons, only WCRs for wells with dates on or after 1980, were included in the domestic well inventory and associated analyses. A total of 5,879 domestic wells constructed since 1980 were considered in the analysis.

2.1.3 WCR Locations

Wells with WCRs marked as domestic were selected and mapped based on one of four geolocation methods, depending on what information was available in the tabulated data. Only wells with installations in 1980 or later were considered. The geolocation methods, in order of priority, are as follows:

- 1. GPS 4 wells
- 2. Address 85 wells
- 3. APN 2,193 wells
- 4. PLSS 3,597 wells

A total of 5,879 domestic wells were located within the Tehama Subbasin using these methods (**Figure 1**). Wells located by PLSS are typically placed at the center of the section in which they are located, and thus may be out of position by as much as about 0.5 mile (half the typical width of a section). Initially, 5,790 of the 5,879 domestic well completion reports were located by PLSS. 4,313 of these wells include a partial APN, none of which were formatted consistently with the Tehama County Parcel APNs (e.g., ###-###-000).

Potential APNs were generated for the partial APNs by adding zeroes. As an example, partial APN "79-60-3" would become "079-060-003-000" by adding leading zeroes before each 3-digit section and appending "-000" to the end. This assumes partial APNs to be partial only by losing leading zeroes; however, this is not the only possible way to format a potential APN from a partial APN.

Generated APNs were matched to Parcel APNs. Because there is uncertainty in the formatting of the partial APN, only APNs which match parcels located within the same PLSS sections as the WCR were adopted. 2,193 matching APNs were adopted, and the locations of the associated WCRs were updated from section centroids to the centroid of each matching parcel.

Other sources of location error include changes in APNs over time; poorly matched addresses; and incorrect WCR entries for PLSS values, GPS coordinates, or addresses. Since many of the location symbols

for domestic wells plot on top of each other in <u>Figure 1</u>, the locations of domestic wells in the Subbasin by Township/Range/Section mapping is displayed in <u>Figure 2</u>. Domestic well completion reports are summarized by decade and subbasin in <u>Table 1</u>.

2.2 Well Permit Records

Under county regulation, a well permit is required prior to drilling and constructing a domestic well. Records of well permits were provided by Tehama County Department of Environmental Health as a tabular dataset (TCDEH, 2021); no GIS data were initially available for the well permits. The period of record for the well permits begins in 2013. The tabulated permit dataset includes permit number, permit date, APN, and well address.

2.2.1 Domestic Well Permits

There are 802 new construction permits for Tehama County. Domestic wells comprise 670 of the 802 new construction wells. Wells with uses other than domestic water supply are denoted with asterisks in the tabulated dataset. Only wells indicated as being sealed were considered.

2.2.2 Locating Well Permits

The 670 domestic well permits in Tehama County were located based on APNs associated with them. Domestic well permits in the County well permit database were located by matching the listed APN with the county parcel data, when possible. For permits with APNs not matching a parcel, the address was used to locate the permit and the APN was updated accordingly. Following this approach, all domestic well permits were matched to unique parcels located within the Tehama County.

A map of the domestic well permits located in the Tehama County is presented in <u>Figure 3a</u>. To directly compare well permits to well completion reports over the same period, a map of well completion reports completed 2013 to 2020 is presented in <u>Figure 3b</u>. Since many of the location dots for domestic wells plot on top of each other in <u>Figure 3a</u>, the count of domestic wells in the County by Township/Range/Section mapping is displayed in <u>Figure 4a</u>. Similarly, well completion reports dated 2013 to 2020 are summarized by section in <u>Figure 4b</u>.

Well completion reports and permits are additionally compared annually for Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff Subbasins in <u>Figure 5a</u>, <u>Figure 5b</u>, <u>Figure 5c</u>, and <u>Figure 5d</u> respectively.

2.3 County Assessor Parcel Data

County Assessor parcel GIS data were provided by Tehama County (Tehama County Assessor's Office, 2021), including land use and other characteristics for each APN. The parcels dataset includes 26,600 unique APNs within the Tehama Subbasin. Of those, 15,959 are inferred as being residential. This includes parcels that are located within a public water system service area. Although the County parcel dataset does not include records related to the presence of domestic wells on parcels, the presence of a resident on a parcel is associated with a drinking water supply and potential for a domestic well. Land use codes used to infer residential parcels and therefore the presence of a domestic well are summarized in **Appendix 1**. Inferred residential parcels are displayed in **Figure 6**. Inferred domestic wells in residential

parcel are also summarized by section in **Figure 7**. All known and inferred domestic well locations are combined in **Figure 8**.

2.4 Water System Data

Public Water System (PWS), State Small Water System (SSWS), and Local Small Water System (LSWS) service area boundaries from State and local data sources were used to map and evaluate where and how many inferred well locations occur inside of a water system service area and therefore may not be supplied by a domestic well. Water system boundaries are a key dataset for comparing with potential domestic well locations identified through analysis of WCRs, parcels, and permits. The service area boundaries for water systems and new construction public water supply wells since 1980 identified in the County are presented in Figure 9.

2.4.1 State Regulated Systems

The PWS boundaries are part of an archived dataset developed by the California Environmental Health Tracking Program (CEHTP) and now maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Division of Drinking Water (DDW) (SWRCB, 2021). This dataset is a publicly available GIS feature class of system boundaries provided voluntarily by water system operators over the period from 2012 to 2019. Previous assessments of this dataset suggest it includes approximately 85 percent of community water systems, although this can vary by region within the state. Of the state regulated PWS boundaries, 42 were identified to have service areas within Tehama County.

2.4.2 Public Water System Wells

PWS well locations were downloaded from the WCR dataset and used to check for any water system wells in areas not covered by the water systems service area boundaries data. Several wells with public water supply planned used are located outside of CEHTP PWS boundaries (**Figure 9a**). These wells are considered in analyses as possibly providing water to nearby users.

3 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Estimates of domestic wells were developed through analysis and comparison of the data sources discussed above. Estimates of the number and locations of domestic wells in Tehama County were made using three sources of data and approaches: from WCRs, well permits, and parcels with residents. Domestic well WCRs and well permits provide a more direct indication of the existence (past or present) of a domestic well whereas the parcel data provide a basis for inferring the existence of domestic wells. The County well permit database is believed to provide the most accurate estimate of the numbers and locations of domestic wells constructed during the available data record (since 2013). However, only the WCR data have information on well depths and construction. Additionally, while WCRs and well permits generally have a date associated with each record indicating the approximate date of well construction, the parcel data do not. However, estimates of well counts based on parcel data do provide an estimate of the maximum possible number of domestic wells, and a reference on the relative spatial density of domestic wells in the County.

Water system service area boundaries were used to refine domestic well estimates derived from parcel counts, with the expectation that parcels and households within a water system boundary are served water by the water system and therefore do not have a domestic well. The number of inferred parcels, well completion reports, and unique well permits (i.e., not collocated with a WCR) are summarized for the entire County, and within two subsets of water system service areas in **Table 2**. One subset includes the number of domestic wells within the community water system boundaries and within a half-mile of other PWS wells, while the other subset includes only community water system wells. It is assumed these public water supply wells supply water in their vicinity despite being located outside of water system boundaries; however, the area served by each PWS well is unknown so this is only an estimate of how these wells might impact domestic well counts. Many wells inferred to be in a parcel located within a community water service area were likely not installed, while wells known to be installed in these areas may no longer be used for domestic water supply. Results of the well location and counts analyses are described below.

3.1 Analysis of Domestic Well Locations and Counts

3.1.1 Domestic Well WCRs

The domestic well WCRs since 1980 were compared with water system boundaries in the two methods described above (**Figure 9b**, **Figure 9c**). Because the WCRs are records of actual wells that were constructed, those located within a water system service area are assumed to be correctly located. It is possible that wells that pre-existed the establishment of a water system in an area may remain in use after the water system is operational; however, whether this occurs, and how often, is unknown.

Of the 5,879 domestic wells represented by WCRs in the County, 260 are located within the known water system boundaries (**Figure 9b**). This represents approximately four (4) % of the domestic well WCRs in the County. However, when considering the half-mile radius around public water supply wells, 1,090 wells (19% of total) are captured.

3.1.2 Domestic Well Permits

Permits are expected to accurately identify well locations, but domestic well permits may exist for wells drilled and constructed prior to the operation of a water system in an area. As shown in annual comparisons for 2020 (**Figures 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d**), permits may be processed before well completion reports and supplement recent domestic well counts.

In contrast to the WCR dataset, which relies on submittal and entry of a WCR in DWR's database, the County well permit dataset is expected to be a more comprehensive representation of the wells drilled in the County for the period over which it spans (2013 to present). Over the same period, there are 670 well permits compared to 567 WCRs.

Of the 670 well permits, 338 domestic well permits in the County are not collocated with a WCR. There are 17 of these unique permits located within known water system boundaries (**Figure 9b**). Like the domestic WCRs in water system boundaries, this represents only five (5) % of the permit dataset. When additionally considering permits located withina 0.5 mile radius around other public supply wells, 71 well permits are represented (**Figure 9c**).

3.1.3 Parcels with Residents

For assessing the maximum possible number of domestic wells in the County, all parcels inferred to be residential were counted. Parcels were inferred as residential based on land use codes listed in **Appendix 1**. Parcels within service areas were also counted but removed from the total inferred count. In this approach, a parcel is considered within a water system service area if its centroid is within the service area.

Based on these criteria, within Tehama County there are a total of 15,959 residential parcels (**Figure 6**) with residents, 8,744 of which are outside of the service area boundaries of all 42 Public Water Systems serving residential parcels. There are only 6,725 inferred parcels outside of the potential radius of influence of other public water supply wells.

3.1.4 Comparisons of Domestic Well Location Information Sources

3.1.4.1 Domestic Wells Within PWS Service Areas

While most residences within a PWS service area are supplied with drinking water by that PWS, it is not unusual for wells that were drilled prior to the creation of the PWS to be retained and used for part, or all, of a residence's use, including for drinking water or landscape irrigation.

Of the 5,879 WCRs located in Tehama County, 260 are located within a water system service area. Of the 338 unique permits located within the Tehama Subbasin, 17 were located within a water system service area.

Of the 15,959 parcels with dwellings noted in the APN dataset, 7,215 are within a water system boundary. This represents a much larger portion of the total inferred dataset (45%) compared to WCRs and permits, suggesting most of those inferred parcels do not have domestic wells.

3.1.4.2 Comparing WCR Locations to Well Permits

The Tehama County well permits dataset, by count, is more complete in representing wells drilled in the County, but it only extends back to 2013. There is no direct linkage between WCRs and well permits on record (i.e., WCRs commonly do not indicate well permit numbers) for majority of the wells, and the available method for geolocating records for a given well present in both datasets may differ. However, it was determined that 332 of the parcels associated with permit locations coincided with WCR locations for domestic wells. Many WCRs are located by the center of section and therefore may not be placed in the correct parcel. This likely explains the low rate of coincidence of well permits and WCRs within parcels.

Consequently, in attempting to tally the permits and WCRs representing known domestic well locations, unique permits may be double counted as WCRs located by TRS. Because there are more permits over the permit's period of record than WCRs, it is assumed that not all WCRs located by TRS are associated with a permit.

3.1.5 Final Domestic Well Count and Location Estimates

The County permit database includes 670 domestic wells installed since 2013. Although over the same period, there are more permits than WCRs (567 domestic WCRs), the WCRs data back further than 1950 and are the more complete dataset. Although there are only 16% more permits than WCRs, 50% of the permits appear to be uniquely located. Given available WCR and well permit data, there are 5,781 uniquely located domestic wells (WCRs and permits) outside of community water systems. Because it appears permits supplement the WCR dataset to some extent, domestic well permit totals were estimated with projected complete 1980-2020 datasets.

A possible total number of domestic wells was estimated assuming that roughly 50% of permits are uniquely located as indicated by the best available location methods for all wells. Permit counts were projected for 1980-2013 given the same distribution as in 2013-2020. The inferred unique permits for 1980-2020 in **Table 2** estimate the maximum possible number of permits to be supplementary to the WCR dataset. There is a total of 8,948 WCRs and estimated unique permits (or wells otherwise not captured by the WCR dataset) outside community water systems, compared to the inferred 8,744 residential parcels outside water system boundaries. This estimated total drops to 6,673 total WCRs and estimated unique permits when assuming there are consistently 16% more permits than WCRs as indicated by the 2013-2020 totals, and that those permits are unique.

The current dataset of permits and WCRs outside community water systems at 5,781 domestic wells represents 68% of the inferred residential parcels. Dependent on the accuracy of extrapolation techniques, the total may represent 76 – 100% of the inferred parcels with a complete dataset.

Well permits generally provide a more complete representation of wells constructed in the County, but these permit records do not contain information on well perforations and depths. An analysis of well construction information was therefore performed on the WCR data only.

3.1.6 WCR Domestic Well Construction Information

Of the 5,879 domestic well WCRs in the Tehama Subbasin, 5,860 included some information on perforated interval (top of bottom of perforations) or total depth. Only WCR records determined to have sufficiently reliable well construction information (i.e., lack of obviously conflicting information on the well construction) were included in the summary and analyses relating to domestic well construction in the County. In analyses using well perforations (screens), where data for bottom of perforations was not available, the reported total well depth was used. A total of 1,070 WCRs included top of screened interval information. Average total depths of WCRs in each section were calculated and are displayed in **Figure 10**. Additionally, to evaluate changes in well depths over time, scatterplots of completed depth over time in Antelope, Bowman, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff Subbasin were plotted in **Figure 11a**, **Figure 11b**, **Figure 11c**, and **Figure 11d**, respectively. Minimum installed depths appear to be increasing with time in all Subbasins, and depths are much more variable within Bowman and Red Bluff Subbasins.

3.2 Public Water System Wells

PWS wells data are maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water in the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS); however, these data are incomplete at this time. The WCR database was queried for PWS wells, and there were 59 wells drilled in 1980 or later with Public Water Supply as the planned use. Of these, only 16 fall within community water system boundaries. Depth to the bottom of perforated interval ranged from 100 to 840 feet below ground surface in these wells. The wells identified here are shown in **Figure 9a**.

4 **REFERENCES**

California Department of Water Resources. 2020. Well Completion Reports Dataset. Data retrieved from data.cnra.ca.gov (https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/well-completion-reports) on 08/01/2020.

California Department of Water Resources. 2021. DAC Mapping Tool. Data retrieved from <u>https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/dacs/</u> on 6/15/2021.

Tehama County Assessor's Office. 2021. GIS of Parcels with Land Use Attributes.

Tehama County Department of Environmental Health. 2021. Well Permits Tabular Dataset. Provided to LSCE in May 2021.

SWRCB. 2021. Water System Boundaries. Retrieved from https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/data_databases/ on 01/15/2021.

SWRCB. 2021. Public Water System Wells. Retrieved from <u>https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/</u> on 1/15/2021.

TABLES

WCR Date Range	Antelope WCRs in Date Range	Bowman WCRs in Date Range	Los Molinos WCRs in Date Range	Red Bluff WCRs in Date Range	Tehama WCRs in Date Range	Cumulative WCRs Since Beginning (Since 1980)
Pre-1950	16	1	9	22	48	48
1950-1959	40	14	21	77	152	200
1960-1969	123	70	47	267	507	707
1970-1979	207	411	187	812	1617	2324
1980-1989	196	421	252	853	1722	4046 (1722)
1990-1999	162	328	205	1080	1775	5801 (3497)
2000-2009	165	393	139	973	1670	7471 (5167)
2010-2019	149	122	57	374	702	8173 (5869)
Since 2020	1	4	0	5	10	8183 (5879)
Unknown	18	13	12	33	76	8259

Table 1. Summary of domestic well WCRs by decade and subbasin.

Table 2. Summary of inferred and known domestic wells

Number of Inferred and Known Domestic Wells	Entire Region	Within Community Water System	Within Community Water System or near (within 0.5 mi) Public Water Supply wells
Number of Parcels with Inferred Domestic Wells	15,959	9,234	7,215
Number of Domestic Wells from WCRs 1980-2020	5,879	1,090	260
Number of Domestic Well Permits (unique; not matching WCRs) 2013-2020	338	71	17
Number of Inferred Unique Domestic Well Permits 1980-2020	3,505	736	176
Number of Domestic Wells + Unique (inferred) Permits 1980- 2020	9,384	1,826	436











































APPENDIX 1

List of Land Use Codes Appendix 1. List of Land Use Codes of Parcels with Inferred Domestic Wells

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. List of Land Use Codes of Parcels with Inferred Domestic Wells

010	Single Family Dwellings	057	Rural Res – w/2 or more MH
011	Condominium Units	058	Rural Res – w/Travel Trailer
013	SFD – Non-Conforming Use	060	Motels less than 25 Units
014	SFD w/ Secondary Use	061	Motels over 25 Units
015	Living Unit in Planned Unit Dev	063	Over 25 Units
016	Mobile Home	065	Motels over 25 Units w/ Shops
017	SFD w/ Mobile Home	301	Irrig Prune Orchard – w/Res
021	One Duplex – One Bldg	302	Irrig Prune Orchard – w/MH
022	Two or more SFD on Single Parcel	303	Irrig Prune Orchard – w/Res & MH
024	2 MH/more on Single Parcel	305	Irrig Prune Orchard – w/2 or More Res
031	Single Triplex	306	Irrig Prune Orchard – w/2 or more MH
032	Three Units	311	Irrig Walnut Orchard – w/Res
033	Single Fourplex	312	Irrig Walnut Orchard – w/MH
034	Four Units	313	Irrig Walnut Orchard – w/Res & MH
041	5-10 Res Units – Single Building	315	Irrig Walnut Orchard – w/2 or More Res
042	5-10 Units (2/more Bldg)	316	Irrig Walnut Orchard – w/2 or More MH
043	11-20 Res Units – Single Bldg	321	Irrig Almond Orchard – w/Res
044	11-20 Units (2/more Bldg)	322	Irrig Almond Orchard – w/MH
045	21-40 Units	323	Irrig Almond Orchard – w/Res & MH
046	41-100 Units	325	Irrig Almond Orchard – w/2 or More Res
047	Over 100 Units	326	Irrig Almond Orchard – w/2 or More MH
051	Rural Res – 1 Res	331	Irrig Olive Orchard w/Res
052	Rural Res – 2 or more REs	332	Irrig Olive Orchard w/MH
055	Rural Res – w/ Mobile Home	333	Irrig Olive Orchard w/Res & MH
056	Rural Res – w/MH & Res	335	Irrig Olive Orchard w/2 or more Res
336	Irrig Olive Orchard w/2 or more MH	413	Dairies w/MH
-----	------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------
341	Irrig Misc Orchard w/ Res	415	Dairies w/2 or more Res
342	Irrig Misc Orchard w/MH	432	Feed Lots w/ MH
343	Irrig Misc Orchard w/Res & MH	521	Field Crops w/Res
346	Irrig Misc Orchard w/ 2 or more MH	522	Field Crops w/MH
351	Irrig Vines & Bush w/Res	523	Field Crops w/Res & MH
352	Irrig Vines & Bush w/MH	525	Field Crops w/2 or more Res
361	Irrig Row Crops w/Res	526	Field Crops w/2 or more MH
365	Irrig Row Crops w/2 or More Res	531	Pasture w/Res
371	Irrig Field Crops w/Res	532	Pasture w/MH
372	Irrig Field Crops w/MH	533	Pasture w/Res & MH
373	Irrig Field Crops w/Res & MH	535	Pasture w/2 or more Res
375	Irrig Field Crops w/2 or more Res	536	Pasture w/2 or more MH
401	Irrig Pasture w/Res	551	Specialty Farms w/Res
402	Irrig Pasture w/MH	552	Specialty Farms w/ MH
403	Irrig Pasture w/Res & MH	553	Specialty Farms w/Res & MH
405	Irrig Pasture w/2 or more Res	555	Specialty Farms w/2 or more Res
408	Irrig Pasture w/2 or more MH	556	Specialty Farms w/2 or more MH
411	Dairies w/Res		
		1	

Appendix 2-B

Communication and Engagement Plan

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Implementation (2021-2023)

Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute

Version 12.15.2021

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 | DISTRICT-WIDE COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT

Background	1
Desired Goals and Outcomes of the Plan	3
Timeline	4
Interested Parties and Other Stakeholders	4
Outreach Roles	4
Communications & Engagement for GSP Elements	5
Communication & Engagement Forum	6
Communication & Engagement Tools	7
Outreach Partners	8
Intra-Basin and Inter-Basin Coordination	9
Evaluation and Assessment	10
Table 1. Summary of Engagement Opportunities, Milestones, and Progress to Date	11

SECTION 2 | SUBBASIN COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT

Table 2. Tehama Stakeholder Group Interests & Purpose of Engagement

SECTION 3 | APPENDICES

Appendix A	Outreach Resources and Materials	. 18
Appendix B	Inter-basin Coordination	. 20
Appendix C	Tribal Engagement in Tehama County: Guidance Document	. 22
Appendix D	Disadvantaged Communities Engagement in Tehama County – Guidance Document	. 25
Appendix E	Media Contact List	. 28
Appendix F	Venues	. 29
Appendix G	Potential GSA Outreach Tasks	. 30
Appendix e 1		

SECTION 1 | DISTRICT-WIDE COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT

Background

The purpose of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), signed by Governor Brown in 2014, is to ensure local sustainable groundwater management in medium- and high- priority groundwater basins statewide. California's Department of Water Resources (DWR) has determined that, in Tehama County, the Antelope Subbasin is high priority, while Los Molinos and Red Bluff are medium priority; these three subbasins are subject to SGMA. Low to very low priority subbasins in Tehama County are Bowman, South Battle Creek, and Bend, which are not subject to SGMA. The Corning Subbasin (high priority; subject to SGMA) is partially within Tehama County and extends into Glenn County. [Refer to map below.]

SGMA requires that a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) (which can be a single local water authority or cooperating collection of local authorities) develops and executes a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to manage a basin's shared resources. The **Tehama County Flood Control & Water Conservation District** (District)¹ serves as the exclusive GSA within Tehama County. The District is responsible for managing the portions of the seven subbasins located within Tehama County. The



¹ The <u>Tehama County Flood Control & Water Conservation District</u> was originally established in 1957 by the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Act. This Act defined the boundary and territory of the District as: "all that territory of the County of Tehama lying within the exterior boundaries thereof."

District is one of two GSAs coordinating within the Corning Subbasin² to develop a single GSP; outreach for this subbasin is being covered under a separate Communications and Engagement Plan. The District is also coordinating with multiple agencies developing GSPs that border the District.

SGMA Milestones

GSA Formation and GSP Development. There is one exclusive GSA in Tehama County – the District. The GSA formed by the state-mandated deadline of June 30, 2017, constituting SGMA's first major milestone. The District operates as the GSA governing all portions of the subbasins within the exterior boundary of Tehama County; and will develop individual GSPs for four subbasins located entirely within the District (Antelope, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, and Bowman³). While the four GSPs and this Communication and Engagement Plan are specific to the Red Bluff, Antelope, Los Molinos, and Bowman Subbasins, the District is still responsible for the other remaining subbasins. The Tehama GSA (District) has agreed to coordinate with the Corning Subbasin GSA via a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to develop a single GSP for the Corning Subbasin.

GSP Adoption. The second major milestone in SGMA is the adoption of GSPs by January 31, 2022. GSPs are prescribed by SGMA and contain required elements not specified in this Communications & Engagement Plan.

Groundwater Sustainability. The third milestone is achieving sustainability by 2042.

Figure 1. SGMA Milestones

June 30, 2017 Groundwater sustainability agencies formed January 31, 2022 All high and medium priority basins managed by groundwater sustainability plans

January 31, 2042

All high and medium priority basins achieve groundwater sustainability

² Information on the Corning Subbasin can be found at <u>CorningSubbasinGSP.org</u>.

³ Bowman Subbasin changed from a medium priority subbasin to a very low priority subbasin in 2018, and the District was able to secure funding under Proposition 1 to develop a GSP even though it is now a very low priority subbasin. Also, the District sees this as an area that may experience growth in the future and would like to manage the subbasin under a GSP.

Desired Goals and Outcomes of the Plan

Goals

SGMA requires the GSA to consider the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater, and encourages involvement of diverse social, cultural, and economic elements of the population within the subbasins during preparation and implementation of GSPs (Water Code Sections 10723.8(a)(4) and 10723.2).

The goals of the Stakeholder Communications & Engagement Plan are to:

- 1. Enhance understanding and inform the public about water and groundwater resources in the District subbasins, the purpose and need for sustainable groundwater management, the benefits of sustainable groundwater management, and the need for the GSPs.
- 2. Engage a diverse group of interested parties and stakeholders and promote informed feedback from stakeholders, the community, and groundwater-dependent users throughout the preparation and implementation process of the GSPs.
- 3. Coordinate communication and involvement between the subbasins and other local agencies, elected and appointed officials, and the general public.
- 4. Utilize the District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings to facilitate a public engagement process.
- 5. Employ a variety of outreach methods that make public participation accessible and that encourages broad participation.
- 6. Respond to public concerns and provide accurate and up-to-date information.
- 7. Manage communications and engagement in a manner that provides maximum value to the public and constitutes an efficient use of the GSA's resources.

Outcomes

The desired outcome of this Communication & Engagement Plan is to achieve understanding and support for adoption of the GSPs and implementation in consideration of the people, economy, and environment within the subbasins and in coordination with adjacent subbasins.

In practical terms, the GSP regulations require a communications section of the GSP that must include the following:

- Explanation of the GSA's decision-making process.
- Identification of opportunities for public engagement and involvement.
- Description of GSA's encouragement of active involvement of diverse elements of the population within each basin.
- Methods the GSA shall follow to inform the public about GSP progress.

This Communication & Engagement Plan forms the basis for the communications section of the GSPs.

Time Period

The Communication & Engagement Plan is intended to cover communications and engagement for August 2021 through December 2023.

In late September, the District will release the Draft GSPs (Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope and Los Molinos subbasins) publicly for at least 45 days for public review and comment (public comment period expected: September 24 – November 19).

As required and planned, before the end of December 2021, the GSA will hold a formal public hearing on the Draft GSPs and then consider adopting the GSPs for submittal to the California Department of Water Resources in January 2022 as the law requires.

This Communication & Engagement Plan will also support the first two years of implementation. Since this is a multi-year effort, the key activities needed to achieve these goals will likely be broken down into annual work plans, and may be amended, as needed.

Refer to <u>**Table 1**</u> *for a summary of engagement progress to date and* <u>**Appendix A**</u> *and* <u>**Appendix B**</u> *for examples of outreach resources and coordination.*

Interested Parties and Other Stakeholders

SGMA identifies interested parties that the GSA must consider when developing and implementing the GSPs, including:

- Agricultural users of water
- Domestic well owners
- Municipal well operators
- Public water systems
- Land use planning agencies
- Environmental users of groundwater
- Surface water users
- The federal government
- California Native American Tribes (see Appendix C for Tribal Outreach Guidance Document)
- Disadvantaged communities (including those served by private domestic wells or small community water systems) (see <u>Appendix D</u> for DAC Guidance Document)

Outreach Roles

[Refer to the District's GSA governance structure]⁴

The **District Board** of Directors (District Board) are elected officials and serve as the GSA Governing Body that has final approval authority for the GSPs and GSA. The District's five Board Members are comprised of the five County Board of Supervisors, which allows for additional collaboration within subbasins. In regard to outreach, the District Board is responsible for:

- Adopting and overseeing implementation of the Communication & Engagement Plan.
- Entering into MOUs with other public agencies to codify agency-to-agency engagement activities for the development and implementation of GSPs.

⁴ <u>http://www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/flood/sgma/governanace%20structure.pdf</u>

- Considering the recommendations of the Groundwater Commission.
- Receiving public comments made verbally and in writing.

The **Groundwater Commission** is comprised of eleven (11) members representing the three incorporated Cities within Tehama County, private pumpers, and surface water agencies or districts.

Groundwater Commission Representation:

- (1) City of Corning
- (1) City of Red Bluff
- (1) City of Tehama,
- (1) El Camino Irrigation District
- (1) Los Molinos Community Services District
- (1) Rio Alto Water District
- (5) County Supervisorial District representatives (one representative per district)

In regard to outreach, the Groundwater Commission is responsible for:

- Developing and implementing, with oversight from the District Board of Directors, the Communication & Engagement Plan.
- Receiving public comments made verbally and in writing.
- Considering and incorporating public and key stakeholder input during GSPs' development/implementation and making recommendations to the District Board.
- Offering the public an opportunity to be educated and to participate in the GSPs' development/implementation process through the Groundwater Commission meetings.

The District Board and Groundwater Commission are committed to keeping the **public informed**, providing the public with **balanced and objective information** to assist the public in understanding SGMA and **creating an open process** for public involvement on the development and implementation of GSPs.

Communications & Engagement for GSP Elements

To truly engage the public in development and implementation of GSPs that are science-based, complex, technical, and include achievable outcomes, the GSA will strive to meet these overall objectives:

- Educate the public in meaningful ways. Communicate what may often be complex concepts in straightforward, comprehensible ways.
- Offer the public and stakeholders a meaningful way to participate during the GSPs' development, adoption, and implementation process.
- Encourage members of the public and stakeholders to share historic data and to also help collect data to gain an improved understanding of the subbasins.
- To facilitate improved coordination amongst the seven subbasins within Tehama County, along with neighboring GSAs.
- Show how input received has been considered and incorporated as appropriate into the GSPs or planning process.
- Remain focused on results.

The GSA carried out community engagement activities during development of the GSPs. The GSPs were prepared iteratively and in a logical progression, building on previously developed technical and policy

information. Throughout the process of preparing the GSPs, background materials along with draft text, figures and tables for each section were provided to the public, including other interested parties, in advance of meetings for input and comment. Received input were then incorporated as appropriate into the Draft GSPs. Draft GSPs will be available for public review and comment in Fall 2021; public workshops will be held during the public comment period. The GSA will hold a formal public hearing and consider adopting the GSPs in December 2021 for a January 2022 submittal.

Implementing the GSPs will begin at the end of January 2022. Implementation will involve advancing projects, establish funding mechanisms, addressing data gaps, monitoring, and developing additional needed projects as part of adaptive management. The GSA will need to prepare annual reports and five-year updates to demonstrate progress toward sustainability. Public outreach will inform each of these activities.

Communication & Engagement Forum

Public Meetings/Hearing

Public meetings or hearings are formal opportunities for people to provide official comments on programs, plans and proposals. The District Board of Directors meetings and the Groundwater Commission meetings⁵ constitute regular public meetings that will be noticed and conducted in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act. SGMA requires that a public meeting be held prior to the adoption of a fee and that public hearings are held for the adoption of GSP elements and the final GSPs. There are also constitutional requirements for public hearings for some fee/rate options. Public meetings and hearings are an important forum for people to share viewpoints and concerns, but often occur at the end of a process, when only one option is under consideration. The GSA will hold required public meetings and hearings but will also use less formal public workshops to solicit feedback and information early in the process.

Stakeholder Briefings

Groundwater Commission members will meet with and communicate regularly with organizations comprised of the stakeholder groups they represent. District staff will be available to assist with presenting any information upon request.

Public Workshops

Public educational workshops provide less formal opportunities for people to learn about groundwater, SGMA, and GSP elements. Workshops can be organized in a variety of ways, including open houses, "stations" where people can ask questions one-on-one, and traditional presentations with facilitated question and answer sessions. In order to solicit feedback from people who may not be comfortable speaking in public, workshops can include small group breakout discussions, comment cards and other techniques. Whatever format is used, workshops will be designed to maximize opportunities for public input.

Public Notices

Public notices, often required by law, aim to notify agencies and the public about activities that may affect the public. As outlined in this Communications and Engagement Plan, the GSA will sponsor a variety of opportunities for people to participate in the development and implementation of the GSPs, including workshops, public hearings, providing comments at District Board meetings and Groundwater

⁵ Visit <u>www.tehamacountywater.ca.gov</u> for meeting information.

Commission meetings and through written comments. And, the GSA will comply with public noticing requirements.

Prior to adoption of or amendment(s) to GSPs, SGMA requires that GSA:

- Provides notice to cities and counties within Plan area
- Considers comments provided by the cities and counties
- Accommodates requests for consultation received from the cities and counties within 30 days
- No sooner than 90 days following public notice, holds public hearings

In addition, when a GSA considers any fees to support the work of sustainability, the GSA will provide public notice and other engagement activities.

Communication & Engagement Tools

The GSA will use a variety of communications and engagement tools to keep the public informed, including the following.

Interested Parties List

SGMA mandates the creation of an interested parties list. SGMA does not specify the type of list (email versus hard copy). The first preference is an email list, to get information out quickly and to reduce costs. A secondary list may be developed for people who don't use email. District Board of Directors and Groundwater Commissioners (and the agencies they represent) and District staff can contribute names of organizations, agencies, and individuals to the list. Individuals may also contact the GSA to be added to the interested parties list via the District website and public meetings or workshops.

The list is broad and includes anyone who would like to stay informed about SGMA activities and anyone the District Board and Groundwater Commission think should be informed about the SGMA process and the outcomes of the planning / management effort. The Groundwater Commission will coordinate the distribution of periodic updates to the interested parties list. This list will also be used for dissemination of information about public workshops, public meetings, etc. Additionally, interested parties can sign up to receive noticed agendas for the District Board meetings and Groundwater Commission meetings.

Informational Materials

Developing a variety of informational materials is critical to successful education and necessary to circulate consistent, accurate information. The District Board with input from the Groundwater Commission may develop / update a range of materials, which may include:

- **Talking Points:** Clear, concise messages that can be used by District Board and Groundwater Commission when communicating with stakeholders, organizations, and the media.
- Fact Sheets: For initiating the GSPs and /or implementing elements of the GSPs.
- **Periodic Updates:** As stated above, the District staff with assistance from their consultants will coordinate on the distribution of periodic updates that can then be used by the District Board, Groundwater Commission, and participating agencies for distribution to the groups and organizations they represent using existing communications tools, such as websites, newsletters, social media, list serves, utility bills, etc.

- **Newspaper public service announcements & editorials:** The District staff, with assistance from their consultants will coordinate on information and updates for submittal to local news sources.
- **Briefing Packets:** For milestone briefings to the public and stakeholders, briefing packets may be developed. Packets may include standard talking points, and other materials to assist in educational outreach and for soliciting feedback.

Website

www.tehamacountywater.org

The District website is a tool for distributing and archiving meeting and communication materials as well as a repository for any studies, informative, and educational materials. District staff coordinates to ensure that the website is updated on a consistent basis to ensure up to date, timely information. The website includes, but is not limited to, the following information:

- Home page: example content may include an overview, calendar of meetings and events, highlighted topics, etc.
- Groundwater basics, SGMA background including links to existing sources of relevant information
- Subbasin-specific information
- District Board information: members, agendas, and meeting materials
- Groundwater Commission information: members, agendas, and meeting materials

Mailings Utility Bill Notifications

District staff may coordinate with participating agencies to utilize postcards and include updates and relevant SGMA implementation information in utility bills.

Social Media

Existing Facebook, Twitter, and other emerging social media technologies may be leveraged to provide updates on milestone progress to interested parties.

Surveys

Online tools may be used periodically to gather stakeholder ideas and to provide feedback on key issues.

Media Plan

District staff will develop press releases and Public Service Announcements (if appropriate) at each milestone and for meetings and workshops. The press releases will be distributed to local and regional media and elected officials. See <u>Appendix E</u> for a media contact list that will be updated on a periodic basis.

Outreach Partners

In addition to the communication tools listed above, other organizations can also partner to assist the GSA reach its communications and engagement goals including, but not limited to:

Countywide

- ✓ <u>Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV)</u> Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) group
- ✓ Shasta-Tehama Watershed Education Coalition

- ✓ Tehama County Farm Bureau
- ✓ Resource Conservation District of Tehama County
- ✓ Rural Community Associates Corporation
- ✓ UC Cooperative Extension
- ✓ Tehama County Cattleman's Association
- ✓ Tehama County Cattlewomen's Association

Subbasin-Specific

Antelope

✓ City of Red Bluff

Los Molinos

- ✓ Los Molinos Mutual Water Company
- ✓ Los Molinos Community Services District
- ✓ Stanford Vina Ranch Irrigation Company
- ✓ Deer Creek Irrigation District
- ✓ Los Molinos Chamber of Commerce

Red Bluff

- ✓ Tehama Colusa Canal Authority
- ✓ Proberta Water District
- ✓ Rawson Water District
- ✓ Elder Creek Water District
- ✓ Gerber-Las Flores CSD
- ✓ Thomes Creek Irrigation District
- Rancho Tehama Association
- ✓ El Camino Irrigation District
- ✓ City of Red Bluff
- ✓ City of Tehama
- ✓ HOAs (e.g., Surrey Village)

Bowman

- ✓ Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District
- ✓ Lake California Property Owners Association
- ✓ Rio Alto Water District
- ✓ Large ranches (e.g., Bengard Ranch)

Intra-Basin and Inter-Basin Coordination

The term "**basin**" under SGMA refers to a groundwater basin, or subbasin, identified and defined under the groundwater inventory <u>Bulletin 118</u>, which is produced by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (California Water Code Section 10721). Coordination within (intra-basin) and across (inter-basin) basin/subbasin boundaries is important to coordinate management actions and share information.

- Intra-basin coordination coordination between two or more GSAs with jurisdiction within the same basin/subbasin (as is the case within the Corning Subbasin).
- Inter-basin coordination coordination across basin/subbasin boundaries.

Intra-Basin Coordination

The Corning Subbasin GSA has jurisdiction for the portion of the Corning Subbasin overlying Glenn County. The District works with the Corning Subbasin GSA to develop and implement a single GSP for the Corning Subbasin. The primary venue for their collaboration will occur at the Corning Subbasin Advisory Board (CSAB) meetings, which are a Brown Act compliant venue for collaboration on the GSP.

Inter-Basin Coordination

Subbasins within Tehama County boundaries. Inter-basin coordination across the subbasins within Tehama County is facilitated by the District serving as the single GSA for these subbasins. For instance, regularly occurring District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings provides a standard and open forum for sharing information with all subbasins within the County.

Subbasins outside of Tehama County boundaries. While inter-basin agreements are optional under SGMA, the District intends to coordinate with adjacent GSAs to share technical information and to ensure that the implementation of the GSPs in adjacent basins are compatible and will not cause any adverse effects in the District subbasins or any other adjacent basins.

Regional coordination. GSAs in the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) are building on the 10+ years of NSV Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) collaboration. GSA representatives from the Vina, Butte, Wyandotte Creek, Corning, Colusa, Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope and Los Molinos subbasins are meeting to consider how to share information and strategically coordinate regional water management.

Refer to the table below for subbasins within the NSV as well as <u>Appendix B</u> on NSV Inter-basin coordination.

Coordination	Subbasin	SGMA	GSA(s)	County(ies)	Nearest Tehama
		Priority			County Subbasins
Inter-basin	Anderson	Medium	Enterprise Anderson	Shasta	Bowman
Intra-basin & Regional	Corning	High	Tehama County FCWCD; Corning Subbasin GSA	Glenn; Tehama	Corning portion within County; Red Bluff
Inter-basin & Regional	Colusa	High	Glenn Groundwater Authority; Colusa Groundwater Authority	Glenn; Colusa; Yolo	Corning
Inter-basin & Regional	Vina	High	Vina; Rock Creek Reclamation District	Butte	Corning; Los Molinos
Regional	Butte	Medium	Butte County Dept of Water and Resource Conservation	Butte	Corning; Los Molinos
Regional	Wyandotte Creek	Medium	Wyandotte Creek	Butte	Corning; Los Molinos

Basin Coordination Summary

Evaluation and Assessment

Any communication strategy should include opportunities to check in at various points during implementation to ensure that it is meeting the communication and engagement goals and complying with SGMA. These check-ins should occur at least on an annual basis.

Timeframe	Milestone or Stage	Required Community Engagement Under SGMA	Communication Strategies	Status (as of August 2021)
Pre-SGMA (before 2015)	Voluntary groundwater management efforts (IRWM and AB3030)	N/A	Volunteer collaboratives and advisory committees engage subject-matter experts and stakeholders	 NSV IRWM group and AB 3030 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Outreach for AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan (1996 and 2012 update)
GSA Formation (2015-2017)	During GSA governance development	Notice of Intent (NOI) of GSA Formation	 Provide notice of GSA outreach resources: website, email listserv, calendar of District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Develop and continue to update list of interested parties 	 District Board public meetings on GSA formation NOI for the District to be the GSA (11/4/15) Groundwater Commission established (6/7/16) Website and initial interested parties list established
Shortly after GSA formation	After identification of outreach responsibilities among GSA entities	Notification of GSA formation	 District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Email notices and updates Newspaper notice of public workshop(s) 	
Before GSP Planning Activities	Prior to beginning GSP development	Provide to the public and State, notice of intent to begin GSP planning and description of opportunities for interested parties to participate in GSP development and implementation	 Public workshop(s) District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Email notices and updates Newspaper notice of public workshop(s) 	 NOI for development of GSPs submitted to DWR on 6/27/18 (Bowman, Antelope, Los Molinos, and Red Bluff) and 9/19/18 (Corning)
Between Notice of GSP Planning and January 31, 2022	During GSP development	Public workshops, public meetings, District Board meetings, Groundwater Commission meetings and other opportunities providing stakeholder avenues to participate in GSP development	 Public workshops and/or public meetings on GSP development. District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Email notice of public workshops / meetings Newspaper notices of public workshops / meetings Updates and information on GSP development at standing meetings Disseminate updates via interested parties list, websites social media, outreach partners 	 Convened Groundwater Commission Ad Hoc committees Developed and implemented Stakeholder Communication & Engagement Plan Professional facilitation services to support outreach and engagement Developed/updated resources (e.g., new website, factsheet, etc.) Emailed interested parties list with public meeting notices; notifications when draft GSP chapters were available for comment, and the quarterly eNewsletter.

Table 1. Summary of Engagement Opportunities, Milestones, and Progress to Date

During GSP Occlopment Active involvement of diverse social, cultural, and occomming elements of the population within the subbasins Provide email notices and updates Update website regularity In addition to the activities Isled above: Update website regularity During GSP Occlopment Active involvement of diverse social, cultural, and occomming elements of the population within the subbasins Provide email notices and updates Update website regularity In addition to the activities Isled above: Occlopment, for oxiding clean engagement, for oxiding clean engagement on GSP development, for oxiding clean messages that GSA retains legal responsibility for timal GSA and GSP related decisions or workshops conducted by GSA regresentables/sistif In addition to the activities isled above: Develop contexts propriate to the audionities for messages that GSA retains legal responsibility for timal Carrier for technical support to islakehoider groups through presentations or workshops conducted by GSA regresentables/sistif In addition to the activities and table groups the support can be assign underspond on the partice support register of the audiones (in any other groups upon reques). In the support can be support and to the audion of the audion outers support register to the audione of the communicate opportaines to the audion uports of the groups upon reques). In the support can be support and to the provide contexts of the partice is and support lead and do to proved notices. • Unite uport technical support lead and support lead and support lead and support lead and uports and communicate opportaines to the audion uport partice is context. • The support lead to the partice is the support lead is to provide notices strategicative regularity single do communitis and	Timeframe	Milestone or Stage	Required Community Engagement Under SGMA	Communication Strategies	Status (as of August 2021)
During GSP development Active involvement of diverse social, cultural, and economic elements of the population within the subbasins Provide email notices and updates Update website regularly Convene regular District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Develop constent appropriate to the audience and their interests, ensuring information can be easily understood Conduct legislative brichings at strategic milestones (and any other groups upon request) Ultize updated interested party stakeholder list, GSA listers delivered wa email and/or U.S. Mail, outreach partners mechanisms for communications and other media outlets such as newspaper and radio to provide notices Strategically engage local, special SGMA identified groups Ultize local channels and mergings on GSP development Leverage and support local agencies and community organizations in disseminating information and engaging stakeholders. Including through existing community meetings, nevelations websites, and social media Organize public meetings around concrete impacts to specific stakeholders Develop additional, locally targeted communitizion strategies to erngage difficult-toreach communities and commanity members					 Regular updates to NSV IRWM TAC and Board, NCWA Groundwater Management Task Force Groundwater Commissioner briefings to their agencies. Public meetings Oct and Dec 2020; April, August, September, October, and November 2021
		During GSP development	Active involvement of diverse social, cultural, and economic elements of the population within the subbasins	 Provide email notices and updates Update website regularly Convene regular District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings Identify and communicate opportunities for public engagement on GSP development, (providing clear messages that GSA retains legal responsibility for final GSA and GSP related decisions) Develop consistent, coordinated messages and talking points Arrange for technical support to stakeholder groups through presentations or workshops conducted by GSA representatives/staff Develop content appropriate to the audience and their interests, ensuring information can be easily understood Conduct legislative briefings at strategic milestones (and any other groups upon request) Utilize updated interested party stakeholder list, GSA listservs delivered via email and/or U.S. Mail, outreach partners mechanisms for communications and other media outlets such as newspaper and radio to provide notices Strategically engage local, special SGMA identified groups Utilize local channels and meetings to identify and communicate opportunities for public engagement and/or public comment during meetings on GSP development Leverage and support local agencies and community organizations in disseminating information and engaging stakeholders, including through existing community meetings, newsletters, websites, and social media Organize public meetings around concrete impacts to specific stakeholders Develop additional, locally-targeted communication strategies to engage difficult-to-reach communities and community members 	 In addition to the activities listed above: Briefings upon request (e.g., County Farm Bureau, STWEC Board, Tehama County Tea Party, Board of Supervisor District 2 Town Halls, etc.) Informal briefing with the Paskenta Tribe (4/6/21) Online survey focused on domestic well owners Online survey eliciting ideas for projects and management actions Framework for receiving public comments on the Draft GSPs via online survey, standard mail, and direct emails

Timeframe	Milestone or Stage	Required Community Engagement Under SGMA	Communication Strategies	Status (as of August 2021)
GSP Adoption or Amendment (initial GSP adoption no later than 1/31/22)	Prior to GSP adoption or amendment	 Provide notice to cities and counties within Plan area Consider comments provided by the cities and counties Accommodate requests for consultation received from the cities and counties within 30 days 	SEE ABOVE	 Notices sent to cities with the Plan areas in August 2021(<u>See example</u>)
	Prior to GSP adoption or amendment	No sooner than 90 days following public notice, hold public hearing/ public workshop	SEE ABOVE	District Board Public Hearing to consider adopting the final GSPs – Dec 20, 2021

SECTION 2 | SUBBASIN COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT

As previously stated, the GSA must identify and consider stakeholders interests when developing and implementing the GSP, including:

- Agricultural users of water
- Domestic well owners
- Municipal well operators
- Public water systems
- Land use planning agencies
- Environmental users of groundwater
- Surface water users
- The federal government
- California Native American Tribes
- Disadvantaged communities

This section identifies stakeholder groups (both county-wide and subbasin-specific) and the associated anticipated level of engagement. It is not an exhaustive list, but provide sufficient detail to guide more meaningful focused outreach and engagement. The list is also intended to be updated periodically or as needed.

Table 2. Tehama Stakeholder Group Interests & Purpose of Engagement

Category of Interest	District-Wide	Antelope	Los Molinos	Red Bluff	Bowman	Anticipated Level of Engagement
General Public • Citizens groups • Community leaders • Interested individual • Universities/Academia	 Interested Individuals on Interested Parties List maintained by GSA Tehama County School District⁶ Latino Outreach of Tehama County University of California Cooperative Extension Board of Supervisors Shasta College Red Bluff-Tehama County Chamber of Commerce 	 Red Bluff City Council Schools (Antelope Elementary School District 	 Chamber of Commerce Lassen View Elementary Los Molinos Unified School District 	 Rancho Tehama Association City of Tehama City of Red Bluff Rancho Tehama Elementary School Schools (Gerber Union Elementary)Red Bluff Joint Union High School District Antelope Elementary School District 	 Lake California Property Owners Association Evergreen Union School District Sunset Hills development 	Inform to improve public awareness of sustainable groundwater management
 Land Use Municipalities Local land use agencies Regional land use agencies Community Service Districts 	 Tehama County Planning Department Tehama County Environmental Health Tehama County Agricultural Department 	 City of Red Bluff Golden Meadows CSD Tehama County Fairgrounds 	Los Molinos CSD	 City of Red Bluff City of Tehama Gerber Las Flores CSD Paskenta CSD (outside of subbasin) Reeds Creek CSD 	• [County]	Consult and involve to ensure land use policies are supporting GSP and there are no conflicting policies between the GSPs and local government agencies
Urban/ Commercial & Non-Commercial Agricultural Users • Water agencies • Irrigation districts • Municipal water companies • Mutual water companies • Resource	 Farm Bureau Cattlemen's Association Cattlewomen's Association County Agricultural Commissioner University of California Cooperative Extension Resource Conservation District 	 Rio Ranch Estates CSD Los Molinos Mutual Water Company City of Red Bluff 	 Los Molinos Mutual Water Company Deer Creek Irrigation District Stanford Vina Ranch Irrigation Company New Clairvaux Monastery 	 El Camino ID Proberta WD Rancho Tehama Association Elder Creek WD Rawson WD Gerber Las Flores CSD City of Red Bluff City of Tehama 	 Rio Alto Water District Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District (ACID) Bengard Ranch 	Inform and involve to ensure sustainable management of groundwater and consider viability of agricultural economy

⁶ Refer to <u>https://www.tehamaschools.org/Districts--Schools/index.html</u> for additional specific school districts.

Category of Interest	District-Wide	Antelope	Los Molinos	Red Bluff	Bowman	Anticipated Level of Engagement
conservation districts Farmers/Farm Bureaus Water Districts Water-users associations Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Coalition 	(RCD) of Tehama CountyShasta Tehama Watershed Education Coalition					
 Other Commercial Users Commercial and industrial self-suppliers 	 Renewable power companies Cal Fire stations Crain processing Plants Sierra Pacific Industries Tehama Co. 	Crain Processing Plant	 Norcal Water Works Anderson & Sons Walnuts Jones & Son Orchards 	 SPI Pactiv CAPAX Wilcox Oaks Golf Club Oak Creek Golf Club LA-Pacific Corp. Walmart Distribution Center 		Inform and involve in assessing impacts to users
 Environmental and Ecosystem Uses Federal and State agencies Wetland managers Environmental groups 	 Audubon Society The Nature Conservancy California Dept of Fish & Wildlife USFWS BOR BLM USFS NRCS DWR CA State Parks Fire Safe Councils (Tehama Glenn FSC) 	 CDFW (Antelope Creek) USFS (Red Bluff Rec Area) USFWS BLM BOR 	 Nature Conservancy Dye Creek preserve Mill Creek conservancy Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy CDFW big interests in Dye, Mill and Deer Creeks – Salmon Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy 	 CDFW (Butler Slough Eco Reserve, Thomes Creek Preserve) USFWS USFS BLM 		Inform and involve to consider/ incorporate potential ecosystem impacts to GSP process
Surface Water Users Irrigation Districts Water Districts Water users associations Agricultural users 	 Mutual Water Co Water District Agricultural users Riparian water right holders 	 Edwards Dam Diversions Los Molinos Mutual Water Company 	 Los Molinos Mutual Water Company Deer Creek Irrigation District Stanford Vina Ranch Irrigation Company 	 Corning Water District Tehama Colusa Canal Authority Thomes Creek WD USFWS 	 ACID Lake California POA to divert water for lake 	Inform and involve to collaborate to ensure sustainable water supplies

Category of Interest	District-Wide	Antelope	Los Molinos	Red Bluff	Bowman	Anticipated Level of Engagement
Economic Development • Chambers of commerce • Business groups/associations • Elected officials • State legislature representatives • Economic Development Team	 County Board of Supervisors James Gallagher (SA) Jim Neilson (Senator) Planning Commission Red Bluff-Tehama County Chamber of Commerce 		Los Molinos Chamber of Commerce	 Red Bluff Tehama County Chamber of Commerce Red Bluff City Council City of Tehama City Council 		Inform and involve to support a stable economy
 Human Right to Water ⁷ Disadvantaged communities Small water systems Environmental justice groups/community- based organizations Domestic well owners 	 Private well owners Small Water Systems Several Disadvantaged Communities 	 Unincorporated County (Antelope Area) Portion of the City of Red Bluff Dairyville Riverview MHC Gurnsey Ave MW Modern Village MWC Howell's Lakeside WC Antoinette MW Friendly Acres MHP 	 Los Molinos Vina Antelope Creek MHP Los Molinos CSD Woodson Bridge Del Oro Water Co. 	 Proberta Gerber Las Flores CSD City of Tehama City of Red Bluff Rancho Tehama Mira Monte WC Surrey Village WC Golden Meadows CSD 	 Lake California Bowman area, unincorporated County Rio Alto Water District Saddleback MWC 	Inform and involve to provide safe and secure groundwater supplies to all communities reliant on groundwater
 Tribes Federally Recognized Tribes Non-Federally Recognized Tribes 	 California Tribal Water Commission Paskenta Band of the Nomlaki (Corning Subbasin) Greenville Rancheria 			Greenville Rancheria		Inform, involve and consult with tribal government
Integrated Water Management • Regional water management groups (IRWM regions) • Flood agencies	 NSV IRWM Mid Upper Sacramento Regional Flood Management Group 					Inform, involve and collaborate to improve regional sustainability

⁷ This is not an exhaustive list as there are 100+ small water systems across the four subbasins.

SECTION 3 | APPENDICES

Appendix A | Outreach Resources and Materials

Several resources and materials, including those identified below, are available on the website: <u>https://tehamacountywater.org/gsa/library/</u>

(Reminder that all Corning Subbasin resources are available on the Corning GSP website: <u>https://www.corningsubbasingsp.org/</u>. Some Corning resources are listed below for readers' convenience.)

Factsheets & Flyers

- Tehama County SGMA Factsheet Link
- Corning General SGMA Factsheet Link
- North Sacramento Valley SGMA Regional Coordination Flyer Link
- Public Webinar Event flyers October 2020 | December 2020 | April 2021 | August 2021
- Comment on Draft GSPs & Fall 2021 Public Meetings Flyer Fall 2021

Quarterly eNewsletter

• Tehama County quarterly eNewsletter – <u>Winter 2020</u> | <u>Spring 2021</u> | <u>Summer 2021</u> | <u>Fall 2021</u>

Online Surveys

Two online surveys launched in 2021. Responses were considered/incorporated into the Draft GSPs.

- Tehama County Subbasins Online Survey | Projects / Management Actions ideas (March July 2021) – <u>Link</u>
 - o 16 total responses.
- Tehama County Subbasins Online Survey | Domestic Well Owners (March 2021 Present) <u>Link</u>
 To date: 17 total responses.

GSA and Advisory Boards Meetings

Updates were regularly shared at Groundwater Commission, District Board, and CSAB meetings. These resources and materials can be found on their respective meetings pages:

- Board of Directors Link
- Groundwater Commission Link
- Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Link

SGMA and Tribal Engagement

• April 6, 2021 webinar presentation - Link

Public Meeting Presentations

Region-wide public meetings

- October 8, 2020 webinar Video | Slide Deck
- December 9, 2020 webinar Video (subbasin-specific slide decks provided below)
- September 29, 2021 webinar Video | Slide Deck
- October 20, 2021 webinar Video | Slide Deck
- November 15, 2021 in-person workshop <u>Agenda Handout</u> | <u>Slide Deck</u>

Subbasin-specific public meetings

- Bowman Subbasin
 - o October 15, 2020 tailgate <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o December 9, 2020 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - April 19, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
 - August 17, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
- Red Bluff Subbasin
 - o October 21, 2020 tailgate <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o October 6, 2020 Thomes Creek community tailgate <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o December 9, 2020 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - April 20, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
 - August 19, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
- Antelope Subbasin
 - o October 14, 2020 tailgate <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o December 9 2020 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o April 21, 2021 webinar Slide Deck | Video
 - August 23 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
- Los Molinos Subbasin
 - October 22, 2020 tailgate <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o December 9, 2020 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - April 22, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
 - August 25, 2021 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>
- Corning Subbasin
 - o December 9, 2020 webinar <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - o October 4, 2021 in-person workshop, Corning <u>Agenda Packet</u> | <u>Slide Deck</u>
 - October 13, 2021 webinar <u>Agenda Packet</u> | <u>Slide Deck</u> | <u>Video</u>

(Visit the Corning GSP website for more information specific to the Corning Subbasin – Link)

Appendix B | Inter-basin Coordination

In the Sacramento Valley, inter-basin coordination is critical as Groundwater Sustainability Agencies develop their Groundwater Sustainability Plans. We all recognize the interconnectedness of groundwater in the subbasins that together make up the larger Sacramento Valley groundwater basin.

Coordination among GSAs can be formalized through Coordination Agreements. These are voluntary, and the components of such agreements are described in the Groundwater Sustainability Regulations in <u>Article 8</u>.

Informal exchange of information and collaboration has been occurring between staff and consultants working on GSPs in subbasins throughout the region with facilitation support from the Consensus Building Institute. The effort began with conversations between County staff from Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, and Butte to identify priorities and resources available for inter-basin coordination.

These <u>slides</u> provide an overview of the scope and timeline of the Inter-basin Coordination efforts (<u>Flier</u>).



Framework for Inter-basin Coordination Northern Sacramento Valley Inter-basin Coordination Report-Final

This report outlines a framework for inter-basin coordination for sustainable groundwater management in the Northern Sacramento Valley. It describes a menu of options for ongoing communication and collaboration between and among groundwater subbasins over the twenty-year implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). This framework can be used by Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to support Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development and implementation in several ways.

- 1. This inter-basin coordination report could be included as an appendix to the GSP and could be updated at regular intervals.
- 2. Individual subbasins could incorporate sections of the report into the body of the GSP, depending upon specific boundary conditions at adjoining subbasins.
- 3. Subbasins could draw on the inter-basin coordination framework if they would like to consider entering into one or more voluntary inter-basin agreements during GSP implementation (GSP Regulations in <u>Article 8</u>, Sec 357.2.

Staff throughout the region will present the framework as a supporting document to guide and inform discussions with GSA Boards and at other subbasin-specific public venues, such as advisory committees, groundwater commissions, or other relevant venues. These discussions could help determine GSA

priorities and the desired approach each GSA would like to take to draw upon the inter-basin coordination framework within their individual GSPs.

Subbasin staff acknowledge that while this report builds upon a long-standing history of regional collaboration, this is just the beginning of inter-basin coordination efforts under SGMA. Therefore, this framework will be continually refined throughout GSP implementation and inter-basin coordination activities will occur on an ongoing basis.

Visit the website for more information:

https://www.buttecounty.net/waterresourceconservation/Sustainable-Groundwater-Management-Act/Inter-basin-Coordination

Appendix C | Tribal Engagement in Tehama County: Guidance Document

Meaningful tribal outreach, dialogue, and consultation is a shared obligation of the GSA in the applicable subbasins where tribal lands exist.

Tribes in Tehama County

There are two⁸ federally-recognized Native American Tribes in Tehama County, including:

- Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians
- Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) identified eight Tribes in Tehama County and Glenn County that may have an interest in groundwater management in the Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, Los Molinos, and/or Corning Subbasins:

- Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria
- Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians
- Grindstone Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki
- Mechoopda Indian Tribe

- Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians
- Redding Rancheria
- Shasta Nation
- Wintu Tribe of Northern California

Outreach Steps – Phase I

- 1. Confirm that the Native American tribes identified above are correctly posed for SGMA outreach.
- 2. The District will prepare background materials related to Native American tribal outreach and engagement. The material will include a compilation of past Native American tribal outreach methods, goals, and results (including primary points of contact). The materials will include SGMA-related obligations for GSAs pursuant to SGMA, and interests and goals as they relate to tribal outreach and potential participation in sustainable groundwater management planning (see *Relevant DWR Information* below).
- The District will conduct an initial, informal communication with tribal primary points of contact to clarify interest in communicating formally regarding SGMA and tribal interests; request advice about appropriate avenues for outreach; and identify next steps. In the event a tribal representative cannot be contacted within 45 days, the District will consult with DWR's Office of Tribal Policy Advisor for guidance (Anecita Agustinez, DWR Tribal Policy Advisor - <u>Anecita.Agustinez@water.ca.gov).</u>
- 4. Following successful initial communication with the Native American tribes, the District will facilitate the implementation of the next steps identified in #3. Actions may include preparation

⁸ Source: <u>https://www.ihs.gov/california/index.cfm/tribal-consultation/resources-for-tribal-leaders/links-and-resources/list-of-federally-recognized-tribes-in-ca/?mobileFormat=0</u>

of a formal letter from the Board to each of the tribes, involvement of other GSAs with the tribes, and/or establishing a consultation framework.

Outreach Steps – Phase II

Refer to <u>Table 1 (Summary of Engagement Opportunities, Milestones, and Progress to Date)</u> and <u>Table 2</u> (Tehama Stakeholder Group Interests & Purpose of Engagement).

Relevant DWR Information

SGMA Section 10720.3. ...any federally recognized Indian Tribe, appreciating the shared interest in assuring the sustainability of groundwater resources, may voluntarily agree to participate in the preparation or administration of a groundwater sustainability plan or groundwater management plan under this part through a joint powers authority or other agreement with local agencies in the basin. A participating Tribe shall be eligible to participate fully in planning, financing, and management under this part, including eligibility for grants and technical assistance, if any exercise of regulatory authority, enforcement, or imposition and collection of fees is pursuant to the Tribe's independent authority and not pursuant to authority granted to a groundwater sustainability agency under this part.

Guidance Document for Sustainable Management of Groundwater: Engagement with Tribal Governments [Link]

Discussion Questions Relating to Tribal Governments Engagement with GSAs [Link]

Must a local agency exclude federal and tribal lands from its service area when forming a GSA? No, federal lands and tribal lands need not be excluded from a local agency's GSA area if a local agency has jurisdiction in those areas; however, those areas are not subject to SGMA. But, a local agency in its GSA formation notice shall explain how it will consider the interests of the federal government and California Native American tribes when forming a GSA and developing a GSP. DWR strongly recommends that local agencies communicate with federal and tribal representatives prior to deciding to become a GSA. As stated in Water Code §10720.3, the federal government or any federally recognized Indian tribe, appreciating the shared interest in assuring the sustainability of groundwater resources, may voluntarily agree to participate in the preparation or administration of a GSP or groundwater management plan through a JPA or other agreement with local agencies in the basin. Water Code References: §10720.3, §10723.2, §10723.8

Tribal Outreach Resources

The follow are links to agency tribal outreach resources and considerations, each of which captures important principles and resources for tribal outreach. A short summary of key outreach principles can be found below.

- <u>CalEPA Tribal Consultation Policy Memo (August 2015)</u>
- DWR Tribal Engagement Policy (May 2016)
- <u>CA Natural Resources Agency Tribal Consultation Policy (November 2012)</u>
- <u>SWRCB Proposed Tribal Beneficial Uses</u>
- <u>CA Court Tribal Outreach and Engagement Strategies</u>
- <u>Traditional Ecological Knowledge resources</u>

<u>Water Education Foundation Tribal Water Issues</u>

Key Outreach Principles

- Engage early and often
- Consider tribal beneficial uses in decision-making (identified by region <u>here</u>); identify and seek to protect tribal cultural resources
- Share relevant documentation with tribal officials
- Conduct meetings at times convenient for tribal participation with ample notifications
- Request relevant process input/data/information from tribes
- Empower tribes to act as tribal cultural resources caretakers
- Designate a tribal liaison(s) where appropriate
- Share resources for tribal involvement as is feasible
- Develop MOUs where relevant
- Be mindful of the traditions and cultural norms of tribes in your area

Key Outreach Partners/Liaisons

The following are potential partners for Tehama County tribal SGMA outreach:

- <u>SGMA Tribal Advisory Group (TAG)</u>: "The Tribal Advisory Group (TAG) includes tribal leadership, subject matter experts, and technical and non-technical members of local, academic, and tribal governments that are actively engaged in local groundwater management and will be key in local implementation of SGMA. TAG members will be responsible for distribution of information and resources to their respective tribes and organizations."
- California Indian Water Commission, Inc.
- DWR Office of Tribal Advisor
- DWR Northern Regional Office Contact
- <u>Central Valley Regional Board Tribal Coordinator</u>

Appendix D | Disadvantaged Communities Engagement in Tehama County – Guidance Document

Important consideration should be given with regard to encouraging community participation in disadvantaged communities (DACs) / severely disadvantaged communities (SDACs) and ensuring accessible and transparent meetings especially in those communities with limited access to digital resources.

Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) in Tehama County Subbasins

DAC and SDAC communities were identified based on data from DWR DAC Mapping too, 2018 Census tract (categorized as "economically distressed areas" Census blockgroup) for the Bowman, Red Bluff, Antelope, Los Molinos, and Corning Subbasins. -- Refer to the Plan Area chapters of the subbasins' GSPs.

Outreach Steps

Phase I

- 1. Use <u>DWR Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool</u> or other geographic information system technology to help identify disadvantaged, severely disadvantaged and economically distressed communities within the Cosumnes subbasin.
- 2. GSAs share insights on engaging with members of these communities from past projects or efforts. Also consider the key outreach principles identified below.
- 3. Review catalog of existing outreach materials. Modify as necessary to fit the needs of each community. This may include translating select materials into one or more languages. Develop additional materials if advantageous.
- 4. Identify potential points of contacts / outreach partners for DAC engagement. See preliminary list of partners below. Conduct an initial, informal communication with organizational points of contact to clarify interest in engaging DAC communities on SGMA; request advice about appropriate avenues for outreach; and identify next steps.

Phase II

Refer to <u>Table 1 (Summary of Engagement Opportunities, Milestones, and Progress to Date)</u> and <u>Table 2</u> (<u>Tehama Stakeholder Group Interests & Purpose of Engagement</u>).

Relevant DWR Information

Guidance on Engaging and Communicating with Underrepresented Groundwater Users [Link]

DWR recognizes that there are groups or communities of groundwater users that have been historically and frequently left out from decision-making with regard to sustainable groundwater management. These groups include, but are not limited to: disadvantaged communities, private domestic well owners, small growers and farmers, Tribes, and communities on small water systems. All beneficial uses and users of groundwater must be part of the effort to achieve sustainability, and engagement should occur with all entities that could be affected by the implementation of a GSP.

California Water Code 10723.2 The groundwater sustainability agency shall consider the interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater, as well as those responsible for implementing groundwater sustainability plans.

23 Cal. Code Regs. §354.10 Notice and Communication. Each Plan shall include a summary of information relating to notification and communication by the Agency with other agencies and interested parties including the following: (a) a description of the beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the basin, including the land uses and property interests potentially affected by the use of groundwater in the basin, the types of parties representing those interests, and the nature of consultation with those parties.

Outreach Resources

Tools for identifying DAC communities include:

- DWR Disadvantaged Community Mapping Tool
- DWR Economically Distressed Areas Mapping Tool
- <u>State Water Board Human Right to Water Portal</u>
- <u>CalEnviroScreen</u>
- US Census Bureau Data Portal

DAC Communications Best Practices and similar reference publications:

- DWR Guidance on Engaging and Communicating with Underrepresented Groundwater Users
- Local Government Commission Best Practices for Virtual Engagement Guide
- <u>Self Help Enterprises webpage</u> on SGMA engagement for DACs
- <u>Self Help Enterprises Technical Assistance Program</u>
- Clean Water Action's <u>Collaborating for Success: Stakeholder Engagement for SGMA</u>
 <u>Implementation</u>
- Water Education Foundation's <u>Solving Water Challenges in DACs: A Handbook to Understanding</u>
 <u>the Issues in California and Best Practices for Engagement</u>

Key Outreach and Engagement Principles⁹

- Decisions that impact DACs must be done with their guidance and input, and agencies should ensure that community residents are able to give meaningful input into the process.
- Partner with local community-based organizations as trusted messengers.
- Target outreach materials and approach appropriately by tailoring communications to the community's needs. Be mindful of language and cultural differences.
- Be aware of communities' level of access to computers, internet, and phone connections.
- Engage early and often. Reach out to community-based organizations and other stakeholders who may be in direct communication with residents early to help make sure that residents are informed and notified through multiple channels about options for public meetings.
- Understand who the target audience is (e.g., with whom you will be meeting) to understand where and when to meet (such as during the day vs. evening meetings)

⁹ Principles extracted and summarized from best practices and other outreach sources noted in "Outreach Resources" section above.

- Conduct meetings at times convenient for public participation with ample notifications.
- When possible, travel to the target community to meet them in their locale.
- One-on-one meetings with individual communities and stakeholders may be more appropriate than trying to meet with several entities in one location.
- For virtual meetings, provide multiple options for teleconferencing, with two-way communication options that allows either computer-users or phone-users to engage. Consider using separate teleconference lines or audio channels to meet language access needs.
- Several meetings may be required to engage new communities and involve them in the SGMA process.
- Provide in-meeting translation and translated materials to the maximum extent possible.
- Though there may be commonalities across regions, each community/DAC/tribe/water system/stakeholder has unique and individualized water-related concerns.

Key Outreach Partners/ Liaisons

The following lists potential partners for outreach to DACs:

- Rural Community Assistance Corporation
- <u>Self Help Enterprises</u>
- Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability
- <u>Clean Water Action</u>

Appendix E | Media Contact List

Organization	Name	Email	Phone
The Sacramento Valley Tim Crews vmtim@pulsaroco.com			
Mirror			
	general	valleymirror@pulsaro.com	
Appeal Democrat (for	News Room	adnewsroom@appealdemocrat.com (for paid notices)	530-749-6552
Corning Observer)	Julie Johnson	jjohnson@tcnpress.com (for general information/ meeting	
		notices)	
Action News Now		news@actionnewsnow.com	530-343-1212
Red Bluff Daily News	George Johnston	gjohnston@redbluffdailynews.com	
KRCR	News Room	news@krcrtv.com	530-243-7777
Multiple Spanish-	Armando Jimenez	ajimenez@bustosmedia.com	
speaking media			

Appendix F | Potential Venues List

The COVID-19 pandemic frequently caused the District and Groundwater Commission to meet virtually during development of the GSPs. As in-person meeting options became available, there was general interest to explore supporting virtual participation options during certain meetings such as public workshops. The following table summarizes potential venues in Tehama County subbasins for various meetings / workshops and identify key logistical amenities, particularly audio-visual capabilities that support virtual and in-person participation.

Subbasin	Name	Address	Capacity	Contact	Amenities	Notes
Red Bluff	County Board	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff		Denise Ranberg	Projector & Screen, wired mics, wi-fi,	GW Commission
	Chambers			530-527-4655	teleconference; chamber is fixed seating;	meeting location
					adjacent room is unfixed seating	
Red Bluff	Red Bluff Community	1500 South Jackson	Varies, up	Karen Shaffer	Projector (additional fee)/Screen,	
	Senior Center	Street, Red Bluff	to 120	Phone: 530-527-8181	microphone, wifi	
				kshaffer@cityofredbluff.org		
Red Bluff	County Dept. of	1135 Lincoln State., Red	Varies, 30-	Melanie Lee	Projector and screen, mics, wi-fi, seating is	
	Education	Bluff	80	mlee@tehamaschools.org	not fixed	
Bowman	TBD					
Los	TBD					
Molinos						
Antelope	TBD					
Corning	Rolling Hills Casino	2655 Everett Freeman	Varies	Karen Hiton	Projector and screen, mics, wi-fi, Indoor and	
		Way, Corning, California		eventsales@rollinghillscasino.com	outdoor space, unfixed seating, room	
		96021			partitioning options	

Appendix G | Potential GSA Outreach Tasks

This appendix is intended to help identify and map out specific issues and strategies that the District, advisory groups, and/or partners may consider during implementation of the GSPs. This does not commit any entity to specific tasks nor preclude them from pursuing other strategies aligned with the subbasin GSPs, related governance documents, and the Communication & Engagement Plan.

Methods

The following are methods that have emerged as highly effective and/or strongly recommended by District Board members, Groundwater Commissioners, District staff, consultants, and/or other subject-matter experts, partners, stakeholders, and the public. As mentioned above, the list does not commit any entity to specific tasks nor preclude them from pursuing other strategies.

- Outreach/project partners and collaborative forums (mailing list networks, newsletters, events, etc.)
- Briefings upon request (communities, organizations, etc.)
- One-on-one communication with GSA representatives and staff
- District Board and Groundwater Commission meetings
- Recorded presentations (e.g., public webinars)
- District website
- Print-friendly handouts (factsheets, event flyers, etc.)
- Quarterly eNewsletter (including print-friendly format)
- Established popular physical locations to access materials (e.g., District office, library, etc.)
- Popular social media platforms / accounts
- Briefings with regulators and land managers (can inform funding and collaborative project opportunities)

Additional methods to consider during implementation of the GSPs

The following methods were not as widely used or perceived as substantially effective during development of the GSPs development, but these may be viewed as more feasible or effective going forward during implementation of the GSPs. Factors to that may influence selecting particular methods include: topic is of high interest to stakeholders / public, key milestones during SGMA implementation, available capacity and funding, etc.)

- Individual calls, texts, mailings
- Surveys
- News articles / op-eds
- Radio (e.g, 97.3, 91.7, and 88.9) / TV PSAs
- Kiosks, marquis, sign postings on community bulletin boards
- Expanding outreach partners (e.g., schools, faith-based groups, etc.)

Issues

The following are topics that have emerged as prominent issues of interest based on discussions among the District Board members, Groundwater Commissioners, District staff, consultants and other experts, partners, stakeholders, the public, etc. As mentioned above, the list does not commit any entity to specific tasks nor preclude them from pursuing other topics or strategies. Note that not all items listed

below are within the groundwater management authorities granted under SGMA; however, are still of interest to those who use groundwater and/or are interested in successful long-term management of groundwater in Tehama County's subbasins.

- Funding options and fees
- Areas with particular groundwater concerns
- Major data gaps (e.g., interconnected surface waters and groundwater dependent ecosystems) - Refer to GSPs for more details
- Regional / watershed planning (e.g., inter-basin coordination)
- Well permitting process
- Coordination with land-use planning and development entities
- Groundwater vs. surface water use
- Impacts to shallow wells
- Socioeconomic impacts
- Affordable and reliable drinking water
- Public input opportunities (confirming interests are being conveyed and considered during SGMA implementation)
- Underrepresented and hard-to-reach communities (DACs, Tribes, etc.), particularly those with limited access to reliable internet or limited familiarity/comfort with virtual participation options.
- Expanding monitoring network
- Future conditions (e.g., drought trends)
- Project feasibility

Appendix 2-C

Northern Sacramento Valley Inter-basin Coordination Report
Northern Sacramento Valley Inter-basin Coordination Report

Antelope | Bowman | Butte | Colusa | Corning | Los Molinos | Red Bluff | Sutter | Vina | Wyandotte Creek | Yolo

Table of Contents

Glossary of Acronyms	.1
1. Introduction & Background	. 2
2. Intent & Purpose	3
3. Evolution of Inter-basin Coordination Efforts	4
4. Inter-basin Coordination Framework	. 6
4.1. Inter-basin Coordination Groups	. 7
5. Conclusion and Next Steps	. 8
Appendices	9

Glossary of Acronyms

- CBI Consensus Building Institute [link]
- DWR California Department of Water Resources
- **GSA** Groundwater Sustainability Agency
- GSP Groundwater Sustainability Plan
- MOU Memorandum of Understanding
- NCWA Northern California Water Association
- NSV IRWM-Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management
- PMAs Projects and Management Actions
- SGMA Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
- SMC Sustainable Management Criteria



1. Introduction & Background

The content of the report is the result of staff recommendations resulting from regional inter-basin coordination staff meetings in the Northern Sacramento Valley (2020-2021). The content will be presented to inform discussions among Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) and gather public input through existing public venues, such as advisory committees, groundwater commissions, and GSA Board meetings.

Inter-basin coordination is critical in the Northern Sacramento Valley as GSAs develop and implement Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs). Since groundwater subbasins in the Northern Sacramento Valley are hydrologically interconnected, water management decisions and actions in subbasins (i.e., groundwater pumping and processes affecting recharge, water demand, and supply including climate change) could change aquifer conditions. Understanding and accounting for these processes is important towards achieving sustainability in all subbasins.



Figure 1. Map of the Northern Sacramento Valley

Inter-basin coordination is described in the GSP Regulations in <u>Article 8</u>. Under the regulations, GSAs must describe how they coordinate with adjoining subbasins to demonstrate implementation will not adversely affect adjoining subbasins. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is required to evaluate whether a GSP adversely affects the ability of an adjacent basin to implement their GSP or impedes achievement of sustainability goals in an adjacent basin (Water Code 17033(c)). Coordination among GSAs can be formalized in different ways and inter-basin agreements are voluntary. <u>Appendix A</u> describes components of Sec 357.2.

Inter-basin coordination discussions among staff representatives from 11 subbasins (Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Sutter, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, and Yolo), with facilitation support from the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) began during the summer of 2020. While efforts have focused on these subbasins, coordination will occur, as warranted, with other neighboring subbasins (Anderson and North Yuba).

Initial stages of inter-basin coordination efforts (May-December 2020) were closely aligned with the GSP Regulations in <u>Article 8</u> components and delineated in Section 3 *Evolution of Inter-basin Coordination Efforts*. After an initial attempt to compile technical information to better understand basin conditions at respective boundaries, staff realized differing timelines for the completion of Basin Setting content in each subbasin meant there would not be sufficient time during initial GSP development to fully characterize or address major inconsistencies. Therefore, the goal for regional inter-basin coordination shifted towards establishing a framework for long-term inter-basin coordination and dialogue (post GSP submittal in 2022). Informal coordination discussions among staff and consultants between neighboring subbasins continued during the GSP development process.

This report outlines the intent and purpose of inter-basin coordination in the Northern Sacramento Valley. It describes the process followed and materials developed throughout the process. It also outlines foundational elements, referred to as "key pillars," of a framework for sustained coordination through GSP implementation.

2. Intent & Purpose

Inter-basin coordination efforts in the Northern Sacramento Valley are focused on establishing a foundation and guidelines for sustained inter-basin coordination through GSP implementation, following the initial submittal of GSPs by January 31, 2022. GSAs intend to:

- 1. Establish a framework allowing for continued dialogue and a venue to address issues and discrepancies during the implementation of the GSPs;
- 2. Coordinate on consistent messaging and communicate shared expectations at a regional level;
- 3. Demonstrate regional coordination efforts and outcomes; and
- 4. Leverage existing agreements and arrangements in the region (e.g., Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management (NSV IRWM), the Six County Memorandum of Understanding among Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Shasta, and Sutter).



The proposed deliverable from this effort is the development of a common approach and draft language for incorporation into each subbasin's GSP. This narrative describes the facilitated effort as well as the framework and scope for long-term coordination during plan implementation. The public will have opportunities to weigh in and provide input on the proposed framework through each subbasin's existing public venues, such as advisory committees, groundwater commissions, and GSA board meetings.

3. Evolution of Inter-basin Coordination Efforts

Inter-basin coordination efforts, facilitated by the Consensus Building Institute (CBI) began in summer 2020 among Subbasin staff from Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Vina, and Wyandotte Creek subbasins to identify priorities and resources available for inter-basin coordination. Soon after, staff representatives from the Sutter and Yolo subbasins joined the meetings. To date, CBI has facilitated nine inter-basin coordination meetings with staff and periodically with technical consultants from the subbasins. Subbasin staff and/or CBI communicated regular updates to GSA Boards and advisory committees in each of the subbasins regarding the status of inter-basin coordination activities [Access Webpage Here].

Initial stages of inter-basin coordination efforts were closely aligned with the GSP Regulations in <u>Article</u> 8:

- 1. General information of subbasins, plans and agencies participating in the coordination agreement,
- 2. **Technical information** including consistent and coordinated data or methodology for inter-basin boundary flows and stream-groundwater interactions at basin boundaries, and information on sustainable management criteria and monitoring that would confirm that no adverse impacts of implementing the GSPs would result to any party to the agreement,
- A description of the process for identifying and resolving conflicts between Agencies that are parties to an inter-basin coordination agreement. Reference: Sections 10727.2, 10733, and 10733.2, Water Code.

The goal at the initial stage was to compile general and technical information identified by DWR in a consistent manner to establish an accurate basis of comparison and to identify any significant inconsistencies that may need to be addressed or resolved. This included developing a series of

- information-sharing documents and outreach materials, summarized below.
 1. Inter-basin Coordination Directory- This document provides an updated and centralized directory with contact information for GSA managers, technical consultants, and facilitators in the various subbasins. This document seeks to facilitate communication among the various representatives leading GSP development [Access Here].
 - 2. **Technical Information-Sharing Template** This template was developed among the managers and technical consulting teams to compile and compare information on modeling tools and water budget results for inter-basin flows, stream-aquifer interactions, and hydro-geologic conditions in the subbasins. Potentially, this document could be used to compile information about Sustainable Management Criteria and Monitoring Networks [Access Draft Template Here]. The first output from the technical information-sharing template summarizes the highlights of compiled model information across the subbasins [Access Here].
 - 3. **Outreach Presentation**—This PowerPoint presentation provides updates on inter-basin coordination activities to the various SGMA public venues (GSA boards, advisory committees, etc.) and an overview of the scope and timeline of inter-basin coordination efforts. This presentation is continuously updated



after each inter-basin coordination staff meeting for use in consistently communicating with GSA Boards/advisory committees and the public throughout the region [<u>Access Here</u>].

- 4. **Outreach Factsheet** The inter-basin coordination factsheet aims to support public outreach and information sharing in the various subbasins. This two-page flier or factsheet summarizes why regional coordination is important under SGMA, who is involved in ongoing efforts, what the coordination priorities are, and includes a table with links to each subbasin's website for additional subbasins' specific information [Access Here].
- 5. Inter-basin Coordination Webpage– Butte County hosts a webpage to provide the most up-to-date information on inter-basin coordination efforts in the Northern Sacramento Valley. The webpage provides an overview of the scope and makes available documentation and results of the inter-basin coordination work, including meeting agendas, summaries, and outputs [Access Here].
- 6. *Meeting Summaries*–CBI develops meeting summaries after each regional inter-basin coordination staff meeting to summarize key discussion themes, action items, and next steps. These summaries are publicly available on the inter-basin coordination webpage [Access Here].

After an initial attempt to compile technical information, staff realized the broad aspirations were not feasible during the initial stages of GSP development. The process of compiling and comparing modeling outputs from the diverse regional hydrological models required a significant amount of time, resources, and varying levels of data. Further, subbasins were at different stages of GSP development and GSAs were facing tight timelines, competing priorities, and capacity limitations to meet the regulatory deadline. While communication on a neighbor-to-neighbor basis on technical components was encouraged through GSP development, subbasin staff representatives realized more robust technical analysis and coordination between and among subbasins was not possible until initial plans (including water budgets) were more fully developed or after adoption of the initial GSPs.

Following reflection from the separate inter-basin efforts and priorities moving forward, subbasin staff recommended shifting the focus of regional coordination meetings to establishing a framework for longterm inter-basin coordination and dialogue following GSP submission in January 2022. To do so, subbasin staff identified desired outcomes in the short-term (during initial GSP development), mid-term (first 5-year update), and long-term (GSP Implementation through 2042) [Access Here]. This approach recognizes adoption of the 2022 GSPs as an initial step in sustainable groundwater management, not the final step. Subbasin staff acknowledged while model outputs may not match perfectly, the main objective is to identify and acknowledge significant discrepancies, understand why those differences exist, and evaluate to the extent they need to be reconciled. Inter-basin coordination has been characterized as "a marathon not a sprint," and current efforts will serve to pave the path for long-term collaboration. Further, GSAs can take advantage of annual reporting and five-year GSP updates to identify and address discrepancies. Lastly, subbasin staff representatives acknowledge public participants are interested in inter-basin coordination efforts and concerns from some subbasins can easily affect others. Subbasin staff understand the need to share and educate the public on what is in the various GSPs, and the SGMA requirements for inter-basin coordination. Staff will continue to provide updates and gather GSA Board and public input related to the direction of current efforts and desired priorities, shared concerns, and possible ideas for inter-basin coordination during GSP implementation.



4. Inter-basin Coordination Framework

This section outlines the foundational pillars that comprise the framework for inter-basin coordination under SGMA between and among subbasins in the Northern Sacramento Valley. These pillars build upon a long-standing history of regional collaboration and embody a commitment for continued coordination, collaboration, and communication for successful groundwater management in the region. Honoring the individual authorities of the GSAs, these pillars represent a menu of options neighboring subbasins can draw upon, based on individual or neighboring subbasins' needs and challenges. GSA Boards can decide which of these options they would like to support and implement, acknowledging circumstances may change over time.

Pillars		Scale(s)	Timing
1. Infor	rmation-sharing	 Neighbor-to- 	• Ongoing (GSP
a. b. c.	Inform each other on changing conditions (i.e., surface water cutbacks, land use changes, policy changes that inform groundwater management) Share annual reports and interim progress reports Share data and technical information and work towards building shared data across and/or along basin boundaries (e.g., monitoring data, water budgets, modeling inputs and outputs, and Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems)	neighborCoordination groups [Refer to section 4.1 below]	 Development) Near-term (5-year update) Long-term (GSP implementation)
2. Join	t analysis & evaluation	• Neighbor-to-	• Near-term (5-vear
a.	Evaluate and compare contents of GSPs with a focus on establishing a common understanding of basin conditions at boundaries	 Coordination groups [Refer 	 <i>update</i>) <i>Long-term (GSP implementation)</i>
b.	Identify significant differences, uncertainties, and potential issues of concern related to groundwater interaction at the boundaries	to section 4.1 below]	
с.	Engage in analysis and evaluation of SMCs between GSPs to assess impacts and identify significant differences and possible impacts between subbasins that could potentially lead to undesirable results		
3. Cool	rdination on mutually beneficial activities	• Neighbor-to-	• Ongoing (GSP
a. b.	Communicate, coordinate, and collaborate on mutually beneficial activities, which could include joint monitoring, joint reporting, regional modeling, and other efforts to address data gaps at subbasin boundaries Collectively pursue funding and collaborate on mutually agreed	neighbor • Coordination groups • Regional: NSV IRWM	Development) • Near-term (5-year update) • Long-term (GSP implementation)
c.	upon projects and management actions that provide benefits across boundaries Leverage existing collaboratives (NSV IRWM, NCWA etc.)	NCWA Groundwater Task Force	
4. Coo	rdinated communication and outreach	Regional: NSV	• Ongoing (GSP
a.	Coordinate and collaborate on regional-scale public engagement and communication strategies that promote awareness on groundwater sustainability, enhance public trust, and maintain institutional knowledge Maintain list of GSP/subbasin staff contacts and websites	IRWM and NCWA Groundwater Task Force	 Development) Near-term (5-year update) Long-term (GSP implementation)
5. Issue	e-resolution process	• Neighbor-to-	• Near-term (5-year
a.	Establish and follow an agreed-upon process for identifying and resolving conflicts between GSAs by the first five-year update [Refer to <u>Appendix D</u> for more details and discussion prompts on issue resolution processes]	neighborCoordination groups	 update) Long-term (GSP implementation).



4.1. Inter-basin Coordination Groups

Inter-basin coordination efforts, as outlined in the pillars above, would require resources and technical support. Subbasin staff recommend organizing inter-basin coordination priorities by specific subbasin boundaries. One suggested approach identifies specific "Coordination Groups" (see Figure 3 and list below). Some of these groups are pairs and others include multiple subbasins around a river boundary.

- 1. Feather River Corridor- Butte, Wyandotte Creek, North Yuba, Sutter
- 2. North Sacramento River Corridor- Antelope, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Corning, Vina, Butte, Colusa
- 3. South Sacramento Corridor- Colusa, Sutter, Yolo

Neighbor to Neighbor, examples:

- 4. Stony Creek- Corning, Colusa
- 5. Thomes Creek- Red Bluff, Corning
- 6. Butte/Vina- Vina, Butte





5. Conclusion and Next Steps

In sum, this report outlines a framework for inter-basin coordination for sustainable groundwater management in the Northern Sacramento Valley. The inter-basin coordination framework describes a menu of options for ongoing communication and collaboration around substantive issues over the twenty-year implementation of SGMA.

The pillars and other content from this report could be used by GSAs to support GSP development and implementation in a number of ways. This inter-basin coordination report could be included as an Appendix to the GSP and could be updated on a yearly basis. Individual subbasins can incorporate sections of the report into the body of the GSP, depending upon specific boundary conditions at adjoining subbasins. Finally, subbasins could draw on the inter-basin coordination framework if they would like to consider entering into one or more voluntary inter-basin agreements during GSP implementation.

The content of the report is the result of staff recommendations resulting from regional inter-basin coordination staff meetings. Staff will present the framework as a supporting document to guide and inform discussions with the GSA Boards and other existing public venues, such as advisory committees or groundwater commissions. GSAs in turn will discuss the menu of options for inter-basin coordination outlined in this report to determine their priorities and desired approach to draw on the inter-basin coordination framework in their individual GSPs. Lastly, Subbasin staff will come together to share input received and determinations from their respective GSAs.

Subbasin staff acknowledge that while this report builds upon a long-standing history of regional collaboration, this is just the beginning of inter-basin coordination efforts under SGMA. Therefore, this framework and inter-basin coordination activities will be continually refined throughout GSP implementation.



Appendices

Appendix A: GSP Emergency Regulations, Article 8: Interagency Agreements §357.2

§ 357.2. Inter-basin Agreements (access here)

Two or more Agencies may enter into an agreement to establish compatible sustainability goals and understanding regarding fundamental elements of the Plans of each Agency as they relate to sustainable groundwater management. Inter-basin agreements may be included in the Plan to support a finding that implementation of the Plan will not adversely affect an adjacent basin's ability to implement its Plan or impede the ability to achieve its sustainability goal. Inter-basin agreements should facilitate the exchange of technical information between Agencies and include a process to resolve disputes concerning the interpretation of that information. Interbasin agreements may include any information the participating Agencies deem appropriate, such as the following:

- (a) General information:
 - (1) Identity of each basin participating in and covered by the terms of the agreement.
 - (2) A list of the Agencies or other public agencies or other entities with groundwater management responsibilities in each basin.
 - (3) A list of the Plans, Alternatives, or adjudicated areas in each basin.
- (b) Technical information:
 - (1) An estimate of **groundwater flow across basin boundaries**, including consistent and coordinated data, methods, and assumptions.
 - (2) An estimate of stream-aquifer interactions at boundaries.
 - (3) A **common understanding of the geology and hydrology** of the basins **and the hydraulic connectivity** as it applies to the Agency's determination of groundwater flow across basin boundaries and description of the different assumptions utilized by different Plans and how the Agencies reconciled those differences.
 - (4) Sustainable management criteria and a monitoring network that would confirm that no adverse impacts result from the implementation of the Plans of any party to the agreement. If minimum thresholds or measurable objectives differ substantially between basins, the agreement should specify how the Agencies will reconcile those differences and manage the basins to avoid undesirable results. The Agreement should identify the differences that the parties consider significant and include a plan and schedule to reduce uncertainties to collectively resolve those uncertainties and differences.
- (c) A description of the **process for identifying and resolving conflicts** between Agencies that are parties to the agreement.
- (d) Inter-basin agreements submitted to the Department shall be posted on the Department's website. **Note:** Authority cited: Section 10733.2, Water Code.

Reference: Sections 10727.2, 10733, and 10733.2, Water Code.



Appendix B: Inter-basin Coordination Fact Sheet

Northern Sacramento Valley I Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Regional Coordination Between Subbasins

Antelope | Bowman | Butte | Colusa | Corning | Los Molinos | Red Bluff | Sutter | Vina | Wyandotte Creek | Yolo

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act What is SGMA? California enacted the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) in 2014 to better manage groundwater over the long term. Sustainability is achieved by avoiding significant and unreasonable conditions for the six "sustainability indicators."



Why is regional coordination important? In the Sacramento Valley, inter-basin coordination is critical as Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSA) develop their Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP). Since groundwater subbasins in the Northern Sacramento Valley (NSV) are hydrologically interconnected, water management decisions and actions in one subbasin (e.g. groundwater pumping) and processes like climate change could change aquifer conditions and affect flows to other subbasins. Understanding and accounting for these processes is key to achieve sustainability in all subbasins.

Who is involved in ongoing efforts?

Collaborative efforts have begun among representatives from 11 subbasins (Antelope, Bowman, Butte, Colusa, Corning, Los Molinos, Red Bluff, Sutter, Vina, Wyandotte Creek, Yolo), with facilitation support from the Consensus Building Institute. While efforts have focused on the subbasins mentioned, coordination will occur, as warranted, with other neighboring subbasins (Anderson and North Yuba).

What are the coordination priorities?

Groundwater Sustainability Agencies are working together to establish a foundation for open and transparent inter-basin coordination and communication by developing tools to:







(R		and a		
Receive Sign up fo interested	r your GSA's parties list.	Contact Your GSA Talk to your GSA representative	Attend Attend pu Advisory Boar	d Meetings ublic workshops, Board, and GSA d meetings
Subbasin		GSA(s)		Website
Antelope	Tehama Coun District (FCW0	ty Flood Control and Water Conser CD)	vation	Website
Bowman	Tehama Coun	ty FCWCD		Website
Butte	Biggs West G of Biggs, City Authority, Gle ID, Western C	ridley WD, Butte County, Butte WD of Gridley, Colusa Groundwater nn County, RD 1004, RD 2106, Rich anal WD	, City wale	Website:
Los Molinos	Tehama Coun	ty FCWCD		Website
Red Bluff	Tehama Coun	ty FCWCD		Website
Corning	Corning Sub-	oasin GSA, Tehama County FCWCD)	Website
Colusa	Glenn Ground Authority	lwater Authority; Colusa Groundwa	ter	Websites (Glenn) (Coluse)
Sutter	Butte WD, City of Live Oak, Sutter Community Service District, Sutter County, Sutter Extension Water District, RD 70, RD 1660, RD 1500, City of Yuba City			Website.
Vina	Rock Creek Re	eclamation District, Vina GSA		Websites Minal (RCDC)
Wyandotte Creek	Wyandotte Cr	eek GSA		Wobsite
Yolo	Yolo Subbasin	Groundwater Agency		Wohsta
		A		



APPENDIX C

Memorandum of Understanding Four County (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama Counties) Regional Water Resource Coordination, Collaboration, and Communication



Memorandum of Understanding Four County (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama Counties) Regional Water Resource Coordination, Collaboration, and Communication

1. BACKGROUND

The counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama share common surface water and groundwater resources. Based on these common resources, local water resource managers understand that regular coordination, collaboration, and communication can result in an improved water resource understanding at both the county and regional level.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to establish the mutual understandings of the four counties with respect to their voluntary joint efforts toward regional coordination, collaboration, and communication.

3. GOALS

The goals of the Four County Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) are:

2.1. To foster coordination, collaboration and communication between the four counties on water-related issues, to achieve greater efficiencies, and enhance public services.

2.2. To provide a framework for the management and disbursement of funding associated with activities pursued jointly under this MOU.

2.3. To improve competitiveness for State and Federal grant funding.

4. DEFINITIONS

4.1. Four County. Participants including the counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama, with representation by the following:

- Butte County: Department of Water and Resource Conservation
- Colusa County: Department of Planning and Building
- Glenn County: Department of Agriculture
- Tehama County: Flood Control and Water Conservation
 District

4.2. Project Manager. A project manager will be determined by the Counties signatory to this MOU for any given project regardless of funding source to meet the goals set forth in this MOU.

5. MUTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS

5.1. Participation. Signatories to this MOU constitute the current participants. Participation is strictly on a voluntary basis and may be



terminated at any time without recourse. Neighboring counties who share water resources common to the participating counties and who are engaged in similar activities will be invited to be signatory to this MOU. Signatories aspire to work collaboratively with other regional programs and technical outreach efforts.

5.2. Activities. Efforts pursued under this agreement will remain consistent with and will not exceed the current authority for any individual participating county. Efforts will include the study and investigation of water resources common to participants, monitoring and reporting, information dissemination and sharing between counties and with other county departments, public outreach and education, and other activities at the agreement and direction of individual county governing bodies.

5.3. County Funding. Counties are not required to commit funding associated with activities completed under this MOU. It is understood that activities under this MOU may result in the more efficient use of existing and future department funding resulting from improved collaboration and coordination.

5.4. External Funding. Signatories will work collaboratively in pursuit of external funding associated with common interest activities based on voluntary participation and agreement. When required, a mutually agreed upon County representative will serve as the Project Manager for activities completed under a contract with an external funding source. Existing county contracting mechanisms will be utilized where available for contractual and invoicing purposes between participating counties. Nothing in this MOU precludes individual counties from the individual pursuit, contracting and completion of work from an externally funded source regardless of a real or perceived regional interest.

5.5. Decision-making. Consensus will be sought when the need for a decision arises.

5.6. Non-binding nature. This document and participation under this MOU are nonbinding, and in no way suggest that a county may not continue its own activities as each county is expected to continue its own policies and procedures and undertake efforts to secure project funding from any source. A county may withdraw from participation at any time.

5.7. Termination. Because the MOU will require periodic review and updating for use into the future, it is envisioned that the joint efforts of those involved will be ongoing in maintaining a living document. Thus this document will remain as a reflection of the understandings of the participants. Individual signatories of this MOU may terminate their involvement at any time with no recourse.



6. SIGNATORIES TO THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

We, the undersigned representatives of our respective counties, acknowledge the above as our understanding of how the Four County Coordination, Collaboration, and Communication MOU will be implemented.

APPROVED JAN 2 4 2006 MAR 1 4 2006 Date Cut Josiassen, Chairman Butte County Board of Supervisors 2/28/06 112 lu Approved As To Form:

- - -



Approved As To Form: Bruce Alpert, Butte County Counsel

6. SIGNATORIES TO THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING We, the undersigned representatives of our respective counties, acknowledge the above as our understanding of how the Four County Coordination, Collaboration, and Communicative MOU will be implemented.

4 2006 Date

.

. .

:

,

& Aristy Scofield

Christy Scofield, Chairperson Colusa County Board of Supervisors

Approved As To Henry Rodegerdis, Colusa County Counsel

EXHIBIT B PAGE 3 OF 3 :

.

•.



ATALYZING COLLABORATION

FAX 530 385 1189 TEHAMA CNTY PUBLIC WORKS





TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MINUTE ORDER December 13, 2005

8. Approval of Four-County Regional Water Resource Coordination- MOU: Ernie Ohlin reviewed that in August 2004, the Board authorized staff to participate in the four county water effort. The MOU attached is allowing all counties to participate together in water resource collaboration and communication. This non-binding voluntary MOU recognizes coordination among Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama County.

Roger Sherrill encouraged the four-county groups to participate and noted in Item 5.1 "Participation" is strictly voluntary. Shasta County provides a major part of the recharge for the northern part of the Sacramento Valley and to move forward could only make for a stronger overall group.

Mark Black, Ag Commissioner for Glenn County, added this will be presented to Glenn County next Tuesday for support. Discussions with Sutter and Yuba County brings interest and they are awaiting the outcome of the four counties. This is a good collaborative effort, giving us strength of possible capturing of funding.

Motion by Director Warner to approve the MOU for signature.

Director Willard questioned if this has been reviewed by County Counsel. Upon his approval, signature will be completed.

Motion revised by Director Warner to approve the MOU for signature by the Chair upon review of County Counsel. Second by Director Avilla and carried by those present 3-0 with 2 absent.

Ayes: Directors':, Charles Willard; Ron Warner; Gregg Avilla Noes: None Absent or Not Voting: Director's: Ross Turner, George Russell

55

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF TEHAMA

I, Gary Antone, Director of the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District of the County of Tehama, State of California, hereby certify the above and foregoing to be full, true and correct copy of an order adopted by said Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District on this 13th day of <u>December, 2005</u>

Dated: This 13th day of December, 2005

Gary Antone

Director of the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District of the County of Tehama, State of California

By Linda Madea. Déput

F:WDMINIMEETINGIMINORDER/05MinOrd/Dec.wpd



FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ADDENDUM ONE:

Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects

In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and require regional solutions, the parties identified in the Four County Memorandum of Understanding hereby agree to adhere to the following Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects:

- 1. Programs and projects related to groundwater level and water quality monitoring shall be conducted in a cooperative manner and related data shall be shared between the participants to prevent negative impacts to our constituents.
- 2. Environmental documents associated with water projects and programs will automatically be circulated to all four counties for review and comment.
- 3. Incidents of abnormal water level or water quality readings will be immediately communicated to all participating counties resulting in a collaborative review and dissemination of related information.
- 4. Project and program related information will be disseminated on a regional basis through the independent county websites, augmented by regional public outreach meetings.
- 5. The parties will work cooperatively to acquire grant funding to conduct aquifer studies that further identify the linkages of the common groundwater resources.
- 6. Efforts pursued under this agreement will remain consistent with and will not exceed the current authority of any participating county.

We, the undersigned representatives of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehana in 2006.

1

207 ir, Butte County Date Board of Supervisors

2/23/07 ounty Counsel

Approved As to Form

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Use-Chair Polusa County Board of Supervisors

· · . .

4<u>-17-0</u>7 Date

Councy Counsel Approved As inform

EXHIBIT A PAGE 2 OF 2



0	A11417	11 00		
5	DOW	TUL	MII	RACT
23	1	180	1	
Ħ		00		

FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING **ADDENDUM ONE:** Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects

In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and require regional solutions, the parties identified in the Four County Memorandum of Understanding hereby agree to adhere to the following Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects:

- 1. Programs and projects related to groundwater level and water quality monitoring shall be conducted in a cooperative manner and related data shall be shared between the participants to prevent negative impacts to our constituents.
- 2. Environmental documents associated with water projects and programs will automatically be circulated to all four counties for review and comment.
- 3. Incidents of abnormal water level or water quality readings will be immediately communicated to all participating counties resulting in a collaborative review and dissemination of related information.
- 4. Project and program related information will be disseminated on a regional basis through the independent county websites, augmented by regional public outreach meetings.
- 5. The parties will work cooperatively to acquire grant funding to conduct aquifer studies that further identify the linkages of the common groundwater resources.
- 6. Efforts pursued under this agreement will remain consistent with and will not exceed the current authority of any participating county.

We, the undersigned representatives of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehama in 2006.

1

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors

4/3/2007 Date

County Counsel

Approved As to Form

Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date



In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and therefore require regional solutions, the parties identified in the original Four County Memorandum of Understanding: Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama are hereby joined by Sutter County in the regional efforts discussed in the Four County MOU and the Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects as discussed in Addendum One to the Four County MOU.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of the Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. And Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU.

The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehama in 2006. Through approval of this addendum, Sutter County makes the same commitment to regional cooperation and coordination that is outlined in the original MOU.

Bill Connelly Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors	05 <u>May 2009</u> Date	Ruce L. Upit County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
×	*		
Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date



In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and therefore require regional solutions, the parties identified in the original Four County Memorandum of Understanding: Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama are hereby joined by Sutter County in the regional efforts discussed in the Four County MOU and the Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects as discussed in Addendum One to the Four County MOU.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of the Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. And Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU.

The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehama in 2006. Through approval of this addendum, Sutter County makes the same commitment to regional cooperation and coordination that is outlined in the original MOU.

County Counsel Date Chair, Butte County Date Approved As to Form Board of Supervisors County Counsel Date Date Chair, Glenn County Approved As to Form Board of Supervisors County Counsel Date Chair, Tehama County Date Board of Supervisors Approved As to Form Da dusa County Chair, C Board of Supervisors s to For



In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and therefore require regional solutions, the parties identified in the original Four County Memorandum of Understanding: Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama are hereby joined by Sutter County in the regional efforts discussed in the Four County MOU and the Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects as discussed in Addendum One to the Four County MOU.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of the Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. And Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU.

The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehama in 2006. Through approval of this addendum, Sutter County makes the same commitment to regional cooperation and coordination that is outlined in the original MOU.

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel

Approved As to Form

County Counsel

Approved As to Form

Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Date

Date

Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors

d As to For

Chair, Sutter County Board of Supervisors

Date

William J. Vanasek

County Counsel Approved as to Form

2

4/14/09 Date



In recognition that certain activities related to water resources do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries and therefore require regional solutions, the parties identified in the original Four County Memorandum of Understanding: Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama are hereby joined by Sutter County in the regional efforts discussed in the Four County MOU and the Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects as discussed in Addendum One to the Four County MOU.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of the Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects. And Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU.

The original MOU was signed by the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa and Tehama in 2006. Through approval of this addendum, Sutter County makes the same commitment to regional cooperation and coordination that is outlined in the original MOU.

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Tehama County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	<u>6-23-09</u> Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date

1



FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING: ADDENDUM THREE Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter

Through adoption of this addendum, the signatories agree to begin a regional water management planning process pursuant to the Four County MOU, geographically covering the area of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter Counties. The planning process shall utilize and incorporate existing plans and processes. The California legislature has recently adopted new criteria associated with the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning process. This new legislative criteria requires that acceptance and approval of the composition of all Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Areas be completed prior to accepting public funding associated with IRWMP grant funds. All IRWMP planning Regions and Plans must comply with the requirements as set forth in the Final Regional Acceptance Process Program Guidelines.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of The Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects; Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU; Addendum Three: Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter.

Connell 05 MAY 2009

Chair, Butte Count

Date Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Date

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Date



Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors

5/09 5/5/ Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Chair, Sutter County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel Approved as to Form

Date



FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING: ADDENDUM THREE Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter

Through adoption of this addendum, the signatories agree to begin a regional water management planning process pursuant to the Four County MOU and geographically covering the area of Butte, Colusa, Glenn Tehama and Sutter Counties. The planning process shall utilize and incorporate existing plans and processes. The California legislature has recently adopted new criteria associated with the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning process. This new legislative criteria requires that acceptance and approval of the composition of all Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Areas be completed prior to accepting public funding associated with IRWMP grant funds. All IRWMP planning Regions and Plans must comply with the requirements as set forth in the Final Regional Acceptance Process Program Guidelines.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of The Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects; Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU; Addendum Three: Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter.

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors Date

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Date

County Counsel Date

Approved As to Form

Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date



Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors

Chair, Sutter County Board of Supervisors

Date

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Date

ŧ.,

Nia

County Counsel Approved as to Form

uliulog Date



FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING: ADDENDUM THREE

Expression of a Commitment to Begin An **Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process** Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter

Through adoption of this addendum, the signatories agree to begin a regional water management planning process pursuant to the Four County MOU and geographically covering the area of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter Counties. The planning process shall utilize and incorporate existing plans and processes. The California legislature has recently adopted new criteria associated with the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning process. This new legislative criteria requires that acceptance and approval of the composition of all Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Areas be completed prior to accepting public funding associated with IRWMP grant funds. All IRWMP planning Regions and Plans must comply with the requirements as set forth in the Final Regional Acceptance Process Program Guidelines.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of The Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects; Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU; Addendum Three: Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter.

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date

Tehama County Ethod Control & Water Conservation District

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form Date



FOUR COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING: ADDENDUM FOUR Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta

Through adoption of this addendum, the signatories agree:

- 1. Shasta County shall join the parties involved in the original Four County Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Addendum Two;
- 2. Signatories to the MOU and its addenda shall be called the Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Group; and,
- 3. Begin a regional water management planning process pursuant to the Four County MOU, geographically covering the area of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta Counties. The planning process shall utilize and incorporate existing plans and processes. The California legislature has recently adopted new criteria associated with the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning process. This new legislative criteria requires that acceptance and approval of the composition of all Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Areas be completed prior to accepting public funding associated with IRWMP grant funds. All IRWMP planning Regions and Plans must comply with the requirements as set forth in the Final Regional Acceptance Process Program Guidelines.
- 4. The signatories to the MOU and its addenda reaffirm the provisions of section 5.6 of the MOU that the MOU and its addenda and participation under the MOU and its addenda are nonbinding.

We, the undersigned as representative of our respective counties, agree to adhere to the conditions of The Four County Memorandum of Understanding; Addendum One to the Four County MOU: Statement of Principles Regarding Water Related Programs and Projects; Addendum Two: Adding Sutter County to the Four County MOU; Addendum Three: Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Sutter; Addendum Four: Expression of a Commitment to Begin An Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Process Within the Counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Sutter and Shasta.

Connelly

Chair, Butte County Board of Supervisors

APR 1 3 2010

Date

County Counsel Approved As to Form

Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Sutter County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved as to Form	Date
Chair, Shasta County Board of Supervisørs	4/27/10 Date	County Counsel Approved as to Form	<u>5/6/10</u> Date



Chair, Glenn County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Tehama County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair, Colusa County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved As to Form	Date
Chair Sutter County Board of Supervisors	<u>4 20 10</u> Date	Wer Ward County Counsel Approved as to Form	<u>4/13)</u> Date
Chair, Shasta County Board of Supervisors	Date	County Counsel Approved as to Form	Date



Appendix D: Issue Resolution Process for Discussion Purposes

This document aims to guide discussions and provide pertinent information as subbasins consider inclusion of an issue resolution process in the Northern Sacramento Valley inter-basin coordination framework. These discussions will take place in the period leading up to the first five-year GSP update.

Discussion Prompts

- 1. What are potential benefits/challenges or concerns of including an issue/dispute resolution process in the inter-basin coordination framework?
- 2. What are shared expectations between and among subbasins?
- 3. What are the GSAs preferences for addressing conflicts if/when they arise?

Background

The Groundwater Sustainability Plan Regulations in <u>Article 8</u> recommend including a "description of a process for identifying and resolving conflicts between Agencies" as a part of inter-basin coordination (Sections 10727.2, 10733, and 10733.2, Water Code). A <u>recent study</u> by Tara Moran, Janet Martinez, and William Blomquist, part of Stanford University's Water in the West found that the ability of interagency coordination "to solve complex challenges will be contingent on the ability of these organizations to effectively prevent and manage conflicts before they arise and to resolve these conflicts equitably and efficiently when they do." (Moran, Martinez, and Blomquist, 2021). Further, given how likely it is for disagreements at a local level to occur during SGMA implementation, the study suggests investing in establishing issue resolution processes before disagreements arise. Meanwhile, deferring their development could complicate the resolution process in times of conflict. Given these recommendations, consider the following questions for reflection and discussion.

Purposes of issue resolution processes

There are many options to identify and resolve issues that involve different parties, goals/objectives, and resources. Ideally, issue resolution processes are thoughtfully designed and tailored to specific contexts. The broader goal for such a process can be to meet the agencies' long-term needs, considering local dynamics, desired outcomes, and expected uses. Goals can include keeping things simple and efficient, maintaining relationships, ensuring quality of the process, fostering participation and community engagement, etc.

The figure below shows different types of dispute resolution processes. In some cases, agencies draft clauses that outline a tiered approach. They often begin with negotiation, which gives the parties control over the process and outcomes. Then, mediation, which brings in a neutral third-party (mediator) to facilitate the discussion and help parties work towards resolving issues. Often, negotiation and mediation lead to "non-binding" outcomes, non-enforceable by courts. Parties could opt to move towards arbitration or litigation, which are controlled by a third party (arbitrator or judge/jury) and can lead to binding and non-binding outcomes (Moran, Martinez, and Blomquist, 2019).



Figure 2. The spectrum of dispute resolution process. Modified from Amsler et al. (2020a).

Negotiation	Mediation	Arbitration	Trial
No third party	• Third part (mediator)	• Third party (arbitrators)	Third party (judge/jury)
Non-binding	Non-binding	Non-binding or binding	• Binding

From Moran, Martinez, and Blomquist, 2019

Examples

1. Example from Moran, Martinez, and Blomquist, 2019

Box 2. A Draft Dispute Resolution Clause.

The blue text notes indicate how each of the preceding five questions are incorporated into the dispute resolution language.

In the event that any dispute [Q1: Provides instruction on what disputes can be addressed. Additional process goals, while not explicit should be subject to discussion.] arises among the Members relating to (i) this Agreement, (ii) the rights and obligations arising from this Agreement, (iii) a Member proposing to withdraw from membership in the Agency, or (iv) a Member proposing to initiate litigation within the Basin or the management of the Basin, the aggrieved Member or Members proposing to withdraw from membership shall provide written notice to the other Members of the controversy or proposal to withdraw from membership [Q2: Provides instruction on who can initiate and participate in the process.]. Within forty-five (45) days after such written notice, the Members shall attempt in good faith to resolve the controversy through informal negotiation [Q3: Describes a series of processes for dispute resolution, beginning with negotiation. Also includes a timeline for process stages.]. If the Members cannot agree upon a resolution of the controversy within forty-five (45) days from the providing of written notice specified above, the dispute shall be submitted to mediation prior to commencement of any legal action or prior to withdrawal of a Member proposing to withdraw from membership. The mediation shall be no less than a full day (unless agreed otherwise among the Members) and the cost of mediation shall be paid in equal proportion among the Members [Q4: Provides instruction on who will pay for dispute resolution processes.]. The mediator shall be either voluntarily agreed to or appointed by the Superior Court upon a suit and motion for appointment of an impartial mediator [Q3a: Provides a clear process for choosing an impartial mediator.]. Upon completion of mediation, if the controversy has not been resolved, any Member may exercise all rights to bring a legal action relating to the controversy or withdraw from membership as otherwise authorized pursuant to this Agreement. The Agency may, at its discretion, participate in mediation upon request by a stakeholder [to be defined by the parties to the Agreement] concerning a dispute alleged by the stakeholder concerning the management of the Basin or rights to extract groundwater from the Basin, with the terms of such mediation to be determined in the sole discretion of the Member Directors [Q2: Allows third-party participation in the dispute resolution process].

Note: This above dispute resolution clause is not intended to serve as an endorsement or illustration of effective practice.


2. Example from Butte Subbasin Cooperation Agreement

Note: This example doesn't provide much specificity. However, acknowledges shared intent to resolve disputes.

ARTICLE 9. DECISION-MAKING AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

9.1. Decision-making Authority. Topics where the Members desire coordinated decision-making will be considered by the Advisory Board, and the Member Directors will strive for unanimous recommendations that will be presented to each Member's governing body for consideration. Such topics include, but are not limited to, development and implementation of the GSP, and associated financial arrangements. When unable to reach unanimous recommendations, the Advisory Board will outline the areas in which it does not agree, providing some explanation to inform the respective GSAs' governing bodies. Despite the recommendations of the Advisory Board, ultimate decision-making authority for topics considered by the Advisory Board resides with each Member's governing body.

9.2. Dispute Resolution. It is the desire of Members to informally resolve all disputes and controversies related to this Agreement, whenever possible, at the least possible level of formality and cost. If a dispute occurs, the disputing Members shall meet and confer in an attempt to resolve the matter. If informal resolution cannot be achieved, the matter will be referred to the Advisory Board for resolution. The Advisory Board may engage the services of a trained mediator or resort to all available legal and equitable remedies to resolve disputes.

Possible Process in the Northern Sacramento Valley

Negotiation

• Parties can attempt to resolve the issue internally through informal negotiations.

Coordination Groups

 Parties can bring issue to the coordination group(s) for joint problem solving. Coordination Groups could work to assess the issue, gather information, and explore options for resolution (with or without support from a facilitator).

Mediation

• If the parties cannot resolve the issue [in X amount of time], the parties will hire a mediator, prior to pursuing legal action.

Arbitration/ Litigation

• If the issue cannot be resolved through mediation, any party could pursue any legal remedies available (e.g., arbitration, litigation)



Worksheet: Key Questions and Considerations for Issue Resolution Process

The questions below could be used to guide the development of a specific issue resolution process in the context of inter-basin coordination in the Northern Sacramento Valley by the first 5-year GSP update. These questions could help to clarify the level of specificity that subbasins would find beneficial and mutually agreeable when/if conflict occurs.

Adapted from Moran, Martinez, and Blomquist, 2019

1) **11	at are the process goals?	
a)	Consider what disputes the process aims to	
	address – all disputes arising at basin boundaries	
	or only a subset?	
b)	Consider inclusivity and transparency of the	
	process, cost efficiency for parties and the	
	GSA(s), timeframes, and other factors important	
	to your agency(ies).	
c)	Other potential objectives include dispute	
	prevention, enhanced relationships, procedural	
	and substantive fairness, legal compliance,	
	durability of resolution and organizational	
	improvement.	
2) Wh	o can initiate and participate in the dispute	
resolu	tion process?	
a)	Consider what parties can initiate the dispute	
	resolution process – is it only parties to the	
	agreement or can external parties invoke it? There	
	are pros and cons to both choices, so discussing	
	this in advance will ensure thoughtful	
	consideration.	
3) Wł	nat processes are used to make decisions related	
3) Wł to disp	nat processes are used to make decisions related bute resolution and what information is	
3) Wh to disp	nat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary?	
3) Wh to disp necess a)	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator.	
3) Wh to disp necess a)	hat processes are used to make decisions related bute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party?	
3) Wh to disp necess a) b)	hat processes are used to make decisions related bute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning	
3) Wh to disp necess a) b)	hat processes are used to make decisions related bute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on	
3) Whto dispnecessa)b)	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines.	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh 	hat processes are used to make decisions related bute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process?	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator,	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program?	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) b) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program? How could you assess whether the outcome of the	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) b) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program? How could you assess whether the outcome of the dispute resolution process was successful?	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) b) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program? How could you assess whether the outcome of the dispute resolution process was successful?	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) b) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program? How could you assess whether the outcome of the dispute resolution process was successful?	
 3) Wh to disp necess a) b) 4) Wh a) b) 	hat processes are used to make decisions related pute resolution and what information is ary? What is the process for selecting a mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party? Consider including a range of processes beginning with internal negotiations and escalating based on clear timelines. o pays for the dispute resolution process? Consider who will pay for the mediator, facilitator, lawyer or other impartial party. Will it be paid for by the disputing parties, the GSA(s) or through a state-funded program? How could you assess whether the outcome of the dispute resolution process was successful?	



Other Resources

- Dutton, A. SGMA Updates, Coordination Considerations, and Potential Next Steps, Cosumnes Subbasin Working Group. February 21, 2018. <u>http://cosumnes.waterforum.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/02/EKI Cosumnes TAC meeting 2018-02-21.pdf</u>
- Moran T., Martinez, J., and Blomquist W. Dispute Resolution Processes: Thinking through SGMA Implementation. Water in the West. Fall, 2019. <u>https://waterinthewest.stanford.edu/publications/dispute-resolution-processes-thinking-through-sgma-implementation</u>
- Moran T. Basin-scale Coordination is Key to SGMA's Success: Thoughts on DWR's Draft GSP Regulations. March 1, 2016. Stanford University. Water in the West. <u>https://waterinthewest.stanford.edu/news-events/news-press-releases/basin-scale-coordinationkey-sgma%E2%80%99s-success-thoughts-dwr%E2%80%99s-draft-gsp</u>
- Moran et al. Dispute Resolution Clauses in Interorganizational Coordination Agreements: A Comparative Analysis. 2021. pending publication.
- Butte County. 2017. Technical Collaboration on Interconnected Subbasins to Advance Sustainable Groundwater Management: Assessment of Interconnected Subbasins. Available at: <u>https://www.buttecounty.net/wrcdocs/Reports/SpecialProjects/InterbasinGWFlow/InterbasinSBA</u> <u>ssessment-FINAL.pdf</u>
- Butte County. 2017. Inter-basin Groundwater Flows Fact Sheet. Available at: <u>https://www.buttecounty.net/wrcdocs/Reports/SpecialProjects/InterbasinGWFlow/FactSheet.pdf</u>
- Buck, Christina. 2017. Butte County Inter-Basin Groundwater Flows Presentation, <u>https://www.buttecounty.net/wrcdocs/Reports/SpecialProjects/InterbasinGWFlow/NSVBoardAss</u> <u>essment20170615.pdf</u>



Appendix 2-D

GSA Outreach Events and Interested Parties List

<u>GSA Outreach Events</u> General SGMA Updates

deneral beinne		
4/4/2016	Tehama County Public Meeting	SGMA Overview
5/25/2016	Tehama County Public Meeting	SGMA Overview
6/27/2016	Tehama County Public Meeting	SGMA Overview
5/30/2017	Tehama County Public Meeting	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions
8/9/2017	Tehama County Public Meeting	Tehama Co Reconnaissance Level GW
		Sustainability Risk Assessment
10/23/2018	Corning City Council Meeting	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions
11/14/2018	Tehama County Farm Bureau Meeting	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions Tehama County GSA and
		Current GW Conditions
4/5/2019	SGMA in the N. Sacramento Valley Forum	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions
5/8/2019	Shasta Tehama Watershed Education Coalition	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions
1/30/2020	Capay Land Owners Association	Tehama County GSA and Current GW
		Conditions

General SGMA Presentations to Community Groups

- 4/14/2016 Sacramento River Discovery Center (Topic: General SGMA Overview)
- 9/15/2016 Sacramento River Discovery Center (Topic: Tehama County GSA)
- 3/11/2020 Tehama County Agricultural Realtor Group (Topic: General SGMA and GSA Updates, Corning Subbasin, Update on Groundwater Levels)
- 10/13/2020 El Camino Irrigation District Board (Topic: General SGMA, Groundwater Levels)
- 3/1/2021 Tehama County Cattlemen's Association (Topic: General SGMA Presentation)
- 3/17/2021 Tehama County Farm Bureau (Topic: GSA and GSP Update)
- 7/13/2021 Tehama County Board of Supervisors (General SGMA update)
- 7/14/2021 Shasta Tehama Watershed Education Coalition (Topic: Current Groundwater Conditions & Progress Update on Development of GSPs)
- 9/15/2021 Red Bluff Kiwanis Club Presentation (General SGMA Update)
- 9/21/2021 Red Bluff Rotary (General SGMA update and GSP overview)

Tribal Presentations

6/13/2019 – Meeting with Paskenta Tribal Council (Topic: General SGMA, GSA, and GSP overview, Corning Subbasin)

4/6/2021 – Meeting with Paskenta Tribal Council (Topic: SGMA and Tribal Engagement)

Subbasin Specific Outreach Series

Oct 6, 2020 - Thomes Creek Estates Group (Red Bluff Subbasin) – SGMA and GSP Overview, next steps

- Oct 14, 2020 Antelope Subbasin SGMA and GSP Overview, next steps
- Oct 15, 2020 Bowman Subbasin SGMA and GSP Overview, next steps
- Oct 21, 2020 Red Bluff Subbasin SGMA and GSP Overview, next steps
- Oct 22, 2020– Los Molinos Subbasin SGMA and GSP Overview, next steps

December 9, 2020 – All Subbasins - review of recent SGMA activities, overview of management planning areas and basin settings

April 19, 2021 - Bowman Subbasin – Plan Area and Basin Setting, SMC April 20, 2021 - Red Bluff Subbasin – Plan Area and Basin Setting, SMC April 21, 2021 - Antelope Subbasin – Plan Area and Basin Setting, SMC April 22, 2021 - Los Molinos Subbasin – Plan Area and Basin Setting, SMC

Aug 17, 2021 - Bowman Subbasin – SMCs, PMAs, and Public Review Schedule Aug 19, 2021 - Red Bluff Subbasin – SMCs, PMAs, and Public Review Schedule

Aug 23, 2021 - Antelope Subbasin – SMCs, PMAs, and Public Review Schedule

Aug 25, 2021- Los Molinos Subbasin – SMCs, PMAs, and Public Review Schedule

Quarterly eNewsletters

December 2020 March 2021 July 2021 All announcements are sent to the mailing list of the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Tehama County Groundwater Commission, Tehama County, and the individuals listed below:

Christina	Buck	Martha	Slack
Sandi	Marsumoto	Courtney	Nichols
Taylor	Wetzel	Rae	Turnbull
Henry	Ratay	Patrick	Wickham
Dennis	Garton	Jenna	Ganoung
Trisha	Weber	Kris	Deiters
Frank	Juenemann	Robin	Kampmann
Debbie	Tiller	Jack	Pratt
Stephanie	Horii	Elvin	Bentz
Sandra	Jorgensen	Erik	Gustafson
Mitch	Belter	Anna	Kladzyk Constantino
Bart	Fleharty	Kathryn	Vogt-Haefelfinger
Rick	Rogers	Jerry	Crow
Rose	Kemp	Thomas	Richardson
Martin	Spannaus	Erin	Smith
Kristin	Maze	Mark	Dutro
Nichole	Bethurem	Lerose	Lane
Charlie	Fee	Scott	Hardage
Jeff	Hillberg	Alison	Divine
Richard	Caylor	Joni	Maggini
David	Orth	Lisa	Hunter
Arnold	Jimenez	Tim	Potanovic
Pam	Farly	Don	George
Steve	McCarthy	Bill	Goodwin
Michelle	Peacher	Carolyn	Steffan
Michael	Smith	Jeff	Sutton
Bill	Borror	Tom	Morrison
Ben	Kermen	Mike	Wallace
Linda	Pitter	Chris	Henderson
Kristina	Miller	Pete	Dennehy
Laura	Peters	Michael	McFadden
Jim	Lowden	Heather	Austin
Dave	Hencratt	Dianne	Jarvis
Brandon	Davison	Robin	Imfeld
Kate	Stockmyer	Doug	McGie
Cindi	Freshour	Bert	Owens
Deb	Man	lan	Turnbull
Kevin	Davies	Ron	Worthley
Daniele	Eyestone	David	Palais
Shawn	Pike	Clay	Parker
Steve	Dails	Matt	Brady
Karen	Bedsaul	Dave	Lester

Nichole	Bethurem	John	Garcia
Kris	Lamkin	Toni	Jorgenson
Shanna	Long	Brian	Mori
John	Leach	Greg	Long
Michael	ward	Matt	Clifford
Kris	Lamkin	John	Hellen
Mark	Rivera	Andrea	Craig
Jana	Gosselin	Carrie	Lee
Eric	Willard	Bob	Williams
Earl	Wintle	Rick	Crabtree
Jessica	Pecha	Bridget	Gibbons
Eddy	Baker	John	Leach
Guadalupe	Green	Dean	Sherrill
Todd	Hamer	Kristal	Davis-Fadtke
Jeanne	Brantigan	Board	Member
Ted	Crain	H.D.	Coelho
Jeff	Rabo	Brad	Samuelson
John	Grennan	Cody	МсСоу
Brian	Sanders	Sue	Knox
Tania	Carlone	Paddy	Turnbull
Donna	Barry	Martha	Kleykamp
Melissa	Rohde	Gloria	Moran
Nicole	Eddy	John	Currey
Lyle	Dawson	Richard	Stout
Todd	Turley	Joanne	Lourence
D.	Wenz	Bill	Crain
Jake	Sahl	Tia	Branton
Jim	Edwards	Harley	North
Ryan	Fulton	Darrell	Wood
Emmy	Westlake	Adam	Englehardt
Stacie	Silva	Andrew	Barron
Kari	Dodd	John	Frehse
Tyler	Christensen	Ellen	Jones
Ryan	Sale	Jim	Kerr
Claire	Taylor	Eddy	Teasdale
John	Peterson	Taylor	Wetzel
Todd	Turley	Linda	Solberg
Gib	Bonner	Robert	Rianda
Brandon	Davison	John	Edson
David	Brown	Pat	Vellines
Armando	Cervantes	Lisa	Porta
Doni	Rulofson	Charleen	Beard
Michael	Bethurem	Richa	McBrayer
Robin	Huffman	Christine	Thompson
Sam	Mudd	Fred	Hamilton
	Shanna John Michael Kris Mark Jana Eric Earl Jessica Eddy Guadalupe Todd Jeanne Ted Jeff John Brian Tania Donna Melissa Nicole Lyle Todd D. Jake Jim Ryan Emmy Stacie Kari Tyler Ryan Emmy Stacie Kari Tyler Ryan Claire John Todd Gib Brandon David Armando Doni Michael Robin Sam	ShannaLongJohnLeachMichaelwardKrisLamkinMarkRiveraJanaGosselinEricWillardEarlWintleJessicaPechaEddyBakerGuadalupeGreenToddHamerJeanneBrantiganTedCrainJohnGrennanBrianSandersTaniaCarloneDonnaBarryMelissaRohdeNicoleEddyJakeSahlJimEdwardsRyanFultonEmmyWestlakeStacieSilvaKariDoddTylerChristensenRyanSaleClaireTaylorJohnPetersonToddTurleyJohnPetersonToddTurleyJohnPetersonKariDoddTylerAlersonToddTurleyJohnPetersonToddTurleyGibBonnerBrandonDavisonDavidBrownArmandoCervantesDoniRulofsonMichaelBethuremRobinHuffmanSamMudd	ShannaLongBrianJohnLeachGregMichaelwardMattKrisLamkinJohnMarkRiveraAndreaJanaGosselinCarrieEricWillardBobEarlWintleRickJessicaPechaBridgetEddyBakerJohnGuadalupeGreenDeanToddHamerKristalJeanneBrantiganBoardTedCrainH.D.JeffRaboBradJohnGrennanCodyBrianSandersSueTaniaCarlonePaddyDonnaBarryMarthaMelissaRohdeGloriaNicoleEddyJohnLyleDawsonRichardToddTurleyJoanneD.WenzBillJakeSahlTiaJimEdwardsAndrewKariDoddJohnTylerChristensenEllenRyanSaleJimClaireTaylorEddyJohnPetersonTaylorToddTurleyLindaGibBonnerRobertBrandonDavisonHarleyRyandRulofsonCharleenMardonPatersonTaylorToddTurleyLindaGibBonnerRobertBrandonDavisonLisaDoniRu

John Veneble Linda Tunison Kauffmann Hylon Allan Fulton Julie Kelley Coke Les Hal Crain Aimee Zarzynski Kim Azevedo Steve Lindeman Lowden Jim ryan teubert Bill Hardwick Mike Perry Matt Hansen Tamara Williams Aris Babayan Mandi Selvester-Ownens David Brower Harold Clark Warner Melissa Karin Knorr Bobie Hughes Linda Herman Mike Murphy Debi Barnwell Franklin Barnes Benjamin Cook Gary Taylor Hoofard Rita Melissa Rohde chris payne Shane Overton Codie McKenzie Ronald Humphrey Vicki Kretsinger - Grabert Angie Rodriguez Rick Massa Vicky Dawley Miller Latisha Johnn Jones Dale Arthur Jim Simon Michelle Dooley Gruenwald Becky Brendon Flynn

Rochfort John and Mary Eric and Jenny Alexander Larry and Donna Frew Danny and Terrie Rice John and Linda Pitter Dave and Darlene Yingst Roberto and Lisa Cruz Mike and Patricia Schager Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District

Appendix 2-E

Comments on the Plan

Antelope Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Public Draft Comments Received with Responses

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page Number	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
Cathy Marcinkevage NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Direction Questions to: Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov	Chapter 3 GDE Identification			The use of Valley Oak rooting depth to inform impacts resulting from streamflow depletion is inappropriate. Streamflow depletion impacts ESA-listed salmonids and their habitat by degrading aquatic habitat. Analyzing whether groundwater levels support Valley Oak trees (i.e., occur within some depth threshold below ground surface) has no informative value with regard to how streamflow depletion may impact identified beneficial uses of surface water (e.g., spawning, rearing and migration of ESA-listed fish). We recommend the GSA develop a future study that investigates the relationship between groundwater levels, streamflow depletion rates, and significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial uses of surface water, especially as those beneficial uses pertain to ESA-listed salmonids and their critical habitat, including EFH	LSCE	Cor bet incl gap env bio salr
Cathy Marcinkevage NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Direction Questions to: Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov	Chapter 3 Avoiding Undesirable Results			The draft chapter does not appear to adequately address the following requirement for minimum thresholds as spelled out in the SGMA regulations: "The relationship between the minimum thresholds for each sustainability indicator, including an explanation of how the Agency has determined that basin conditions at each minimum threshold will avoid undesirable results for each of the sustainability indicators." (CCR 23 §354.28(b)(2)) The draft Chapter 3 does not include a minimum threshold or measurable objective for streamflow depletion, explaining that a lack of information prevents them from doing so. In fact, the GSA has not even identified an appropriate undesirable result for streamflow depletion. According to DWR (2021), "it is up to GSAs to define in their GSPs the specific significant and unreasonable effects that would constitute undesirable results and to define the groundwater conditions that would produce those results in their basins." The GSA should qualitatively describe what conditions within the subbasin would constitute an undesirable result with regard to streamflow depletion, ensuring that the description accounts for impacts to instream habitat that support ESA-listed salmon and steelhead. With regard to the lack of data informing streamflow depletion impacts, NMFS recommends the final GSP follow guidance from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (2019) and develop conservative streamflow depletion thresholds as a cautionary principle until the surface flow/groundwater dynamic in the Antelope subbasin is better studied and understood	LSCE	GSF MT gro inte gro inte

Consultant Team Response

mments noted. Further shallow monitoring will tter describe stream-aquifer interaction to termine potential impacts to beneficial users. GSP cludes plan for future monitoring to address data ps. Definition of undesirable results for vironmental beneficial uses will be the outcome of blogical study, which will include health of ESA-listed mon and steelhead.

P states that interconnected surface water MOs and s are interim, and the chronic lowering of oundwater elevations will be used as a proxy for erconnected surface waters. MOs and MTs of oundwater level monitoring wells are included in erconnected surface water sections.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page Number	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
Cathy Marcinkevage NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Direction Questions to: Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov	Chapter 3 Using Groundwater Elevations as a Proxy for Streamflow Depletion			The GSA should provide an explanation, with supporting evidence, for why using groundwater level as a minimum threshold is a reasonable proxy for depletion of interconnected surface water, as well as why those levels are sufficient to avoid streamflow depletion that significantly impacts surface water beneficial uses	LSCE	Con as n betw inte pro: the
Cathy Marcinkevage NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Direction Questions to: Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov	Chapter 3 Basing Sustainable Management Criteria on Historical Drought Conditions			The proposed groundwater elevations chosen as streamflow depletion minimum thresholds and measurable objectives are completely inappropriate for avoiding significant impacts to ESA- listed salmonids and their habitat. Basic hydraulic principles dictate that groundwater flow is proportional to the difference between groundwater elevations at different locations along a flow path. Using this basic principle, groundwater flow to a stream, or conversely, seepage from a stream to the underlying aquifer is proportional to the difference between water elevation in the stream and groundwater elevations at locations away from the stream. Most of the minimum thresholds and measurable objectives correspond to historically low groundwater levels, even exceeding the depth to groundwater seen during California's recent historical drought. These groundwater levels would likely create historically high streamflow depletion rates and result in instream conditions that negatively affect ESA-listed salmonids and their critical habitat. During the first few years of GSP implementation, the GSA should design and implement studies that better inform appropriate minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for streamflow depletion. In the interim, we again suggest the GSA follow guidance by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (2019) that recommends conservative sustainability management criteria be established to ensure groundwater dependent ecosystem protection.	LSCE	Con Spe ider env
Cathy Marcinkevage NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Direction Questions to: Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov	Chapter 3 NMFS Recommendation for future projects and management actions			We suspect that groundwater recharge projects are likely to be an important action implemented as part of the effort to achieve groundwater sustainability in the Antelope subbasin. NMFS encourages the GSA to consider implementing recharge projects that facilitate floodplain inundation, which offer multiple benefits including downstream flood attenuation, groundwater recharge, and ecosystem service. Managed floodplain inundation can recharge floodplain aquifers, which in turn slowly release stored water back to the stream during summer months. These projects also reconnect the stream	LSCE	Con con the

mment noted. Further explanation will be provided monitoring improves understanding of relationship tween groundwater levels and depletion of erconnected surface water. Water levels serve as a oxy in the interim and appropriate MTs will be set in e future.

mment noted. TSS well installation is ongoing. ecific plans will be developed over time to fill these entified data gaps, and potential impacts to vironmental beneficial uses will be further assessed.

mment noted. PMAs are implemented based on nditions to avoid undesirable results. The timing of e PMAs is not known at this time.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
	Subsection	Page	Table Number		Team Comment	
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder	
				salmon and steelhead by creating off-channel habitat		
				characterized by slow water velocities, ample cover in		
				the form of submerged vegetation, and high food availability. As		
				an added bonus, these types of multi-benefit projects likely have		
				more diverse grant funding streams that can lower their cost as		
				compared to traditional off-channel recharge projects. NMFS		
				implementing floodplain recharge projects.		
				Disadvantaged Communities, Drinking Water Users, and		
				Tribes		
				The identification of Disadvantaged Communities (DACs),		
				drinking water users, and tribes is insufficient. We note the		
				following deficiencies with the identification of these key		
				beneficial users.		
				• The GSP erroneously maps "Economically Disadvantaged		
				Areas" rather than "Disadvantaged Communities" in Figure		
E. J. Remson				2-11. The GSP must map the locations of DACs within the		
				subbasin, identify each DAC by name, and provide the		
The Nature Conservancy				population of each DAC. The GSP also fails to identify the		
				population dependent on groundwater as their source of		
Other contributors to				drinking water in the subbasin.		
comments include:				• The plan identifies the Greenville Rancheria Tribe as a		
Water Action/Fund	Chanter 2			stakeholder within the subbasin, but does not provide a		Co
o J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida,	Identification of			map of the tribal lands of tribal interests in the subbasin.		po
Union of Concerned	Key Beneficial			These missing elements are required for the GSA to fully		G
o Samantha Arthur.	Uses and Users			understand the specific interests and water demands of		ou
Audubon California				these beneficial users, and to support the consideration of		
o Danielle V. Dolan, Local				beneficial users in the development of sustainable		
Government Commission				management criteria and selection of projects and		
Nature Conservancy				management actions.		
				Deserves and attempt		
				Recommendations		
				• Provide a map that identifies each DAC in the subbasin		
				DAC Identify the sources of drinking water for DAC		
				members, including an estimate of how many people rely		
				on groundwater (e.g., domestic wells, state small water		
				systems, and public water systems).		
				• Provide a map of tribal lands and describe tribal interests		
				in the subbasin.		
						1

Comments noted. DACs maps updated with population estimates. People belonging to Greenville Rancheria Tribe live in Tehama County; however, Greenville Rancheria is located in Greenville, CA putside of the subbasin.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
	Subsection	Page	Table Number		Team Comment	
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder	
				Interconnected Surface Waters		
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include: • Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund • J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists • Samantha Arthur, Audubon California • Danielle V. Dolan, Local Government Commission • Melissa M. Rohde, The Nature Conservancy	Chapter 3 Identification of Key Beneficial Uses and Users			 The identification of Interconnected Surface Waters (ISWs) is insufficient, due to lack of supporting information provided for the ISW analysis. The GSP describes the use of a groundwater model (Tehama Integrated Hydrologic Model) to analyze the interaction between groundwater and surface water within the subbasin. While Appendix 2-J gives a detailed description of the model, the GSP could be improved by including a summary in the main GSP text. This information should include groundwater level monitoring well data and stream gauge data that were incorporated into the model, the screening depths of wells used in the groundwater model, and description of the temporal (seasonal and interannual) variability of the data used to calibrate the model. The GSP does not provide any concluding statements in the GSP text about which reaches are considered to be interconnected. Figure 2-52 (Surface Water and Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Stations) presents stream reaches in the subbasin labeled as perennial and intermittent/ephemeral. However, this figure does not label reaches as interconnected (gaining/losing) or disconnected. Consider any segments with data gaps as potential ISWs and clearly mark them as such on maps provided in the GSP. In the main text of the GSP, summarize the groundwater modeling analysis. Discuss temporal (seasonal and interannual) variability of the data used to calibrate the model. To confirm and illustrate the results of the groundwater modeling, overlay the subbasin's stream reaches with deth-to-groundwater gradient near the stream reaches. Show the location of groundwater wells used in the analysis. For the depth-to-groundwater contour maps, use the best practices presented in Attachment D. Specifically, ensure that the first step is contouring groundwater elevations, and then subtracting this layer from land surface elevations, and then subtracting this layer from land surface elevations and then subtracting the slayer. 	LSCE	Fig inte dat gai Fur gro

gure 2-52 symbology updated to show terconnected/disconnected reaches (based on terconnected surface water in the Central Valley ataset developed by TNC), and model outputs of aining and losing reaches added to Appendix 2-J. urther shallow monitoring is needed to assess roundwater gradients near stream reaches.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
	Subsection	Page	lable Number	Commont	Team Comment	
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder	
				contours of depth to groundwater along streams and other land		
				surface depressions where GDEs are commonly found.		
				Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems		
				The identification of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems		
				(GDEs) is insufficient. The GSP took initial steps to identify and		
				map GDEs using the Natural Communities Commonly Associated		
				with Groundwater dataset (NC dataset). Potential GDEs were		
				Identified in areas overlying groundwater within 30 feet of land		
				surface based on spring 2015 groundwater conditions, but this		
				conditions in the subhasin's GDEs. We recommend using		
				groundwater data from multiple seasons and water year types		Ap
				over the pre-SGMA period (i.e., 2005-2015) to determine the		Inv
				range of depth to groundwater. Using seasonal groundwater		Ap
				elevation data over multiple water year types is an essential		
E. J. Remson				component of identifying GDEs and is necessary to capture the		Spr
				variability in groundwater conditions inherent in California's		01/
The Nature Conservancy				Mediterranean climate. The GDE Appendix (Appendix 2-H) refers		res
				to Figure 1 through Figure 4 that illustrate the steps of the GDE		but
Other contributors to				analysis. These figures appear to be missing from the appendix,		000
comments include:				The GSP does not provide an inventory of flora and fauna in the		Jan
Water Action/Fund				subbasin, nor is any discussion of threatened or endangered		Dei
 J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, 	Chapter 3			species provided.		ide
Union of Concerned	Key Beneficial				LSCE	inc
Scientists	Uses and Users			RECOMMENDATIONS		ava
Audubon California				 Include the missing Figures 1-4 in the GDE Appendix 2-H. 		(de
o Danielle V. Dolan, Local				 Use depth-to-groundwater data from multiple seasons and 		
Government Commission				water year types (e.g., wet, dry, average, drought) to determine		Ine
o Melissa M. Rohde, The				the range of depth to groundwater around NC dataset polygons.		
Nature Conservancy				2015) be established to characterize groundwater conditions		(He
				over multiple water year types. Refer to Attachment D of this		
				letter for best practices for using local groundwater data		*H
				to verify whether polygons in the NC Dataset are supported by		Effe
				groundwater in an aquifer.		of /
				• Provide depth-to-groundwater contour maps, noting the best		Res
				practices presented in Attachment D. Specifically, ensure that		
				the first step is contouring groundwater elevations, and then		
				subtracting this layer from land surface elevations from a digital		
				elevation model (DEM) to estimate depth-to-groundwater		
				Contours across the landscape.		
				• Refer to Attachment B for more information on TNC S plant		
				plants that have reported maximum root denths that exceed the		
				averaged 30-ft threshold, such as Valley Oak (Quercus lobata).		

pendix 2-H Figures 1-4 included in final document. rentory of flora and fauna added as an addition to pendix 2-I.

ring 2015 water levels were used because /01/2015 is the baseline date for undesirable sults. SGMA regulations state that "The plan may, t is not required to, address undesirable results that curred before, and have not been corrected by, nuary 1, 2015".

pth-to-groundwater contours will not improve GDE entification as wells shallower than 50 feet were not luded in contour analysis. As shown in Figure 2-53, ailability of water level data from shallow wells epth < 100 ft) are very limited in the Subbasin.

e suggested 80-ft rooting depth for the Valley Oak is m a specific study in a fractured bedrock vironment that is not applicable in Tehama County oward, 1992)*.

oward, Janet L. 1992. Quercus lobata. In: Fire ects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain search Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer).

	Section/	Dese	Figure/		Name of Consultant	
Commenter Name	Subsection	Page	(if applicable)	Commont	Personder	
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	CommentWe recommend that the reported max rooting depth for these deeper-rooted plants be used. For example, a depth-to- groundwater threshold of 80 feet should be used instead of the 30-ft threshold, when verifying whether Valley Oak polygons from the NC Dataset are connected to groundwater. It is important to emphasize that actual rooting depth data are limited and will depend on the plant species and site-specific conditions such as soil and aquifer types, and proximity to other water sources.If insufficient data are available to describe groundwater conditions within or near polygons from the NC dataset, include those polygons as "Potential GDEs" in the GSP until data gaps are reconciled in the monitoring network.Provide a complete inventory, map, or description of fauna (e.g., birds, fish, amphibian) and flora (e.g., plants) species in the subbasin and note any threatened or endangered species (see Attachment C in this letter for a list of freshwater species located in the Antelope Subbasin).Native vegetation and Managed WetlandsNative vegetation and managed wetlands are water use sectors that are required to be included in the water budget. The	Responder	
Other contributors to comments include: Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists Samantha Arthur, Audubon California Danielle V. Dolan, Local Government Commission Melissa M. Rohde, The Nature Conservancy 	Chapter 3 Identification of Key Beneficial Uses and Users			 integration of native vegetation into the water budget is sufficient. We commend the GSA for including the groundwater demands of this ecosystem in the historical, current and projected water budgets. Managed wetlands are not mentioned in the GSP, so it is not known whether or not they are present in the subbasin. RECOMMENDATION State whether or not there are managed wetlands in the subbasin. If there are, ensure that their groundwater demands are included as separate line items in the historical, current, and projected water budgets. 	LSCE	St wi
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include: Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists 	Chapter 3 Engaging Stakeholders			Stakeholder Engagement During GSP DevelopmentStakeholder engagement during GSP development is insufficient.SGMA's requirement for public notice and engagement ofstakeholders is not fully met by the description in theCommunications and Engagement Plan (Appendix 2-A).We note the following deficiencies with the overall stakeholderengagement process:The GSP identifies the Greenville Rancheria as tribalstakeholders present within the subbasin. Appendix C (of theCommunications and Engagement Plan) describes Tribal	LSCE	Co

Statement added in GSP Chapter 2B on managed vetlands in Antelope. Managed wetlands now ncluded in Figure 2-31

Comments noted. Appendix 2-A updated to include recent outreach and engagement.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant
	Subsection	Page	Table Number		Team Comment
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder
 Samantha Arthur, 				Engagement in Tehama County. This appendix describes	
Audubon California				outreach principles, outreach partners, and steps to be taken for	
 Danielle V. Dolan, Local 				tribal engagement. However, the GSP does not state what steps	
Government Commission				were actually taken or the results of tribal engagement actions.	
 Melissa M. Rohde, The 				• The GSP documents opportunities for public involvement and	
Nature Conservancy				engagement in general terms. Public outreach and engagement	
				activities include nublic meetings, nublic hearings, workshops	
				nublic notices stakeholder briefings, newsletters, and undates	
				to the GSA website. While the GSP provides a guidance	
				document on DAC engagement, its description consists primarily	
				of informing DACs by outreach to DAC-related organizations. The	
				GSR doos not state whether DACs and environmental	
				stakeholders are represented on a CSA Advisory Committee or	
				Stakeholders are represented on a GSA Advisory Committee of	
				BUdiu.	
				• The plan does not include documentation on now stakenoider	
				input from the above mentioned outreach and engagement was	
				considered and incorporated into the GSP development process.	
				• We note that Appendix G (of the Communications and	
				Engagement Plan) is still under development and will include	
				more details of outreach to stakeholders during GSP	
				implementation. Ensure that as this section is finalized, it	
				includes a detailed plan for continual opportunities for	
				engagement through the implementation phase of the GSP	
				that is specifically directed to DACs, domestic well owners, and	
				environmental stakeholders.	
				RECOMMENDATIONS	
				• In the communications and Engagement Plan, describe active	
				and targeted outreach to engage all stakeholders throughout	
				the GSP development and implementation phases. Refer to	
				Attachment B for specific recommendations on how to actively	
				engage stakeholders during all phases of the GSP process. While	
				some of these resources have already been stated in the GSP,	
				we recommend that the GSA should improve utilization of these	
				resources and documentation of the engagement process.	
				 Provide documentation on how stakeholder input was 	
				incorporated into the GSP development process.	
				 Provide information on whether the GSA has initiated contact 	
				with tribal stakeholders in the subbasin during GSP	
				development, and how tribal concerns were considered	
				during the GSP development process.	
				 Utilize DWR's tribal engagement guidance to comprehensively 	
				identify, involve, and address all tribes and tribal interests that	
				may be present in the subbasin.	

	Section/ Subsection	Page	Figure/ Table Number		Name of Consultant Team Comment	
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include: • Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund • J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists • Samantha Arthur, Audubon California • Danielle V. Dolan, Local Government Commission • Melissa M. Rohde, The Nature Conservancy	Chapter 3 Considering Beneficial Uses and Users When Establishing Sustainable Management Criteria and Analyzing Impacts on Beneficial Uses and Users	Number	(if applicable)	CommentThe consideration of beneficial uses and users when establishingsustainable management criteria (SMC)is insufficient. The consideration of potential impacts on allbeneficial users of groundwater in the basinare required when defining undesirable results and establishingminimum thresholds. Disadvantaged Communities and Drinking Water Users For chronic lowering of groundwater levels, the GSP states (p. 3-17): "The MTs were set to the following: Upper Aquifer: Springgroundwater elevation where less than 10 - 20% (on average) ofdomestic wells could potentially be impacted." No furtherdetails are provided on the minimum threshold impacts todomestic wells, including the methodology used to conduct theassessment. The GSP does not sufficiently describe whetherminimum thresholds will avoid significant and unreasonable lossof drinking water to domestic well users that are not protectedby the minimum threshold. In addition, the GSP does notsufficiently describe or analyze direct or indirect impactson DACs, drinking water users, or tribes when definingundesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwaterlevels minimum thresholds are consistent with the Human Rightto Water policy.The undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwaterlevels is established as (p. 3-31): "25% of groundwaterlevels is established as (p. 3-31): "25% of groundwaterlevels users experienced during dry years or periods ofdrought will not result in an undesirable result. This isgroundwater levels, significant and unre	LSCE	

Comments noted. The GSP documents the number of wells impacted at the MT, some of which may be used by DACs.

SMCs are only established for TDS as other COCs are not caused by or related to groundwater depletion. SGMA functions together with existing water quality regulations and programs.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
	Subsection	Page	Table Number	Commont	Team Comment	
Commenter Name	Number	Page Number	(if applicable)	Comment (SMCL) of 1,000 mg/L. This is the only constituent of concern (COC) for which SMC are established. Section 2.2.2.3 (Groundwater Quality) discusses other COCs (nitrate, arsenic, and boron) in the subbasin that have exceeded regulatory standards. Significantly, the narrative identifies nitrate levels in the northern portion of the subbasin as significant and increasing. Nitrate is an acute contaminant; failure to address or mitigate this impact will have a direct impact on public health, particularly for domestic well owners who may not be aware that their well is contaminated. SMC should be established for all COCs in the subbasin that may be impacted or exacerbated by groundwater use and (or management in addition to	Responder	
				 groundwater use and/or management, in addition to coordinating with water quality regulatory programs. RECOMMENDATIONS Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels Describe direct and indirect impacts on DACs, domestic well owners, and tribes when describing undesirable results and defining minimum thresholds for chronic lowering of groundwater levels. Include information on the impacts during prolonged periods of below average water years. Consider minimum threshold exceedances during drought years when defining the groundwater level undesirable result across the subbasin. 		
				 Degraded Water Quality Describe direct and indirect impacts on DACs, drinking water users, and tribes when defining undesirable results for degraded water quality. For specific guidance on how to consider these users, refer to "Guide to Protecting Water Quality Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act." Evaluate the cumulative or indirect impacts of proposed minimum thresholds for degraded water quality on DACs, drinking water users, and tribes. Set minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for all water quality constituents within the subbasin that are impacted or exacerbated by groundwater use and/or management. 		
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include:	Chapter 3 Considering Beneficial Uses and Users When Establishing Sustainable Management Criteria and			Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems and Interconnected Surface Waters Sustainable management criteria for chronic lowering of groundwater levels provided in the GSP do not consider potential impacts to environmental beneficial users. The GSP neither describes nor analyzes direct or indirect impacts on	LSCE	Co be de as pl

Comments noted. Further shallow monitoring will better describe stream-aquifer interaction to determine potential impacts to environmental users associated with groundwater levels. GSP now includes blan for future monitoring to address these data gaps.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant
	Subsection	Page	Table Number		Team Comment
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder
 Ngodoo Atume, Clean 	on Beneficial Uses			results. This is problematic because without identifying potential	
Water Action/Fund	and Users			impacts on GDEs, minimum thresholds may compromise, or	
 J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, 				even destroy, these environmental beneficial users. Since GDEs	
Union of Concerned				are present in the subbasin, they must be considered when	
Scientists				developing SMC.	
 Samantna Artnur, Auduban California 					
Audubon California				Sustainable management criteria for depletion of	
Government Commission				interconnected surface water are established by proxy using	
• Melissa M. Rohde. The				groundwater levels. The GSP states (p. 3-25): "MTs are interim	
Nature Conservancy				and will be the same water levels used in for the chronic	
				lowering of groundwater elevations described in Section 3.3.1.1.	
				Extensive data gaps are discussed in Section 3.7.8.7. The GSA will	
				continue to evaluate new monitoring information and determine	
				these thresholds later." While the GSP clearly recognizes the	
				data gap for depletion of interconnected surface water SMC, we	
				would like to see further discussion of how the interim SMC will	
				affect beneficial users, and more specifically GDEs, or the impact	
				of these minimum thresholds on GDEs in the subbasin. The GSP	
				makes no attempt to evaluate how the proposed minimum	
				thresholds and measurable objectives avoid significant and	
				unreasonable effects on surface water beneficial users in the	
				subbasin (see Attachment C for a list of environmental users in	
				the subbasin), such as increased mortality and inability to	
				perform key life processes (e.g., reproduction, migration).	
				RECOMMENDATIONS	
				 When defining undesirable results for chronic lowering of 	
				groundwater levels, provide specifics on what biological	
				responses (e.g., extent of habitat, growth, recruitment rates)	
				would best characterize a significant and unreasonable impact to	
				GDEs. Undesirable results to environmental users occur when	
				'significant and unreasonable' effects on beneficial users are	
				caused by one of the sustainability indicators (i.e., chronic	
				lowering of groundwater levels, degraded water quality, or	
				depletion of interconnected surface water). Thus, potential	
				impacts on environmental beneficial uses and users need to be	
				considered when defining undesirable results in the subbasin.	
				Defining undesirable results is the crucial first step before the	
				minimum thresholds can be determined.	
				When defining undesirable results for depletion of	
				interconnected surface water, include a description of potential	
				impacts on instream habitats within ISWs when minimum	
				thresholds in the subbasin are reached. The GSP should confirm	
				that minimum thresholds for ISWs avoid adverse impacts on	
				environmental beneficial users of interconnected surface waters	
				as these environmental users could be left unprotected by the	
				GSP. These recommendations apply especially to environmental	

Comments noted. Climate change is incorporated into the water budget projections. The scenarios listed may be added to future modeling for the five-year update.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
Commenter Name	Subsection	Page Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Team Comment Responder	
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	CommentRECOMMENDATIONSIntegrate climate change, including extreme climate scenarios, into all elements of the projected water budget to form the basis for development of sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions.Incorporate climate change scenarios into projects and management actions.Incorporate climate change scenarios into projects and management actions.The consideration of beneficial users when establishing monitoring networks is insufficient, due to lack of specific plans to increase the Representative Monitoring Sites (RMSs) in the monitoring network that represent water quality conditions and shallow groundwater elevations around DACs, domestic wells, GDEs, and ISWs in the subbasin. These beneficial users may	Responder	
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include: • Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund • J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists • Samantha Arthur, Audubon California • Danielle V. Dolan, Local Government Commission • Melissa M. Rohde, The Nature Conservancy	Chapter 3 Data Gaps			remain unprotected by the GSP without adequate monitoring and identification of data gaps in the shallow aquifer. The Plan therefore fails to meet SGMA's requirements for the monitoring network. Figure 3-1 (Representative Monitoring Sites) shows insufficient representation of DACs and drinking water users for water quality monitoring. Figure 3-2 (Groundwater Level Representative Monitoring Sites – Upper Aquifer) and Figure 3-3 (Groundwater Level Representative Monitoring Sites – Lower Aquifer) show insufficient representation of DACs and drinking water users for groundwater elevation monitoring. Refer to Attachment E for maps of these monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users of groundwater. The GSP provides some discussion of data gaps for GDEs in Section 3.7.8.7 (Assessment and Improvement of Monitoring Network - Interconnected Surface Waters), but does not provide specific plans, such as locations or a timeline, to fill the data gaps. Figure 3-7 (Identification of Data Gaps (GDE)) maps high priority GDEs alongside existing shallow monitoring wells, but this figure does not show additional proposed monitoring well locations. RECOMMENDATIONS • Provide maps that overlay current and proposed monitoring well locations with the locations of DACs, domestic wells, and GDEs to clearly identify monitored areas. • Increase the number of RMSs in the shallow aquifer across the subbasin as needed to map ISWs and adequately monitor all groundwater condition indicators across the subbasin and at appropriate depths for all beneficial users. Prioritize proximity to DACs, domestic wells, GDEs, and ISWs when identifying new RMSs.	LSCE	Cc Sp ide

Comments noted. TSS well installation is ongoing. pecific plans will be developed over time to fill these dentified data gaps.

	Section/	Dege	Figure/		Name of Consultant
Commenter Name	Number	Number	(if applicable)	Comment	Responder
				 Ensure groundwater elevation and water quality RMSs are monitoring groundwater conditions spatially and at the correct depth for all beneficial users - especially DACs, domestic wells, and GDEs. Further describe biological monitoring that can be used to assess the potential for significant and unreasonable impacts to GDEs or ISWs due to groundwater conditions in the subbasin. Additional studies of GDEs and groundwater - surface water interactions are briefly discussed in the Projects and Management Actions chapter, but very few details are provided. 	
E. J. Remson The Nature Conservancy Other contributors to comments include: • Ngodoo Atume, Clean Water Action/Fund • J.Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Union of Concerned Scientists • Samantha Arthur, Audubon California • Danielle V. Dolan, Local Government Commission • Melissa M. Rohde, The Nature Conservancy	Chapter 3 Addressing Beneficial Users in Projects and Management Actions			The consideration of beneficial users when developing projects and management actions is incomplete. The GSP identifies the benefits and impacts of identified projects and management actions, including water quality impacts, to key beneficial users of groundwater such as GDEs and DACs. However, projects and management actions to improve water supply and GDE habitats (e.g., Invasive Plant Removal from Creeks and Irrigation Conveyance Canals, Levee Setback and Stream Channel Restoration) are described as potential projects without a known timeline for implementation. We commend the GSA for describing the environmental benefits of the Multi-Benefit Recharge Project (Section 4.3.3) in the subbasin, as developed with support and guidelines from The Nature Conservancy. The GSP describes the Tehama County Domestic Well Tracking and Outreach Program (Section 4.5.2.6) and the Well Deepening or Replacement Program (Section 4.5.2.7). However, these programs are described as potential projects to be implemented on an as-needed basis, instead of projects that will be implemented within the GSP planning horizon. We strongly recommend inclusion of a drinking water well impact mitigation program to proactively monitor and protect drinking water wells through GSP implementation. RECOMMENDATIONS • Describe the projected timelines for implementing the Invasive Plant Removal and Levee Setback and Stream Channel Restoration projects and management actions in Chapter 4 of the GSP. • For DACs and domestic well owners, provide specific plans for implementation of a drinking water well impact mitigation program to proactively monitor and protect drinking water wells through GSP implementation. Refer to Attachment B for specific recommendations on how to implement a drinking water well mitigation program.	LSCE

Comments noted. Project and management actions will be implemented as needed based on MTs, therefore the timing of those projects is unknown at this time.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page Number	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
				• Develop management actions that incorporate climate and water delivery uncertainties to address future water demand and prevent future undesirable results.		
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Public participation has appeared very low overall. Groundwater is as invisible as the greenhouse gasses in the air, measurable only by experts with sufficient equipment. Potable water, like breathable air, is a necessity for life, and we're expecting, even trusting our elected officials and the expert contractors to look out for us, the general public. As the song goes, "You never miss the water, till the well runs dry". In the plan, specify and acknowledge the level of public participation so far, outside of elected officials and their appointees to committees and outside of special interests such as Farm Bureau officials. Somewhere in the GSPs, specify, or estimate, the amount of participation to date by individuals not appointed or paid by any agency to participate	LSCE	Cor wit
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				The GSP contractors have explained, during public presentations, that the possibility of correct analysis of groundwater is only as good as the available data. The experts acknowledge in meetings that crucial groundwater data is missing. Data is especially missing for the very areas where the growth in agricultural pumping is occurring, and yet there is no stopping growth in these areas, mainly west of I-5. Big ag has discovered Tehama County at the very time that they have developed ways to grow nut trees in the hot and dry grasslands on the west side of I-5. Add to the plan that big ag needs to establish and pay for the monitoring of groundwater data wherever a new orchard of a defined size is established. Define such a size that would require the developer to establish a groundwater monitoring station that provides data available to the public.	LSCE	Cor futi gap wel
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				There is no definition of big ag in the plan. It would be helpful to make the distinction because of the massive size of the industry establishing itself the county, much occurring before this plan is adopted. There is no established precedent in the plan as to the management of overconsumption. The last should be the first to be asked to stop pumping, but it should apply only to big ag because of the scale of their extraction of groundwater	LSCE	Cor all t unc sus

mment noted. Public participation is discussed thin Appendix 2-A.

omment noted. The GSP recognizes data gaps and ture efforts will be made by the GSA to fill those ps including the installation of multi-completion ells through the TSS program.

mment noted. Agriculture users are defined among the water users. The plan was written to avoid desirable results and have groundwater stainability.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page Number	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Add whatever you can to make this plan more sustainable before its adoption, but adopt the GSPs because they are adaptable.	LSCE	Corr
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				I understand the need for GSPs and appreciate the process; however, unless the plan becomes more rigorous than it appears in this first complete draft, big ag will continue to expand and extract more groundwater, getting us all farther from sustainability and costing us each a lot to pay for executing the plan. Additionally, more families will have to pay for new and deeper residential wells because this plan allows big ag to continue to expand for awhile. This allowable decline, negotiated in ad hoc committees, is specified in the plan, and that makes the plan unsustainable as well as expensive. This version of the GSP, therefore, is a GUP, a Groundwater Unsustainability Plan	LSCE	Con
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Depending on grants as mitigation for allowing overexploitation of the groundwater is not a plan for sustainability. Even if every family having to dig a deeper well were paid for the cost of that well, whether by big ag or the State of California, that condition would not lead to sustainability. Mitigation is not a plan for sustainability.	LSCE	Com
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				The baseline established in the GSP is lower than the current groundwater level. To allow the groundwater to continue to decline is not in the direction of sustainability. Sustainability at this point means stopping the decline, at the very least, and not allowing additional decline. Measurement levels are complicated by drought, and drought is given exception for management action. The drought exception is problematic and should be omitted in the GSPs	LSCE	Com and Mar leve
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				There should be a definition of sustainability in the plan using recent academic sources. The GSP should open with a discussion of what sustainability is. We can hope that future generations can access [groundwater] resources as we can, which is one early definition of sustainability. The concept of sustainability came out of efforts to continue development, to allow continued growth despite increasingly obvious limits to growth. Since then, many scholars recognize the greenwashing that comes with sustainability plans that facilitate growth. This is one such plan. Include a definition of sustainability using recent	LSCE	Com

Consul	tant Te	eam R	esponse
--------	---------	-------	---------

mment noted.

mment noted.

mment noted.

mment noted. Sustainability is defined in the GSP d measured through different Sustainable anagement Criteria (SMC) including groundwater els.

mment noted. Sustainability is defined on page 3-1 ough 3-6.

	Section/		Figure/		Name of Consultant	
	Subsection	Page	lable Number	Comment	Team Comment	
	Number	Number		academic sources. Collaborate with authors and educators with expertise on sustainability, and do not assume sustainability needs little definition or discussion in individual GSPs. Most people have no idea of what sustainability means.	Kesponder	
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Any process which lets big ag continue to usurp groundwater, allowing the groundwater to continue to decline to some level below the current level and call it sustainable is unsustainable. This seemingly well intended process is unlikely to produce real sustainability in groundwater use because it does not stop the current expansion of big ag wells. The GSP needs to be specifically involved in the county's well permitting process. Add this requirement to the plans	LSCE	Com the The time one
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Knowing that too many current domestic wells went dry recently, knowing the groundwater levels have been declining, drought or not, because of big ag's already drawing the deep aquifer down, the authors of the GSP include more drawing down of the deep aquifer. There are currently over 50 ag well permits approved and not yet built, many likely for new orchards (the department approving the permits does not track the particular use other than "ag"). When the new orchards are established and start pumping, the groundwater will be sucked in mass quantity to water dry rangeland in the hot season, which is most of the year, to water trees which will die without regular and consistent watering. They must be irrigated, so there is no way to pause the pumping without losing the orchard. Big ag will not submit easily to their trees dying when the county gave them permit to draw water for their massive acreage of trees. This plan is not sustainable as it does not stop the expansion of big ag into dry areas of the county. There's no designation of inappropriate land use. There are no ideas specified about zoning changes needed to reach sustainability. Instead, the plan identifies the remaining creek beds and the total acreage which might yet be exploited by big ag. It's like an invitation, with a free study of where the water is, for big ag to buy rangeland and request well permits to grow nut trees. This GSP is literally a publicly funded study by a well drilling corporation seeking out where the groundwater is and how much might remain accessible to big ag. The plan does not define big ag. It does not require monitoring wells before big ag permits are granted in areas with no data. The only thing the GSP does is to establish the term sustainability, under-defined, and cost average residents lots of money while continuing to allow big ag to do whatever they want. If the Farm Bureau does not protest too much about this GSP, then we do not have a plan which could possibly get us to sustainability. The GSP, however	LSCE	Corr

nment noted. Well permitting will be addressed by Tehama County Water Commission in the future. GSP only includes information available at the e. Review of County Well Permitting Ordinances is e of the management actions.

nments noted.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection	Page	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Commont	Name of Consultant Team Comment Pospondor	
	Number	Number		well intended, needs to start with recommending the county instating specific restrictions and rules for new development. The plan needs to include the legality of such rules and restrictions. California has planning tools and court rulings which need to be included in the GSPs for reference by the Board of Supervisors as they must implement management actions, according to the GSPs	Kesponder	
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Sometimes common sense must take over to get to sustainability because by the time that the groundwater is fully understood, it will be too late. What is generally known about the deep aquifers is that they are a gift from the last ice age; this theory, supported by academic sources, should be included in the GSPs. Nature's systems cost us nothing until we take too much. Grants for projects to clean and try to inject water into the ground are funded by debt to which we all have to pay service. There is no such thing as free money for projects. Acknowledge in the GSPs that slowing or stopping growth is the cheapest way in the direction of sustainability, and probably the only way.	LSCE	Coi
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Management actions should include policies, in addition to any projects. There should be recommended policies since the county's groundwater is already in decline in large areas. We cannot get to sustainability via projects alone, not to mention that projects are expensive, no matter which budget they come from. Rules, such as no more growth in the acreage of orchards, is the way to sustainability, or at least to not crashing quite as soon. Projects, such as injecting water into the ground, if possible, would be expensive, and it would be a public expense unless the agency starts collecting money for the possible projects now. The expense for future projects, needed when the groundwater declines to the unacceptable level specified in the GSPs, should be collected now from companies extracting the groundwater for profit. State that in the GSPs as a recommended management action. Fairness needs to be indicated as a working principle in the GSPs. The companies who profit directly from the mass extraction of groundwater should be the ones who pay for restoring the groundwater to a sustainable level as defined in the GSPs Management Objectives.	LSCE	Cor fro (be cor
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				The commons is a shared resource, such as groundwater. Include a discussion of the tragedy of the commons, since the GSPs are trying to prevent that.	LSCE	Сог

mment noted.

omment noted. Management actions are distinct om projects as they are designed to affect water use behavior) compared to physical projects that require onstruction. Management actions can be policies.

mment noted.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page N <u>umber</u>	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Setting the MT so low means many wells will fail, due to a combination of factors, such as extended drought, a general drawdown of the groundwater in most areas over the past few decades, and new ag wells supporting new orchards. Recommended management actions should include compensation for the loss of domestic wells and the cost of digging new or deeper domestic wells, adding individual domestic water tanks, and delivering water to homes in rural areas where wells have gone dry due to unsustainable groundwater pumping.	LSCE	Corthe
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				Mitigation measures may be used to imitate sustainability, but where they cost residents not profiting from the extraction of mass quantities of groundwater for profit, a policy of fairness should be specified in the GSPs in the Management Objectives and Management Actions. Consistently recognize in specific recommended policies and actions that social equity is a major leg on which sustainability stands.	LSCE	Con
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				The GSPs plan to continue to draw down the water table. The Minimum Threshold is set lower than the depths of most domestic wells, with no recommendation or policy, save hoping for the drought to end, to restore the groundwater level. State the intention to limit additional industrial agricultural wells because there is no place with consistent extra water that we can afford to pipeline in; that's why we're doing groundwater sustainability planning. We cannot afford expensive projects to deepen domestic wells, build more above ground storage; every project takes money. What doesn't take money is to limit new wells. Keep the range lands for grazing with every policy recommendation and planning tool available in California. State the tools available. Keep orchards where they have surface water availability, using groundwater only during droughts. It's that simple to become more sustainable. Sustainability is about balance; it's not about drawing down the water table until Undesirable Results occur. URs are already occurring. We're at the threshold of what's minimal. Our objective should not be to make domestic wells deeper, as recommended by the Farm Bureau. Digging and pumping from deeper depths is expensive. That's an undesirable result of too much agricultural development coupled with extended drought and overall overgrowth of California. Getting to sustainability starts with no growth in industrial wells. Sustainability is about balance between economic, environmental, and equity - profit, planet, and people. There's an energy component as well, as energy	LSCE	Cor

mments noted. One of the management actions in e GSP is Well Deepening or Replacement Program.

mments noted.

mments noted.

Commenter Name	Section/ Subsection Number	Page Number	Figure/ Table Number (if applicable)	Comment	Name of Consultant Team Comment Responder	
				costs money and affects all three Es (or Ps). More engineering is costly, and even with grants, that doesn't get us to sustainability or provide a drop of water that isn't already spoken for. Nature works for free, and she knows what she is doing. We need to get out of the way, and she will replenish our groundwater, our streams and rivers. Regenerative agriculture can help pivot methods so that less water is required. Recommend regenerative agriculture as a management tool.		
Robin Huffman Corning, CA				In the GSPs, define the unacceptable consequences, the indicators of groundwater unsustainability. It is unacceptable to have domestic wells lose water due to groundwater decline from industrial pumping. Recognize that it is nearly impossible to prove that is happening to a specific resident because of a specific ag well, and that the onus currently is on the owner of the domestic well to prove. This is unfair and needs to be addressed in the GSPs. It is unacceptable to deplete the groundwater such that we lose what natural oaks remain. Nature needs more water than it's getting now due to the extensive extraction of groundwater. A sustainable plan would restore water for the ecosystem. Add recommendations for restoring groundwater in areas that are known to be, or are likely to be in decline. It is unacceptable to create losing streams. A sustainable groundwater management plan should restore flows in creeks, not allow continued big ag development alongside creeks. Add policy and management recommendations regarding losing streams.	LSCE	С

Comments noted.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE West Coast Region 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100 Sacramento, California 95814-4700

September 29, 2021

Ryan Teubert Water Resources Manager Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District GSA – Antelope 9380 San Benito Avenue Gerber, California 96035-9701

Electronic transmittal only

Re: NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service Comments on the Draft Chapter 3 of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Antelope Subbasin.

Dear Mr. Teubert:

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is the federal agency responsible for managing, conserving, and protecting living marine resources in inland, coastal, and offshore waters of the United States. We derive our mandates from numerous statutes, including the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). The purpose of the ESA is to conserve threatened and endangered species and their ecosystems.

In July 2021, the Antelope subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (hereafter, "GSA") released their "draft Chapter 3: Sustainable Management Criteria" for public comment. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has designated the Antelope subbasin a "high" priority for groundwater management, necessitating the development of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) by January 2022, as required under California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 (SGMA). Several waterways that overlie portions of the Antelope subbasin support federally threatened California Central Valley (CCV) steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and threatened Central Valley (CV) spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*). In addition, the Antelope subbasin is designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Pacific Coast Chinook salmon, including CV fall-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), which are managed under the MSA. This letter transmits NMFS' comments regarding the draft Chapter 3.

Surface water and groundwater are hydologically linked in the Antelope subbasin, and this linkage is critically important in creating seasonal habitat for steelhead and Chinook salmon. Where the groundwater aquifer supplements streamflow, the influx of cold, clean water is critically important for maintaining temperature and flow volume. Pumping water from these aquifer-stream complexes has the potential to affect salmon and steelhead habitat by lowering groundwater levels and interrupting the hyporheic flow between the aquifer and stream. NMFS is concerned that groundwater extraction in the Antelope subbasin is currently impacting steelhead and Chinook salmon instream habitat and that the draft GSP does not adequately address and minimize these impacts.



Comments

<u>GDE identification</u>: The use of Valley Oak rooting depth to inform impacts resulting from streamflow depletion is inappropriate. Streamflow depletion impacts ESA-listed salmonids and their habitat by degrading aquatic habitat. Analyzing whether groundwater levels support Valley Oak trees (*i.e.*, occur within some depth threshold below ground surface) has no informative value with regard to how streamflow depletion may impact identified beneficial uses of surface water (*e.g.*, spawning, rearing and migration of ESA-listed fish¹). We recommend the GSA develop a future study that investigates the relationship between groundwater levels, streamflow depletion rates, and significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial uses of surface water, especially as those beneficial uses pertain to ESA-listed salmonids and their critical habitat, including EFH.

<u>Avoiding Undesirable Results</u>: The draft chapter does not appear to adequately address the following requirement for minimum thresholds as spelled out in the SGMA regulations:

"The relationship between the minimum thresholds for each sustainability indicator, including an explanation of how the Agency has determined that basin conditions at each minimum threshold will avoid undesirable results for each of the sustainability indicators." (CCR 23 §354.28(b)(2))

The draft Chapter 3 does not include a minimum threshold or measurable objective for streamflow depletion, explaining that a lack of information prevents them from doing so. In fact, the GSA has not even identified an appropriate undesirable result for streamflow depletion. According to DWR (2021), "it is up to GSAs to define in their GSPs the specific significant and unreasonable effects that would constitute undesirable results and to define the groundwater conditions that would produce those results in their basins." The GSA should qualitatively describe what conditions within the subbasin would constitute an undesirable result with regard to streamflow depletion, ensuring that the description accounts for impacts to instream habitat that support ESA-listed salmon and steelhead. With regard to the lack of data informing streamflow depletion impacts, NMFS recommends the final GSP follow guidance from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (2019) and develop conservative streamflow depletion thresholds as a cautionary principle until the surface flow/groundwater dynamic in the Antelope subbasin is better studied and understood.

<u>Using Groundwater Elevations as a Proxy for Streamflow Depletion:</u> The GSA should provide an explanation, with supporting evidence, for why using groundwater level as a minimum threshold is a reasonable proxy for depletion of interconnected surface water, as well as why those levels are sufficient to avoid streamflow depletion that significantly impacts surface water beneficial uses.

Basing Sustainable Management Criteria on Historical Drought Conditions: The proposed groundwater elevations chosen as streamflow depletion minimum thresholds and measurable

¹ Identified beneficial uses for Antelope Creek include spawning and early development, migration, and cold-water habitat (Central Valley Basin Plan; copy found at

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf.

objectives are completely inappropriate for avoiding significant impacts to ESA-listed salmonids and their habitat. Basic hydraulic principles dictate that groundwater flow is proportional to the difference between groundwater elevations at different locations along a flow path. Using this basic principle, groundwater flow to a stream, or conversely, seepage from a stream to the underlying aquifer is proportional to the difference between water elevation in the stream and groundwater elevations at locations away from the stream. Most of the minimum thresholds and measurable objectives correspond to historically low groundwater levels, even exceeding the depth to groundwater seen during California's recent historical drought. These groundwater levels would likely create historically high streamflow depletion rates and result in instream conditions that negatively affect ESA-listed salmonids and their critical habitat. During the first few years of GSP implementation, the GSA should design and implement studies that better inform appropriate minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for streamflow depletion. In the interim, we again suggest the GSA follow guidance by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (2019) that recommends conservative sustainability management criteria be established to ensure groundwater dependent ecosystem protection.

<u>NMFS recommendation for future Projects and Management Actions:</u> We suspect that groundwater recharge projects are likely to be an important action implemented as part of the effort to achieve groundwater sustainability in the Antelope subbasin. NMFS encourages the GSA to consider implementing recharge projects that facilitate floodplain inundation, which offer multiple benefits including downstream flood attenuation, groundwater recharge, and ecosystem service. Managed floodplain inundation can recharge floodplain aquifers, which in turn slowly release stored water back to the stream during summer months. These projects also reconnect the stream channel with floodplain habitat, which can benefit juvenile salmon and steelhead by creating off-channel habitat characterized by slow water velocities, ample cover in the form of submerged vegetation, and high food availability. As an added bonus, these types of multi-benefit projects likely have more diverse grant funding streams that can lower their cost as compared to traditional off-channel recharge projects. NMFS stands ready to work with any GSA interested in designing and implementing floodplain recharge projects.

Please direct questions regarding this letter to Amanda Cranford, of my staff, at <u>Amanda.Cranford@noaa.gov</u> or (916) 930-3706

Sincerely,

A. Catherine Marinkunge

Cathy Marcinkevage Assistant Regional Administrator California Central Valley Office

References:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2019. Fish & Wildlife Groundwater Planning Considerations. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Groundwater Program. June 2019. 28 pp. Available at: <u>https://cawaterlibrary.net/document/fish-wildlife-</u> groundwater-planning-considerations/
- California Department of Water Resources. 2021. Letter from Craig Altare (DWR) to Taylor Blakslee (Cuyama Basin GSA), re. Cuyama Valley - 2020 Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Available at <u>https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/assessments/32</u>

Cc: To the File ARN 151422-WCR2021-SA00121

Electronic copy only:

- Angela Murvine, California Department of Fish and Wildlife Statewide SGMA Coordinator, Angela.Murvine@wildlife.ca.gov
- Bridget Gibbons, California Department of Fish and Wildlife Central Valley SGMA Biologist, <u>Bridget.Gibbons@wildlife.ca.gov</u>
- Craig Altare, California Department of Water Resources, Supervising Engineering Geologist, <u>Craig.Altare@water.ca.gov</u>
- Erin Smith, Antelope Subbasin SGMA Point of Contact, California Department of Water Resources, <u>Erin.Smith@water.ca.gov</u>

November 12, 2021

From: Robin Huffman, Corning, California

The following comments are for the Red Bluff GSP, in which I live, and all Tehama County GSPs to which these comments apply. Most of the comments apply to all the GSPs. I submit that most of these comments should be addressed in all of the GSPs. The authors of the GSPs know, or can find, where in the GSPs to address the comments, and so while the following comments are general and not systematic, chapter to chapter, the formal responses should be specific to pages in applicable chapters. I am not paid to look up page numbers, even as I have much experience doing so. I cannot apologize for not putting in more time for free; nevertheless, I am participating for good reason. I look forward to reading the responses.

I am a general member of the public, a resident of Tehama County with a domestic well that is relatively deep and declining to a concerning level. Hundreds of acres of rangeland around me have, in the past two years, been converted to nut trees, and more big acreage orchards are being developed out here on the west side of I-5. I have been following the GSP process for a couple of years, and I have participated in some of the meetings, mostly listening.

Comments for the Tehama County GSPs

- 1. Public participation has appeared very low overall. Groundwater is as invisible as the greenhouse gasses in the air, measurable only by experts with sufficient equipment. Potable water, like breathable air, is a necessity for life, and we're expecting, even trusting our elected officials and the expert contractors to look out for us, the general public. As the song goes, "You never miss the water, till the well runs dry". In the plan, specify and acknowledge the level of public participation so far, outside of elected officials and their appointees to committees and outside of special interests such as Farm Bureau officials. Somewhere in the GSPs, specify, or estimate, the amount of participation to date by individuals not appointed or paid by any agency to participate.
- 2. The GSP contractors have explained, during public presentations, that the possibility of correct analysis of groundwater is only as good as the available data. The experts acknowledge in meetings that crucial groundwater data is missing. Data is especially missing for the very areas where the growth in agricultural pumping is occurring, and yet there is no stopping growth in these areas, mainly west of I-5. Big ag has discovered Tehama County at the very time that they have developed ways to grow nut trees in the hot and dry grasslands on the west side of I-5. Add to the plan that big ag needs to establish and pay for the monitoring of groundwater data wherever a new orchard of a defined size is established. Define such a size that would require the developer to establish a groundwater monitoring station that provides data available to the public.

- 3. There is no definition of big ag in the plan. It would be helpful to make the distinction because of the massive size of the industry establishing itself the county, much occurring before this plan is adopted. There is no established precedent in the plan as to the management of overconsumption. The last should be the first to be asked to stop pumping, but it should apply only to big ag because of the scale of their extraction of groundwater.
- 4. Add whatever you can to make this plan more sustainable before its adoption, but adopt the GSPs because they are adaptable.
- 5. I understand the need for GSPs and appreciate the process; however, unless the plan becomes more rigorous than it appears in this first complete draft, big ag will continue to expand and extract more groundwater, getting us all farther from sustainability and costing us each a lot to pay for executing the plan. Additionally, more families will have to pay for new and deeper residential wells because this plan allows big ag to continue to expand for awhile. This allowable decline, negotiated in ad hoc committees, is specified in the plan, and that makes the plan unsustainable as well as expensive. This version of the GSP, therefore, is a GUP, a Groundwater Unsustainability Plan.
- 6. Depending on grants as mitigation for allowing overexploitation of the groundwater is not a plan for sustainability. Even if every family having to dig a deeper well were paid for the cost of that well, whether by big ag or the State of California, that condition would not lead to sustainability. Mitigation is not a plan for sustainability.
- 7. The baseline established in the GSP is lower than the current groundwater level. To allow the groundwater to continue to decline is not in the direction of sustainability. Sustainability at this point means stopping the decline, at the very least, and not allowing additional decline. Measurement levels are complicated by drought, and drought is given exception for management action. The drought exception is problematic and should be omitted in the GSPs.
- 8. There should be a definition of sustainability in the plan using recent academic sources. The GSP should open with a discussion of what sustainability is. We can hope that future generations can access [groundwater] resources as we can, which is one early definition of sustainability. The concept of sustainability came out of efforts to continue development, to allow continued growth despite increasingly obvious limits to growth. Since then, many scholars recognize the greenwashing that comes with sustainability plans that facilitate growth. This is one such plan. Include a definition of sustainability using recent academic sources. Collaborate with authors and educators with expertise on sustainability, and do not assume sustainability needs little definition or discussion in individual GSPs. Most people have no idea of what sustainability means.
- 9. Any process which lets big ag continue to usurp groundwater, allowing the groundwater to continue to decline to some level below the current level and call it

sustainable is unsustainable. This seemingly well intended process is unlikely to produce real sustainability in groundwater use because it does not stop the current expansion of big ag wells. The GSP needs to be specifically involved in the county's well permitting process. Add this requirement to the plans.

- 10. Knowing that too many current domestic wells went dry recently, knowing the groundwater levels have been declining, drought or not, because of big ag's already drawing the deep aguifer down, the authors of the GSP include more drawing down of the deep aquifer. There are currently over 50 ag well permits approved and not yet built, many likely for new orchards (the department approving the permits does not track the particular use other than "ag"). When the new orchards are established and start pumping, the groundwater will be sucked in mass quantity to water dry rangeland in the hot season, which is most of the year, to water trees which will die without regular and consistent watering. They must be irrigated, so there is no way to pause the pumping without losing the orchard. Big ag will not submit easily to their trees dying when the county gave them permit to draw water for their massive acreage of trees. This plan is not sustainable as it does not stop the expansion of big ag into dry areas of the county. There's no designation of inappropriate land use. There are no ideas specified about zoning changes needed to reach sustainability. Instead, the plan identifies the remaining creek beds and the total acreage which might yet be exploited by big ag. It's like an invitation, with a free study of where the water is, for big ag to buy rangeland and request well permits to grow nut trees. This GSP is literally a publicly funded study by a well drilling corporation seeking out where the groundwater is and how much might remain accessible to big ag. The plan does not define big ag. It does not require monitoring wells before big ag permits are granted in areas with no data. The only thing the GSP does is to establish the term sustainability, under-defined, and cost average residents lots of money while continuing to allow big ag to do whatever they want. If the Farm Bureau does not protest too much about this GSP, then we do not have a plan which could possibly get us to sustainability. The GSP, however well intended, needs to start with recommending the county instating specific restrictions and rules for new development. The plan needs to include the legality of such rules and restrictions. California has planning tools and court rulings which need to be included in the GSPs for reference by the Board of Supervisors as they must implement management actions, according to the GSPs.
- 11. Sometimes common sense must take over to get to sustainability because by the time that the groundwater is fully understood, it will be too late. What is generally known about the deep aquifers is that they are a gift from the last ice age; this theory, supported by academic sources, should be included in the GSPs. Nature's systems cost us nothing until we take too much. Grants for projects to clean and try to inject water into the ground are funded by debt to which we all have to pay service. There is no such thing as free money for projects. Acknowledge in the GSPs that slowing or stopping growth is the cheapest way in the direction of sustainability, and probably the only way.
- 12. Management actions should include policies, in addition to any projects. There should be recommended policies since the county's groundwater is already in decline in large areas. We cannot get to sustainability via projects alone, not to mention that projects are expensive, no matter which budget they come from. Rules, such as no more growth in the acreage of orchards, is the way to sustainability, or at least to not crashing quite as soon. Projects, such as injecting water into the ground, if possible, would be expensive, and it would be a public expense unless the agency starts collecting money for the possible projects now. The expense for future projects, needed when the groundwater declines to the unacceptable level specified in the GSPs, should be collected now from companies extracting the groundwater for profit. State that in the GSPs as a recommended management action. Fairness needs to be indicated as a working principle in the GSPs. The companies who profit directly from the mass extraction of groundwater should be the ones who pay for restoring the groundwater to a sustainable level as defined in the GSPs Management Objectives.
- 13. The commons is a shared resource, such as groundwater. Include a discussion of the tragedy of the commons, since the GSPs are trying to prevent that.
- 14. Setting the MT so low means many wells will fail, due to a combination of factors, such as extended drought, a general drawdown of the groundwater in most areas over the past few decades, and new ag wells supporting new orchards. Recommended management actions should include compensation for the loss of domestic wells and the cost of digging new or deeper domestic wells, adding individual domestic water tanks, and delivering water to homes in rural areas where wells have gone dry due to unsustainable groundwater pumping.
- 15. Mitigation measures may be used to imitate sustainability, but where they cost residents not profiting from the extraction of mass quantities of groundwater for profit, a policy of fairness should be specified in the GSPs in the Management Objectives and Management Actions. Consistently recognize in specific recommended policies and actions that social equity is a major leg on which sustainability stands.
- 16. The GSPs plan to continue to draw down the water table. The Minimum Threshold is set lower than the depths of most domestic wells, with no recommendation or policy, save hoping for the drought to end, to restore the groundwater level. State the intention to limit additional industrial agricultural wells because there is no place with consistent extra water that we can afford to pipeline in; that's why we're doing groundwater sustainability planning. We cannot afford expensive projects to deepen domestic wells, build more above ground storage; every project takes money. What doesn't take money is to limit new wells. Keep the range lands for grazing with every policy recommendation and planning tool available in California. State the tools available. Keep orchards where they have surface water availability, using groundwater only during droughts. It's that simple to become more sustainable. Sustainability is about balance; it's not about drawing down the water table until

Undesirable Results occur. URs are already occurring. We're at the threshold of what's minimal. Our objective should not be to make domestic wells deeper, as recommended by the Farm Bureau. Digging and pumping from deeper depths is expensive. That's an undesirable result of too much agricultural development coupled with extended drought and overall overgrowth of California. Getting to sustainability starts with no growth in industrial wells. Sustainability is about balance between economic, environmental, and equity - profit, planet, and people. There's an energy component as well, as energy costs money and affects all three Es (or Ps). More engineering is costly, and even with grants, that doesn't get us to sustainability or provide a drop of water that isn't already spoken for. Nature works for free, and she knows what she is doing. We need to get out of the way, and she will replenish our groundwater, our streams and rivers. Regenerative agriculture can help pivot methods so that less water is required. Recommend regenerative agriculture as a management tool.

- 17. In the GSPs, define the unacceptable consequences, the indicators of groundwater unsustainability.
 - It is unacceptable to have domestic wells lose water due to groundwater decline from industrial pumping. Recognize that it is nearly impossible to prove that is happening to a specific resident because of a specific ag well, and that the onus currently is on the owner of the domestic well to prove. This is unfair and needs to be addressed in the GSPs.
 - It is unacceptable to deplete the groundwater such that we lose what natural oaks remain. Nature needs more water than it's getting now due to the extensive extraction of groundwater. A sustainable plan would restore water for the ecosystem. Add recommendations for restoring groundwater in areas that are known to be, or are likely to be in decline.
 - It is unacceptable to create losing streams. A sustainable groundwater management plan should restore flows in creeks, not allow continued big ag development alongside creeks. Add policy and management recommendations regarding losing streams.
 - It is acceptable to not allow new industrial scale ag wells for water intensive perennial crops like almonds. Banning that kind of well is a relatively simple and inexpensive step towards managing groundwater that we can take now, so that we can continue living here. No one I know wants to be displaced because of almonds. The system will certainly not recover with additional wounds. Address this issue as a policy and management recommendation in the GSPs.

Thank you in advance for addressing the points made in this comment letter. I look forward to reading the responses.





Leaders for Livable Communities



CLEAN WATER ACTION | CLEAN WATER FUND

November 19, 2021

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District GSA 9380 San Benito Ave Gerber, CA 96035

Submitted via email: nbethurem@tcpw.ca.gov

Re: Public Comment Letter for Antelope Subbasin Draft GSP

Dear Nichole Bethurem,

On behalf of the above-listed organizations, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Antelope Subbasin being prepared under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Our organizations are deeply engaged in and committed to the successful implementation of SGMA because we understand that groundwater is critical for the resilience of California's water portfolio, particularly in light of changing climate. Under the requirements of SGMA, Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) must consider the interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater, such as domestic well owners, environmental users, surface water users, federal government, California Native American tribes and disadvantaged communities (Water Code 10723.2).

As stakeholder representatives for beneficial users of groundwater, our GSP review focuses on how well disadvantaged communities, tribes, drinking water users, climate change, and the environment were addressed in the GSP. While we appreciate that some basins have consulted us directly via focus groups, workshops, and working groups, we are providing public comment letters to all GSAs as a means to engage in the development of 2022 GSPs across the state. Recognizing that GSPs are complicated and resource intensive to develop, the intention of this letter is to provide constructive stakeholder feedback that can improve the GSP prior to submission to the State.

Based on our review, we have significant concerns regarding the treatment of key beneficial users in the Draft GSP and consider the GSP to be **insufficient** under SGMA. We highlight the following findings:

- 1. Beneficial uses and users are not sufficiently considered in GSP development.
 - a. Human Right to Water considerations are not sufficiently incorporated.
 - b. Public trust resources are not sufficiently considered.
 - c. Impacts of Minimum Thresholds, Measurable Objectives and Undesirable Results on beneficial uses and users **are not sufficiently** analyzed.
- 2. Climate change **is not sufficiently** considered.

- 3. Data gaps **are not sufficiently** identified and the GSP **needs additional plans** to eliminate them.
- 4. Projects and Management Actions **do not sufficiently consider** potential impacts or benefits to beneficial uses and users.

Our specific comments related to the deficiencies of the Antelope Subbasin Draft GSP along with recommendations on how to reconcile them, are provided in detail in **Attachment A**.

Please refer to the enclosed list of attachments for additional technical recommendations:

Attachment A	GSP Specific Comments
Attachment B	SGMA Tools to address DAC, drinking water, and environmental beneficial uses and users
Attachment C	Freshwater species located in the basin
Attachment D	The Nature Conservancy's "Identifying GDEs under SGMA: Best Practices for using the NC Dataset"
Attachment E	Maps of representative monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users

Thank you for fully considering our comments as you finalize your GSP.

Best Regards,

Ngodoo Atume Water Policy Analyst Clean Water Action/Clean Water Fund

r = (t

Samantha Arthur Working Lands Program Director Audubon California

E.S. Rum

E.J. Remson Senior Project Director, California Water Program The Nature Conservancy

papet

J. Pablo Ortiz-Partida, Ph.D. Western States Climate and Water Scientist Union of Concerned Scientists

awelle) Dolan

Danielle V. Dolan Water Program Director Local Government Commission

Melisse M. Rehde

Melissa M. Rohde Groundwater Scientist The Nature Conservancy

Attachment A

Specific Comments on the Antelope Subbasin Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan

1. Consideration of Beneficial Uses and Users in GSP development

Consideration of beneficial uses and users in GSP development is contingent upon adequate identification and engagement of the appropriate stakeholders. The (A) identification, (B) engagement, and (C) consideration of disadvantaged communities, drinking water users, tribes,¹ groundwater dependent ecosystems, streams, wetlands, and freshwater species are essential for ensuring the GSP integrates existing state policies on the Human Right to Water and the Public Trust Doctrine.

A. Identification of Key Beneficial Uses and Users

Disadvantaged Communities, Drinking Water Users, and Tribes

The identification of Disadvantaged Communities (DACs), drinking water users, and tribes is **insufficient**. We note the following deficiencies with the identification of these key beneficial users.

- The GSP erroneously maps "Economically Disadvantaged Areas" rather than "Disadvantaged Communities" in Figure 2-11. The GSP must map the locations of DACs within the subbasin, identify each DAC by name, and provide the population of each DAC. The GSP also fails to identify the population dependent on groundwater as their source of drinking water in the subbasin.
- The plan identifies the Greenville Rancheria Tribe as a stakeholder within the subbasin, but does not provide a map of the tribal lands or tribal interests in the subbasin.

These missing elements are required for the GSA to fully understand the specific interests and water demands of these beneficial users, and to support the consideration of beneficial users in the development of sustainable management criteria and selection of projects and management actions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide a map that identifies each DAC in the subbasin by name and provide the population of each identified DAC. Identify the sources of drinking water for DAC members, including an estimate of how many people rely on groundwater (e.g., domestic wells, state small water systems, and public water systems).
- Provide a map of tribal lands and describe tribal interests in the subbasin.

¹ Our letter provides a review of the identification and consideration of federally recognized tribes (Data source: SGMA Data viewer) within the GSP from non-tribal members and NGOs. Based on the likely incomplete information available to our organizations for this review, we recommend that the GSA utilize the California Department of Water Resources' "Engagement with Tribal Governments" Guidance Document

^{(&}lt;u>https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management/Best-Management-Practices-and-Guidance-Documents</u>) to comprehensively address these important beneficial users in their GSP.

Interconnected Surface Waters

The identification of Interconnected Surface Waters (ISWs) is **insufficient**, due to lack of supporting information provided for the ISW analysis. The GSP describes the use of a groundwater model (Tehama Integrated Hydrologic Model) to analyze the interaction between groundwater and surface water within the subbasin. While Appendix 2-J gives a detailed description of the model, the GSP could be improved by including a summary in the main GSP text. This information should include groundwater level monitoring well data and stream gauge data that were incorporated into the model, the screening depths of wells used in the groundwater model, and description of the temporal (seasonal and interannual) variability of the data used to calibrate the model.

The GSP does not provide any concluding statements in the GSP text about which reaches are considered to be interconnected. Figure 2-52 (Surface Water and Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Stations) presents stream reaches in the subbasin labeled as perennial and intermittent/ephemeral. However, this figure does not label reaches as interconnected, disconnected, or reaches with data gaps.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide a map showing all the stream reaches in the subbasin, with reaches clearly labeled as interconnected (gaining/losing) or disconnected. Consider any segments with data gaps as potential ISWs and clearly mark them as such on maps provided in the GSP.
- In the main text of the GSP, summarize the groundwater elevation data and stream flow data used in the modeling analysis. Discuss temporal (seasonal and interannual) variability of the data used to calibrate the model.
- To confirm and illustrate the results of the groundwater modeling, overlay the subbasin's stream reaches with depth-to-groundwater contour maps to illustrate groundwater depths and the groundwater gradient near the stream reaches. Show the location of groundwater wells used in the analysis.
- For the depth-to-groundwater contour maps, use the best practices presented in Attachment D. Specifically, ensure that the first step is contouring groundwater elevations, and then subtracting this layer from land surface elevations from a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) to estimate depth-to-groundwater contours across the landscape. This will provide accurate contours of depth to groundwater along streams and other land surface depressions where GDEs are commonly found.

Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

The identification of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) is **insufficient**. The GSP took initial steps to identify and map GDEs using the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater dataset (NC dataset). Potential GDEs were identified in areas overlying groundwater within 30 feet of land surface based on Spring 2015 groundwater conditions, but this was the only dataset used to characterize groundwater conditions in the subbasin's GDEs. We recommend using groundwater data from multiple seasons and water year types over the pre-SGMA period (i.e., 2005-2015) to determine the range of depth to groundwater. Using seasonal groundwater elevation data over multiple water year types is an essential component of identifying GDEs and is necessary to capture the variability in groundwater conditions inherent in

California's Mediterranean climate. The GDE Appendix (Appendix 2-H) refers to Figure 1 through Figure 4 that illustrate the steps of the GDE analysis. These figures appear to be missing from the appendix, however.

The GSP does not provide an inventory of flora and fauna in the subbasin, nor is any discussion of threatened or endangered species provided.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Include the missing Figures 1-4 in the GDE Appendix 2-H.
- Use depth-to-groundwater data from multiple seasons and water year types (e.g., wet, dry, average, drought) to determine the range of depth to groundwater around NC dataset polygons. We recommend that a baseline period (10 years from 2005 to 2015) be established to characterize groundwater conditions over multiple water year types. Refer to Attachment D of this letter for best practices for using local groundwater data to verify whether polygons in the NC Dataset are supported by groundwater in an aquifer.
- Provide depth-to-groundwater contour maps, noting the best practices presented in Attachment D. Specifically, ensure that the first step is contouring groundwater elevations, and then subtracting this layer from land surface elevations from a digital elevation model (DEM) to estimate depth-to-groundwater contours across the landscape.
- Refer to Attachment B for more information on TNC's plant rooting depth database. Deeper thresholds are necessary for plants that have reported maximum root depths that exceed the averaged 30-ft threshold, such as Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*). We recommend that the reported max rooting depth for these deeper-rooted plants be used. For example, a depth-to-groundwater threshold of 80 feet should be used instead of the 30-ft threshold, when verifying whether Valley Oak polygons from the NC Dataset are connected to groundwater. It is important to emphasize that actual rooting depth data are limited and will depend on the plant species and site-specific conditions such as soil and aquifer types, and proximity to other water sources.
- If insufficient data are available to describe groundwater conditions within or near polygons from the NC dataset, include those polygons as "Potential GDEs" in the GSP until data gaps are reconciled in the monitoring network.
- Provide a complete inventory, map, or description of fauna (e.g., birds, fish, amphibian) and flora (e.g., plants) species in the subbasin and note any threatened or endangered species (see Attachment C in this letter for a list of freshwater species located in the Antelope Subbasin).

Native Vegetation and Managed Wetlands

Native vegetation and managed wetlands are water use sectors that are required to be included in the water budget.^{2,3} The integration of native vegetation into the water budget is **sufficient**. We commend the GSA for including the groundwater demands of this ecosystem in the historical, current and projected water budgets. Managed wetlands are not mentioned in the GSP, so it is not known whether or not they are present in the subbasin.

RECOMMENDATION

• State whether or not there are managed wetlands in the subbasin. If there are, ensure that their groundwater demands are included as separate line items in the historical, current, and projected water budgets.

B. Engaging Stakeholders

Stakeholder Engagement During GSP Development

Stakeholder engagement during GSP development is **insufficient**. SGMA's requirement for public notice and engagement of stakeholders is not fully met by the description in the Communications and Engagement Plan (Appendix 2-A).⁴

We note the following deficiencies with the overall stakeholder engagement process:

- The GSP identifies the Greenville Rancheria as tribal stakeholders present within the subbasin. Appendix C (of the Communications and Engagement Plan) describes Tribal Engagement in Tehama County. This appendix describes outreach principles, outreach partners, and steps to be taken for tribal engagement. However, the GSP does not state what steps were actually taken or the results of tribal engagement actions.
- The GSP documents opportunities for public involvement and engagement in general terms. Public outreach and engagement activities include public meetings, public hearings, workshops, public notices, stakeholder briefings, newsletters, and updates to the GSA website. While the GSP provides a guidance document on DAC engagement, its description consists primarily of informing DACs by outreach to DAC-related organizations. The GSP does not state whether DACs and environmental stakeholders are represented on a GSA Advisory Committee or Board.
- The plan does not include documentation on how stakeholder input from the above mentioned outreach and engagement was considered and incorporated into the GSP development process.

² "Water use sector' refers to categories of water demand based on the general land uses to which the water is applied, including urban, industrial, agricultural, managed wetlands, managed recharge, and native vegetation." [23 CCR §351(al)]

³ "The water budget shall quantify the following, either through direct measurements or estimates based on data: (3) Outflows from the groundwater system by water use sector, including evapotranspiration, groundwater extraction, groundwater discharge to surface water sources, and subsurface groundwater outflow." [23 CCR §354.18]

⁴ "A communication section of the Plan shall include a requirement that the GSP identify how it encourages the active involvement of diverse social, cultural, and economic elements of the population within the basin." [23 CCR §354.10(d)(3)]

• We note that Appendix G (of the Communications and Engagement Plan) is still under development and will include more details of outreach to stakeholders during GSP implementation. Ensure that as this section is finalized, it includes a detailed plan for continual opportunities for engagement through the implementation phase of the GSP that is specifically directed to DACs, domestic well owners, and environmental stakeholders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- In the Communications and Engagement Plan, describe active and targeted outreach to engage all stakeholders throughout the GSP development and implementation phases. Refer to Attachment B for specific recommendations on how to actively engage stakeholders during all phases of the GSP process. While some of these resources have already been stated in the GSP, we recommend that the GSA should improve utilization of these resources and documentation of the engagement process.
- Provide documentation on how stakeholder input was incorporated into the GSP development process.
- Provide information on whether the GSA has initiated contact with tribal stakeholders in the subbasin during GSP development, and how tribal concerns were considered during the GSP development process.
- Utilize DWR's tribal engagement guidance to comprehensively identify, involve, and address all tribes and tribal interests that may be present in the subbasin.⁵

C. Considering Beneficial Uses and Users When Establishing Sustainable Management Criteria and Analyzing Impacts on Beneficial Uses and Users

The consideration of beneficial uses and users when establishing sustainable management criteria (SMC) is **insufficient**. The consideration of potential impacts on all beneficial users of groundwater in the basin are required when defining undesirable results and establishing minimum thresholds.^{6,7,8}

Disadvantaged Communities and Drinking Water Users

For chronic lowering of groundwater levels, the GSP states (p. 3-17): *"The MTs were set to the following: Upper Aquifer: Spring groundwater elevation where less than 10 - 20% (on average) of domestic wells could potentially be impacted."* No further details are provided on the minimum threshold impacts to domestic wells, including the methodology used to conduct the assessment. The GSP does not sufficiently describe whether minimum thresholds will avoid significant and

⁵ Engagement with Tribal Governments Guidance Document. Available at:

https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Sustainable-Groundwater-Management/Best-Management-Practices-and-Guidance-Documents/Files/Guidance-Doc-for-SGM-Engagement-with-Tribal-Govt_ay_19.pdf

⁶ "The description of undesirable results shall include [...] potential effects on the beneficial uses and users of groundwater, on land uses and property interests, and other potential effects that may occur or are occurring from undesirable results." [23 CCR §354.26(b)(3)]

⁷ "The description of minimum thresholds shall include [...] how minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests." [23 CCR §354.28(b)(4)]

⁸ "The description of minimum thresholds shall include [...] how state, federal, or local standards relate to the relevant sustainability indicator. If the minimum threshold differs from other regulatory standards, the agency shall explain the nature of and the basis for the difference." [23 CCR §354.28(b)(5)]

unreasonable loss of drinking water to domestic well users that are not protected by the minimum threshold. In addition, the GSP does not sufficiently describe or analyze direct or indirect impacts on DACs, drinking water users, or tribes when defining undesirable results, nor does it describe how the groundwater levels minimum thresholds are consistent with the Human Right to Water policy.⁹

The undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels is established as (p. 3-31): "25% of groundwater elevations measured at the same RMS wells exceed the associated MTs for two (2) consecutive measurements. If the water year is dry or critically dry, then levels below the MTs are not undesirable if groundwater management allows for recovery in average or wetter years." By only using minimum threshold exceedances during non-drought years to define undesirable results for groundwater levels, significant and unreasonable impacts to beneficial users experienced during dry years or periods of drought will not result in an undesirable result. This is problematic since the GSP is failing to manage the subbasin in such a way that strives to minimize significant adverse impacts to beneficial users, which are often felt greatest in below-average, dry, and drought years. Furthermore, the requirement that 25% of monitoring wells exceed the minimum threshold before triggering an undesirable result means that areas with high concentrations of domestic wells may experience impacts significantly greater than the established minimum threshold because the 25% threshold isn't triggered.

For degraded water quality, minimum thresholds are set for total dissolved solids (TDS) to 750 milligrams per liter (mg/L), lower than the upper secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL) of 1,000 mg/L. This is the only constituent of concern (COC) for which SMC are established. Section 2.2.2.3 (Groundwater Quality) discusses other COCs (nitrate, arsenic, and boron) in the subbasin that have exceeded regulatory standards. Significantly, the narrative identifies nitrate levels in the northern portion of the subbasin as significant and increasing. Nitrate is an acute contaminant; failure to address or mitigate this impact will have a direct impact on public health, particularly for domestic well owners who may not be aware that their well is contaminated. SMC should be established for all COCs in the subbasin that may be impacted or exacerbated by groundwater use and/or management, in addition to coordinating with water quality regulatory programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels

- Describe direct and indirect impacts on DACs, domestic well owners, and tribes when describing undesirable results and defining minimum thresholds for chronic lowering of groundwater levels. Include information on the impacts during prolonged periods of below average water years.
- Consider minimum threshold exceedances during drought years when defining the groundwater level undesirable result across the subbasin.

Degraded Water Quality

 Describe direct and indirect impacts on DACs, drinking water users, and tribes when defining undesirable results for degraded water quality.¹⁰ For specific guidance on how

⁹ California Water Code §106.3. Available at:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=WAT§ionNum=106.3 ¹⁰ "Degraded Water Quality [...] collect sufficient spatial and temporal data from each applicable principal aquifer to determine groundwater quality trends for water quality indicators, as determined by the Agency, to address known water quality issues." [23 CCR §354.34(c)(4)]

to consider these users, refer to "Guide to Protecting Water Quality Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act."¹¹

- Evaluate the cumulative or indirect impacts of proposed minimum thresholds for degraded water quality on DACs, drinking water users, and tribes.
- Set minimum thresholds and measurable objectives for all water quality constituents within the subbasin that are impacted or exacerbated by groundwater use and/or management.

Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems and Interconnected Surface Waters

Sustainable management criteria for chronic lowering of groundwater levels provided in the GSP do not consider potential impacts to environmental beneficial users. The GSP neither describes nor analyzes direct or indirect impacts on environmental users of groundwater when defining undesirable results. This is problematic because without identifying potential impacts on GDEs, minimum thresholds may compromise, or even destroy, these environmental beneficial users. Since GDEs are present in the subbasin, they must be considered when developing SMC.

Sustainable management criteria for depletion of interconnected surface water are established by proxy using groundwater levels. The GSP states (p. 3-25): "*MTs are interim and will be the same water levels used in for the chronic lowering of groundwater elevations described in Section 3.3.1.1. Extensive data gaps are discussed in Section 3.7.8.7. The GSA will continue to evaluate new monitoring information and determine these thresholds later.*" While the GSP clearly recognizes the data gap for depletion of interconnected surface water SMC, we would like to see further discussion of how the interim SMC will affect beneficial users, and more specifically GDEs, or the impact of these minimum thresholds on GDEs in the subbasin. The GSP makes no attempt to evaluate how the proposed minimum thresholds and measurable objectives avoid significant and unreasonable effects on surface water beneficial users in the subbasin (see Attachment C for a list of environmental users in the subbasin), such as increased mortality and inability to perform key life processes (e.g., reproduction, migration).

RECOMMENDATIONS

 When defining undesirable results for chronic lowering of groundwater levels, provide specifics on what biological responses (e.g., extent of habitat, growth, recruitment rates) would best characterize a significant and unreasonable impact to GDEs. Undesirable results to environmental users occur when 'significant and unreasonable' effects on beneficial users are caused by one of the sustainability indicators (i.e., chronic lowering of groundwater levels, degraded water quality, or depletion of interconnected surface water). Thus, potential impacts on environmental beneficial uses and users need to be considered when defining undesirable results in the

¹¹ Guide to Protecting Water Quality under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act

https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/communitywatercenter/pages/293/attachments/original/1559328858/Guide_to _Protecting_Drinking_Water_Quality_Under_the_Sustainable_Groundwater_Management_Act.pdf?1559328858.

subbasin.¹² Defining undesirable results is the crucial first step before the minimum thresholds can be determined.¹³

- When defining undesirable results for depletion of interconnected surface water, include a description of potential impacts on instream habitats within ISWs when minimum thresholds in the subbasin are reached.¹⁴ The GSP should confirm that minimum thresholds for ISWs avoid adverse impacts on environmental beneficial users of interconnected surface waters as these environmental users could be left unprotected by the GSP. These recommendations apply especially to environmental beneficial users that are already protected under pre-existing state or federal law.^{6,15}
- When establishing SMC for the subbasin, consider that the SGMA statute [Water Code §10727.4(I)] specifically calls out that GSPs shall include "impacts on groundwater dependent ecosystems."

2. Climate Change

The SGMA statute identifies climate change as a significant threat to groundwater resources and one that must be examined and incorporated in the GSPs. The GSP Regulations require integration of climate change into the projected water budget to ensure that projects and management actions sufficiently account for the range of potential climate futures.¹⁶ The effects of climate change will intensify the impacts of water stress on GDEs, making available shallow groundwater resources especially critical to their survival. Condon *et al.* (2020) shows that GDEs are more likely to succumb to water stress and rely more on groundwater during times of drought.¹⁷ When shallow groundwater is unavailable, riparian forests can die off and key life processes (e.g., migration and spawning) for aquatic organisms, such as steelhead, can be impeded.

The integration of climate change into the projected water budget is **insufficient**. The GSP incorporates climate change into the projected water budget using DWR change factors for 2030 and 2070. However, the plan does not consider multiple climate scenarios (e.g., the 2070 extremely wet and extremely dry climate scenarios) in the projected water budget. The GSP would benefit from clearly and transparently incorporating the extremely wet and dry scenarios provided by DWR into projected water budgets or selecting more appropriate extreme scenarios for the subbasin. While these extreme scenarios may have

¹² "The description of undesirable results shall include [...] potential effects on the beneficial uses and users of groundwater, on land uses and property interests, and other potential effects that may occur or are occurring from undesirable results". [23 CCR §354.26(b)(3)]

¹³ The description of minimum thresholds shall include [...] how minimum thresholds may affect the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater or land uses and property interests." [23 CCR §354.28(b)(4)]

¹⁴ "The minimum threshold for depletions of interconnected surface water shall be the rate or volume of surface water depletions caused by groundwater use that has adverse impacts on beneficial uses of the surface water and may lead to undesirable results." [23 CCR §354.28(c)(6)]

¹⁵ Rohde MM, Seapy B, Rogers R, Castañeda X, editors. 2019. Critical Species LookBook: A compendium of California's threatened and endangered species for sustainable groundwater management. The Nature Conservancy, San Francisco, California. Available at:

https://groundwaterresourcehub.org/public/uploads/pdfs/Critical_Species_LookBook_91819.pdf ¹⁶ "Each Plan shall rely on the best available information and best available science to quantify the water budget for the basin in order to provide an understanding of historical and projected hydrology, water demand, water supply, land use, population, climate change, sea level rise, groundwater and surface water interaction, and subsurface groundwater flow." [23 CCR §354.18(e)] ¹⁷ Condon et al. 2020. Evapotranspiration depletes groundwater under warming over the contiguous United States.

¹⁷ Condon et al. 2020. Evapotranspiration depletes groundwater under warming over the contiguous United States. Nature Communications. Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-14688-0

a lower likelihood of occurring, their consequences could be significant and their inclusion can help identify important vulnerabilities in the subbasin's approach to groundwater management.

The GSP integrates climate change into key inputs (e.g., changes in precipitation, evapotranspiration, and surface water flow) of the projected water budget, and calculates a sustainable yield based on the projected water budget with climate change incorporated. However, if the water budgets are incomplete, including the omission of extreme climate scenarios, then there is increased uncertainty in virtually every subsequent calculation used to plan for projects, derive measurable objectives, and set minimum thresholds. Plans that do not adequately include climate change projections may underestimate future impacts on vulnerable beneficial users of groundwater such as ecosystems, DACs, tribes, and domestic well owners.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Integrate climate change, including extreme climate scenarios, into all elements of the projected water budget to form the basis for development of sustainable management criteria and projects and management actions.
- Incorporate climate change scenarios into projects and management actions.

3. Data Gaps

The consideration of beneficial users when establishing monitoring networks is **insufficient**, due to lack of specific plans to increase the Representative Monitoring Sites (RMSs) in the monitoring network that represent water quality conditions and shallow groundwater elevations around DACs, domestic wells, GDEs, and ISWs in the subbasin. These beneficial users may remain unprotected by the GSP without adequate monitoring and identification of data gaps in the shallow aquifer. The Plan therefore fails to meet SGMA's requirements for the monitoring network.¹⁸

Figure 3-1 (Representative Monitoring Sites) shows insufficient representation of DACs and drinking water users for water quality monitoring. Figure 3-2 (Groundwater Level Representative Monitoring Sites – Upper Aquifer) and Figure 3-3 (Groundwater Level Representative Monitoring Sites – Lower Aquifer) show insufficient representation of DACs and drinking water users for groundwater elevation monitoring. Refer to Attachment E for maps of these monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users of groundwater.

The GSP provides some discussion of data gaps for GDEs in Section 3.7.8.7 (Assessment and Improvement of Monitoring Network - Interconnected Surface Waters), but does not provide specific plans, such as locations or a timeline, to fill the data gaps. Figure 3-7 (Identification of Data Gaps (GDE)) maps high priority GDEs alongside existing shallow monitoring wells, but this figure does not show additional proposed monitoring well locations.

¹⁸ "The monitoring network objectives shall be implemented to accomplish the following: [...] (2) Monitor impacts to the beneficial uses or users of groundwater." [23 CCR §354.34(b)(2)]

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide maps that overlay current and proposed monitoring well locations with the locations of DACs, domestic wells, and GDEs to clearly identify monitored areas.
- Increase the number of RMSs in the shallow aquifer across the subbasin as needed to map ISWs and adequately monitor all groundwater condition indicators across the subbasin and at appropriate depths for *all* beneficial users. Prioritize proximity to DACs, domestic wells, GDEs, and ISWs when identifying new RMSs.
- Ensure groundwater elevation and water quality RMSs are monitoring groundwater conditions spatially and at the correct depth for *all* beneficial users especially DACs, domestic wells, and GDEs.
- Further describe biological monitoring that can be used to assess the potential for significant and unreasonable impacts to GDEs or ISWs due to groundwater conditions in the subbasin. Additional studies of GDEs and groundwater surface water interactions are briefly discussed in the Projects and Management Actions chapter, but very few details are provided.

4. Addressing Beneficial Users in Projects and Management Actions

The consideration of beneficial users when developing projects and management actions is **incomplete**. The GSP identifies the benefits and impacts of identified projects and management actions, including water quality impacts, to key beneficial users of groundwater such as GDEs and DACs. However, projects and management actions to improve water supply and GDE habitats (e.g., Invasive Plant Removal from Creeks and Irrigation Conveyance Canals, Levee Setback and Stream Channel Restoration) are described as potential projects without a known timeline for implementation.

We commend the GSA for describing the environmental benefits of the Multi-Benefit Recharge Project (Section 4.3.3) in the subbasin, as developed with support and guidelines from The Nature Conservancy.

The GSP describes the Tehama County Domestic Well Tracking and Outreach Program (Section 4.5.2.6) and the Well Deepening or Replacement Program (Section 4.5.2.7). However, these programs are described as potential projects to be implemented on an as-needed basis, instead of projects that will be implemented within the GSP planning horizon. We strongly recommend inclusion of a drinking water well impact mitigation program to proactively monitor and protect drinking water wells through GSP implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Describe the projected timelines for implementing the Invasive Plant Removal and Levee Setback and Stream Channel Restoration projects and management actions in Chapter 4 of the GSP.
- For DACs and domestic well owners, provide specific plans for implementation of a drinking water well impact mitigation program to proactively monitor and protect

drinking water wells through GSP implementation. Refer to Attachment B for specific recommendations on how to implement a drinking water well mitigation program.

• Develop management actions that incorporate climate and water delivery uncertainties to address future water demand and prevent future undesirable results.

Attachment B

SGMA Tools to address DAC, drinking water, and environmental beneficial uses and users

Stakeholder Engagement and Outreach



Clean Water Action, Community Water Center and Union of Concerned Scientists developed a guidance document called <u>Collaborating for success</u>: <u>Stakeholder engagement</u> for <u>Sustainable Groundwater Management Act</u> <u>Implementation</u>. It provides details on how to conduct targeted and broad outreach and engagement during Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development and implementation. Conducting a targeted outreach involves:

- Developing a robust Stakeholder Communication and Engagement plan that includes outreach at frequented locations (schools, farmers markets, religious settings, events) across the plan area to increase the involvement and participation of disadvantaged communities, drinking water users and the environmental stakeholders.
- Providing translation services during meetings and technical assistance to enable easy participation for non-English speaking stakeholders.
- GSP should adequately describe the process for requesting input from beneficial users and provide details on how input is incorporated into the GSP.

The Human Right to Water

	Review Criteria (All Indicators Must be Present in Order to Protect the Human Right to Water)	Yes/No
A.	Plan Area	
1	Dues the GSP Edeal(b), description, and provide maps of all of the following beneficial terms in the GSS areard? a. Disadostraged Communities (DACS): b. Tribles: c. Community water systems: d. Private with communities:	
2	Land are publish and practices. ¹¹ Doch the GOP reverse all inference publics and practices of Data are sequences which could impact groundwater resources? These include that are not limited on the following: 1. Water was publics General Plans and local land one and water planning decuments b. Plans for development and resoning. C. Processes for permitting activities which will inserties water consumption.	
8	Basin Setting (Groundwater Conditions and Water Budget)	-
1	Does the groundwater level conditions section include past and current drinking water supply issues of domestic well users, small community water systems, state small water systems, and disadvantaged communities?	
2	Does the groundwater quality conditions section include past and current drinking water quality issues of domestic well users, small community water systems, state small water systems, and disadvantaged communities, including public water wells that had or have MCLs exceedances? ¹⁷	
3	Does the groundwater quality conditions section include a review of all contaminants with primary dinking water standards known to exist in the GSP area, as well as besayalent chromium, and PFOs/PFOAs ²⁺⁴	
4	Incorporating drinking water needs into the water budget. ¹⁰ Does the Future Projected. Water Budget section explicitly include both the current and projected future drinking water needs of communics on donestic wells and community water systems including but not limited in utilid development and community: "dans for inflid development	

The <u>Human Right to Water Scorecard</u> was developed by Community Water Center, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability and Self Help Enterprises to aid Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) in prioritizing drinking water needs in SGMA. The scorecard identifies elements that must exist in GSPs to adequately protect the Human Right to Drinking water.

Drinking Water Well Impact Mitigation Framework



The Drinking Water Well Impact Mitigation

Framework was developed by Community Water Center, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability and Self Help Enterprises to aid GSAs in the development and implementation of their GSPs. The framework provides a clear roadmap for how a GSA can best structure its data gathering, monitoring network and management actions to proactively monitor and protect drinking water wells and mitigate impacts should they occur.

Groundwater Resource Hub



Groundwater dependent eccepters (GDEs) are plant and animal communities that require groundwater to meet some or all of their water needs. California is home to a diverse range of GDEs including paim cases in the Sonoran Desert, hot springs in the Mojave Desert, seasonal wetlands in the Central Valley, perennial riparian forests along the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, and The Nature Conservancy has developed a suite of tools based on best available science to help GSAs, consultants, and stakeholders efficiently incorporate nature into GSPs. These tools and resources are available online at <u>GroundwaterResourceHub.org</u>. The Nature Conservancy's tools and resources are intended to reduce costs, shorten timelines, and increase benefits for both people and nature.

Rooting Depth Database



The <u>Plant Rooting Depth Database</u> provides information that can help assess whether groundwater-dependent vegetation are accessing groundwater. Actual rooting depths will depend on the plant species and site-specific conditions, such as soil type and

availability of other water sources. Site-specific knowledge of depth to groundwater combined with rooting depths will help provide an understanding of the potential groundwater levels are needed to sustain GDEs.

How to use the database

The maximum rooting depth information in the Plant Rooting Depth Database is useful when verifying whether vegetation in the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NC Dataset) are connected to groundwater. A 30 ft depth-togroundwater threshold, which is based on averaged global rooting depth data for phreatophytes¹, is relevant for most plants identified in the NC Dataset since most plants have a max rooting depth of less than 30 feet. However, it is important to note that deeper thresholds are necessary for other plants that have reported maximum root depths that exceed the averaged 30 feet threshold, such as valley oak (Quercus lobata), Euphrates poplar (Populus euphratica), salt cedar (Tamarix spp.), and shadescale (Atriplex confertifolia). The Nature Conservancy advises that the reported max rooting depth for these deeper-rooted plants be used. For example, a depth-to groundwater threshold of 80 feet should be used instead of the 30 ft threshold, when verifying whether valley oak polygons from the NC Dataset are connected to groundwater. It is important to re-emphasize that actual rooting depth data are limited and will depend on the plant species and site-specific conditions such as soil and aguifer types, and availability to other water sources.

The Plant Rooting Depth Database is an Excel workbook composed of four worksheets:

- 1. California phreatophyte rooting depth data (included in the NC Dataset)
- 2. Global phreatophyte rooting depth data
- 3. Metadata
- 4. References

How the database was compiled

The Plant Rooting Depth Database is a compilation of rooting depth information for the groundwater-dependent plant species identified in the NC Dataset. Rooting depth data were compiled from published scientific literature and expert opinion through a crowdsourcing campaign. As more information becomes available, the database of rooting depths will be updated. Please <u>Contact Us</u> if you have additional rooting depth data for California phreatophytes.

¹ Canadell, J., Jackson, R.B., Ehleringer, J.B. et al. 1996. Maximum rooting depth of vegetation types at the global scale. Oecologia 108, 583–595. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00329030

GDE Pulse



<u>GDE Pulse</u> is a free online tool that allows Groundwater Sustainability Agencies to assess changes in groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) health using satellite, rainfall, and groundwater data. Remote sensing data from satellites has been used to monitor the health of vegetation all over the planet. GDE pulse has compiled 35 years of satellite imagery from NASA's Landsat mission for every polygon in the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater Dataset. The following datasets are available for downloading:

Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) is a satellite-derived index that represents the greenness of vegetation. Healthy green vegetation tends to have a higher NDVI, while dead leaves have a lower NDVI. We calculated the average NDVI during the driest part of the year (July - Sept) to estimate vegetation health when the plants are most likely dependent on groundwater.

Normalized Difference Moisture Index (NDMI) is a satellite-derived index that represents water content in vegetation. NDMI is derived from the Near-Infrared (NIR) and Short-Wave Infrared (SWIR) channels. Vegetation with adequate access to water tends to have higher NDMI, while vegetation that is water stressed tends to have lower NDMI. We calculated the average NDVI during the driest part of the year (July–September) to estimate vegetation health when the plants are most likely dependent on groundwater.

Annual Precipitation is the total precipitation for the water year (October 1st – September 30th) from the PRISM dataset. The amount of local precipitation can affect vegetation with more precipitation generally leading to higher NDVI and NDMI.

Depth to Groundwater measurements provide an indication of the groundwater levels and changes over time for the surrounding area. We used groundwater well measurements from nearby (<1km) wells to estimate the depth to groundwater below the GDE based on the average elevation of the GDE (using a digital elevation model) minus the measured groundwater surface elevation.

ICONOS Mapper Interconnected Surface Water in the Central Valley



ICONS maps the likely presence of interconnected surface water (ISW) in the Central Valley using depth to groundwater data. Using data from 2011-2018, the ISW dataset represents the likely connection between surface water and groundwater for rivers and streams in California's Central Valley. It includes information on the mean, maximum, and minimum depth to groundwater for each stream segment over the years with available data, as well as the likely presence of ISW based on the minimum depth to groundwater. The Nature Conservancy developed this database, with guidance and input from expert academics, consultants, and state agencies.

We developed this dataset using groundwater elevation data <u>available online</u> from the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). DWR only provides this data for the Central Valley. For GSAs outside of the valley, who have groundwater well measurements, we recommend following our methods to determine likely ISW in your region. The Nature Conservancy's ISW dataset should be used as a first step in reviewing ISW and should be supplemented with local or more recent groundwater depth data.

Attachment C

Freshwater Species Located in the Antelope Valley Basin

To assist in identifying the beneficial users of surface water necessary to assess the undesirable result "depletion of interconnected surface waters", Attachment C provides a list of freshwater species located in the Antelope Valley Basin. To produce the freshwater species list, we used ArcGIS to select features within the California Freshwater Species Database version 2.0.9 within the basin boundary. This database contains information on ~4,000 vertebrates, macroinvertebrates and vascular plants that depend on fresh water for at least one stage of their life cycle. The methods used to compile the California Freshwater Species Database contains locality observations and/or distribution information from ~400 data sources. The database is housed in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's BIOS² as well as on The Nature Conservancy's science website³.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Legal Protected Status		
Scientific Name		Federal	State	Other
BIRDS				
Agelaius tricolor	Tricolored Blackbird	Bird of Conservation Concern	Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Plegadis chihi	White-faced Ibis		Watch list	
Vireo bellii pusillus	Least Bell's Vireo	Endangered	Endang ered	
Actitis macularius	Spotted Sandpiper			
Aechmophorus clarkii	Clark's Grebe			
Aechmophorus occidentalis	Western Grebe			
Aix sponsa	Wood Duck			
Anas acuta	Northern Pintail			
Anas americana	American Wigeon			
Anas clypeata	Northern Shoveler			
Anas crecca	Green-winged Teal			
Anas cyanoptera	Cinnamon Teal			
Anas discors	Blue-winged Teal			
Anas platyrhynchos	Mallard			

¹ Howard, J.K. et al. 2015. Patterns of Freshwater Species Richness, Endemism, and Vulnerability in California. PLoSONE, 11(7). Available at: <u>https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0130710</u>

² California Department of Fish and Wildlife BIOS: <u>https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/data/BIOS</u>

³ Science for Conservation: <u>https://www.scienceforconservation.org/products/california-freshwater-species-database</u>

Anas strepera	Gadwall			
	Greater White-			
Anser albifrons	fronted Goose			
Ardea alba	Great Egret			
Ardea herodias	Great Blue Heron			
Aythya affinis	Lesser Scaup			
Aythya americana	Redhead		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Aythya collaris	Duck			
Aythya marila	Greater Scaup			
Aythya valisineria	Canvasback		Special	
Botaurus lentiginosus	American Bittern			
Bucephala albeola	Bufflehead			
Bucephala clangula	Common Goldeneye			
Butorides virescens	Green Heron			
Calidris alpina	Dunlin			
Calidris mauri	Western Sandpiper			
Calidris minutilla	Least Sandpiper			
Chen caerulescens	Snow Goose			
Chen rossii	Ross's Goose			
Chlidonias niger	Black Tern		Special Concern	BSSC - Second priority
philadelphia	Bonaparte's Gull			
Cinclus mexicanus	American Dipper			
Cistothorus palustris palustris	Marsh Wren			
Cygnus buccinator	Trumpeter Swan			
Cygnus columbianus	Tundra Swan			
Cypseloides niger	Black Swift	Bird of Conservation Concern	Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Dendrocygna bicolor	Fulvous Whistling-Duck		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Egretta thula	Snowy Egret			
Empidonax traillii	Willow Flycatcher	Bird of Conservation Concern	Endang ered	
Fulica americana	American Coot			
Gallinago delicata	Wilson's Snipe			

Gallinula chloropus	Common Moorhen			
Grus canadensis	Sandhill Crane			
Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald Eagle	Bird of Conservation Concern	Endang ered	
Himantopus mexicanus	Black-necked Stilt			
Icteria virens	Yellow-breasted Chat		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Limnodromus scolopaceus	Long-billed Dowitcher			
Lophodytes cucullatus	Hooded Merganser			
Megaceryle alcyon	Belted Kingfisher			
Mergus merganser	Common Merganser			
Mergus serrator	Merganser			
Numenius americanus	Curlew			
Numenius phaeopus	Whimbrel			
Nycticorax nycticorax	Black-crowned Night-Heron			
Oreothlypis luciae	Lucy's Warbler		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Oxyura jamaicensis	Ruddy Duck			
Pelecanus erythrorhynchos	American White Pelican		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Phalacrocorax auritus	Double-crested Cormorant			
Phalaropus tricolor	Wilson's Phalarope			
Piranga rubra	Summer Tanager		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Pluvialis squatarola	Black-bellied Plover			
Podiceps nigricollis	Eared Grebe			
Podilymbus podiceps	Pied-billed Grebe			
Porzana carolina	Sora			
Rallus limicola	Virginia Rail			
Recurvirostra americana	American Avocet			
Riparia riparia	Bank Swallow		I hreate ned	

Setophaga petechiaYellow WarblerSecond priorityTachycineta bicolorTree SwallowImage: Second prioritySecond priorityTringa melanoleucaYellowlegsImage: Second PriorityImage: Second priorityTringa melanoleucaWilletImage: Second PriorityImage: Second PriorityTringa solitariaSolitaryImage: Second PriorityImage: Second PriorityVireo belliiBell's VireoImage: Special Special ConcernSpecial PriorityXanthocephalus xanthocephalusYellow-headed BlackbirdSpecial Special Special ConcernSpecial PriorityRustanchinecta gigasGiant Fairy ShrimpImage: Special Special ConcernSpecial Moyle 2013FISHSanta Ana suckerSpecial Endang ered - Moyle 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniWestern Pond TurtleSpecial Special ConcernEndang ered ARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusArroyo Toad ToadEndangered Special ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TeefogSpecial ConcernARSSCRean draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRean draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSC					BSSC -
Output ge percenta Trachycineta bicolorTree SwallowImage: Constraint of the system Creater YellowlegsImage: Constraint of the system ConcernImage: Constraint of the system ConcernTringa semipalmataWilletImage: Constraint of the system SolitaryImage: Constraint of the system ConcernImage: Constraint	Setonhaga netechia	Yellow Warbler			Second
Tachyonical blockTries Greater YellowlegsImage: Second	Tachycineta bicolor				priority
Tringa melanoleucaYellowlegsImage: Second sec		Greater			
Tringa semipalmataWilletImage: constraint of the section of th	Tringa melanoleuca	Yellowlegs			
Tringa solitariaSolitary SandpiperInterpretVireo belliiBell's VireoInterpretInterpretXanthocephalus xanthocephalusYellow-headed BlackbirdSpecial ConcernBSSC - Third priorityCRUSTACEANSGiant Fairy ShrimpInterpretInterpretBranchinecta gigasShrimpInterpretInterpretFISHSanta Ana suckerSpecial ThreatenedSpecial ConcernEndang ered - Moyle 2013Catostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerInterpretEndang ered - Moyle 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniSticklebackEndanggreedEndang ered - Moyle 2013HERPSHerpsInterpretInterpretActinemys marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogInterpret ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogARSSCARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedCandida te EndangARSSC	Tringa semipalmata	Willet			
Minga solitariaSalitoppenImage solitariaSalitoppenVireo belliiBell's VireoImage solitariaSpecialBSSC - Third priorityXanthocephalus xanthocephalusYellow-headed BlackbirdSpecial ConcernBSSC - Third priorityCRUSTACEANSGiant Fairy ShrimpImage solitariaSpecial Special ConcernSpecial solitariaFISHSanta Ana suckerThreatenedSpecial Special Special Special Special Special 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniSanta Ana suckerEndang ered - Moyle 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013HERPSUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogImage solitaria ThreatenedARSSCRean draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedConcern ConcernARSSC	Tringa colitoria	Solitary			
Vireo belliBell's VireoImage: Second content of the se					
Xanthocephalus xanthocephalusYellow-headed BlackbirdSpecial ConcernThird priorityCRUSTACEANSGiant Fairy ShrimpInternetInternetBranchinecta gigasGiant Fairy ShrimpInternetInternetFISHSanta Ana suckerArread Endang ered - MoyleInternetCatostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerSpecial ThreatenedEndang ered - MoyleGasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndang ered - Moyle 2013Endang ered - MoyleActinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial Endang eredARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadInternet EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadSpecial EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogInternet EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TeefrogSpecial EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TeefrogARSSCARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSC		Beil's Vireo			BSSC -
xanthocephalusBlackbirdConcernpriorityCRUSTACEANSGiant Fairy ShrimpIane Pairy ShrimpIane Pairy ShrimpIane Pairy ShrimpIane Pairy PairsFISH	Xanthocephalus	Yellow-headed		Special	Third
CRUSTACEANSBranchinecta gigasGiant Fairy ShrimpInclusionInclusionFISHEndang ered - Moyle 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013Catostomus santaanaaSanta Ana suckerInreatenedSpecial ConcernEndang ered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial EndangeredSpecial Endang ered - Moyle 2013Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial EndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSC	xanthocephalus	Blackbird		Concern	priority
Branchinecta gigasGiant Fairy ShrimpIntegrationIntegrationFISHFishEndang ered - Moyle 2013Catostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerFireatenedSpecial Endang ered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013HERPSUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadEndangeredIntegration ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSC	CRUSTACEANS		I	1	
DrinnipInterpretationFISHCatostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerThreatenedSpecial ConcernEndang ered - Moyle 2013Catostomus santaanaeUnarmored threespine sticklebackThreatenedSpecial Endang ered - Endang ered - 2013Endang ered - Moyle 2013HERPSUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogSpecial EndangeredARSSCReana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedCandida te EndangARSSC	Branchinecta didas	Giant Fairy Shrimp			
Catostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerThreatenedSpecial ConcernEndang ered - 	FISH	Ommp	<u> </u>		
Catostomus santaanaeSanta Ana suckerThreatenedSpecial Concernered - Moyle 2013Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang ered - Moyle 2013HERPSActinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadInternet EndangeredARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedCandida te EndangARSSC				1	Endang
Santa Ana suckerSpecial ThreatenedMoyle 2013Catostomus santaanaesuckerThreatenedConcern2013Unarmored dasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndang ered - 2013Endang ered - 2013HERPSActinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadIndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogConcernARSSCARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia Red- legged FrogIntreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedCandida te EndangARSSC					ered -
Outostonnus suntaundeJunkerInneuteniedOoneenZonoGasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndangeredEndang eredEndang eredHERPSActinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogInneuteniedSpecial ConcernARSSCReana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangSpecial ConcernARSSC	Catostomus santaanae	Santa Ana	Threatened	Special	Moyle 2013
Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoniUnarmored threespine sticklebackEndang 	Outostornus suntaanae	300101	Threatened	Concern	Endang
Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsonithreespine sticklebackEndang eredMoyle 2013HERPSActinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadImage: ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogImage: ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangSpecial ConcernARSSC		Unarmored			ered -
Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadImage and the second se	Gasterosteus	threespine	Endangered	Endang	Moyle
Actinemys marmorata marmorataWestern Pond TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadIIIAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredIIAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadIIIPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogIIIRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangII	HERPS	Stickleback	Endangered		2010
Actinentys mannorataWestern Politi TurtleSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadImage: ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusRed-spotted ToadImage: ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusCalifornia TreefrogImage: ConcernARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia Red- legged FrogImage: ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogImage: ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangImage: Concern	Actinomus marmarata	Western Dand		Special	
Anaxyrus boreas boreasBoreal ToadImage: Special EndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadImage: Special ConcernARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogImage: Special Legged FrogARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangCandida te EndangCandida te Endang	marmorata	Turtle		Concern	ARSSC
Nitroxyrus boredsBoreal ToadBoreal ToadArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadIIIPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogIIARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangI	Anaxyrus horeas				
Anaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredSpecial ConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadIIIIPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogIIARSSCARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedSouthern Hountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangI	boreas	Boreal Toad			
Anaxyrus californicusArroyo ToadEndangeredConcernARSSCAnaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted Toad				Special	
Anaxyrus punctatusRed-spotted ToadImage: California TreefrogImage: California California Red-spottedImage: California California Red- Iegged FrogImage: California ThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- Iegged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangCandida te Endang	Anaxyrus californicus	Arroyo Toad	Endangered	Concern	ARSSC
Anaxyrus punctatusToadImage: California TreefrogImage: California TreefrogImage: California ARSSCPseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia Red- legged FrogSpecial ThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangCandida te Endang		Red-spotted			
Pseudacris cadaverinaCalifornia TreefrogImage: California Red- Legged FrogSpecialARSSCRana draytoniiCalifornia Red- Legged FrogThreatenedSpecial ConcernARSSCSouthern Mountain Yellow-leggedCandida te EndangCandida te EndangCandida te Endang	Anaxyrus punctatus	Toad			
Pseudacris cadaverina Treefrog ARSSC California Red- legged Frog Special Special Southern Concern ARSSC Mountain te Legged Yellow-legged Endang Endang		California			
California Red- legged FrogSpecialRana draytoniilegged FrogThreatenedConcernARSSCSouthern MountainCandida te 	Pseudacris cadaverina	Treefrog			ARSSC
Rana draytonii legged Frog Threatened Concern ARSSC Southern Candida Mountain te Yellow-legged Endang Endang		California Red-	_	Special	
SouthernCandidaMountainteYellow-leggedEndang	Rana draytonii	legged Frog	Ihreatened	Concern	ARSSC
Yellow-legged Endang		Mountain		te	
		Yellow-legged		Endang	
Kana muscosa Frog Endangered ered ARSSC	Kana muscosa	Frog	Endangered	ered	ARSSC
Great Basin	On an interneting	Great Basin			
Spea intermontana Spaderoot ARSSC	Spea intermontana	Spaderoot			ARSSU
Sierra Thampophis couchii Carterspake	Thampophis couchii	Sierra			
			1	1	
hammondii hammondii Gartersnake Special Concern ARSSC	The survey surlay	True string d		Omenial	

Thamnophis sirtalis sirtalis	Common Gartersnake		
Anaxyrus boreas halophilus	California Toad		ARSSC
Pseudacris regilla	Northern Pacific Chorus Frog		
Rana aurora	Northern Red-	Special	ARSSC
INSECTS & OTHER INV	ERTS	Concern	AROOC
Capnia valhalla	Viking Snowfly		
Acentrella spp.	Acentrella spp.		
Agabus disintegratus			Not on any status lists
Ameletus spp.	Ameletus spp.		
Anax junius	Common Green Darner		
Argia vivida	Vivid Dancer		
Atherix pachypus			Not on any status lists
Attenella soquele	A Mayfly		
Baetis flavistriga	A Mayfly		
Baetis tricaudatus	A Mayfly		
Berosus infuscatus			Not on any status lists
Brachycentrus			
Brachycentrus echo	A Caddisfly		
Chironomidae fam.	Chironomidae fam.		
Chloroperlidae fam.	Chloroperlidae fam.		
Cladotanytarsus spp.	Cladotanytarsus spp.		
Cricotopus nostocicola			Not on any status lists
	Dicosmoecus		
Dicosmoecus spp.	spp. Hagen's Small		
Diphetor hageni	Minnow Mayfly		
Drunella coloradensis	A Mayfly		

Drunella spp.	Drunella spp.		
Enallagma	Tule Bluet		
Epeorus spp.	Eukiefferiella		
Eukiefferiella spp.	spp.		
Glossosoma spp.	Glossosoma spp.		
Heterocerus mexicanus			Not on any status lists
Heteroplectron			
californicum	A Caddisfly Hydronsyche		
Hydropsyche spp.	spp.		
Hydroptila spp.	Hydroptila spp.		
Ischnura denticollis	Black-fronted Forktail		
Libellula saturata	Flame Skimmer		
	Limnephilidae		
Limnephilidae fam.	tam.		
Limnephilus spp.	Limnephilus spp.		
Micrasema spp.	Micrasema spp.		
Narpus spp.	Narpus spp.		
Neophylax spp.	Neophylax spp.		
Optioservus spp.	Optioservus spp.		
Pachydiplax	Blue Dasher		
	Paracladopelma		
Paracladopelma spp.	spp.		
Paraleptophlebia spp.	spp.		
Perlidae fam.	Perlidae fam.		
Perlinodes aurea	Longgill Springfly		
Polypedilum spp.	Polypedilum spp.		
Rhantus gutticollis			Not on any status lists
Rhionaeschna multicolor	Blue-eyed Darner		
Rhyacophila arnaudi	A Caddisfly		
Rhyacophila spp.	Rhyacophila spp.		
Serratella spp.	Serratella spp.		
Simulium spp.	Simulium spp.		

Skwala spp.	Skwala spp.			
Sperchon spp.	Sperchon spp.			
Sympetrum corruptum	Variegated Meadowhawk			
Zaitzevia narvula				Not on any status lists
Zaitzevia parvala Zaitzevia snn	Zaitzevia spp			1010
Bicancora rutriformia	Second Sallfly			
	Scooped Sallity		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
				Not on
Castor canadensis	American Beaver			any status lists
Lontra canadensis canadensis	North American River Otter			Not on any status lists
Neovison vison	American Mink			Not on any status lists
Ondatra zibethicus	Common Muskrat			Not on any status lists
Sorex palustris	American Water Shrew			Not on any status lists
MOLLUSKS		_		
Anodonta californiensis	California Floater		Special	
Planorbella traski	Keeled Rams- horn			х
Planorbella trivolvis	Marsh Rams- horn			CS
PLANIS				
Puccinellia simplex	Little Alkali Grass			
Alnus rhombifolia	White Alder			
Alopecurus aequalis aequalis	Short-awn Foxtail			
Anemopsis californica	Yerba Mansa			
Arundo donax	NA			

			Not on anv
Baccharis glutinosa	NA		status lists
			Not on any status
Baccharis salicina			lists
Beckmannia syzigachne	American Sloughgrass		
Bolboschoenus maritimus paludosus	NA		Not on any status lists
Carex alma Carex schottii	Sturdy Sedge Schott's Sedge		
Castilleja miniata miniata	Greater Red Indian- paintbrush		
Chloropyron maritimum canescens			Not on any status lists
Datisca glomerata	Durango Root		
Eleocharis macrostachya	Creeping Spikerush		
Eleocharis parishii	Parish's Spikerush		
Euthamia occidentalis	Western Fragrant Goldenrod		
Helenium puberulum	Rosilla		
Hosackia oblongifolia	NA		1.B.3
Juncus dubius	Mariposa Rush		
Juncus duranii	Duran's Rush	Special	CRPR - 4.3
Juncus macrophyllus	Longleaf Rush		
Juncus mertensianus	Mertens' Rush		
Juncus nodosus	NA	Special	CRPR - 2B.3

Juncus rugulosus	Wrinkled Rush			
Juncus textilis	Basket Rush			
Juncus xiphioides	Iris-leaf Rush			
Lemna minor	Lesser Duckweed			
Mimulus cardinalis	Scarlet Monkeyflower			
Mimulus guttatus	Common Large Monkeyflower			
Mimulus parishii	Parish's Monkeyflower			
Mimulus pilosus				Not on any status lists
Muhlenbergia utilis	Apareio Grass			
Navarretia fossalis	Spreading Navarretia	Threatened	Special	CRPR - 1B.1
Perideridia pringlei	Pringle's Yampah		Special	CRPR - 4.3
Persicaria amphibia				Not on any status lists
Persicaria hydropiperoides				Not on any status lists
Phacelia distans	NA			
Plagiobothrys leptocladus	Alkali Popcorn- flower			
Platanus racemosa	California Sycamore			
Potamogeton foliosus foliosus	Leafy Pondweed			
Potamogeton pusillus pusillus	Slender Pondweed			
Ranunculus hydrocharoides	NA		Special	CRPR - 2B.1
Rumex salicifolius salicifolius	Willow Dock			

Dur nie menitine e	Ditala average		
Ruppia maritima	Ditch-grass		
Salix exigua exigua	Willow		
Salix gooddingii	Goodding's Willow		
Salix laevigata	Polished Willow		
Salix lasiolepis lasiolepis	Arroyo Willow		
Salix melanonsis	Dusky Willow		
Schoenoplectus acutus acutus	NA		
Schoenoplectus acutus occidentalis	Hardstem Bulrush		
Schoenoplectus americanus	Three-square Bulrush		
Schoenoplectus californicus	California Bulrush		
Scirpus microcarpus	Small-fruit Bulrush		
Solidago spectabilis	Nevada Goldenrod		
Stachys albens	White-stem Hedge-nettle		
Stuckenia pectinata			Not on any status lists
Symphyotrichum frondosum	Alkali Aster		
Toxicoscordion venenosum venenosum			Not on any status lists
Triglochin maritima	Common Bog Arrow-grass		
Typha domingensis	Southern Cattail		
Typha latifolia	Broadleaf Cattail		
Veronica anagallis- aquatica	NA		

Zannichellia palustris	Horned Pondweed			
------------------------	--------------------	--	--	--



July 2019



I DENTIFYING GDEs UNDER SGMA Best Practices for using the NC Dataset

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires that groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs) be identified in Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs). As a starting point, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is providing the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater Dataset (NC Dataset) online¹ to help Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs), consultants, and stakeholders identify GDEs within individual groundwater basins. To apply information from the NC Dataset to local areas, GSAs should combine it with the best available science on local hydrology, geology, and groundwater levels to verify whether polygons in the NC dataset are likely supported by groundwater in an aquifer (Figure 1)². This document highlights six best practices for using local groundwater data to confirm whether mapped features in the NC dataset are supported by groundwater.



Figure 1. Considerations for GDE identification. Source: DWR²

¹ NC Dataset Online Viewer: <u>https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/NCDatasetViewer/</u>

² California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2018. Summary of the "Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater" Dataset and Online Web Viewer. Available at: <u>https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Data-and-Tools/Files/Statewide-Reports/Natural-Communities-Dataset-Summary-Document.pdf</u>

The NC Dataset identifies vegetation and wetland features that are good indicators of a GDE. The dataset is comprised of 48 publicly available state and federal datasets that map vegetation, wetlands, springs, and seeps commonly associated with groundwater in California³. It was developed through a collaboration between DWR, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). TNC has also provided detailed guidance on identifying GDEs from the NC dataset⁴ on the Groundwater Resource Hub⁵, a website dedicated to GDEs.

BEST PRACTICE #1. Establishing a Connection to Groundwater

Groundwater basins can be comprised of one continuous aquifer (Figure 2a) or multiple aquifers stacked on top of each other (Figure 2b). In unconfined aquifers (Figure 2a), using the depth-to-groundwater and the rooting depth of the vegetation is a reasonable method to infer groundwater dependence for GDEs. If groundwater is well below the rooting (and capillary) zone of the plants and any wetland features, the ecosystem is considered disconnected and groundwater management is not likely to affect the ecosystem (Figure 2d). However, it is important to consider local conditions (e.g., soil type, groundwater flow gradients, and aquifer parameters) and to review groundwater depth data from multiple seasons and water year types (wet and dry) because intermittent periods of high groundwater levels can replenish perched clay lenses that serve as the water source for GDEs (Figure 2c). Maintaining these natural groundwater fluctuations are important to sustaining GDE health.

Basins with a stacked series of aquifers (Figure 2b) may have varying levels of pumping across aquifers in the basin, depending on the production capacity or water quality associated with each aquifer. If pumping is concentrated in deeper aquifers, SGMA still requires GSAs to sustainably manage groundwater resources in shallow aquifers, such as perched aquifers, that support springs, surface water, domestic wells, and GDEs (Figure 2). This is because vertical groundwater gradients across aquifers may result in pumping from deeper aquifers to cause adverse impacts onto beneficial users reliant on shallow aquifers or interconnected surface water. The goal of SGMA is to sustainably manage groundwater resources for current and future social, economic, and environmental benefits. While groundwater pumping may not be currently occurring in a shallower aquifer, use of this water may become more appealing and economically viable in future years as pumping restrictions are placed on the deeper production aquifers in the basin to meet the sustainable yield and criteria. Thus, identifying GDEs in the basin should done irrespective to the amount of current pumping occurring in a particular aquifer, so that future impacts on GDEs due to new production can be avoided. A good rule of thumb to follow is: if groundwater can be pumped from a well - it's an aquifer.

³ For more details on the mapping methods, refer to: Klausmeyer, K., J. Howard, T. Keeler-Wolf, K. Davis-Fadtke, R. Hull, A. Lyons. 2018. Mapping Indicators of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems in California: Methods Report. San Francisco, California. Available at: <u>https://groundwaterresourcehub.org/public/uploads/pdfs/iGDE_data_paper_20180423.pdf</u>

⁴ "Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act: Guidance for Preparing

Groundwater Sustainability Plans" is available at: <u>https://groundwaterresourcehub.org/gde-tools/gsp-guidance-document/</u> ⁵ The Groundwater Resource Hub: <u>www.GroundwaterResourceHub.org</u>



Figure 2. Confirming whether an ecosystem is connected to groundwater. Top: (a) Under the ecosystem is an unconfined aquifer with depth-to-groundwater fluctuating seasonally and interannually within 30 feet from land surface. (b) Depth-to-groundwater in the shallow aquifer is connected to overlying ecosystem. Pumping predominately occurs in the confined aquifer, but pumping is possible in the shallow aquifer. Bottom: (c) Depth-to-groundwater fluctuations are seasonally and interannually large, however, clay layers in the near surface prolong the ecosystem's connection to groundwater. (d) Groundwater is disconnected from surface water, and any water in the vadose (unsaturated) zone is due to direct recharge from precipitation and indirect recharge under the surface water feature. These areas are not connected to groundwater and typically support species that do not require access to groundwater to survive.
BEST PRACTICE #2. Characterize Seasonal and Interannual Groundwater Conditions

SGMA requires GSAs to describe current and historical groundwater conditions when identifying GDEs [23 CCR §354.16(g)]. Relying solely on the SGMA benchmark date (January 1, 2015) or any other single point in time to characterize groundwater conditions (e.g., depth-to-groundwater) is inadequate because managing groundwater conditions with data from one time point fails to capture the seasonal and interannual variability typical of California's climate. DWR's Best Management Practices document on water budgets⁶ recommends using 10 years of water supply and water budget information to describe how historical conditions have impacted the operation of the basin within sustainable yield, implying that a baseline⁷ could be determined based on data between 2005 and 2015. Using this or a similar time period, depending on data availability, is recommended for determining the depth-to-groundwater.

GDEs depend on groundwater levels being close enough to the land surface to interconnect with surface water systems or plant rooting networks. The most practical approach⁸ for a GSA to assess whether polygons in the NC dataset are connected to groundwater is to rely on groundwater elevation data. As detailed in TNC's GDE guidance document⁴, one of the key factors to consider when mapping GDEs is to contour depth-to-groundwater in the aquifer that is supporting the ecosystem (see Best Practice #5).

Groundwater levels fluctuate over time and space due to California's Mediterranean climate (dry summers and wet winters), climate change (flood and drought years), and subsurface heterogeneity in the subsurface (Figure 3). Many of California's GDEs have adapted to dealing with intermittent periods of water stress, however if these groundwater conditions are prolonged, adverse impacts to GDEs can result. While depth-to-groundwater levels within 30 feet⁴ of the land surface are generally accepted as being a proxy for confirming that polygons in the NC dataset are supported by groundwater, it is highly advised that fluctuations in the groundwater regime be characterized to understand the seasonal and interannual groundwater levels required by GDEs, and inadvertently result in adverse impacts to the GDEs. Time series data on groundwater elevations and depths are available on the SGMA Data Viewer⁹. However, if insufficient data are available to describe groundwater conditions within or near polygons from the NC dataset, include those polygons in the GSP <u>until</u> data gaps are reconciled in the monitoring network (see Best Practice #6).



Figure 3. Example seasonality and interannual variability in depth-to-groundwater over time. Selecting one point in time, such Spring 2018, as to characterize groundwater conditions in GDEs fails to capture what groundwater conditions are necessary to maintain the ecosystem status into the future so adverse impacts are avoided.

⁶ DWR. 2016. Water Budget Best Management Practice. Available at:

https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/sgm/pdfs/BMP_Water_Budget_Final_2016-12-23.pdf

⁷ Baseline is defined under the GSP regulations as "historic information used to project future conditions for hydrology, water demand, and availability of surface water and to evaluate potential sustainable management practices of a basin." [23 CCR §351(e)]

⁸ Groundwater reliance can also be confirmed via stable isotope analysis and geophysical surveys. For more information see The GDE Assessment Toolbox (Appendix IV, GDE Guidance Document for GSPs⁴).

⁹ SGMA Data Viewer: <u>https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewer</u>

BEST PRACTICE #3. Ecosystems Often Rely on Both Groundwater and Surface Water

GDEs are plants and animals that rely on groundwater for all or some of its water needs, and thus can be supported by multiple water sources. The presence of non-groundwater sources (e.g., surface water, soil moisture in the vadose zone, applied water, treated wastewater effluent, urban stormwater, irrigated return flow) within and around a GDE does not preclude the possibility that it is supported by groundwater, too. SGMA defines GDEs as "ecological communities and species that depend on groundwater emerging from aquifers or on groundwater occurring near the ground surface" [23 CCR §351(m)]. Hence, depth-to-groundwater data should be used to identify whether NC polygons are supported by groundwater and should be considered GDEs. In addition, SGMA requires that significant and undesirable adverse impacts to beneficial users of surface water be avoided. Beneficial users of surface water include environmental users such as plants or animals¹⁰, which therefore must be considered when developing minimum thresholds for depletions of interconnected surface water.

GSAs are only responsible for impacts to GDEs resulting from groundwater conditions in the basin, so if adverse impacts to GDEs result from the diversion of applied water, treated wastewater, or irrigation return flow away from the GDE, then those impacts will be evaluated by other permitting requirements (e.g., CEQA) and may not be the responsibility of the GSA. However, if adverse impacts occur to the GDE due to changing groundwater conditions resulting from pumping or groundwater management activities, then the GSA would be responsible (Figure 4).



Figure 4. Ecosystems often depend on multiple sources of water. Top: (Left) Surface water and groundwater are interconnected, meaning that the GDE is supported by both groundwater and surface water. (Right) Ecosystems that are only reliant on non-groundwater sources are not groundwater-dependent. Bottom: (Left) An ecosystem that was once dependent on an interconnected surface water, but loses access to groundwater solely due to surface water diversions may not be the GSA's responsibility. (Right) Groundwater dependent ecosystems once dependent on an interconnected surface water system, but loses that access due to groundwater pumping is the GSA's responsibility.

¹⁰ For a list of environmental beneficial users of surface water by basin, visit: <u>https://qroundwaterresourcehub.org/gde-tools/environmental-surface-water-beneficiaries/</u>

BEST PRACTICE #4. Select Representative Groundwater Wells

Identifying GDEs in a basin requires that groundwater conditions are characterized to confirm whether polygons in the NC dataset are supported by the underlying aquifer. To do this, proximate groundwater wells should be identified to characterize groundwater conditions (Figure 5). When selecting representative wells, it is particularly important to consider the subsurface heterogeneity around NC polygons, especially near surface water features where groundwater and surface water interactions occur around heterogeneous stratigraphic units or aquitards formed by fluvial deposits. The following selection criteria can help ensure groundwater levels are representative of conditions within the GDE area:

- Choose wells that are within 5 kilometers (3.1 miles) of each NC Dataset polygons because they
 are more likely to reflect the local conditions relevant to the ecosystem. If there are no wells
 within 5km of the center of a NC dataset polygon, then there is insufficient information to remove
 the polygon based on groundwater depth. Instead, it should be retained as a potential GDE
 until there are sufficient data to determine whether or not the NC Dataset polygon is supported
 by groundwater.
- Choose wells that are screened within the surficial unconfined aquifer and capable of measuring the true water table.
- Avoid relying on wells that have insufficient information on the screened well depth interval for excluding GDEs because they could be providing data on the wrong aquifer. This type of well data should not be used to remove any NC polygons.



Figure 5. Selecting representative wells to characterize groundwater conditions near GDEs.

BEST PRACTICE #5. Contouring Groundwater Elevations

The common practice to contour depth-to-groundwater over a large area by interpolating measurements at monitoring wells is unsuitable for assessing whether an ecosystem is supported by groundwater. This practice causes errors when the land surface contains features like stream and wetland depressions because it assumes the land surface is constant across the landscape and depth-to-groundwater is constant below these low-lying areas (Figure 6a). A more accurate approach is to interpolate groundwater elevations at monitoring wells to get groundwater elevation contours across the landscape. This layer can then be subtracted from land surface elevations from a Digital Elevation Model (DEM)¹¹ to estimate depth-to-groundwater contours across the landscape (Figure 6; Figure 7). This will provide a much more accurate contours of depth-to-groundwater along streams and other land surface depressions where GDEs are commonly found.



Figure 6. Contouring depth-to-groundwater around surface water features and GDEs. (a) Groundwater level interpolation using depth-to-groundwater data from monitoring wells. (b) Groundwater level interpolation using groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells and DEM data.



Figure 7. Depth-to-groundwater contours in Northern California. (Left) Contours were interpolated using depth-to-groundwater measurements determined at each well. (Right) Contours were determined by interpolating groundwater elevation measurements at each well and superimposing ground surface elevation from DEM spatial data to generate depth-to-groundwater contours. The image on the right shows a more accurate depth-to-groundwater estimate because it takes the local topography and elevation changes into account.

¹¹ USGS Digital Elevation Model data products are described at: <u>https://www.usgs.gov/core-science-</u>

systems/ngp/3dep/about-3dep-products-services and can be downloaded at: https://iewer.nationalmap.gov/basic/

BEST PRACTICE #6. Best Available Science

Adaptive management is embedded within SGMA and provides a process to work toward sustainability over time by beginning with the best available information to make initial decisions, monitoring the results of those decisions, and using the data collected through monitoring programs to revise decisions in the future. In many situations, the hydrologic connection of NC dataset polygons will not initially be clearly understood if site-specific groundwater monitoring data are not available. If sufficient data are not available in time for the 2020/2022 plan, The Nature Conservancy strongly advises that questionable polygons from the NC dataset be included in the GSP <u>until</u> data gaps are reconciled in the monitoring network. Erring on the side of caution will help minimize inadvertent impacts to GDEs as a result of groundwater use and management actions during SGMA implementation.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Groundwater basin is an aquifer or stacked series of aquifers with reasonably welldefined boundaries in a lateral direction, based on features that significantly impede groundwater flow, and a definable bottom. 23 CCR §341(g)(1)

Groundwater dependent ecosystem (GDE) are ecological communities or species that depend on <u>groundwater emerging from aquifers</u> or on groundwater occurring <u>near</u> <u>the ground surface</u>. 23 CCR §351(m)

Interconnected surface water (ISW) surface water that is hydraulically connected at any point by a continuous saturated zone to the underlying aquifer and the overlying surface water is not completely depleted. 23 CCR §351(o)

Principal aquifers are aquifers or aquifer systems that store, transmit, and yield significant or economic quantities of groundwater to <u>wells</u>, <u>springs</u>, <u>or surface water</u> <u>systems</u>. 23 CCR §351(aa)

ABOUT US

The Nature Conservancy is a science-based nonprofit organization whose mission is to conserve the lands and waters on which all life depends. To support successful SGMA implementation that meets the future needs of people, the economy, and the environment, TNC has developed tools and resources (www.groundwaterresourcehub.org) intended to reduce costs, shorten timelines, and increase benefits for both people and nature.

Attachment E

Maps of representative monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users



Figure 1. Groundwater elevation representative monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users: a) Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs), b) Drinking Water users, c) Disadvantaged Communities (DACs), and d) Tribes.



Figure 2. Groundwater quality representative monitoring sites in relation to key beneficial users: a) Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs), b) Drinking Water users, c) Disadvantaged Communities (DACs), and d) Tribes.

Appendix 2-F

Hydrograph Well Locations, Hydrographs, and Groundwater Level Trend Statistics Appendix 2-F Hydrograph Well Locations, Hydrographs, and Groundwater Level Trend Statistics

Antelope Subbasin



Table 1 - Trends of Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation Change from 1990 to 2018

					Parametric Method (OLSR)			Non-parametric Methods	
Abbreviated Well Name	Well Name	Well Depth (ft)	Screen Interval (ft bgs)	Number of Seasonal High (Spring) Measurements from 1990 to 2018	Regression of Groundwater Elevation Change (ft/year)	R²	p value	Mann-Kendall Test Results	Theil-Sen Slope of Groundwater Elevation Change (ft/year)
17E1	26N02W17E001M	145	55 - 145	28	-0.02	0.00	0.73	Insufficient evidence to identify a significant trend	-0.04
23D1	27N03W23D001M	250	30 - 155	27	-0.27	0.25	0.01	Significant decreasing trend	-0.29
31C1	27N02W31C001M	540	40 - 289	27	-0.21	0.29	0.00	Significant decreasing trend	-0.21

Hydrographs used for water level trend analysis

Water Level Hydrograph: Shows water level change over time















Other hydrographs used for groundwater level evaluation































Abbreviated Well Name: 20C1Subbasin: AntelopeWell Depth (ft): 50Well Type: MonitoringWell Name: 27N03W20C001MAquifer: UpperScreen Depth (ft bgs): N/A





























Appendix 2-G

Water Quality Hydrographs

Appendix 2-G

Groundwater Quality (Nitrate)

Hydrographs of Select Wells

Antelope Subbasin






























Appendix 2-H

Freshwater Flora and Fauna

Freshwater Species	Located in the	Antelope Subbasin
---------------------------	----------------	-------------------

Scientific Name	Common Name	Legal Protected Status				
		Federal	State	Other		
	BIRDS					
		Bird of		BSSC - First		
Agelaius tricolor	Tricolored Blackbird	Conservation	Special Concern	priority		
Plegadis chihi	White-faced Ibis	Concern	Watch list			
Vireo bellii pusillus	Least Bell's Vireo	Endangered	Traton not			
Actitis macularius	Spotted Sandpiper					
Aechmophorus clarkii	Clark's Grebe					
Aechmophorus occidentalis	Western Grebe					
Aix sponsa	Wood Duck					
Anas acuta	Northern Pintail					
Anas americana	American Wigeon					
Anas clypeata	Northern Shoveler					
Anas crecca	Green-winged Teal					
Anas cyanoptera	Cinnamon Teal					
Anas discors	Blue-winged Teal					
Anas platyrhynchos	Mallard					
Anas strepera	Gadwall					
Anser albifrons	Greater White- fronted					
	Goose					
Ardea alba	Great Egret					
Ardea herodias	Great Blue Heron					
Aythya affinis	Lesser Scaup					
Aythya americana	Redhead		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority		
Aythya collaris	Ring-necked Duck					
Aythya marila	Greater Scaup					
Aythya valisineria	Canvasback		Special			
Botaurus lentiginosus	American Bittern					
Bucephala albeola	Bufflehead					
Bucephala clangula	Common Goldeneye					
Butorides virescens	Green Heron					
Calidris alpina	Dunlin					
Calidris mauri	Western Sandpiper					
Calidris minutilla	Least Sandpiper					
Chen caerulescens	Snow Goose					
Chen rossii	Ross's Goose					
Chlidonias niger	Black Tern		Special Concern	BSSC - Second priority		
Chroicocephalus philadelphia	Bonaparte's Gull					
Cinclus mexicanus	American Dipper					
Cistothorus palustris palustris	Marsh Wren					
Cygnus buccinator	Trumpeter Swan					
Cygnus columbianus	Tundra Swan					

Cypseloides niger	Black Swift	Bird of Conservation Concern	Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Dendrocygna bicolor	Fulvous Whistling-Duck		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Egretta thula	Snowy Egret			
Empidonax traillii	Willow Flycatcher	Bird of ConservationCo ncern	Endangered	
Fulica americana	American Coot			
Gallinago delicata	Wilson's Snipe			
Gallinula chloropus	Common Moorhen			
Grus canadensis	Sandhill Crane			
Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald Eagle	Bird of Conservation Concern	Endangered	
Himantopus mexicanus	Black-necked Stilt			
Icteria virens	Yellow-breasted Chat		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Limnodromus scolopaceus	Long-billed Dowitcher			
Lophodytes cucullatus	Hooded Merganser			
Megaceryle alcyon	Belted Kingfisher			
Mergus merganser	Common Merganser			
Mergus serrator	Red-breasted Merganser			
Numenius americanus	Long-billed Curlew			
Numenius phaeopus	Whimbrel			
Nycticorax nycticorax	Black-crowned Night-Heron			
Oreothlypis luciae	Lucy's Warbler		Special Concern	BSSC - Third priority
Oxyura jamaicensis	Ruddy Duck			
Pelecanus erythrorhynchos	American White Pelican		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Phalacrocorax auritus	Double-crested Cormorant			
Phalaropus tricolor	Wilson's Phalarope			
Piranga rubra	Summer Tanager		Special Concern	BSSC - First priority
Pluvialis squatarola	Black-bellied Plover			
Podiceps nigricollis	Eared Grebe			
Podilymbus podiceps	Pied-billed Grebe			
Porzana carolina	Sora			
Rallus limicola	Virginia Rail			
Recurvirostra americana	American Avocet			
Riparia riparia	Bank Swallow		Threatened	
Setophaga petechia	Yellow Warbler			BSSC - Second priority
Tachycineta bicolor	Tree Swallow			
Tringa melanoleuca	Greater Yellowlegs			
Tringa semipalmata	Willet			

Tringa solitaria	Solitary Sandpiper			
Vireo bellii	Bell's Vireo			
Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus	Yellow-headed Blackbird		Special Concern	BSSC -Third priority
	CRUSTACEA	NS		
Branchinecta gigas	Giant Fairy Shrimp			
	FISH			
Catostomus santaanae	Santa Ana sucker	Threatened	Special Concern	Endang ered – Moyle 2013
Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni	Unarmored threespine stickleback	Endangered	Endangered	Endang ered – Moyle 2013
	HERPS			
Actinemys marmorata marmorata	Western Pond Turtle		Special Concern	ARSSC
Anaxyrus boreas boreas	Boreal Toad			
Anaxyrus californicus	Arroyo Toad	Endangered	Special Concern	ARSSC
Anaxyrus punctatus	Red-spotted Toad			
Pseudacris cadaverina	California Treefrog			ARSSC
Rana draytonii	California Red- legged Frog	Threatened	Special Concern	ARSSC
Rana muscosa	Southern Mountain Yellow- legged Frog	Endangered	Candida te Endangered	ARSSC
Spea intermontana	Great Basin Spadefoot			ARSSC
Thamnophis couchii	Sierra Gartersnake			
Thamnophis hammondii hammondii	Two-striped Gartersnake		Special Concern	ARSSC
Thamnophis sirtalis sirtalis	Common Gartersnake			
Anaxyrus boreas halophilus	California Toad			ARSSC
Pseudacris regilla	Northern Pacific Chorus Frog			
Rana aurora	Northern Red- legged Frog		Special Concern	ARSSC
	INSECTS & OTHER	INVERTS		
Capnia valhalla	Viking Snowfly			
Acentrella spp.	Acentrella spp.			
Agabus disintegratus				Not on any status lists
Ameletus spp.	Ameletus spp.			
Anax junius	Common Green Darner			
Argia vivida	Vivid Dancer			
Atherix pachypus				Not on any status lists
Attenella soquele	A Mayfly			
Baetis flavistriga	A Mayfly			
Baetis tricaudatus	A Mayfly			
Berosus infuscatus				Not on any status lists

Brachycentrus americanus	A Caddisfly		
Brachycentrus echo	A Caddisfly		
Chironomidae fam.	Chironomidae fam.		
Chloroperlidae fam.	Chloroperlidae fam.		
Cladotanytarsus spp.	Cladotanytarsus spp.		
Cricotopus nostocicola			Not on any status lists
Dicosmoecus spp.	Dicosmoecus spp.		
Diphetor hageni	Hagen's Small Minnow Mayfly		
Drunella coloradensis	A Mayfly		
Drunella spp.	Drunella spp.		
Enallagma carunculatum	Tule Bluet		
Epeorus spp.	Epeorus spp.		
Eukiefferiella spp.	Eukiefferiella spp.		
Glossosoma spp.	Glossosoma spp.		
Heterocerus mexicanus			Not on any status lists
Heteroplectron californicum	A Caddisfly		
Hydropsyche spp.	Hydropsyche spp.		
Hydroptila spp.	Hydroptila spp.		
Ischnura denticollis	Black-fronted Forktail		
Libellula saturata	Flame Skimmer		
Limnephilidae fam.	Limnephilidae fam.		
Limnephilus spp.	Limnephilus spp.		
Micrasema spp.	Micrasema spp.		
Narpus spp.	Narpus spp.		
Neophylax spp.	Neophylax spp.		
Optioservus spp.	Optioservus spp.		
Pachydiplax longipennis	Blue Dasher		
Paracladopelma spp.	Paracladopelma spp.		
Paraleptophlebia spp.	Paraleptophlebia spp.		
Perlidae fam.	Perlidae fam.		
Perlinodes aurea	Longgill Springfly		
Polypedilum spp.	Polypedilum spp.		
Rhantus gutticollis			Not on any status lists
Rhionaeschna multicolor	Blue-eyed Darner		
Rhyacophila arnaudi	A Caddisfly		
Rhyacophila spp.	Rhyacophila spp.		
Serratella spp.	Serratella spp.		
Simulium spp.	Simulium spp.		
Skwala spp.	Skwala spp.		
Sperchon spp.	Sperchon spp.		
Sympetrum corruptum	Variegated Meadowhawk		

Zaitzevia parvula				Not on any			
Zaitzevia son	Zaitzevia snn			Status IISts			
Bisancora rutriformis	Scooped Sallfly						
Castor canadensis	American Beaver			status lists			
Lontra canadensis canadensis	North American River Otter			Not on any			
				status lists			
Neovison vison	American Mink			Not on any status lists			
Ondatra zibethicus	Common Muskrat			Not on any status lists			
Sorex palustris	American Water Shrew			Not on any status lists			
	MOLLUSKS	6					
Anodonta californiensis	California Floater		Special				
Planorbella traski	Keeled Rams- horn		•	Х			
Planorbella trivolvis	Marsh Rams- horn			CS			
	PLANTS						
Puccinellia simplex	Little Alkali Grass						
Alnus rhombifolia	White Alder						
Alopecurus aequalis aequalis	Short-awn Foxtail						
Anemopsis californica	Yerba Mansa						
Arundo donax	NA						
Baccharis glutinosa	NA			Not on any status lists			
Baccharis salicina				Not on any status lists			
Beckmannia syzigachne	American Sloughgrass						
Bolboschoenus maritimus	NIA			Not on any			
paludosus	NA			status lists			
Carex alma	Sturdy Sedge						
Carex schottii	Schott's Sedge						
Castilleja miniata miniata	Greater Red Indian- paintbrush						
Chloropyron maritimum canescens				Not on any status lists			
Datisca glomerata	Durango Root						
Eleocharis macrostachya	Creeping Spikerush						
Eleocharis parishii	Parish's Spikerush						
Evith ansis as a side stalis	Western Fragrant						
	Goldenrod						
Helenium puberulum	Rosilla						
Hosackia oblongifolia	NA			1.B.3			
Juncus dubius	Mariposa Rush						
Juncus duranii	Duran's Rush		Special	CRPR - 4.3			
Juncus macrophyllus	Longleaf Rush						
Juncus mertensianus	Mertens' Rush						

Juncus nodosus	NA		Special	CRPR - 2B.3
Juncus rugulosus	Wrinkled Rush			
Juncus textilis	Basket Rush			
Juncus xiphioides	Iris-leaf Rush			
Lemna minor	Lesser Duckweed			
Mimulus cardinalis	Scarlet Monkeyflower			
Mimulus guttatus	Common Large Monkeyflower			
Mimulus parishii	Parish's Monkeyflower			
Mimulus pilosus				Not on any status lists
Muhlenbergia utilis	Aparejo Grass			
Navarretia fossalis	Spreading Navarretia	Threatened	Special	CRPR - 1B.1
Perideridia pringlei	Pringle's Yampah		Special	CRPR - 4.3
Persicaria amphibia				Not on any status lists
Persicaria hydropiperoides				Not on any status lists
Phacelia distans	NA			
Plagiobothrys leptocladus	Alkali Popcorn- flower			
Platanus racemosa	California Sycamore			
Potamogeton foliosus foliosus	Leafy Pondweed			
Potamogeton pusillus pusillus	Slender Pondweed			
Ranunculus hydrocharoides	NA		Special	CRPR - 2B.1
Rumex salicifolius salicifolius	Willow Dock			
Ruppia maritima	Ditch-grass			
Salix exigua exigua	Narrowleaf Willow			
Salix gooddingii	Goodding's Willow			
Salix laevigata	Polished Willow			
Salix lasiolepis lasiolepis	Arroyo Willow			
Salix melanopsis	Dusky Willow			
Schoenoplectus acutus acutus	NA			
Schoenoplectus acutus occidentalis	Hardstem Bulrush			
Schoenoplectus americanus	Three-square Bulrush			
Schoenoplectus californicus	California Bulrush			
Scirpus microcarpus	Small-fruit Bulrush			
Solidago spectabilis	Nevada Goldenrod			
Stachys albens	White-stem Hedge-nettle			
Stuckenia pectinata				Not on any status lists
Symphyotrichum frondosum	Alkali Aster			
Toxicoscordion venenosum venenosum				Not on any status lists
Triglochin maritima	Common Bog Arrow-grass			
Typha domingensis	Southern Cattail			
Typha latifolia	Broadleaf Cattail			
Veronica anagallis- aquatica	NA			

Zappichellia palustris Horned Pondweed				
Zarinichenia pausuis Tiomed Fondweed	Zannichellia palustris	Horned Pondweed		

Appendix 2-I

Surface Water Depletion and GDE Methodology and Analysis

Appendix 2-I Part 1

Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Analysis and Prioritization Methodology

Antelope Subbasin

MEMORANDUM

- DATE: September 7, 2021
- **TO**: Eddy Teasdale
- FROM: Andrew Francis
- **RE**: Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Analysis and Prioritization Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline the process used to identify and prioritize groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDE) in four Tehama County (TC) subbasins: the Antelope, Bowman, and Red Bluff Subbasins. The results of the identification and prioritization process is presented in the groundwater sustainability plans (GSP)s developed for the individual Subbasins. GDEs are defined under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) as "ecological communities that depend on groundwater emerging from an aquifer or on groundwater occurring near the ground surface" (23 CCR § 351 (m)). GSP regulations state that GDE's are to be identified and that all beneficial users of groundwater are to be considered in the development of a GSP (23 CCR § 355.4 (b)(4)). The approach used to both identify and prioritize GDE's was based on the guidance document Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act – Guidance for Preparing Groundwater Sustainability Plans (Rohde et al., 2018), which provides information on the data types and methods that can be used to identify and prioritize GDEs. The guidance document was produced by The Nature Conservancy (TNC), an environmental stakeholder who has been actively involved in GSP development and review throughout the State. The identification process includes using mapped vegetation, mapped naturally occurring surface water features, and shallow groundwater level data to assess if there is a connection to groundwater in areas where vegetation or surface water is present. In addition to the information provided by TNC, feedback from local stakeholders was a key component in this process to incorporate GDE's in the four Subbasin GSPs in TC.

The following outlines the data sources and processes used to identify and prioritize GDE's:

- 1. GDE Identification TNC Guidance
 - a. GDE indicators (GDEi) Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG)
 - i. Vegetation
 - ii. Wetlands
 - b. Review of Aerial Imagery

- i. LandIQ, 2018
- c. Establish a connection to groundwater
 - i. Depth to Water Contours
- d. Final GDE Designations
- 2. GDE Prioritization
 - a. GDE Pulse Analysis Vegetation Prioritization
 - b. Wetlands Prioritization

1. GDE Identification – TNC Guidance

The TNC guidance document lays out a two-step process for identifying GDEs. The first is to review aerial imagery to identify land use changes that may have occurred in areas that were mapped as vegetation or surface water, and the second is to assess if there is a connection to groundwater. The TNC guidance document also recommends additional steps for specific GDE types (e.g., river, wetlands, terrestrial vegetation, springs/seeps) under conditions where there does not appear to be a connection to groundwater based on the 30-foot threshold. These additional steps require field evaluation which have not been conducted and are not discussed in this memorandum.

a. GDE Indicators (GDEi) – Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater

The mapped vegetation and surface water features used to identify GDEs was the Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG) dataset. The NCCAG is a compilation of 48 publicly available state and federal agency datasets that map vegetation, wetlands, springs, and seeps in California. The NCCAG was developed by a working group comprised of the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), and TNC (Klausmeyer et al, 2018). Historic mapping of vegetation and surface water was screened to exclude areas that are less likely to be associated with groundwater. This resulted in two individual datasets: *Vegetation* and *Wetlands*. Both of these are geospatial datasets that can be used in a mapping software such as ArcGIS. The vegetation includes all terrestrial vegetation and identifies the dominate species for each area. The wetlands data is a collection of surface water features that are potentially reliant on groundwater including streams, springs, seeps, and wetlands. The mapped areas vegetation and surface water in NCCAG data set are considered indicators of GDEs (GDEi).

i. <u>Vegetation</u>

The mapped NCCAG vegetation is presented in Figure 1 is primarily located along the Sacramento River and its tributaries. There is minimal coverage in the western parts of the Red Bluff and Bowman subbasins and lighter coverage in the eastern portions of Antelope and Los Molinos. There are approximately 12,000 acres of Vegetation GDEi across the four TC Subbasins. Also symbolized in this figure is the year the individual GDEi were mapped. The dates range from 1994 to 2014.

ii. <u>Wetlands</u>

The mapped wetlands GDEi are presented in Figure 2. The wetlands data set includes all surface water ecosystems that are potentially supported by groundwater including wetlands, rivers, lakes, springs, and seeps. There are approximately 7,600 acres of Wetland GDEI across the four TC Subbasins. Also symbolized in this figure is the year the individual GDEi were mapped. The dates range from 1972 to 2010.

b. Review of Aerial Imagery

The first step for identifying GDEs was to determine where land use changes had occurred between the time the GDEi were originally mapped and current conditions. The timeframe for GDEi is between 1972 and 2014 and the current land use conditions are represented by a 2018 land use dataset produced by Land IQ. GDEi were reviewed by comparing the vegetation and wetlands NCCAG datasets to the 2018 Land IQ dataset. If there were GDEi that overlayed or intersected with areas in the Land IQ dataset that were identified as developed, the GDEi were removed as potential GDEs. GDEi are generally accurate based on the Land IQ data. TNC vegetation and wetlands GDEi consistently aligned with the areas that are mapped as native vegetation and surface water in the 2018 Land IQ imagery. The areas of developed and undeveloped land are presented in Figure 3.

c. Evaluate Existence of a Connection to Groundwater

i. Depth to Water Contours

Groundwater dependence is required for a GDE and depth to water measurements were used to indicate the groundwater connection. Rhode et al, 2018 provides a work sheet outlining steps to assess if there a connection to groundwater. The first and primary step of this worksheet was to identify areas where depth to groundwater is less than 30 feet bgs. Well construction and groundwater level data were obtained from multiple public agency online databases including DWR, United States Geological Survey (USGS), the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB).

To identify areas where depth to groundwater exceeded 30 feet, shallow groundwater level data from wells constructed to depths of up to 100 feet bgs were used to create depth to

water contours. Contours for Spring 2015 are presented in Figure 4. 2015 was selected as this is the baseline year of SGMA. There are a limited number of shallow wells with ground water level data in each of the individual subbasins. Where data gaps exist, the depth to water and groundwater connection may not be possible to determine. To generalize, water levels are shallow (less than 30 feet) along the Sacramento River and

water levels away from the Sacramento River appear to be greater than 30 feet, indicating a lack of a connection to groundwater

d. Final GDE Designation

Final GDE designation included all of those GDEi that are located in areas that have not been developed and where the depth to groundwater is not greater than 30 feet bgs.

2. GDE Prioritization

Following the identification of GDE's that currently exist (post 2015 baseline), the GDEi were prioritized using TNC's GDE Pulse tool. The GDE Pulse tool provides information on the health of vegetation. The purpose of prioritizing GDEs was to identify areas that have potentially been impacted by declining water levels. Information from the prioritized areas will assist with determining undesirable results and minimum thresholds for the groundwater sustainability indicators.

a. GDE Pulse Analysis - Vegetation Prioritization

Given the large area of all the designated GDEs, areas were prioritized based on their observed health using remote sensing data. TNC developed the GDE Pulse tool (<u>https://gde.codefornature.org/#/map</u>) which allowed for easy access to processed remote sensing data to evaluate vegetation health. The metric used in the GDE pulse tool to evaluate changes in vegetation health was the Normalized Derived Vegetation Index (NDVI). This NDVI is a value calculated from the measured near-infrared (NIR) radiation and visible red light. Figure 5 shows an example of healthy and unhealthy vegetation along with an example for how the NDVI value is calculated.



Figure 5. Example NDVI Calculation from Klausmeyer et al. 2019

The NDVI values calculated were based on images collected between July 9 and September 7 for each year. This time frame was selected based on the findings from Huntington et al., 2016 in that this is the time of year that vegetation is most likely relying on groundwater.

An annual NDVI value based on summer conditions was assigned to each individual GDE. A linear regression was performed to determine the trend of NDVI values between 1990 and 2018. This timeframe was selected as it is the baseline period for historic water conditions in the four TC Subbasins. The results from that analysis are presented in Figure 6.

NDVI trends were divided into three categories based on the magnitude of change from 1990 to 2018: *No Decline, Minimal Decline – Low Priority, Significant Decline – High Priority.* The magnitude of change is not a representation of actual vegetation health, but how the health of the vegetation has changed over the baseline period. High priority sites should be evaluated further to better understand the relationship between groundwater conditions and GDE health. High priority areas will also serve as the representative monitoring sites for all GDEs across the four Subbasins.

b. Wetlands Prioritization

The GDE pulse tool did not include any metrics on the health of areas in the Wetlands dataset. Wetland prioritization was determined by their proximity to Vegetation GDEs with declining NDVI values. Wetlands GDEs were assigned either high or low prioritization if in contract with or overlaying a Vegetation GDE with a high or low prioritization.

References

Huntington, Justin, Kenneth McGwire, Charles Morton, Keirith Snyder, Sarah Peterson, Tyler Erickson, Richard Niswonger, Rosemary Carroll, Guy Smith, and Richard Allen. 2016. "Assessing the Role of Climate and Resource Management on Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem Changes in Arid Environments with the Landsat Archive." *Remote Sensing of Environment.* https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.rse.2016.07.004.

Klausmeyer, K., Howard J., Keeler-Wolf T., Davis-Fadtke K., Hull R., and Lyons A. (2018). Mapping Indicators of Groundwater dependent ecosystems in California

Rohde, M. M., S. Matsumoto, J. Howard, S. Liu, L. Riege, and E. J. Remson. 2018. Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act: Guidance for Preparing Groundwater Sustainability Plans. The Nature Conservancy, San Francisco, California. Appendix 2-I Part 2

Timeseries Graphs of Depth to Water at Shallow Wells and NDVI and NDMI of Adjacent Vegetation









































































































































