

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board

August 4, 2021, 1:30 – 4:00 pm

Meeting #16 Meeting Summary

Pursuant to Governor Newsom’s Executive Orders N-29-20, this meeting was conducted by teleconference/webinar.

Webinar: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/794753277>

Telephone: +1 (571) 317-3122

Meeting Access Code: 794-753-277

1. Welcome and Introductions

At 1:30 p.m., Julie Leimbach (Ms. Leimbach), facilitator for the Corning Subbasin Advisory Board (CSAB), called the meeting to order.

Roll call

Nichole Bethurem (Ms. Bethurem) and Lisa Hunter (Ms. Hunter) took the roll call for the CSAB Members.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)

- ✓ Bob Williams – yes
- ✓ David Lester – yes

Alternate:

- ✓ Ian Turnbull – yes and Ian Turnbull will serve as a CSAB member in this meeting.

Steven Gruenwald was not present.

Corning Sub-basin GSA (CSGSA)

- ✓ Julia Violich – yes

Alternate:

- ✓ John Amaro – yes and John Amaro will serve as a CSAB member in this meeting.

Grant Carmon and Brian Mori were not present.

Agenda Review, Review of Groundrules

Ms. Leimbach welcomed meeting participants to the sixteenth CSAB meeting. She reviewed the agenda and reminded attendees that CSAB meetings are following Brown Act guidelines. To access the meeting materials, please go to [CSAB August 4th Meeting Materials](#).

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

The CSAB received comments from the public for items not on the agenda.

- Tamara Williams (Ms. Williams) – I have been providing comments and suggestions. I have engaged in conversations with staff about encouraging broader public outreach. It is disconcerting that the second of the public workshops planned for this process to allow for public input is happening in the public comment review period for the GSP, which seems late in the game to me. I would like to ask the Board to do anything in your power to encourage broad public engagement in these last couple of months in the preparation process. Except for a few geographic areas in the basin, public outreach has been lacking.
- Leros Lane (Ms. Lane) – I have not looked through Draft GSP Sections 5 and 6. But it doesn't seem like the existing water laws are being addressed by these proposed roles, costs, and fees.

3. Action Item: Approval of the Meeting Summary

The CSAB had no comments. The public participants made the following comments:

- Ms. Williams – Requested a correction for item 2, “Items not on the Agenda.”
 - Where the draft summary states that Ms. Williams commented that she is “Interested in timing of Sept. 2021 workshop...” it should read “summer 2021 workshop.”
 - I will also reiterate my comment from last month’s meeting that I thought would be included in the meeting summary:

“With the public review period for the Draft GSP, I remain concerned about the public outreach to gather broad public comments. When will the summer public workshop be held and how will outreach for the workshop be conducted to ensure broad stakeholder input? The Corning Subbasin website says, “The Project Team will host two GSP workshops anticipated in Fall 2020 and Summer 2021 to provide additional information to Corning Subbasin stakeholders and allow for additional input.”

Ian Turnbull (Mr. Turnbull) made the motion: *The CSAB approves the CSAB July Meeting Summary with the suggested edits from the public comment.* Julia Violich (Ms. Violich) seconded the motion. Ms. Leimbach opened CSAB debate on this motion and hearing no further debate, she called a vote.

Roll call vote:

TCFCWCD

- Bob Williams – Aye
- David Lester – Aye
- Ian Turnbull – Aye

CSGSA

- Julia Violich – Aye
- John Amaro – Aye

The Board unanimously approved the motion with a 5-0 vote.

4. GSA Updates

Ms. Bethurem and Ms. Hunter reported out to the CSAB on the TCFCWCD and CSGSA, respectively.

TCFCWCD

- TCFCWCD has posted the draft Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Chapters on the district website: tehamacountywater.org
- On July 27, TCGSA released an e-newsletter on the District's website under the groundwater sustainability tab.

CSGSA

- In its most recent meeting, the CSGSA reviewed the interbasin coordination report and received an update on grant agreements.
- The GSA staff are realigning grant funds with Montgomery & Associates (M&A) to assure funding is available in areas that are needed.

5. Priority Actions for Plan Implementation and Data Gaps

Lisa Porta (Ms. Porta) reviewed the schedule of GSP development.

Review Plan Implementation Activities

Ms. Porta presented on the implementation of the GSP, outlining the following topic items:

- Description of GSP implementation focusing on first 5 years
- Development of approximate costs and funding plan
- Required elements for all GSAs (outreach, monitoring, reporting, and day-to-day GSA operations)
- Plan to address data gaps identified in GSP
- Refine development of feasible projects and management actions to address current and potential future unsustainable conditions

Ms. Porta reviewed the identified implementation tasks including:

1. GSA Administration
2. GSA Funding
3. Monitoring and Reporting
4. Address Data Gaps
5. Expand Monitoring Networks
6. Update Data Management System
7. Update and Refine Hydrologic Model
8. Projects and Management Actions

Ms. Porta said they would also provide an Appendix of GSP Funding Mechanisms for the list of activities.

Review Funding Needs

Ms. Porta presented a summary of funding needs and general initial start-up costs. She highlighted that these costs are draft and will be further refined. This is the level of funding information that is required in the GSP.

DWR recently released a survey to assess statewide basin funding needs. During this current drought proclamation, the Governor approved \$60 M for this fiscal year. The state is already considering another \$200 M for the next fiscal year. She encouraged anyone interested in participating in the survey, to please contact your GSA representative to receive the survey.

Ms. Porta reviewed a summary of priority management actions and a summary of priority projects and costs. She noted that many of the projects are described conceptually. The GSAs will not have jurisdiction to lead all of these projects contributing to sustainability, but they will track, document, and report on the projects, and coordinate with the lead agencies that will implement the projects.

Ms. Porta noted that the team received a question about additional water sources for projects. The GSP will include an Appendix on this topic attached to Section 7: Projects and Management Actions.

GSA Staff

GSA staff had no further clarifications at this time.

CSAB Discussion

Board members

- Mr. Turnbull – City and landowners have wanted invasive plant removal on Stony Creek for fire/fuels reduction. The issues in the past have been related to permitting. There may be an opportunity to do some cost-sharing because of the reduction of a fire hazard in the creek.
 - Ms. Porta - We will consider this possibility; the more we can show multi-benefit the better for funding opportunities.
- Bob Williams (Mr. Williams) – I see one of our biggest challenges with surface water storage or groundwater recharge on conveyance features as being able to acquire that water from the USBR and being able to pay that cost. The DWR used to actively communicate with USBR. The Corning Canal is the only large unlined canal. It goes right through areas that are impacted by groundwater use. In order to get that water in there, DWR needs to work out water availability and cost.
 - Ms. Porta – Once you review, please let us know if you have suggestions and edits for how that is described.
- Dave Lester (Mr. Lester) – Through DWR, is there grant funding available? Or will it become available?
 - Ms. Porta – Yes, Bryce will describe grant funding opportunities.
 - Mr. Lester – I have been talking with the City of Corning staff about a grant to work on the wastewater treatment plant effluent reuse for irrigation. I could reduce my groundwater use by $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ if I used that recycled water, as my farm is nearby. If there are grants available, it would be a lot more attractive to the wastewater treatment plant operators.

Public Comment

- Ms. Williams – I agree that everybody needs to get the USBR involved so we can dislodge this surface water dilemma. I would encourage this Board to be in contact with the USBR to think about how they could pull from their end. Trying to take everything up through DWR could be difficult. You on the ground have power to work through your personal relationships and connect to get that surface water.

- Ms. Lane – Commented on invasive species along Stony Creek. Previously the conservation camps have worked on clearing out vegetation along creek banks. \$30,000/acre is an awfully steep price for removing invasive species. She recommended working with the conservation camp.
 - Ms. Porta – A State agency put together a thorough analysis of Arundo and invasive species eradication and what it would cost to fully remove them, which is what we used in this cost table. Maybe if Conservation Corps is working on it, then costs could be reduced. We could refine the number working with the Resource Conservation Districts.
 - Ms. Lane -I would hope that those costs could be mitigated because that is an awful lot of money.

6. Continue to Evaluate Funding Mechanisms

Bryce McAteer (Mr. McAteer), WestWater, presented answers to questions raised in the July CSAB meeting and provided a continued evaluation of SGMA funding needs and mechanisms.

Clarify Questions from July Meeting

Mr. McAteer provided information and considerations addressing several questions received during the July CSAB Meeting on the following topics:

1. Corning Subbasin Land Use
 - a. The information provided in this slide is provided in the draft GSP. The land-use estimates summarized come from a mix of data sources.
 - b. For Irrigated lands, Urban and Rural Residential, and Non-Irrigated lands, please see slide 17.
2. Corning Subbasin Groundwater Use
 - a. Summary groundwater use estimates for current hydrological conditions. The data was based on information provided in the draft GSP. For the estimates, see slide 18.
 - b. Total groundwater pumping under current conditions averages 157,900 acre-feet per year (AFY).
 - c. Approximately 97% of groundwater is estimated to be used for Agricultural purposes.
 - d. The difference in pumping between wet years and dry or critical years is about 19,100 acre-feet (AF).
3. De Minimis (Minor) Groundwater Users and Fees
 - a. De Minimis extractor is a specific SGMA term referring to extractors of 2 AFY or less for domestic purposes.
 - b. The Water Code (WAT §10730(a)) states “... A groundwater sustainability agency shall not impose a fee pursuant to this subdivision on a De Minimis extractor unless the agency has regulated the users pursuant to this part.”
 - c. Regulated User: Undefined in SGMA. GSAs must determine who is a regulated user, which may mean one of the following:
 - i. “Noticed” water user
 - ii. Monitored/Extractions Reported
 - iii. Implement Policies, Projects, and/or Management Actions that affect De Minimis Extractors

Mr. Williams – A ranch that has 2,000 unirrigated acres that have wells provide small amounts of stock and domestic water supplies, would he be considered a De Minimis User.

- a. Mr. McAteer – If they have stock watering wells, they would not be considered a De Minimis user. But if the well is being used exclusively for household water, then that would be considered a De Minimis extraction
 - i. GSAs adopting land-based fees have taken different approaches in terms of charging small parcels. Some GSAs using this mechanism have opted to charge all lands, while some have provided exemptions for small parcels that are De Minimis users. We have seen GSAs develop land-based fees, in which case all landowners are being charged or De Minimis parcels are exempted. But that needs to be defined by the GSA program.

Review Potential Funding Approaches

Mr. McAteer presented on potential funding approaches.

He provided a summary breakdown of estimated funding needs by General Program Administration, Management Actions, and Projects. For more detail on estimated costs and activities and implementing entities, please see slide 22. These costs will continue to be refined based on staff and stakeholder feedback.

One of the major focuses is recovering the cost of the General Program Administration. We have seen GSAs implement funding mechanisms through fees, charges, and assessments to fund the administrative costs. Mr. McAteer outlined some example approaches for sharing and allocating these costs with an example budget of \$600,000 per year.

1. Member-Agency Cost-Share Approach
 - a. This approach is reliant on existing revenue sources to finance the Administration.
 - b. Example methods of splitting the costs between the participating GSAs were presented, including:
 - i. Split costs based on gross acres within each GSA.
 - ii. Split costs based on irrigated acres and urban and residential areas on groundwater.
2. Acreage-Based Fee or Assessment
 - a. Example methods of splitting the costs included:
 - i. Charging by gross acres
 - ii. Charging by Irrigated, Municipal, and Residential acres
 - b. This approach is relatively simple to administer given the availability of existing information. Irrigated and municipal acres could potentially serve as a proxy for groundwater use.
3. Groundwater Use-Based Fee
 - a. Example methods of splitting the costs included:
 - i. Charging each acre-foot pumped
 - ii. Charging each acre-foot pumped, but by using classes of charges based on types of use.
 - b. If groundwater use varies significantly from year to year, as in the Corning Subbasin, the revenues would also vary despite the consistent nature of administrative costs.
4. Well-Based Fee
 - a. Example methods of splitting the costs included:
 - i. Charging each well equally
 - ii. Charging each well using classes of charges based on well type, such as domestic, production, and public supply.

Mr. McAteer presented a comparison of the above approaches based on benefit logic, revenue stability, data requirements, other considerations, and cost summary based on the example budget of \$600,000.

Mr. McAteer reviewed the regulatory processes for adopting fees or assessments levied by GSAs. Fees and assessments that might be levied by a GSA are governed by the provisions of SGMA, Proposition 13, Proposition 218, and Proposition 26. He reviewed the mechanism, general applicability, approval, public hearing requirements, collection methods, and fee study requirements. For the full table, please see slide 29.

The GSAs would need to work with a consultant to develop and select the appropriate charging procedure.

GSAs can use a variety of funding sources to fund their needs. In addition, GSAs have the flexibility to utilize new or adjusted funding mechanisms over time as new data, needs, and opportunities are identified. Potential funding sources were summarized by activity type:

- General Program Administration – GSA self-funding (fees, assessments)
- Management Actions – Grants, partner funding, GSA self-funding
- Projects – Grants, partner funding, GSA self-funding, bonds, and borrowing

GSA Staff

The GSA staff provided no further clarifications at this time.

CSAB Discussion

- Ms. Violich – What methods are other rural areas using?
 - Mr. McAteer – Every area is unique when it comes to funding General Administrative expenses. Some areas have opted to charge all acres, and others have chosen to limit the charges to areas using groundwater. One example of the latter approach is described below:
 - In Salinas Valley, the charge is based on municipal connection and irrigated acres.
 - There is not a significant number of rangeland and foothill acres that are unirrigated in the Salinas Valley basins that are managed by SGMA.
 - They used a Prop 26 approach to charge irrigated grounds and municipal connections.
 - For those using Prop 26 and 218, it is common for all acres in the basin to be charged. Sometimes there are exemptions for parcels of 2 acres or less. Federal lands are also exempted. Sometimes agencies have imposed a minimal charge for non-irrigated grounds and a higher charge for irrigated lands or left out non-irrigated ground entirely (although this is less common).
 - Some of the appetite for fees depends on the perception of the value of the GSP.
 - Ms. Violich – I was going to ask about a sliding scale that could put the emphasis on those irrigating regularly.
 - For the regulatory process, is that a majority of those voting or majority of those assessed?
 - Mr. McAteer - I will get clarification on this for the next meeting.
 - Mr. Lester – Last week’s Tehama Groundwater Commission Meeting, two other commissioners and I were adamant that those who have rangeland with minimal groundwater use have very little charge. The bulk of the charge should be provided by those using the groundwater. This is inequitable between those who are pumping water.
 - Ms. Violich – This sounds like a sliding scale.

- Mr. McAteer – The circumstances in Corning and equity in the basin need to be considered and reviewed with legal counsel. At the end of the day, it will be the GSA’s boards that decide on the approach that they find are most appropriate.
- Mr. Williams – With regard to the acreage-based fee assessment on slide 25, does this include exemptions for small parcels?
 - McAteer – This does not include those exemptions. This refers to the gross acres in the Corning Subbasin area. There are other iterations based on these approaches that could be developed if chosen for consideration.
 - Mr. Williams – It would be interesting to see how many acres that would exclude. If you threw out the small acreage, that fee would go up, but the parcels may be using the same amount of ground water regardless of the parcel size.
- Mr. Turnbull – Trying to put meters on everybody’s wells will be a non-starter. That has been something that has arisen repeatedly. It might make technical sense, but practically, it doesn’t work. One of the options would be based on usage, but I don’t think it’s politically doable.

Public Comment

- Ms. Williams – I appreciate the longstanding resistance to metering. As a groundwater hydrologist and granddaughter of well drillers, I understand that huge hurdle. I think it will be important going forward to look at the cost financially and politically and environmentally in complying with regulations of the reality of needing to know the actual pumping distribution.
 - We may need to keep this dialogue going. Treating metering as a non-starter at this point might be okay, but I’m not sure how it will play with the state. The subbasin managers may want some way to provide that information for modeling and cost recovery and implementing individual well management practices, including conservation as part of sustainability planning. It’s time to look at the simple way to meter. Most wells have power meters on them. It’s simple to take the pump information and turn it into pumping quantities. Somehow, we have to get past that.
- John Amaro (Mr. Amaro) – I agree with the comments on metering. Tehama County is such a checkerboard of land use. I was wondering if you could have a well fee based on the size of the well. Could that get you away from reading and monitoring a meter? As far as well metering, I wonder if that would be a possibility?
 - Mr. McAteer – A capacity-based fee could be appropriate. However, there are over 4,000 wells in the Corning Subbasin. Collecting the information on each well’s capacity could require a high level of effort, but it could provide an equitable method for recovering costs.
- Del Reimers (Mr. Reimers) – We own land on both sides of the border between Glenn and Tehama Counties. In Colusa, we voted by the parcel but we pay by the acre. The person in town had the same vote as us with 640 acres in a parcel.
 - The Williamson Act makes it so that we pay more for groundwater than property taxes. We didn’t have a vote on it in Glenn County. I am hoping that Tehama doesn’t do what Glenn County did. We have land with 1864 water rights to pay for rangeland, and we pay the same as the guy pumping water for the orchard. We hit 400 feet with drilling and hit hard rock. Hopefully, there is another funding mechanism to apply for this. We are adding to the groundwater with our surface water. We are watering cattle. Our water table on the lower end is 20 ft. because we are irrigating. There should be benefits to us that apply only to surface water.

- Ritta Martin (Ms. Martin) – I want to echo what happened here with the Colusa Subbasin irrigated versus non-irrigated lands and fees. I brought up in our last meeting that the Westside Ad-Hoc Report in 2020 came up with alternative methods for the costs similar to some methods that were presented by Bryce McAteer. The land issues are very similar between Colusa and Corning subbasin.
- Jaime Lely (Ms. Lely) – I am a pumper on the Glenn side in the valley, and I represent a rangeland group. There is a big difference here with this CSAB that has been willing to have this discussion. The Westside owners do not have the revenue, nor do they use the groundwater to pay for GSA fees.
 - I am more willing to pay as a landowner pumping groundwater in the valley. However, in the hills, we only have domestic wells. We are not pumping to water cattle feeding off troughs.
 - I do like the idea that the fee could be \$100/well.
 - The quantity and quality are very low on the Westside. The benefit of charging the per acre-foot is not the same as the quantity and quality of water down in the valley.
 - If the costs for groundwater were to increase, it might incentivize landowners in the westside to irrigate more to make their lands more productive, which is against the SGMA objectives of using less groundwater.
 - Recommended including an option outlined in the Westside Ad-Hoc Committee Report which was an incentive program for non-pumpers with land that is not being used. This option was not included in Mr. McAteer’s presentations of funding options.
- Ms. Violich – I am hearing a lot of agreement between comments made by the CSAB and public. I would suggest that a sliding scale would address people’s comments. I encouraged Bryce to look at developing a sliding fee scale to make equitable representation in the fee structure. We don’t want to incentivize people to install more orchards and use more groundwater to be able to pay their groundwater fees.
- Ms. Porta – Clarified that surface water and groundwater users are using both sources conjunctively. In this situation, it might be challenging to separate the use and define the charges.

7. Review Upcoming DWR Grant Opportunities

Review DWR SGMA Grants

Mr. McAteer reviewed the upcoming DWR grant and SGMA funding opportunities, including the following:

- Round 2, SGMA Implementation Grant Program (Prop 68)~\$77M for the construction of projects that support GSP implementation; solicitation opens Spring 2022.
- Governor’s Budget (May 2021) \$300M for SGMA implementation:
 - Infrastructure projects to improve water supply, water quality, and/or the reliability of drinking water wells
 - Technical assistance grants to ensure engagement of underrepresented communities
 - Provide underrepresented communities with direct and tangible drinking water quality and supply benefits
 - \$10 million to accelerate collection and reporting of subsidence data
 - \$49 million for critical data collection, enhanced groundwater monitoring, and groundwater accounting
 - \$12 million for drought-related drinking water emergencies
 - \$60 million grants to incentivize agricultural water use efficiency

There is ongoing funding available for Technical Support Services (TSS) for well installations and similar projects.

Mr. McAteer highlighted two other potential grant programs for GSP work, including USBR CalFED Bay Delta Restoration Program and the USBR WaterSMART program.

CSAB Discussion

- Ms. Violich – Are these grant funds one-time offerings? How quickly do we need to be ready, and how much can we rely on grant opportunities?
 - McAteer – We can consider grants to be opportunistic. Many of these programs have been available yearly for several years and anticipate that those will continue into the future. However, some may only be available in the near term and new programs will likely arise too.
 - Prop 68 funds are expected to be a one-time funding source.
 - We anticipate that new state funding opportunities will continue to arise as California recognizes SGMA as a 20-year process. The Governor’s budget reflects this recognition.
- Mr. Williams – Of these grant opportunities, will any be able to pay for Grant Administration? Are we putting the cart before the horse in talking about grant opportunities?
 - Mr. McAteer – I think it is important to think about all of these in tandem. Some grant opportunities may not require an agency cost share or may allow for a cost-share in an in-kind fashion. We want to make sure we are aware of grant opportunities that can reduce the cost of general administration, including monitoring, reporting, and data collection.
 - Mr. Williams – It’s hard to imagine applying for grants.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment at this time.

8. Open Discussion on GSP Sections and Feedback

Ms. Porta provided a brief summary of Section 5: Monitoring Networks content and noted that the CSAB members did not submit any comments on this section.

Ms. Porta went on to review Section 6: Sustainable Management Criteria and summarized the comments received by the CSAB members.

Summarize Feedback from CSAB

The CSAB provided the following comments on Section 6:

- Clarifications regarding domestic well impacts analysis assumptions and data discrepancies
- Revised text in groundwater level (GWL) contour maps explanation boxes
- Clarification on process for isolation of elastic from inelastic subsidence
- Clarifications on approach to develop GWL Minimum Thresholds (MT)
- Clarification of domestic well 25-ft operation safety factor versus MT buffer
- Clarification on land use impacts and management during drought
- Suggested revisions to Appendix 6A

CSAB Discussion

- There were no further CSAB comments at this time.

Public Comment

- There were no public comments at this time.

Ms. Porta mentioned there will be another opportunity for public comment at the public workshops and during the 45-day public review period.

9. Review Action Items and Adjourn

2021 CSAB Meeting Schedule, Topics, and Recommendations To Be Made

Ms. Porta reviewed upcoming CSAB meetings and proposed topics:

- September 1 – Review final draft GSP, remaining questions and comments, moving towards GSP implementation. CSAB to vote on releasing the Draft GSP for public review.
- October – There will be a Public Workshop on the Draft GSP but no CSAB meeting.
- November 10 – Review public comments on GSP. CSAB to consider Recommendation for Adoption of Groundwater Sustainability Plan to Groundwater Sustainability Agencies.
- December 1 –
 - CSAB meeting, as needed. Recommendation for Adoption of Groundwater Sustainability Plan to Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, if consensus not reached on November 10.
 - Following CSAB recommendation, GSAs will hold public hearings to formally adopt the GSPs at the Board level.

CSAB Comments

- Mr. Lester – For the funding mechanism, what needs to be finalized for the plan to be submitted?
 - Ms. Porta – The funding plan does not need to be fully developed. It should include general cost, potential approaches, and an approach for refining the funding mechanisms for funding the GSA. The GSP needs a documented plan but don't have to have it all figured out yet.
- Mr. Lester – We are two different counties, so does the funding mechanism need to be the same for both sides of the boundary?
 - Ms. Porta – I believe the funding mechanism can be different for each County.
 - Mr. McAteer – Each GSA can implement different funding mechanisms. They will want to coordinate. The MOU describes that the GSAs will determine how they share those costs. They will need to identify the costs that are required, how they are allocated and shared, and determine how such costs are recovered.

Public Comments

- Ms. Williams– Will the public workshop be multiple dates and locations? I suggest getting the word out to the public that it's coming up.
 - Ms. Porta – The public workshop is being developed.
 - Ms. Hunter – We are still in the early stages of developing the public workshop. Please send ideas to the GSA staff.

Ms. Leimbach thanked Ms. Porta, CSAB members, and the public for participating in this great discussion and adjourned the meeting at 3:52 p.m.

Meeting Participants

CSAB Members

- Julia Violich, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- David Lester, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Groundwater Commissioner)
- Bob Williams, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Board Member)

Alternates

- John Amaro, CSAB alternate for Corning Sub-basin GSA, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
- Ian Turnbull, CSAB alternate for Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Member of the AB3030 TAC for the District

Other Participants

- Nichole Bethurem, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
- Matt Brady, Farmland Reserve
- Dave Brown, Lawrence and Associates
- Brooke Davis, Glenn County Planning and Community Development
- Holly Dawley, GCID
- Adam Englehardt
- Ryan Fulton
- Todd Hamer, Tehama County Groundwater Commission
- Matt Hansen, landowner
- Lisa Humphreys, Glenn County Farm Bureau
- Lisa Hunter, Glenn County Water Resources/CSGSA
- Leros Lane, landowner
- Jaime Lely, landowner
- Ritta Martin, landowner
- Leland Meibeyer
- Del Reimers, landowner
- Don Rust, Glenn County Planning and Community Development
- Martha Slack, Rio Alto Water District
- Michael Ward, landowner
- Tamara Williams, landowner

Consultants and Project Team

- Lisa Porta, Montgomery & Associates
- Bryce McAteer, WestWater Research
- Julie Leimbach, Kearns & West