

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board

November 4, 2020, 1:30 – 3:30 pm

Meeting #7 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/385239005>

Telephone: +1 (872) 240-3212

Meeting Access Code: **385-239-005**

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

Roll call

Ryan Teubert and Lisa Hunter took the roll call for the CSAB Members.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)

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

Alternate:

- ✓ Ian Turnbull

Corning Sub-basin GSA

- ✓ Lisa Hunter
- ✓ John Viegas
- ✓ Julie Violich [joined at 1:43 and left at 3:04pm]

Agenda Review, Review of Groundrules

Rafael Silberblatt welcomed meeting participants to the seventh CSAB meeting. He reviewed the agenda and reminded attendees that CSAB meetings are following Brown Act guidelines. He invited members of the public to announce their name and affiliation into the chat box to be included in the meeting summary.

2. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

- Delbert David, Member of the Public - I am having difficulty accessing the web platform. There is a form that needs to be filled out for teleconferencing and they don't want you to come in within the two-minute rule. I recommend that you should get the form out of the way.

3. Action Item: Approval of the Meeting Summary

David Lester made the motion: *The CSAB approves the CSAB October Meeting Summary*. John Viegas seconded the motion. Mr. Silberblatt opened discussion on this motion. Hearing no comments from CSAB board members, he called a vote.

Roll call vote:

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)

- David Lester – Aye
- Bob Williams – Aye
- Steven Gruenwald – Aye

Corning Sub-basin GSA

- Lisa Hunter – Aye
- John Viegas – Aye

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

4. GSA Updates

Ryan Teubert and Lisa Hunter reported to the CSAB on the TCFCWCD and Corning Sub-basin GSA (CSGSA) activities , respectively.

Tehama County GSA (Ryan Teubert)

- TCGSA Board will be reviewing the Corning Subbasin Sustainability Goal on November 16 and will have notes from that at the next meeting.
- For other subbasins in Tehama County, they are creating a draft Sustainability Goal to be presented some time in December.
- In the month of October, they focused on outreach for the four subbasins within the county as well as providing information for the Corning Subbasin. They had four meetings: Bowman had six attendees, Red Bluff had zero, Los Molinos had 12, and Antelope had one.
- They held a specific meeting for the Thomes Creek area for those who had concerns about new orchards in the area and how that would affect groundwater levels. There were 27 attendees.
- A presentation was also made at a Tehama County Board of Supervisor's meeting that had three attendees as well as a webinar in October that had around 20 participants.

Corning Sub-basin GSA (Lisa Hunter)

- CSGSA last met September 9 and their next meeting is November 10. There haven't been any decisions made in the interim.

- CSGSA will look at the preliminary Corning Subbasin Sustainability Goal description, as the Tehama County Groundwater Commission edited the descriptions that have been approved at the previous meeting.
- The Department of Water Resources (DWR) has granted Facilitation Support services for the Corning Subbasin. This will include additional support for outreach activities (e.g., additional outreach meetings, meeting materials, and support for the Corning Sub-basin GSA meetings). More outreach will be happening within the next month or so.

5. Brief Follow up on Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels SMC

Lisa Porta provided a follow up on Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) discussion from last month, summarized the revisions that have been made to the initial SMC, and provided an overview of next steps.

- Proposed Representative Monitoring Points (RMP) Network for Groundwater Levels
 - There were questions on the RMP monitoring network at the last meeting. Lisa presented the latest data on the wells proposed as RMP for monitoring the chronic lowering of groundwater levels sustainability indicator.
 - There will be 41 RMP wells monitoring levels shallower than 450 feet; there will be 21 RMP wells that monitor levels deeper than 450 feet.
 - Both counties are working with DWR to add a couple of wells to the monitoring network. They are marked on the maps on Slide 4 by a green dot.
 - Lisa Porta answered Lisa Hunter's question: The monitoring network can be expanded in the future, and only RMP wells will be reviewed with the minimum thresholds and measurable objectives. If more wells are added, they will need an SMC review to be determined in the five-year-updates.
- Minimum Thresholds (MT) and Measurable Objectives (MO)
 - It was determined that the most reasonable Minimum Threshold would be the minimum level of Fall 2018, instead of the previous proposal of Fall 2019.
 - After reviewing the hydrographs, they found that, in general, Fall of 2019 was not the most recent minimum water level because Fall of 2018 was actually a lower value.
 - It was determined that the most reasonable Measurable Objective would be the Maximum of Spring 2012, instead of the previous proposal of the average of all data between 2012 and 2018.
 - The average of 2012 to 2018 was skewed lower because of some special cases.
 - In cases where RMP wells lack Fall 2018 or Spring 2012 data, data from an adjacent similar water year can be substituted.
- Next Steps
 - The Groundwater Level SMC GSP Section is currently being developed and should be ready for review in December. It will summarize the methodology and include hydrographs as well as Undesirable Results and Significant and Unreasonable Conditions statements.

- Feedback will be solicited on the Groundwater Level SMC GSP Section in January and February.
- Potential responses to feedback on the initial SMC for GSAs will be shared in February.
- In March through May, potential projects and actions will be run through the model to determine if the SMCs are viable.

Discussion and Feedback from CSAB

- Hal Crain - Who is working to establish these MTs? What enforcement action would be taken if we fall below the MT?
 - Lisa Porta - The GSP Team is establishing the MT, with input from CSAB members and the public. The purpose of the MT is to be able to plan projects and management actions that will prevent water levels from dipping below the MT, so there won't be a trigger and then an action. The goal is to keep the levels sustainable and the MT allows us to have parameters for what is and isn't a sustainable water level.
 - Hal Crain - It seems premature to establish the MT when we are still studying the hydrology and improving the model.
 - Lisa Porta - One reason for establishing the initial MT now is so we have an idea of what we don't want to see happen. This will help us determine if the goals are reasonable or if there are other actions or mitigations that need to be developed to help support the beneficial users that may be affected. It will give us something to compare to and guide future discussion and action. These initial MTs can be refined over the next few months before GSP finalization.
- David Lester - In a previous meeting, we talked about how a different modeling system is being used in the north, i.e. Red Bluff and other subbasins in Tehama County. They are referring to two or three aquifers in their models. Are we looking only at the Corning Subbasin? The Red Bluff Subbasin is having a lot of problems that the Corning Subbasin has as well.
 - Lisa Porta - We will examine our water levels and will compare notes to water levels and associated MTs in adjacent basins. The modeling and management may be different, but we will be comparing levels to ensure consistency. We need to make sure that the MTs are not negatively affecting each other's basin management.
- Ian Turnbull - What mechanism will we use to determine if we are in a drought and identify it as such?
 - Lisa Porta - In other GSPs, they use an Official Declaration approach, we can do that and/or also identify Critically Dry Years, per the DWR water year indexing approach. For example, we can say "In more than two consecutive critically dry years, it is not an undesirable result". There are different ways that we can do that. We will provide some options to consider. The preliminary model will show us if those levels will rebound if there are wetter years. Projected scenarios incorporating climate change will show us extended periods of drought and how water levels are affected.

Public Comment

- Delbert David, Member of the Public - How are you working El Nino and La Nina events into this?
 - Lisa Porta - We aren't specifically including them per say, but we do have a projected water budget and model that is being worked on that includes projected climate change at 2030 and 2070. They will be included as a stress test for the model to see what may happen in relation to the MT when more extreme climate events may happen.
- Matt Hansen, Private Pumper, Thomes Creek - The purpose of the MT is to prevent domestic wells from being sucked dry. As DWR has the data, have you taken into account the total completion depth of wells when establishing the MT so we ensure that when the levels dip down, the wells aren't going dry?
 - Lisa Porta - Yes, we looked at that in the last couple of meetings. That is how we established that water levels should not drop any further if we don't want to affect domestic wells. We know that there may be some domestic wells that are really shallow, and they might need to be drilled deeper. They will be considered in the future. There are different ways to go about SMCs to make sure all beneficial users are protected.
- Eddy Teasdale, LSCE - Based on DWR's guidance it seems we need at least one well every 25 square miles, how does the current distribution of wells fit what is needed for monitoring?
 - Lisa Porta - We have looked at the guidelines and we know we have some data gaps. There are a few areas where we could do better, but it seems to fit pretty well. We are looking at the distribution of where the pumping occurs relative to ag land use.. The whole western part of the basin is mostly brush, not a lot of wells or pumping. That is why it looks empty, but it's not considered a data gap. We might try to get in a couple of wells just for monitoring, but for now we are trying to be more specific to the areas where most of the pumping is occurring.
 - Ryan Teubert – Consider reaching out to landowners to help fill the data gaps.
- Eddy Teasdale, LSCE - On the objectives, why would you want to set an objective prior to 2015? Do you think realistically we can get back to 2012 levels?
 - Lisa Porta - That was a level that was more sustainable for most folks. The 2015 level was one that was already creating some challenges for beneficial users. The measurable objective is not something you have to attain in order to be sustainable, as long as you don't go below the Minimum Threshold and do not incur undesirable results, you are sustainable. We have a lot of wells that are pretty stable. We have discussed prior and I think it is reasonable.
 - Tamara Williams - Has there been a consensus on the "new normal" (i.e., the post-2000 water bubble condition)? It looks like we are losing 20-40 feet.
 - Lisa Porta - I think we are there. This basin has been very water-rich, with about 1500 feet of drinking water available in some places. Sustainability is about staying at a level that will be maintained over time on average. We are trying to find that "new normal". The consensus has been that the MO and MT are fine, as long as we don't dip below the MT. We understand, and with future projects and actions we will hopefully be able to come back to the MO like we were talking about.
- Leros Lane, Member of the Public - Does the historical data support simplifying the less than 450-foot depth as a single modeling unit?
 - Lisa Porta - This was not based on modeling; this was based on measured historical groundwater elevation data. The model is a tool to help us understand differences and project what might happen in the future, but data collection and analysis will help us understand what is happening

in the basin. The 450 was based on this historical data set, not the modeling. We have four layers split up differently in the model.

6. Review Integrated Model Updates

Overview of revisions made to model

Lisa Porta reviewed the extent of the model. Instead of modeling the entire Sacramento Valley, the model concentrates on the Northern Sacramento Valley including the Corning Subbasin and the basins around it. Slide 12 shows the various elements included in the model, like canals, stream nodes, and lake elements. Lisa Porta reviewed the Map of Diversions and Deliveries on slide 13 that was covered in previous meetings.

- Initial refinements were made to the C2VSim-FG Base model to better represent local conditions
 - Refined surface water delivery areas and delivery volumes from canal delivery areas to individual water districts based on available historical data
 - Refined groundwater pumping depths within the Corning Subbasin to better match well completion records provided by DWR
 - Incorporated detailed historical urban water usage for City of Corning and Hamilton City
 - Replaced the boundary condition representing Black Butte Lake with a simulated lake feature and modified Stony Creek to conform to this lake feature. Replacing Black Butte Lake with the simulated lake is a better way of modeling this feature than in the initial model.
 - Incorporated all available observation wells into the model to be able to check for how well the model simulates water levels compared to actual data
 - Applied minor adjustments to hydrogeologic model parameters to better match historical observations after incorporating these model changes
- Additional refinements since last meeting on modeling (July)
 - Transferred all previous model refinements to the currently available DWR C2VSim model
 - Incorporated all wells with groundwater elevation measurements into the model, for calibration verification
 - Further refined hydrogeological model parameters (Kv, Kh) to better simulate conditions
 - Refined land surface values, specifically surface runoff values, (Curve numbers) for native vegetation to better reflect precipitation recharge
 - Further refined surface water diversion volumes based on historical records
- Land Use Information Revisions
 - Crop and land use parameters in the model were reviewed and it was found that the land use in the model prior to 1988 seemed off because there were discrepancies in total land use prior to 1988 (refer to slide 16). Around 1988, there was a change in how land use distribution was recorded in the model causing a shift. To be more accurate and consistent, land use in 1988 was extended back in time to 1974 and the land use then stays constant there. After doing that, the simulated water levels became more reflective of actual data.
- Crop Evapotranspiration (ET) Revisions
 - Annual ET estimates from C2VSim and from other widely used sources were reviewed.
 - Based on review of the estimates, it was decided to reduce C2VSim estimates of ET for pasture, which is typically grazed and may not be fully irrigated, by approximately 6.9 inches on average to better reflect reality.

- See slide 17 for Corning subbasin annual ET for key crops. They compared C2VSim to other models and academic research sources. Generally it compared well except for pasture which needed a tweak to not over pump for land use.
 - Note: In the table, other deciduous generally refers to walnuts and prunes in this subbasin.
- Applied Water Demands Review and Revisions
 - Average annual applied water estimates from 2000 to 2015 for C2VSim were reviewed for consistency with other available current estimates
 - Based on review of applied water estimates and Consumptive Use Fraction (irrigation efficiency) values by crop, some modifications were made to the C2VSim for the Corning Subbasin, in particular:
 - The irrigation period for grain was modified to allow for a single irrigation in the month of April, resulting in an average annual irrigation depth of approximately 5 inches.
 - The Target Soil Moisture Fraction (TSMF) was modified:
 - For pasture to result in an average irrigation efficiency of approximately 0.60
 - For almonds and pistachios, and for olives to result in an average irrigation efficiency of approximately 0.80.
- Effects of Model Refinements
 - Models are never perfect, but the model is effective for use in developing water budgets and planning for projects and management actions to attain and maintain SMC.
 - Simulated groundwater levels are closer to observed values
 - Trends in land use and groundwater pumping are more accurate and consistent
 - Water demand and water use sources are more accurate, especially for recent years
 - Shallow groundwater levels and streamflow are well represented in the model
- Initial Model Calibration Checks
 - Slides 21 through 24 show calibration checks to see that the model is appropriate for what is needed for the GSP. Our model is better at estimating historical data than the beta version. It provides good representation for seasonal variations but needs more work to better represent recent dips in pumping. The last 15 years need more revision to better represent the observed data.

Discussion and feedback from CSAB on model

- Ian Turnbull - Looking at both shallow and deep over the last 15-20 years, there is significant divergence. You acknowledged that there are some tweaks you can make to correct that, what tweaks are you considering?
 - Lisa Porta - Models are never going to be completely perfect and may not always be within 10 feet of data. We can still ensure that the depth of pumping is correct, the pumping takes place in the right layer of the model, the correct amount of pumping is simulated, and that aquifer parameters are accurate.
 - Ian Turnbull - What changed at 2000? It looked like the model was tracking with the observed data, but there is divergence there that is much more than just a couple feet.
 - Lisa Porta/Charlie Brush- One part is the water source type. The model might think there is more surface water being used but in reality less surface water was being used in more recent years and more pumping was occurring. The

revisions we made to the surface layer may not have propagated down to the deeper part of the model. We don't have good historical data on how much water was applied and where within each water district. We averaged the water spread across districts and the historical data. We are taking the water from the Corning Canal and applying it to the different districts based on historical ratios of how much water they had and what their contracts are.

- Lisa Hunter - On slide 24, what is the simulated period for these graphs?
 - The simulated period is water year 1974 to 2015. On the Stony Creek at Black Butte, the years are shown but not on the other ones, they are all modeling the same time period.

7. Review of Water Budgets

Revised historical water budget

Lisa Porta gave a recap of the July meeting which included a discussion regarding DWR's Best Management Practices document requirements as well as the factors for the three subbasin wide water budgets: historical conditions, current conditions, and projected conditions over the 50-year planning and implementation horizon (including climate change).

- Historical/Current/Project Water Budgets
 - Historical water budget summarizes what has happened in the past over a certain time period. It helps us understand inflows and outflows by water source, review changes in storage, identify certain water year types that have caused significant rise or decline in water storage levels, and verify if the subbasin has recovered in the years following a drought. This helps us understand past water conditions to better predict the future.
 - Current water budgets look at the same information as the historical water budget but with different assumptions. For the Corning Subbasin, the current water budget will use the same simulation time frame as the historical climatic and hydrological period but use current land use and water use conditions.
 - Projected water budgets use the current model set up but apply different climate and hydrology factors to show potential future changes.
- Corning Subbasin Draft Historical Groundwater Budget
 - Lisa Porta presented drafts of the current version of the historical water budget based on the changes made to the model.
 - Slide 33 shows the draft historical groundwater budget and slide 34 contains the same information shown as net changes. It shows the difference between inflows and outflows. If the black line (average annual change in storage) is at around zero, then the basin is generally in balance.
- Comparison of Draft Historical and Current Groundwater Budgets
 - Cumulative change in storage is now slightly declining
 - If water management stays the same, the Subbasin will continue to see storage declines and water level declines. These projections do not include climate change factors.
 - Streams are starting to lose to groundwater more than previously. This is an effect that we will try to curb using projects and management actions.

- Total groundwater pumping is projected to increase by about 20,000 acre-feet from historical average in the current model.
- Historically, the subbasin has been healthy, but has trended downward in recent decades. Currently, the subbasin is still ok, but is overall less healthy than it was in the past. In the future, we will probably need to implement projects to maintain water levels.
- Corning Subbasin Projected Water Budgets Approach
 - Two projected water budgets will be developed for this GSP, using DWR-provided 2030 and 2070 projected conditions. Projecting to 2030 will give better understanding of whether or not our goals are sustainable with climate change. 2070 shows whether sustainability can be maintained over a longer time period with future climate changes.
 - The projected period will correspond to historical water years 1974-2015 with the following changes:
 - Precipitation and ET adjusted for climate change
 - Projected streamflow adjusted using DWR-provided CalSim output and HUC 8 watershed change factors
 - 2015 diversions will be used for the entire period apart from diversions on the GCID canal which will be adjusted using CalSim output.
 - Most recently available land use already in the model will be used for the entire projected period

Discussion and feedback from CSAB

- Lisa Hunter - DWR provides a few different projected conditions, are you using the Central Tendencies version?
 - Lisa Porta - Yes, we are using the 2030 and 2070 Central Tendencies. We aren't going to look at the Extreme Climate Scenarios because they are optional.

Public Comment

- Will Halligan, LSCE GSP Consultation for Tehama County FCWCD - Is the reason for poor model calibration of the deep aquifer zones in the last 15 years due to a need to update your conceptualization of land use changes and changes in groundwater pumping over time? Is the use of the C2VSIM model versus using SVSIM which has more layers a factor in the poor calibration?
 - Lisa Porta - I haven't seen the SVSIM model results. I don't think we have poor model calibration. It actually shows we have a good representation of overall water levels over time. We are using a model that was vetted by DWR and approved for use in GSP. We can always do better, but at this point for the current GSP, this is an appropriate model.
 - Will Halligan - How does your current water budget approach consistent with DWR BMPs? Also, is the projected water budget time frame 2016 through 2072?
 - We are following the water budget BMP very closely. We are including everything that needs to be included in the BMP water budget requirements. We are using a time period analysis for climate change projections, not a transient analysis. The projected time frame is at 2030 and at 2070 climatic and hydrologic projected conditions. It is what was recommended by DWR in their climate change guidance.
- Erin Smith - What is the time frame for the 20,000 AF increase estimate?

- Lisa Porta - The entire time frame at current conditions, not quite at 2015. Historical climate and hydrology with current land use and surface water use. Using the general historical signal and adding current land and surface water use, there is a projected 20,000 acre-foot increase in pumping.
- Lerose Lane, Member of the Public - How are you determining the split in the stream or river flows from surface water inflow and groundwater inflow?
 - Lisa Porta - At the boundary conditions (slide 12), there is a time series of surface water inflows estimated by stream gauges. The model propagates this flow down into the channel. The interaction between groundwater and surface water occurs due to water level changes in the shallow aquifer. This allows us to add to the water budget where the water flows between surface water and groundwater. We also calculate runoff into the basin. Some of this is split into groundwater, providing groundwater inflow.
 - Charlie Brush - The stream is simulated in the model. There is a stream node where the elements cross that calculates how deep the groundwater is and how high the water is in the stream. If the water in the stream is high, then water flows into the groundwater. If the groundwater is high, the water flows into the stream. We have a few stream flow observation points that we try, in the model, to match as closely as we can.
- Eddy Teasdale, LSCE - In your current water budget you mention that you're using 2015 land use data. In the Red Bluff subbasin there has been about a 10% increase in new orchards in the last three to five years. This may be true of the Corning Subbasin as well. Could there be a benefit to using more recent data?
 - Lisa Porta - 2015 is the latest and greatest that we have in the model. Land use updates in the model are very complicated and time-consuming, however, we are aware of the changes in land use and we will do a separate analysis to identify what the potential changes in land use will do to the water budget but at this point, it's not going to be included in the model.
- Delbert David, Member of the Public - I understand your inflow and outflow budgeting, but how do you run a budget if you don't know the total budget of water in the aquifer? Since 1980, we have a bank of water and no one has been able to tell us how much water is in the aquifer. You are going to disregard how much is in the bank to determine how much we can use in the future? This affects how much water DWR puts into Shasta for storage in the fall so they can meet their protection for flooding. DWR does not have a good track record of predicting climate change.
 - Lisa Porta - We know how much depth and volume is in the aquifer and how much usable water there is, so you are able to compare current conditions with historical data to establish a rough estimate. The main thing is changes in the volume, not the actual volume. We will follow up on your comment and see what information we can get.
- Tamara Williams - Are the other Tehama County subbasins handling the water budgets in the same manner as the Corning Subbasin?
 - We are still working on it. We can discuss offline.
- Tamara Williams - Are there active gauges on Thomes Creek? I was surprised there was no observed data after 1997.

- I think some of the gauges come on and off. The gauge has been active since 2014, we don't know prior to that. We will double check.

8. Next Steps

Lisa Porta reviewed slide 47 and explained that once we have the SMCs developed and checked with the model, we will verify that the SMCs are possible to be maintained. For PMAs, the model can be used to simulate potential projects and actions to determine the potential change between the baseline projected model to see if SMCs are being maintained. Lisa Porta reviewed the graphic on slide 48 and explained that the goal is to reach sustainability by 2042, and that from 2022 to 2042 is where GSP threshold can be adaptively managed.

Review updated overall timeline and schedule for 2020 and early 2021 CSAB meetings

Lisa Porta proposed moving the December 2nd meeting to December 9th, but after feedback, the group decided to keep the meeting on the 2nd of December. December and January meetings will be reserved for feedback on Draft GSP sections.

CSAB discussion

There were no comments at this time.

Public Comment

- Tamara Williams - Are there notes or materials from the meeting that was held in Flournoy?
 - Ryan Teubert - Yes, I will send them privately over email.
- Jaime Lely, Landowner - As pointed out there is not much data on the West side. You are saying that this is not a data gap, but will this area also be treated the same as the rest of the basin even though the conditions are not the same. I mean the reason there are not many wells on the west side is because there is not much water on the west side.
 - Lisa Porta - That area will not be necessarily treated the same as the rest of the basin based on land use, water use and aquifer conditions. Because there is not a lot of data, we can't set up our SMCs in the same way, but if we can get access to wells or information there, we can add them to the network.

9. Adjourn

Rafael Silberblatt thanked Lisa Porta, CSAB members, and the public for participating in this great discussion and adjourned the meeting at 3:30 PM.

Meeting Participants

CSAB Members

- Lisa Hunter, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- John Viegas, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- Julia Violich, Corning Sub-basin GSA
- Steven Gruenwald, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Private Citizen)
- David Lester, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Groundwater Commissioner)

- Bob Williams, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Board Member)
- Ian Turnbull, Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Alternate

Other Participants

- Bridget Gibbons, CDFW
- Delbert Davi, Member of the Public
- Eddy Teasdale, LSCE
- Erin Smith, DWR Northern Region
- Hal Crain
- Holly Dawley, GCID (Corning Sub-basin GSA Staff)
- Jaime Lely, Landowner
- Kristina Miller
- Leros Lane, Member of the Public
- Mariana Rivera-Torres, CBI
- Mary Fahey, Colusa Groundwater Authority
- Matt Hansen, Landowner
- Martin Spannaus, Landowner
- Michael Ward, Landowner
- Stephanie Horii, CBI
- Tamara Williams
- Thad Bettner, GCID (Corning Sub-basin GSA Staff)
- Todd Hamer
- Will Halligan, LSCE
- Ryan Teubert, TCFCWCD
- Nichole Bethurem, TCFCWCD

Consultants and Project Team

- Lisa Porta, Montgomery & Associates
- Patrick Wickham, Montgomery & Associates
- Rafael Silberblatt, Kearns & West
- Katy Kennedy, Kearns & West
- Byron Clarke, Davids Engineering
- Charles Brush, Hydrolytics