



Corning Subbasin Advisory Board



Tehama County Flood Control
and Water Conservation District

Members

Matt Hansen -- Dave Lester -- Steve Gruenwald -- Ian Turnbull (Alternate)
John Amaro -- Brian Mori -- Jim Yoder -- Grant Carmon (Alternate)

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board

August 6, 2025 | 1:30p.m.

Location | 794 Third Street, Corning, CA 96021

And Teleconference

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Member Hansen called the Corning Subbasin Advisory Board (CSAB) meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)		Corning Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) (CSGSA)	
X	Matt Hansen		John Amaro
X	David Lester	X	Brian Mori
X	Steve Gruenwald		Jim Yoder
X	Ian Turnbull (Alternate)	X	Grant Carmon (Alternate)

A quorum of members was present.

Other participants: Lisa Hunter (Glenn County), Lena Sequeira (Tehama County), Adriana Langarica (Tehama County), Eddy Teasdale (Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE)), Michael Ward, Jenny Scheer, *Maddie Munson, *Brandon Davison, *Valerie Kincade, *Holly Stanitsas, *Ryan Fulton, *Monique Gaido, *Greg Krzys, *Marisa Perez-Reyes, *Jacques DeBra, *Pavan Dhaliwal, *Evan Markey, *Steve Stull, *James.

* = Online Participant

3. Meeting Minutes

a. Approval of April 2, 2025 meeting minutes

Motion by Member Gruenwald to approve as presented, seconded by Member Lester. Approved unanimously.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation

a. Well Mitigation Program

- 1. Status update from CGSA on their development of a well mitigation program for the Glenn County portion of the Corning Subbasin**

L. Hunter stated that there were no specific updates at this time, but noted they have an upcoming meeting scheduled.

Member Hansen asked if they are waiting on Tehama County.

L. Hunter responded that they intend to discuss that at the upcoming meeting, as they want to align the programs as closely as possible.

2. Status update from Tehama County GSA on their development of a well mitigation program for the Tehama County portion of the Corning Subbasin.

A. Langerica reported that the STRAW proposal has been completed and will be taken to the working group next week for finalization.

3. Discussion to Identify potential opportunities for coordination of the programs. As appropriate, provide recommendations to GSAs

This remains a standing item to support coordination on well mitigation as needed.

b. Demand Management Program

1. Receive overview of County of Tehama and Corning Subbasin Groundwater Demand Management Framework Technical Report.

Eddy Teasdale (LSCE) reported that a draft Demand Management Framework document has been developed and shared with the Tehama Ad Hoc group. He noted that the framework is complete and reviewed the next steps, including potential funding for implementation.

He reviewed the table of contents for the technical memo and explained that the purpose was to present the information and receive feedback. He emphasized the importance of addressing timelines, noting that Tehama has a 2026 deadline, while Glenn's deadline is 2027.

Discussion focused on clarifying what constitutes implementation of the workplan, identifying potential funding sources, and making decisions related to the program framework.

Member Hansen asked whether the document had been circulated to the working groups.

Member Turnbull noted that input had been provided on a prior version of the document.

Member Gruenwald expressed his concerns.

Discussion focused on the different versions of the document.

L. Hunter expressed her opinion on ensuring equality between Tehama and Glenn Counties and requested greater inclusiveness.

Member Hansen noted that, to his understanding, the technical memo was prepared using Corning grant funds. He added that the document would improve with additional input.

E. Teasdale clarified that the document was completed using multiple basins' outreach funds and emphasized that the most recent version is not solely Tehama-focused.

Member Gruenwald asked when the most recent version of the document would be available for review.

E. Teasdale responded that the most recent version would be available by mid-August.

L. Hunter expressed concern that the CSGSA had not provided any input on the document.

E. Teasdale clarified that the document will have an August date on the cover and will be distributed by the following Friday.

Michael Ward noted that the next Demand Management meeting [for Tehama County] is scheduled for 8/27 and stated that it would be helpful to receive a copy of the document before that date.

Discussion focused on the timeline for distributing the document and the intended recipients.

2. Status update from the CGSA on their development of demand management program for the Glenn County portion of the Corning Subbasin.

L. Hunter reported that the CSGSA ad hoc committee would be meeting soon to discuss the framework document.

3. Status update from Tehama County GSA on their development of a demand management program for the Tehama County portion of the Corning Subbasin.

A. Langarica provided an update, stating that there is one more working group meeting before the document is presented to the Commission, with the next step being a review of the document.

Member Hansen asked for clarification on whether there would be one more meeting before it goes to the Commission.

A. Langarica confirmed.

4. Discussion to identify potential opportunities for coordination of the programs. As appropriate, provide recommendations to GSAs.

Tehama provided an update on their progress in developing the Demand Management framework.

Member Hansen acknowledged L. Hunter's points as valid but noted that the timeline is driving Tehama's progress.

c. Discussion and potential recommendation to GSAs on Corning Subbasin model and options for the periodic evaluation.

E. Teasdale began the presentation by providing background that the Corning Subbasin uses a different model than the other Tehama basins. He discussed the concept of moving to a single modeling tool to simplify the process, highlighting the benefits and presenting the pros and cons of each platform. He stated that he was seeking recommendations based on the information presented.

He noted that the GSP periodic evaluation is due to DWR in 2027, but the grant funds expire in April 2026, so a decision on which model to use is needed to best utilize the grant funds.

Technical issues briefly disrupted online participants' audio, but the issues were resolved, and E. Teasdale returned to the Demand Management discussion. With no further questions, E. Teasdale continued, presenting and comparing the model domains for Corning and Tehama.

E. Teasdale reviewed the primary differences between the two models and explained the rationale for recommending using SVSim. He noted that a challenge with the six-layer C2VSim model, currently funded by DWR and used in the Corning Subbasin, is that it would not be ready for the periodic evaluation. Tehama is moving forward with SVSim, with the goal of eventually using it in the Corning Subbasin as well. He emphasized the importance of SVSim for Demand Management due to its nine-layer model.

E. Teasdale reiterated that he was seeking direction from the group.

Member Turnbull asked about C2VSim's timeline with DWR.

E. Teasdale explained the reasons for choosing SVSim.

Member Gruenwald requested further clarification.

E. Teasdale reiterated that the recommendation is to use SVSim, the nine-layer model, noting that C2VSim is on DWR's timeline.

Member Lester expressed support for switching to SVSim and suggested simplifying the process by using a single model.

Member Gruenwald voiced concern about investing in a model that DWR requirements might later change.

Discussion focused on funding sources for the upkeep of SVSim.

Member Carmon noted that the Colusa Subbasin [to the south] is using C2VSim and asked what model is being used to the north.

E. Teasdale responded that Shasta is using a completely different model.

Member Carmon clarified that Tehama is not the only GSA affected and asked about potential costs to residents from switching models.

E. Teasdale responded that the costs would be minimal.

Discussion followed on ensuring that costs remain low.

Member Hansen stated that using a single model makes the most sense and that the more refined model would be better for Demand Management. He agreed with Carmon's comments regarding costs and highlighted efficiencies in SVSim.

E. Teasdale noted that SVSim provides multiple efficiencies and added that maintaining separate models could increase costs and delay timelines.

Member Turnbull commented on the improved resolution in the upper layers of the nine-layer model, noting it provides a better understanding of conditions.

E. Teasdale added that deeper pumping needs in Demand Management would further demonstrate the benefits of the nine-layer mode.

Public Comment:

A resident provided a report on the effects of the dropping water table in their area.

Member Hansen stated that he would follow up with the resident for general comments and suggested leaving this portion of the meeting open for discussion on the models.

Member Mori asked for clarification that if SVSim is adopted, the funds would go to LSCE.

E. Teasdale clarified the details of the contract.

L. Hunter shared her perspective that all models are valuable tools and emphasized the importance of highlighting differences between them. She referenced recent conversations in Butte County and noted that DWR remains committed to C2VSim, supporting its use. L. Hunter explained that DWR has released an update to C2VSim and they have indicated openness to incorporating local refinements. She stated that incorporating local modifications could make the Corning Subbasin model more realistic.

and could be completed in time for the periodic evaluation. L. Hunter asked for DWR's perspective on the models and whether using a DWR-supported model would result in less scrutiny, while noting that relying on a localized model maintains dependence on a consulting team.

Michael Ward stated his opinion on the timeline.

Member Carmon reiterated his view that he prefers using a model approved by DWR and noted that he does not see the need for immediate action.

Discussion followed regarding the number of models in use across the state and their respective structures.

Member Hansen shared his perspective on the matter, followed by a conversation about the costs and effort involved in updating different models.

Member Lester moved to proceed with SVSim, and Member Hansen seconded the motion.

Ayes: Gruenwald, Hansen, Lester

Noes: Mori, Carmon

Member Hansen clarified that the motion to utilize SVSim passed with a majority vote of 3 to 2.

L. Hunter noted that this decision serves as a recommendation to be taken back to the GSAs.

Further discussion addressed the cost of switching to SVSim. Member Hansen suggested that this topic be discussed at the GSA level.

d. Update on Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM) Implementation Grant.

E. Teasdale discussed the periodic evaluation due to DWR in January 2027, noting that the GSA must submit a periodic evaluation at least every five years, which could also include a GSP amendment with updated information. He recommended preparing a periodic evaluation without an amendment and explained the rationale behind this recommendation. E. Teasdale reviewed all components involved in completing a periodic evaluation and noted that while grant funds are set to expire in April 2026, DWR appeared supportive of extending the grant agreement for this task.

Discussion followed, generally favoring proceeding with the periodic evaluation without a GSP amendment and addressing data collection.

E. Teasdale then discussed corrective actions, emphasizing that these summarize the items needing attention in the periodic evaluation and that a model is necessary to complete them. He reviewed the corrective

actions and DWR's requirements, including considerations related to nitrates and water quality.

He continued discussing corrective actions related to land subsidence and monitoring gaps within Thomes Creek.

Discussion followed regarding nitrates and water quality.

Member Gruenwald asked whether the report would address the effects of recent fires on flows and noted his opinion that flows have changed since the fires.

E. Teasdale responded that the model should capture the impacts of the fires and reiterated his recommendation to proceed with a periodic evaluation without an amendment at this time.

He presented a ranking matrix designed to prioritize in-lieu surface water connection projects and allocate funds for the remaining grant period. E. Teasdale reviewed cost information, the process for running projects through the matrix, and efforts to finalize landowner agreements. He stated the goal is to complete the agreements within the next few weeks to proceed with next steps.

E. Teasdale then reviewed the updated matrix approved by the Tehama Board, providing updated quotes and project information. He highlighted locations where property owners had agreed to install monitoring wells, noting that grant funds must be used by April 2026.

Member Turnbull commented that a resident in the room had volunteered for monitoring but had not received a response.

The resident then addressed the matter.

Discussion followed regarding monitoring wells and outreach efforts.

E. Teasdale reviewed the grant implementation schedule and provided updates on the five wells that have been developed. He noted that extensions are being requested from DWR for the monitoring tasks.

He also discussed the cameras purchased for well inspections, followed by a discussion on the process for using the cameras.

6. Groundwater Sustainability Agency Updates.

Tehama: None.

CSGSA: Working on a five-year permit for recharge at Stony Creek.

7. Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Member Reports and Comments.

Jenny Scheer, a water consultant with Water and Land Solutions subcontracted on the LSCE Team, reported that a project is underway to revive the Thomes Creek Water District. She explained the project and its potential benefits for agricultural users, noting that their current contract expires in 2030 and that water

use before then is important to maintain allocations. She also mentioned efforts to address previous compliance-related debts.

Discussion followed regarding the potential benefits and opportunities of having access to the water.

J. Scheer noted that obtaining new contracts would be difficult, so any available water would support existing contracts.

Further discussion focused on water allotment and recharge efforts through Stony Creek.

Public Comment:

A resident provided an update on the wells they personally monitor in their area, reviewing measurements for various wells and sharing information on the depth of newly drilled wells. The resident expressed appreciation for the county's monitoring efforts in coordination with the state.

Member Turnbull asked how long the resident had been taking measurements, and the resident replied since the fall of last year.

Discussion followed regarding the resident's situation.

Bruce Rossen from Senator Megan Dahle's district office in Redding expressed appreciation for the work being done and noted that the Senator wished to remain engaged.

8. Next Meeting

10/1/2025

9. Adjourn

3:34pm