

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Special Meeting

May 6, 2021, 6pm

Meeting Summary

Location | 727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080

Remote Participation | Telephone: (530) 212-8376, Conference Code: 142001

Meeting Materials | CorningSubbasinGSP.org/CSAB-meetings

[Agenda](#) | [Presentation Slides](#) | [Fall Hydrograph Data Handout](#)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tania Carlone (Ms. Carlone), facilitator for the Corning Subbasin Advisory Board (CSAB) Special Meeting, called the meeting to order. The meeting held in the Tehama County Board of Supervisors Chambers supported both in-person and remote participation. Stephanie Horii (Ms. Horii), facilitation support for the Special Meeting, explained how those participating remotely could view the presentation and provide verbal or emailed comments.

Roll call

Ryan Teubert (Mr. Teubert) and Lisa Hunter (Ms. Hunter) took the roll call for the CSAB Members.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)

- ✓ Bob Williams
- ✓ David Lester
- ✓ Steven Gruenwald

Corning Sub-basin GSA (CSGSA)

- ✓ Brian Mori
- ✓ Grant Carmon (by phone)

Opening Remarks

Mr. Teubert and Ms. Hunter welcomed and thanked participants for attending the evening CSAB Special Meeting. In response to requests, staff and consultants have been and will continue to explore providing in-person meeting options. However, venue options are currently limited due to COVID safety protocol constraints.

This meeting was focused on the Groundwater Levels (GWL) Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) per the CSAB's decision to hold a Special Meeting to further delve into the SMCs related to chronic lowering of groundwater levels. The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss comments, consider options, and seek agreement on a pathway forward to establish GWL SMCs for the Corning Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

The consultant team had been compiling and incorporating comments from CSAB, other GSAs' representatives, and members of the public, and presented the latest revisions for CSAB members and attendees to discuss and identify the next steps in preparation for the next CSAB standard meeting on June 2. Staff reiterated the

importance for stakeholders to share their input to help create a robust GSP for the Corning Subbasin while keeping in mind that implementation of the GSP will be adaptive over the next 20 years.

Agenda Review, Review of Groundrules

Ms. Carlone reviewed the agenda and reminded attendees that CSAB meetings are following Brown Act guidelines for special meetings. She invited members of the public to announce their name and affiliation when providing comments to include in the meeting summary.

2. Overview of Groundwater Level SMC Comments Received

Lisa Porta (Ms. Porta), technical consultant for the Corning Subbasin GSP development, briefly described the initial approach for identifying GWL SMC and summarized key takeaways from comments received to date, sharing relevant clarifications as appropriate to support common understanding:

- **Initial Approach:** 1) Received feedback on goals and beneficial users; 2) developed initial SMC approach; 3) applied approach to each Representative Monitoring Point (RMP) well (applying unique Management Objective [MO] and Minimum Threshold [MT] at each well); and 4) refined MOs and MTs and defined Undesirable Results (URs).
- **General Feedback Received:** Input from CSAB, GSA representatives, and members of the public indicate there was general agreement that the current proposed MTs were too high (too restrictive) and did not provide enough operational flexibility in some areas of the Corning Subbasin. There were divergent viewpoints on the protection of beneficial users and what is considered “significant and unreasonable,” and how much lower water levels should be allowed to decline over the long term.
- **Comments for Minimum Thresholds (MTs):**
 - Generally, using recent minimum water levels for MTs is acceptable, but set these lower than historical measurements and consider adding a small buffer for future flexibility.
 - Include enough operational flexibility for ag wells.
 - Assess different approaches depending on the area of the Subbasin.
 - Reduce number of RMP wells.
 - Check results of groundwater model simulation to see what groundwater levels in the future baseline may be in RMP wells.
- **Comments Related to Undesirable Results (URs):**
 - Choose a UR that allows for flexible future conditions if there are localized areas with declining GWLs.
 - Proposed UR may be sufficient (depending on how MOs and MTs are set).
- **Domestic Well Owners’ Key Concern:** Concerns expressed that lowering water levels will continue to cause wells to go dry.
- **Comments on Projects and Management Actions:**
 - Need to start looking at possible management actions.
 - Start to develop plans, including engaging US Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and state agencies in control of surface water allocations, to help correct and avoid unsustainable conditions as necessary.
- **Clarifications and Additional Information to Consider:**
 - The GWL Sustainability Indicator is about chronic decline of groundwater levels (not seasonal)
 - The SMC are based on what is “significant and unreasonable” to beneficial users in the subbasin.

- Water levels are below historical lows in many parts of the Corning Subbasin.
- Shallow wells that are stable, tend to draw water from nearby streams.
- Need to consider how this GWL SMC may affect other Sustainability Indicators' SMC.

Discussion: CSAB questions and comments

CSAB members shared the following questions and comments:

Capturing range of perspectives.

- Input received to date were overall summarized accurately.
- Acknowledging the importance to consider impacts to both ag and domestic wells.

Chronic decline.

- What constitutes “chronic decline?”
 - Ms. Porta – Specific definitions can vary depending on the groundwater basin and other factors. Generally, it is whether the groundwater levels are coming back up or continuously declining when looking at long-term trends. Fluctuations are not chronic. It helps to look at water years and see how the water levels are behaving (e.g., in the Corning Subbasin, water levels that do not come back up during wet years may indicate chronic decline around that monitoring site).
- It seems like we are in a 20-year cycle for drought based on rainfall data. Does that impact how accurately we can identify long-term trends?
 - Ms. Porta – We are looking at all the data, which will help more accurately identify when a chronic shift may have started.
- It would be helpful to know how we can differentiate how much chronic decline in GWL is due to drought versus pumping.

Discussion: CSAB and Public

One member of the public raised the following issues:

- **Groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs).** Concerned about protecting groundwater dependent ecosystems (GDEs). Suggested monitoring wells within a certain distance of a stream to detect habitat impacts due to groundwater use.
- **Protecting storage.** Acknowledged the agricultural perspective and desire to continue pumping groundwater but encouraged a more proactive approach to protecting groundwater tables to protect farmers, ranchers, and ag-residential/domestic well owners over the long term.
- **Protecting domestic well owners and local landowners.** A CSAB member acknowledged recharge concerns, the desire to protect growers and other landowners, and challenges to find the right balance for solutions that fit everyone. He invited the landowner to share suggestions on what direction he would like to see. The landowner stated he would like to see minimum thresholds that protect the domestic use and local landowners.
- **Better control of well expansion in near-term.** In the immediate timeframe, the landowner stated he would like a management action that considers a possible moratorium on ag well expansion (and potentially include limits on domestic well expansion too) until we have better fleshed out the GSP and how we plan to sustainably manage the groundwater. He acknowledged there have been or there are efforts currently underway to better manage ag production well construction to avoid negatively impacting shallow wells, and that these efforts are generally supported by the responsible, local ag

producers. However, the trend of new large corporate farms is a concern without greater control or certainty that these incoming businesses will be good neighbors.

3. Monitoring Network Data Review and Well Locations

Ms. Porta presented an update of the monitoring network review and proposed refinements based on CSAB feedback:

- **Reduce number of wells in the network.** At least eight wells were identified for potential removal from the Representative Monitoring Points (RMP) network (some were redundant with other wells, others lacked sufficient data for identifying a MT). There are currently a total of 54 wells in the RMP network. Ms. Porta advised against removing more wells at this point until there is better clarity about the variability across sites and which wells may best suit the RMP network. She noted that the monitor network can and will be modified throughout GSP development and implementation as more data become available. For instance, some wells are new but will provide important data going forward; therefore, the network includes existing nearby wells to serve as a temporary proxy until sufficient data are gathered from the new wells. Additionally, not all wells on private properties may remain in the network if access agreements are not confirmed.
- **Consider network zones.** CSAB members and stakeholders had suggested looking at zones/regions of groundwater levels to potentially develop more zone/region specific strategies. Ms. Porta presented three potential zones based on groundwater level trends:
 - West (west of I-5): observing an average chronic decline.
 - Center of the Subbasin (between I-5 and west of the Sacramento River): groundwater levels are more stable, but we are starting to see a slight decline.
 - East/Near Sacramento River: groundwater levels are shallow and stable (fluctuates seasonally and with wet years, but are stable in general).
- **Potential further refinements ([Refer to slide 18](#)).** Ms. Porta shared recommendations for evaluating and maintaining the RMP network during GSP implementation, including obtaining well construction data, confirming access agreements, and standardizing protocols for monitoring, etc. Tools and programs are available (e.g., DWR's technical support services) to help add RMPs going forward. The network should have enough wells to develop groundwater elevation contour of MTs and MOs (can help show how potential MTs may change the direction of groundwater flow).

Discussion: CSAB questions and comments

CSAB members generally supported the current RMP network. A couple members stated they would prefer to see additional wells in the future on the west side where there are deep wells and less available data. A member pointed to the tradeoff considerations and cost implications for numerous wells in the network.

More specific discussion is provided below:

- **West side, deep wells.** Consider keeping or adding more RMP wells in the western portions of the basin where we lack data.
- **Minimize costs while maintaining adequate network.** Concerns were raised about the ongoing costs for monitoring approximately 50 wells. What opportunities, if any, are there to ensure we start with a good RMP network and reduce the number of wells (e.g., areas with stable or slightly declining groundwater levels)?

- Ms. Porta – Generally advise against removing wells at this point until you can confirm which wells can be in the network (e.g., obtain construction data and access agreements) and avoid creating data gaps. You could consider strategically removing a couple wells in the shallow areas, but you should keep the deep wells for now. The number of shallow RMP wells have already been reduced; you still want to keep shallow wells to assess potential streamflow depletion due to pumping (one of the required Sustainability Indicators to monitor). You want enough wells to identify a good contour of the MTs. Removing wells from the network also reduces the number of wells that may exceed their MTs and trigger URs.
- Ms. Porta / Mr. Teubert – Wells monitored by DWR and multi-completion wells with data loggers (that can be downloaded without taking a manual measurement) help reduce effort and monitoring costs.
- **Standardize measurement timing.** Keep in mind that ag wells shut off after the irrigation season at different times depending on the crop type. Even a 2-4 week difference between taking the dry season measurements can affect our ability to identify groundwater level trends.
 - Ms. Porta – That nuance could be included in the GSP monitoring procedures to identify what time of year is most appropriate to measure groundwater levels and to take measurements within that timeframe each year.
 - Mr. Teubert – DWR tends to monitor within a two-week window to maintain that standardization.

Discussion: CSAB and Public

Six members of the public shared questions or comments:

- **West side groundwater levels.** Emphasize the GSAs should monitor the west side closely. Multiple members of the public raised concerns about the declining trend in groundwater levels in the west side.
- **North to south zones or management areas.** Given there is about 80-foot groundwater surface elevation differential from north to south, consider separating the “slightly declining” region into two or three zones (north, central, and south). Could this help better detect if there is a groundwater decline problem and develop projects/management actions specific to the area of concern?
 - Ms. Porta – Can delve into this topic in the later discussion.
 - Mr. Teubert – Keep in mind that SGMA has a specific definition for “management areas.” Designating “management areas” under SGMA triggers certain management parameters (e.g., a management area would need its own adequate monitoring network, SMCs, etc.), which seems different than what we are looking to accomplish with creating zones within the network.
- **Measurement timing for deepest decline each year.** If the objective is to monitor the most critical drawdown in the season, mid to late August is a better timeframe.
- **Minimum thresholds.** Concern was expressed if minimum thresholds are based on aggregate measurements of different aquifer levels (which may not adequately protect shallow wells).
- **SMCs in data poor areas.** How might you set SMC or defining undesirable results in areas that lack RMP sites? Could you use a certain number of reported domestic well failures?
 - Ms. Porta – Ideally more wells will be added to the network to address those data gaps. Using the contour map approach can help explore how different potential MTs affect domestic wells and inform project / management action considerations (e.g., if you set the MT at a certain level, how many domestic wells may be potentially affected, and is that number considered significant and unreasonable and/or warrants mitigation measures?).

- Ms. Carlone / Ms. Porta – The GSP regulations also require that GSAs identify data gaps and describe how they plan to address those data gaps in the GSP. A project or management action may be one of those tools to do that. One of the proposed management actions discussed at the May 5th CSAB meeting was to develop a more complete database of domestic well locations, depth, construction, etc.

4. Options for Groundwater Level (GWL) Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC)

Revisions

Ms. Porta provided an overview of model outputs of projected water levels and potential revised options for setting MTs and MOs for groundwater levels based on previous input from CSAB and stakeholders:

Projected Baseline Model Results

- Water levels were simulated with current conditions and with projected climate change (and without projects).
- Results indicated there would be an average water level decline of 10 feet (up to 20 feet in some areas). Less variation and water level declines are expected closer to Sacramento River due to surface water recharge. Generally, water levels are projected to stabilize at a new low level, assuming current land and water use remains the same.

Revisions based on input

- Focusing on Fall data only (to account for seasonal variability) for setting SMC.
- Using data since 2012 to better capture the recent trend in groundwater level changes (because levels have reached historical minimum levels due to drought, increased pumping, and slower water level recovery).
- Revised minimum threshold (MT) options for consideration.

Potential SMC Options to Consider

- Measurable Objective (MO): highest Fall groundwater level since 2012.
Measurable Objective Notes
 - The proposed MO has not changed from previous discussions.
 - 2012 seemed to be an acceptable number for beneficial users – not the highest water levels in recent decades, but still captured levels before the drought. No feedback was received to date that strongly said otherwise.
- Minimum Threshold (MT) Options (using only Fall data):
 - Option 1: lowest Fall level since 2012, minus 5-foot buffer
 - Option 2: lowest Fall level since 2012, minus 15-foot buffer
 - Option 3: lowest Fall level since 2012, minus 25-foot buffer
 - Option 4: lowest Fall level since 2012, minus 15% of minimum water level depth
 - Option 5: lowest Fall level since 2012, minus 30% of minimum water level depth

Minimum Threshold Notes:

- “Lowest since 2012” means that lowest water levels could differ depending on the specific area or well (e.g., some levels were lowest in 2015, some 2018, and others in 2019).

- Using percentages (i.e., the 15% and 30% options) aims to allow for operational flexibility and scale the buffer depending on the depth of the well (e.g., shallower wells will have a smaller buffer compared to deeper wells).
- Undesirable Result (UR): when 20% of groundwater elevations measured at RMP wells drop below the associated minimum threshold during two consecutive years.

Undesirable Result Notes:

- The proposed UR has not changed. General input was that the UR definition was acceptable, depending on how we defined the MTs.
- With 54 wells in the RMP network, this UR equates to 11 wells exceeding MTs two years in a row, in the same wells.

Example scenarios: How do these MOs and potential MTs perform? What are the potential risks?

Ms. Porta shared examples of the MOs and potential MTs for wells in each of the three zones (near stream, center of the basin, and west side). [Slides 29 and 30](#) also summarize potential risks to consider related to different SMC options and the general locations of groundwater concerns in the subbasin:

- Near the stream – current levels are close to the MO already and appear relatively stable. Levels declined due to the drought, but then rebounded. Ms. Porta suggested the MT does not need to be set very deep because we do not expect the levels to fluctuate much more, even with climate change modeling.
- Center (east of I-5) – the groundwater trend lines are decreasing slightly – not a steep decline compared to west side levels, but also not as stable as levels near the stream.
- West side – groundwater trend lines are consistently decreasing since 2011 without signs of recovering. With these deeper wells, there are larger differences between using 5- to 25-foot buffer compared to using the 15 to 30% buffer approach.
- Ms. Porta, in combination with others’ input, suggested the MTs should incorporate some operational flexibility to withstand longer droughts. However, deep MTs may negatively affect domestic well owners and warrant mitigation measures; high pumping usage could affect groundwater flow into neighboring subbasins and stream recharge and/or draw up higher salinity water close to the Coastal Range.
- The GSP will also need to consider and identify if/how MTs and URs for one sustainability indicator may affect another sustainability indicator (e.g., need to avoid setting groundwater levels MTs too low that it causes subsidence URs).

Additional GWL SMC options

CSAB member Brian Mori shared additional GWL SMC options and considerations:

- Set the MO based on the 2015 Fall minimum level (aims to be closer to “new normal” conditions, allow for operational flexibility workable for all beneficial users, decrease dependence on “drought declaration,” etc.)
- Set MTs for RMP wells where static water is less than 80 feet from ground surface elevation: 2015 Fall level plus a 25-foot operating range
- Set MTs for RMP wells where static water is more than 80 feet from ground surface elevation: 2015 Fall level plus a 30% operating range. Mr. Mori stated he felt that, based on his review of the data, the 30% seemed to be a reasonable level with realistic expectations to balance the needs and interests of all beneficial users.

- Mr. Mori reviewed how these MOs and MTs performed using the same wells Ms. Porta presented to help compare these alternative SMC. He also added that the proposed MTs for many of these wells are well above the depth of the well, decreasing the risk of the well going dry and giving “breathing room” to address wells that may be at risk (e.g., shallow, domestic wells where GWL are at risk of dipping below the MT).

Discussion: CSAB questions and comments

Overall, CSAB comments reflected a desire for setting SMCs that: are realistically achievable, are customized within reason to the area or well, and allow operational flexibility for ag producers/pumpers, while also protecting domestic well owners with shallow wells.

Setting Realistic Measurable Objectives

- CSAB members confirmed with staff that conceptually, MOs are where we’d like to be, but SGMA does not require that we achieve the MO by 2042, nor are URs triggered until 2042 (e.g., we can dip below the MT, then make progress towards the MO). Groundwater levels can fluctuate around the MO, but they should not be close to the MT as we near 2042.
- Several CSAB members emphasized setting realistic MOs rather than unattainable objectives. Some raised concerns with hydrographs where levels on average were fluctuating around the MO, but were repeatedly below the MO in the most recent years, even in wet years; they questioned if that indicated the MO was set at an unachievable level given the basin’s potential “new normal.” Concerns were raised that the State might modify the GSP policies/regulations in the future and deem basins that do not achieve their MOs (even if those MOs were overly ambitious) as unsuccessful in achieving sustainability and trigger State intervention.
- Conversely, others indicated they support a loftier goal and that the MO should be at or better than current conditions (as long as the State does not penalize a basin for not achieving its MOs). Ms. Porta stated that MOs are generally set higher or similar to current conditions. Setting the MO using the 2015 Fall minimum is lower than current average water levels, so it will be important to explain the rationale if the GWL SMC uses the 2015 Fall minimum as the MO. A CSAB member stated that setting the MO below current conditions would likely upset many of the landowners in his area.
- A CSAB member shared contextual background for why a couple changes in groundwater conditions may have occurred: In 2014/15, the USBR changed surface water allocations, leading to many farmers switching to groundwater, contributing to a sharp increase in groundwater use. In the Flournoy area, there used to be a ditch that held surface water from Thomes Creek, but is no longer there and therefore no longer supports recharge (and some nearby wells have gone dry). These types of policies or land use conversions (that are expected to remain the same), need to be considered in how we define the “new normal” and setting realistic MOs.
 - Ms. Porta – If desired, the ditch could be a potential project / management action (apply for grant funding to revive the recharge area to help water levels increase again).

Use the percentages approach vs. fixed numeric footage (or combination)

- Overall, CSAB members stated they appreciated the operational flexibility from using the percentage buffer approach. However, using the percentage approach for shallow wells offers little buffer; a fixed numeric buffer may be better for shallow/stable GWLs.

- Therefore, CSAB members suggested analyzing the percentage approach for deeper GWL areas (generally those in the west side of the Subbasin) and a fixed numeric footage for shallower or more stable GWLs (generally those closer to the Sacramento River).
- Members indicated they wish to further explore and understand the implications of using the percentage buffer approach. 15% seemed too restrictive. Members ranged on whether they preferred 20% or 30%. 30% offers the greatest operational flexibility (and deep wells tend to fluctuate the most); however, 30% poses a higher risk of negatively impacting domestic well owners with shallower wells. A CSAB member requested more information to clarify and help demonstrate why 30% would be unreasonable.

Stable GWLs (generally near the Sacramento River)

- CSAB members shared different preferences for the fixed numeric buffer for shallow/stable GWL areas. Some preferred a 5- to 15-foot buffer; others suggested something deeper but did not feel strongly on the exact number given that these levels likely will not decrease drastically and dip below wherever the minimum threshold is ultimately set.
- Given that the GWLs closer to the Sacramento River are relatively stable, CSAB members suggested focusing on areas of greater concern (i.e., the wells in the west side of the Subbasin).
- A CSAB member clarified that using the fixed numeric footage approach should not necessarily be based on proximity to the river, but rather by characteristics of the wells (e.g., location of the standing water, stable levels, performance when being tested/pumped, etc.).

Discussion: CSAB and Public

Five members of the public provided questions and comments:

Aspirational and Protective Approaches to SMCs and Setting MOs

- Several members of the public stated they prefer aspirational measurable objectives rather than settling for a “new normal.” Rather than lower the MOs, explore what projects and management actions are needed to achieve the more aspirational MOs. Consider recharge projects, maximizing surface water use efficiency, curb increases in groundwater use (e.g., new orchards or new development), coordinate with potential partners like USBR and Resource Conservation Districts, etc.
- A member of the public conveyed this is an opportunity for the Subbasin to aim beyond sustainability, cultivate its natural resources, and improve farming practices for future generations.
- One person observed that hydrograph data with 50-year history show a substantial decline of 10 to more than 25 feet. She postulated that while the hydrographs discussed today may appear like a “new normal,” it is also possible that these are 10-20 year trends. We may already be damaging our aquifers, so the GSAs are encouraged to take a protective approach when setting MTs.
- A member of the public asserted that even though SGMA does not give local agencies authority over county planning; water management is inseparable from land use planning. GSP decisions need to consider the implications on the character of the county.
- There was a suggestion to use the 2015 Fall level for the MOs, which would emphasize the areas of highest concern are away from the river and in areas with the biggest decline.

Approaches to Setting MTs

- Several members of the public shared concerns with using the percentage buffer approach for the deep wells, particularly with the higher percentage options (e.g., 30% buffer could lead to substantial

decreases in water levels and require costly redrilling). The communities whose wells may go dry first are also likely those who cannot afford redrilling.

- A member of the public conveyed the 30% buffer seemed appropriate for areas further west from the river, particularly along the I-5 corridor where there is both a high concentration of residences and farming using the groundwater.
- Domestic well owners are not the only ones at risk. Combined use (ag-residential) small pumpers are at risk too.
- Public comments generally indicated support for dividing the monitoring network into zones (e.g., based on general groundwater trends/concerns). There was a suggestion to use different percentages for the MTs depending on groundwater concerns (e.g., 30% buffer in good areas, 20% in slightly concerning areas, and 10% buffer in critical areas).
- One person suggested using the flows from Shasta Dam to determine appropriate water level depths for wells near the river. 10-15 feet buffer seems more appropriate than 25 feet.
- Another member of the public asserted the 25-foot buffer would help take the focus off of the wells near the river that are relatively stable (due to recharge from Shasta Dam releases), and direct more attention to wells of greater concern in the western portion of the subbasin.

Understanding historical trends

- Multiple members of the public cited other factors that contributed to decreases in groundwater level in addition to the USBR and Flournoy examples previously raised. Land use conversion in the west side of the Corning Subbasin (from historically large ranches converted to orchards) is likely a major cause for the drastic drop in GWLs. Several deep wells were installed at this time too.

Process and Discussion

- In general, public comments aligned with CSAB members' desire to work together and find a middle ground to support ag while also protecting domestic/ag-residential well users and habitats dependent on groundwater.
- A few acknowledged the complex topic warrants sufficient time, but observed participants seemed to have meeting fatigue given that the meeting was in the evening and went longer than expected.

5. Next Steps

Ms. Porta and Ms. Carlone reviewed discussion outcomes and proposed next steps based on the meeting discussion:

- CSAB members generally agreed to explore using fixed/static buffers for the MTs closer to the river where water levels are more stable. Using the percentage approach may make more sense for the western areas of the subbasin where water levels are deeper, more variable, and high concerns among those who have shallower wells or use less groundwater.
- CSAB members have diverse perspectives on the specific numbers for the fixed numeric buffer and percentage buffer.
- The MOs should be revisited to confirm they are realistically attainable and adequately protective / balanced across beneficial users' needs.
- Members indicated they wish to further explore and understand the implications for using the different approaches discussed this evening. For CSAB consideration and discussion at the next meeting, the technical consultant will present SMCs and MT contour maps based on:

- MOs for stable wells based on 2012 fall levels
- MOs for declining wells based on 2015 fall levels.
- MTs for stable wells set with a buffer of 20 feet
- MTs for declining wells based on two percentage scenarios (20% and 30%) for comparison

Next CSAB Meeting: June 2, 2021, 1:30-4:00 pm

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 pm.

Meeting Participants

CSAB Members

- Bob Williams, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Board Member)
- Brian Mori, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- David Lester, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Groundwater Commissioner)
- Grant Carmon, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- Steven Gruenwald, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Private Citizen)

Other Participants

- Allan Fulton
- Chase Hurley
- Hal Crain, Tehama County Groundwater Commission, Surface Water Agencies or Districts, Supervisorial District 4 Representative
- Eddy Teasdale, LSCE
- Erin Smith, CA DWR
- Holly Dawley, GCID
- Jenny Scheer
- Leros Lane, Farmer/ private well owner
- Lisa Hunter, Glenn County Water Resources Coordinator
- Martha Slack, Rio Alto Water District
- Matt Hansen, Landowner
- Nichole Bethurem, TCFCWCD
- Ryan Teubert, TCFCWCD
- Susan Silveira, Landowner
- Tamara Williams, Landowner
- Timothy Mesa, Landowner
- Michael Ward, Landowner

Consultants and Project Team

- Lisa Porta, Montgomery & Associates
- Tania Carlone, Consensus Building Institute
- Stephanie Horii, Consensus Building Institute