

Solano Subbasin

June 29 2022 Virtual Town Hall Summary

Held virtually via zoom from 5:30 pm - 7:00 pm Pacific Time

Virtual Town Hall Objectives

1. Describe the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) requirements
2. Describe costs for GSP implementation in the Solano Subbasin
3. Outline the approach to charges and rationale for the Solano GSA
4. Discuss and answer questions about proposed charges
5. Describe opportunities to get involved and grant opportunities being pursued

Virtual Town Hall Agenda

View the Town Hall agenda [here](#) and the video recording [here](#).

Summary of Participation: Number of Participants

Number of registrations: 145

Total participants: 99

Participants from the general public: 90

Solano Subbasin Project Team and translation teams: 9

Outreach Summary

The Virtual Town Hall (VTH) was announced in a number of ways to raise awareness of the event and encourage participation by community members. Three e-blast went out to a listserv of 550 subscribers and reached 645 viewers. The Solano and Dixon Resource Conservation Districts assisted with outreach through social media and e-blasts to members of the irrigated lands regulatory program. Event flyers and an outreach message were provided to the GSA Collaborative agencies for distribution to their networks. Online advertisements were placed in The Reporter, The Rio Vista Beacon, and the Dixon Independent Voice.

Participant Poll Responses

Virtual Town Hall participants were asked to respond to three poll questions via Zoom. Polls were offered in both English and Spanish. The poll questions asked how participants heard about the Town Hall, what kind of water user they are, what organization they represented (if any), and whether they had seen, read, or commented on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Presentation Highlights

Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Overview

Chris Lee, Solano County Water Agency and the Solano Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Solano GSA), welcomed participants on behalf of the Solano GSA and the other GSAs who worked to develop the Solano Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The meeting was recorded and simulcast in Spanish. Chris clarified that this is a public outreach meeting and not the formal Public Hearing for the Prop 218 charge; the Public Hearing takes place on July 14.

Jenn Fox, a facilitator with Ag Innovations and the Solano Subbasin Community Engagement Team, highlighted that a meeting goal was to listen to participant questions. She thanked everyone for joining the meeting and described the importance of community engagement. She also noted that this meeting is NOT a public hearing. Participants were invited to introduce themselves using the chat feature. Representatives from across the basin were on the call: from Vacaville, Putah Creek, Rio Vista, English Hills, and other locations. The meeting agenda included an overview of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and the GSP, and how costs and

the approach to charges were determined. Most of the meeting was dedicated to participant questions and comments.

Meeting participants responded to a poll with three questions. The first question asked how many, if any, Town Halls participants have attended - for some, this is their first Town Hall while others have attended two or more Subbasin virtual town halls. The second question asked how people heard about the VTH - with most responding that they learned of the meeting through the newsletter. The third question asked if people had seen the GSP - and about half the respondents were familiar with the document.

Throughout the meeting, links to information were shared via the chat, including [SolanoGSP.com](https://solanogsp.com), and its subpages which provide information about the GSP.

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and Solano Subbasin

Chris Lee provided a brief introduction as to why charges are necessary. To comply with SGMA, GSAs are responsible for a range of activities related to GSP implementation, including: administrative tasks, monitoring activities, outreach and coordination, annual reports, and five-year updates. To pay for these activities, Solano GSA is proposing a flat charge of \$2.79/acre to ensure that GSAs in the Subbasin maintain local control and that the Water Boards does not take over GSP implementation.

Several GSAs cover the Subbasin, with Solano GSA covering the largest area and using the largest amount of groundwater. If you are not sure which GSA you are located in, an interactive mapping tool is available at <https://solanogsp.com/solano-subbasin>. The focus at this meeting is on funding options for the Solano GSA. Other GSAs in the Subbasin already have funding mechanisms in place.

The GSAs will be implementing the GSP over the next 20 years. The five largest GSAs make up the Solano Collaborative and developed the GSP: City of Vacaville, Sacramento County, Solano Irrigation District, Solano Subbasin, and Northern Delta. More recently, six Reclamation Districts (RDs) - RD 3, RD 317, RD 349, RD 555, RD 556, and RD 2111 - have formed as independent GSAs to coordinate on the Solano Subbasin GSP.

Proposed Funding Approach for the Solano GSA

Chris explained that charges are required for administration to ensure that the Subbasin, as a whole, complies with SGMA. Solano GSA needs a clear funding process to contribute its share to GSP implementation. Each GSA covers all of its own administrative costs and its proportionate share of regional SGMA compliance costs. Similarly, each GSA determines its own funding process and looks to keep costs as low as possible. Annual cost shares were shown for the largest GSAs.

Jacques DeBra, Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), provided greater detail on the SGMA costs for Solano GSA - breaking down the administrative costs and the proportionate share of the joint GSP implementation costs. Over the next five years, the annual costs for the Solano GSA average \$570,857. More information about determining and allocating SGMA costs are contained in the Solano Subbasin Prop 218 [Charge Report](#). Across the state, Prop 218 is the most common approach for generating revenue to cover SGMA costs.

As part of a long-term funding strategy, the GSAs are also pursuing grant funds to cover the costs of projects and management actions. Several options were considered in the Charge Report, and by the Solano GSA Board, including: an initial charge established for the first two years, or using a tiered approach to charges based on the amount of groundwater used. The tiered approach is not feasible at this time due to inadequate parcel-level data on groundwater pumping. Using the proposed approach, the annual Solano GSA costs were distributed across the acreage in the Solano GSA area, resulting in a charge of \$2.79 per acre.

Without a long-term funding option, the State would intervene and establish charges. State charges would likely consist of a \$300 charge per well, plus a fee based on groundwater use. For a 40-acre irrigated parcel, the Solano GSA charge at \$2.79/acre would result in an annual cost of \$111.60. If that 40-acre irrigated parcel had

one well (\$300) and used three acre-feet (3 AF) of water per acre per year, assuming a cost of \$40/AF. An administrative fee is likely to be applied to parcels without a well. The charge is for SGMA compliance, regardless of water supply sources. SGMA excludes federal, state, and tribal lands from SGMA implementation charges.

The presenters turned to focus on the Solano GSA’s proposed funding approach. The Solano GSA Board struggled with how to fund SGMA compliance and maintain local control. The decision on the Prop 218 charge was not made lightly, It is, however, a path that allows the entire Subbasin to move forward. The Solano GSA is starting to collect parcel-level data that could allow a graduated charge in the future.

A public hearing on the proposed Prop 218 charge will take place on July 14 at 5 pm. Presenters stressed that this VTH meeting was held to share information and hear questions - it is not a public hearing. If approved at the July 14th Board meeting, charge information would be sent to the Solano County Assessor’s Office with the charge added to the tax roll in December of 2022.

Panel Question and Answer Session

Throughout the meeting, participants were invited to share their questions and comments throughout the meeting. The meeting panelists wrote answers to questions using the zoom platform, with all participants who joined the meeting via a computer able to see written answers to questions. Questions were also answered verbally during the meeting. Jenn Fox, moderated a panel discussion that provided verbal responses to questions. In the meeting recording, this panel Question and Answer session [starts here](#).

Questions and Answers Summary

The variety of questions shows that there was a diversity of interests among participants. The answers listed below were typed quickly as a part of the work to reply to as many questions as possible. The questions have not been edited nor have typos been corrected, and the answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. Questions and Answers addressed the following topic areas:

- Charge authority
- Charge calculations
- Charge options
- GSA jurisdiction/charge duration
- Previous and future grants
- SGMA and GSP implementation

Additional information is available on the SolanoGSP.com website, including the [Charge Report](#) and [Frequently Asked Questions](#).

Questions about Charge Authority

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|---|--|
| The unmanaged area and probationary reporting and fees website shows base fees are only required from “all extractors required to report (excludes fees minimus extractors)”. There is no fee for lands without groundwater well as suggested during the meeting. | There are a lot of unknowns if we do not maintain local control. We do not have all of the answers. We are trying to protect the entire subbasin. We have heard from some water users that a flat charge is not appropriate and that is why the Solano GSA wants to explore some type of graduated charge. |
| Did I miss something? Were the charges voted on? The state can’t mandate a new tax, A Water tax without a vote. When did this happen and when was this voted on and approved? | There is a public hearing scheduled for July 14 at 5 pm at the SCWA office where the Solano GSA will receive input and that evening will vote on the proposed charge. |
| As with other agencies will there be an oversight committee? | Yes, the Solano GSA reviews staff work, and the Solano GSA finances are audited when the Water Agency's finances are audited every year. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Our charge will be 15% of the gross income. It is not proportional to any services nor is it less than the state fees projected. Our crop is dry non-irrigated pasture using three-acre feet of water total per year. The charge does not meet the state constitutional requirements in this area, Is the agency going to consider crop, % of gross income, and water use? What avenues are available to correct this injustice? It is immediate, not something five years down the line.or even two years! No property should be taxed 55% of the gross income</p> | <p>The Solano GSA Board wants to look at a graduate charge to accommodate all water users. We are currently collecting data at the parcel level and once complete we will present to the Solano GSA Board for consideration.</p> |
| <p>NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record.</p> | |

The following questions about charge authority were answered live during the meeting:

- After five years does the tax go away? if maxed out, will there be no more increase without a vote of the people?
- Why are federal, state, and tribal lands excluded? They use this water, too.
- How do we find the resolution and all details regarding the resolution?

Questions about Charge Calculations

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|--|---|
| Will Solano County open space be assessed? | All areas within the Solano GSA, with the exception of State, Federal, and Tribal lands will pay the proposed charge. |
| Will the Rural North Vacaville be paying a fee? They have 2 wells in the Sub basin | All parcel owners in the Solano GSA will pay the proposed charge, including local agencies. |
| seems costs could go down over time as processes are refined and data etc. are systematized. Companies have to do this all the time in a competitive world. Has that been considered? | As we learn more and are able to refine our activities and processes, there is a possibility that costs might go down. There is also the possibility that as conditions change in the subbasin over time, we might have to do additional actions and costs might go up for some areas that need projects or management actions. |
| Why does the cost of legal decrease in future years? | As we move through the Prop 218 funding mechanism, we anticipate we will have less need for legal assistance. |
| Your previous fact sheet indicates that the state charge would be \$300 per well charge & the use fee is for acre-feet of groundwater pumped/extracted. Now you are referring to the state charging by parcel acres regardless of water source. This is confusing. Please clarify. | Both the fact sheet and the Charge report show what the State Water Board would potentially charge, per their website. The Solano GSA is proposing a flat charge per acre, not an additional charge for owning a well. Apologies if that was miscommunicated. |
| Who will be scrutinizing these costs as we move forward? | Each of the GSAs have governing bodies who will scrutinize costs. |
| Does rural residential zoning exempt a property from the fees? | For the existing proposed long-term funding, we are not exempting rural residential parcels as all parcels benefit from being in the GSP. As we explore a graduated charge, there will likely be different charges for different types of water users. |
| <p>NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| if your property is just residential 5 acres and not farmed and well water is just used for household use/ watering garden/lawn why are we being charged? | For the existing proposed long-term funding, we are not exempting rural residential parcels as all parcels benefit from being in the GSP. As we explore a graduated charge, there will likely be different charges for different types of water users. |
| When are these fees due | If the Solano GSA is successful with the Proposition 218 process, the fees would be put on the County tax roll and landowners would see the first half of the fee in December. |
| If a property owner allows their well to be monitored, can this monitoring exclude the property owner from these fees? | If we move forward with a graduated charge in the future, there could be ways for landowners to provide information that could determine what level of charges they would pay. Even with a graduated charge, all landowners would still likely pay some type of charge to be covered by the GSP. |
| I would want to know what other GSA's are charging | If your question is specific to the Solano Subbasin GSAs, this information is provided in the Engineer's Report, which presents the cost estimate per GSA. The manner in which the GSAs will handle this is forthcoming by each GSA. |
| No inflation shown? | Inflation is built in the costs that are normalized over a 5-year period so that we do not change the amount charged each year. |
| I live on a 5 rural residential parcel. How do I determine if my parcel qualifies for the Domestic well exemption? | <u>Please send me your information at clee@scwa2.com and I will take a look.</u> |
| what is a domestic well exemption? | The domestic well exemption is applied to wells that serve domestic uses only and the total amount of water pumped during a year is less than 2 Acre Feet. |
| The costs shown are pretty specific to the nearest dollar. Are your estimates that accurate? | The estimates are based on the best available information for the level of effort to comply with SGMA. The costs are presented in the GSP in rounded numbers. The more specific numbers came about through the application of other computations to arrive at GSA-specific cost estimates. |
| Is there going to be a control on increases for this fund? | The Prop 218 charge will be the maximum allowed for the next 5 years. Future looks might have different rates for different users. |
| Are all water wells being charged or are there wells that are not known to the GSA? for example wells drilled in the 1940s - 1950s. | The Solano GSA proposed charge would be for the acreage of the property and not by the presence of a well or wells. |
| What is the detail for the operational cost? If no admin cost. is this outside consulting cost to perform service? | There are admin costs for the Solano GSA as detailed in the Charge study. We have tried to keep those costs as low as possible. The Solano GSA does not have the staff to do the monitoring and reporting, so most of the costs will be for contracted services. |
| What is the use fee? | We are looking at a flat charge of \$2.79 an acre. If we move forward with a graduated charge, each parcel would still pay a SGMA/GSP charge. |
| Can we decrease admin and implementation fees AT ALL? | We will be doing a hard look at implementation costs each year and will reassess funding needs as appropriate. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Thank you, but for Rio Vista, the individual property owners will or will be charged, as the proposed amount seems it would be charged directly to the City of Rio Vista? Is that correct | Yes, both the Cities of Rio Vista and Dixon are members of the Solano GSA. Both cities have existing funding mechanisms in place to charge water users and will contribute their share directly to the Solano GSA. |
| Are the cities going to pay their share for all the city wells? I paid my permit for the cost of drilling. Equipment maintenance power etc. I'm not paying for my water usage. If the state wants it, they can pay it. I'm not paying for my water usage. | Yes, the cities are contributing as well. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

The following questions about charge calculations were answered live during the meeting:

- These appear to be charges going forward; how much \$\$\$ has been spent to date?
- I hope that your presentation will discuss why the State fees would be higher or worse for ranchers who don't actually use much groundwater.
- What is the expense to match the revenue?
- Since inflation is a factor in the fees, what is it and why has it not been addressed?
- Will do. I own a second 5-acre parcel with no well. Will I be billed for it?
- Can you show an example of a cost comparison between state takeover and the proposed SGSA charges for the property that has no groundwater wells?
- Are cost estimates adjusted for inflation?
- What are you think the per acre charge per year will be after the 5 years is up? Is it going to just keep going up.?Anything involved with this State seems to go that way!
- is the state proposed a \$4,800 use fee per landowner, per parcel, or per well?
- Why are property owner fees NOT INCLUDED?
- If you do not have even one well on your parcel the state charge would be zero it seems to me.
- Sorry, you may have covered this but as a property owner is my vote weighted based on the amount of acreage I own? Or, does the Board outright approve it?
- Just want to understand the charge to those owners who have ranch property, but a water well is only for personal use, not irrigation to the ranch.
- Are you going to be developing FAQs about fees on the website?
- I am still really not understanding where the \$4,800 use fee for the example presented came from. was that calculated from the \$40/ac ft figure?
- How was the costs distributed between the different GSA's? It seems the Solano GSA is bearing a larger cost per acre than other GSA's.

Questions about Charge Options

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|---|--|
| What amount of local revenues have been raised since 2017 to offset the property owners' fees? | Local agencies have matched the \$1 million in grant funding with likely funding from the local agencies. |
| Can we appropriate funds from the general county services to cover property owners' fees? | No, the Solano GSA cannot do that. |
| How will landowners be able to give input about rate changes when the time comes to change to a graduated rate? | Once we have parcel-specific data, we will provide that to the Solano GSA Board of Directors. They will likely direct staff to develop recommendations for different tiers. We will then hold stakeholders' meetings to determine what makes the most sense for all water user types in the subbasin. If and when there is agreement amongst stakeholders, we will likely do another Proposition 218 process to utilize a tiered charge approach that would supersede the flat charge. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>How about the treatment of the Delta properties in Solano County? These properties are already subjected to programs like the Freshwater Trust and North Delta. Again I am in agreement with groundwater uses being charged a fee. But islands like Ryer Island and Hasting Island get water from the river and not groundwater. Is this fair? Can these types of properties that can prove that they do not use groundwater for irrigation, apply for a fee reimbursement, or have the fees waived?</p> | <p>Parcels in the Northern Delta GSA will only pay the fes associated there. The Solan GSA does include parts of the Delta and those parcels would pay the proposed charge from the Solano GSA, not both.</p> |
| <p>The future “graduated” scale Chris referred to - please clarify if that means those who use groundwater at significant levels will pay a higher rate than those who do not pump water?</p> | <p>The concept of a graduated rate would include a rate that is higher for groundwater users and less for those not using groundwater.</p> |
| <p>Does the long-term funding only consider the per-acre charge and the grants? Or are extraction charges also considered within the prop 218 charge bubble?</p> | <p>The current Proposition 218 Charge does not include any additional costs for groundwater extraction. Groundwater extractions fees may or may not be a part of a graduated charge in the future.</p> |
| <p>So what are other GSPs doing to alleviate high costs to ranchers with non-irrigated rangeland?</p> | <p>The Solano GSA is exploring the possibility of a graduated rate (instead of a flat rate) that would charge more for groundwater users than for those not using groundwater.</p> |
| <p>can you explain why you chose this way to fund yourselves? why are you charging the people who aren't or are barely using the groundwater? you will force us to plant an orchard and such up groundwater to pay the taxes</p> | <p>We, unfortunately, do have acre-level data at this time. We are gathering it now. We are doing a flat charge to make sure we have the funding available to comply with SGMA to keep local control and not have the State Water Board come in and take over. The Solano GSA Board has directed staff to gather the data and look at some type of graduated charge in the near future.</p> |
| <p>I have no problem assessing properties that have the ability to be irrigated by groundwater. How do you account for the assessment of properties that cannot be irrigated either based on environmental restrictions (Jepson Prairie) or the topography (Montezuma Hills) is not compatible with irrigation? By assessing these types of properties, are these properties subsidizing the irrigated properties? Is this fair?</p> | <p>We will be looking at a graduated charge in the near future that will take into account all of the different water users in the subbasin. We just do not have the data right now.</p> |
| <p>that's not the only way to charge. I read prop 218. this is the most unfair and laziest way to charge. you are punishing the people (ranchers) who do not use groundwater!</p> | <p>We will be looking at a graduated charge once we have the data to look at that. We are under a time crunch from the state.</p> |
| <p>It is punitive to landowners in Solano’s dry land farming regions to have to pay the same rate as other landowners in ag areas that pump significant amounts of groundwater. Why are you not using the tiered proposal for such significant differences in usage?</p> | <p>We will be looking to move towards a tiered approach to a charge once we have parcel-specific data to determine what those tiers would look like.</p> |
| <p>NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Are the GSAs contemplating collecting information to inform a tiers/parcel levels/use charge? | Yes, we are doing that now to gather information for a future tiered charge. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

The following questions about charge options were answered live during the meeting:

- Since the Board of Supervisors sits on the SCWA, what other options for funding did the BOS bring forward to support the property owners?
- Prop 218 provides 5 methods for charging landowners. You have chosen the per acre charge and applied this charge on property that is not pulling any not any groundwater out of the ground. This is not equitable.
- IDEA: For two years, schools were closed. Can we use some of our unused school taxes to offset property owner fees?
- Have local gov't tried to raise revenues through non-property-related fees of taxes for Prop 218?

Questions about GSA Jurisdiction or Charge Duration

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|---|---|
| If you are not in the mapped area do you still have to pay? Our ranch is outside of the colored area. | If your location is outside the Solano GSA, the Prop 218 fee being discussed tonight is not a charge for your area. Other GSAs will be communicating charges related to their areas at a future time. |
| Where will the office of the GSA be located? | On the Solano GSP website, there is an interactive map where you can enter your address to see which GSA area your property is located in. That map also shows contact information for each GSA. |
| I appreciate the near-term need for intensive water management, yet is there a sunset date for these charges? Is this a creation of a new agency we will have to fund indefinitely? | SGMA and the GSP are here for at least the next 50 years. We will revisit funding every five years if not sooner if the data becomes available to make different charges available for different users. |
| Why is Fairfield not in the Solano GSA? | Solano GSA does not extend beyond the Solano Subbasin boundaries. The City of Fairfield is not within the Solano Subbasin. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

The following questions about GSA jurisdiction or duration were answered live during the meeting:

- Have we considered asking the SCWA Board for more funding again to offset the property owners fees?
- If replacing an existing ag well, will those be permitted by the county in a timely manner?

Questions about Previous or Future Grants

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|--|---|
| Prop 1 and Prop 68 grant funding: What entities and how strenuously has the SGSA or others been motivated to seek outside funding sources? | All of the GSA are very motivated to look at additional outside funding. One issue being a medium priority subbasin is that there are other areas in the state with severe groundwater issues. We are fortunate that are subbasin is pretty stable. |
| How was the grant money allotted and could some of the money have been designated to offset the property owner fees? | The grant money was used to develop the GSP. Future funding will be available for projects and management actions. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Do I understand correctly per Chris you folks are just now looking into grants? | We are looking at new grants. Previous grants were only available for developing the GSP. |
| Can the property owners see the audit of this grant funding for transparency to the property owners to ascertain their fiscal responsibility? | Yes, when it is available. The state audits all grants. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

The following questions about previous or future grants were answered live during the meeting:

- Can you please include decreasing property owners' fees with future grants?

Questions about SGMA and GSP Implementation

| Question | Quick Answer* |
|---|--|
| Some wells in the more northern parts of subbasin have gone dry recently. Is this policy going to be retroactive? | (I assume this is referring to the Executive Order.) Please report any wells that have gone dry. There are links on the Solano GSP website, the Solano County website, and the DWR website. |
| All of the English Hills area runoff runs through my property. can something be done to "contain" this water for use? You had mentioned something about this in the beginning | Capturing storm runoff for use in enhancing groundwater recharge is a project concept that is being explored, especially in the northwestern part of the subbasin. |
| Have we heard back from the state regarding our submitted plan?? | DWR has up to two years from the due date to provide comments on or otherwise follow up with the GSAs. DWR took nearly two years following the submission of the critically overdrafted basin GSPs. |
| Thanks for answering question 2. What steps are you taking to implement this directive? | I assume this is about the tiered approach, so I answered that on 94. |
| What are the thoughts on folks owning mineral and water rights on a property? | Neither the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act nor the Groundwater Sustainability Plan change any existing property rights. |
| How do the fees protect the groundwater supply? | The fees support the requirement for the Subbasin to comply with the SGMA regulations, to be sustainable, and to maintain local control for groundwater management. |
| What level of rainfall does the GSP assume? Will an extended drought impact our GSP plan? | The GSP evaluates a future 50-year period with hydrology (including rainfall, ET, and surface water inflows) that is consistent with long-term historical conditions. As a result, it incorporates consideration of historical drought cycles. Different climate change scenarios are also evaluated and considered. |
| English Hills has had water issues in the past. Rural North Vacaville Water District was created to help parcels where wells went dry. Will you be watching this area differently than the whole basin? | The GSP identified areas in the northwestern part of the Subbasin that are of particular attention related to recent groundwater level declines. The GSAs will continue to track conditions in this part of the subbasin with additional consideration of implementing projects to enhance recharge in these areas to ensure groundwater conditions are sustainable. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| The Solano Subbasin appears to be in good shape (sustainable) currently; how can we keep it that way and avoid folks coming into the Solano Subbasin and depleting our subbasin. | The GSP requires extensive monitoring and reporting. We have thresholds that will trigger actions when needed, to make sure we manage our groundwater resources sustainably. |
| What parameters are used to determine if sustainability is achieved? | The submitted Groundwater Sustainability Plan outlines metrics by which sustainability is measured including minimum threshold for different sustainability indicators such as water levels, land subsidence, and water quality |
| Will this improve our water quality? Will it reduce the amount of hexavalent chromium and arsenic? | These constituents are naturally occurring. It is generally not likely that maintaining a sustainable groundwater basin will address all water quality concerns. It is possible for local groundwater quality to be improved in the vicinity of groundwater recharge projects. |
| NOTE: The answers were typed quickly and are not a part of any legal record. | |

The following questions about SGMA and GSP implementation were answered live during the meeting:

- What do we get for these charges?
- As a property owner how can I contribute to recharging the subbasin?

Upcoming Grant Opportunities

Two-State grants were received to develop the GSP. Another round of SGMA funding will be opened later this year, although critically over-drafted basins may receive a higher priority. The GSAs will also be looking at funding from federal sources, other state grants, or private foundations to help offset costs,

Next Steps and Ways to Stay Involved

In closing, Chris Lee extended his appreciation for those who have been involved throughout the last several years and for those who are becoming involved now. All comments are taken to heart and everyone is invited to attend the July 14 public hearing. Participants were encouraged to visit the GroundwaterGuide.com and SolanoGSP.com websites. These pages include pages with information on GSA meetings, a place to sign up for the GSP newsletter, information on upcoming events, and a Frequently Asked Questions page.

- A survey link was shared with Virtual Town Hall participants to provide feedback on this meeting
- Visit solanogsp.com, join the Solano GSP newsletter list, and stay engaged
- See which GSA you are in, using the [interactive map](#)
- Review the GSP at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/117>
- For more questions about outreach, contact Guadalupe@aginnovations.org
- Visit <https://groundwaterguide.com/> which also includes information in Spanish.