

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board  
Meeting Packet

September 7, 2022

## Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Meeting

September 7, 2022 | 1:30 p.m.

### In-Person Location:

City of Corning Council Chambers  
794 Third Street  
Corning, CA 96021

Due to limited parking for Corning City Hall, meeting attendees are asked to park their vehicles in the parking lot across from City Hall, next to the railroad tracks.

### Alternate Meeting Location:

1177 Magnolia Ave., Larkspur, CA 93939

### Remote Public Participation Option:

Microsoft Teams meeting

**Join on your computer or mobile app**

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 233 540 351 995

Passcode: TLEvMT

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

### Or call in (audio only)

[+1 323-676-6164,,849833409#](#) United States, Los Angeles

Phone Conference ID: 849 833 409#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

---

## MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Meeting Minutes
  - a. \*Approval of June 8, 2022 meeting minutes
4. Period of Public Comment
5. Groundwater Sustainability Agency Updates
6. Meeting Schedule
  - a. \*Set meeting schedule for the remainder of 2022
  - b. Discussion on 2023 meeting schedule frequency

7. Funding Plan for Corning Subbasin Shared Costs
  - a. Discussion on cost-sharing mechanisms between the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies
  - b. \*Recommendation to the GSAs on a funding plan for Corning Subbasin shared costs
8. Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant
  - a. Discussion of grant application and project prioritization
9. Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Member Reports and Comments
10. Next Meeting
11. Adjourn

A complete agenda packet, including back-up information, is available for public inspection during normal work hours at 225 North Tehama Street, Willows, CA 95988 or 9380 San Benito Avenue, Gerber, CA 96035. After posting of this Meeting Agenda, the public may request copies of support information for public agenda items listed.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, The Corning Subbasin Advisory Board will make available to persons with a disability disability-related modification or accommodations. If requested, this document and other agenda materials can be made available in an alternative format for persons with a disability who are covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Contact Nichole Bethurem at 530-385-1462 or Lisa Hunter at 530-934-6540.

# Corning Subbasin Advisory Board

June 8, 2022 | 1:30 p.m.

## Meeting Minutes

Location | 794 Third Street, Corning, CA 96021

## And Teleconference

Meeting Materials | [CorningSubbasinGSP.org/CSAB-meetings](https://CorningSubbasinGSP.org/CSAB-meetings)

### 1. Call to Order

Justin Jenson (Mr. Jenson) called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

### 2. Roll Call

Mr. Jenson conducted the roll call.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (TCFCWCD)		Corning Sub-basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (CSGSA)	
x	Steven Gruenwald		Grant Carmon
x	Dave Lester	x	Brian Mori
	Bob Williams		Julia Violich
x	Ian Turnbull (Alternate)	x	John Amaro (Alternate)

Other participants: Lisa Hunter (Glenn County Water Resources Coordinator), Justin Jenson (Tehama County Deputy Director Public Works – Water Resources), Todd Hamer (Tehama County Groundwater Commission), Pete Dennehy (Montgomery & Associates), Ron and Cathy Tobin (Landowners), Michael Ward (Landowner)

### 3. Meeting Minutes

Motion by Member Turnbull (Mr. Turnbull), second by Member Lester (Mr. Lester) to approve the April 6, 2022 CSAB meeting minutes as distributed.

Ayes: Members Gruenwald, Lester, Turnbull, Mori, Amaro

Noes: None

Absent: Members Williams, Carmon, Violich

### 4. Period of Public Comment

There was no public comment.

### 5. Groundwater Sustainability Agency Updates

Mr. Jenson and Ms. Hunter reported to the CSAB on the TCFCWCD and CSGSA, respectively:

## TCFCWCD

- Tehama County is in the process of approving a funding mechanism. The fee structure is being presented for approval to move forward. Mr. Jenson discussed the \$0.29 per acre well registration program fee and upcoming public hearings.
- Tehama County is coordinating with the Tehama County Resource Conservation District to identify potential project funding opportunities.

In response to Mr. Mori, Mr. Jenson discussed the temporary well permit regulations approved by the TCFCWCD Board of Directors in response to Governor's Executive Order N-7-22. Mr. Jenson stated Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) approval of well permits is automatic if the conditions fall within the parameters of the temporary regulation. The temporary regulations and maps can be viewed at [tehamacountywater.org](http://tehamacountywater.org).

Mr. Mori commented on recent Board of Supervisors election results and asked how they may impact water efforts in Tehama County.

## CSGSA

- The last CSGSA meeting included a presentation on Land IQ and discussions about retaining legal counsel on an as-needed basis.
- The CSGSA approved a well permit acknowledgment form in response to Governor's Executive Order N-7-22. Glenn County's well permit moratorium remains in effect; therefore, compliance with the Executive Order essentially only applies to replacement ag wells.
- The CSGSA member agencies are discussing short-term funding strategies and a long-term funding mechanism. A Request for Proposals (RFP) process to develop the funding mechanism will be considered at the next CSGSA meeting.
- Ms. Hunter provided an update on the final invoice and reporting for the Proposition 1 grant.
- A Technical Support Services application is being considered to address erosion concerns in the Stony Creek area.

In response to Mr. Mori, Ms. Hunter stated the Land IQ presentation was an informational overview of the program and its features. Mr. Mori asked if Land IQ is being considered for a land use assessment as part of the long-term funding mechanism.

Michael Ward (Mr. Ward) asked for clarification on the assessment being considered. Ms. Hunter stated it is referring to the long-term funding assessment and how fees may be developed. Mr. Mori discussed the concerns with developing equitable costs for irrigated versus non-irrigated lands. Mr. Jenson discussed data requirements for funding mechanisms and the need to withstand challenges. Mr. Turnbull stated the need for landowners to be able to easily resolve errors.

## 6. Discussion: Funding Corning Subbasin Shared Costs

Mr. Jenson presented the SGMA Cost Allocation Approaches for the Corning Subbasin PowerPoint. The presentation included the following slides: SGMA Funding Needs, Sources of SGMA Implementation Funding, Expected Sources of Funding, How do the GSAs Share SGMA Costs?, Mechanisms for Recovering Costs, Approaches for Allocating Costs, Subbasin Data for Consideration, Comparison of Cost Allocation Approaches, Recommendations for Corning Subbasin GSAs. The complete slide deck can be viewed at [corningsubbasingsp.org/csab-meetings](http://corningsubbasingsp.org/csab-meetings).

Ms. Hunter stated while GSAs are required to develop individual funding mechanisms, some costs will be more economical to share. Staff from the two GSAs will need to coordinate on the most effective way to distribute those costs. In response to Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Jenson stated the costs provided are a good starting point to work from.

Mr. Gruenwald discussed concerns with the proposed \$1 million annual budget presented. Mr. Gruenwald stated costs for staffing and legal services seem low. Mr. Gruenwald asked if the costs could be compared to those GSAs further along in the process. Mr. Jenson stated in addition to the broad ranges based on localized costs, it is difficult to determine the costs agencies included in their budget. Mr. Lester stated many of the GSAs with funding mechanisms in place are critically overdraft and have more complicated problems to address.

Discussion ensued regarding legal exposure, specifically related to environmental groups, for the GSAs as the process advances.

In response to Mr. Turnbull's comments on the Subbasin Data for Consideration slide, there was discussion on the accuracy of the acreage by water use type. Ms. Hunter stated the figures could be referenced with the GSP for confirmation. Mr. Mori discussed a hybrid mechanism of parcels and land use types, stating it may solve conflicts between the various stakeholder groups.

Mr. Jenson clarified the purpose of this agenda item is to determine the methodology of how the GSAs will share the costs of administering the program. Ms. Hunter stated the importance of having the GSA cost share determined to ensure GSA fees account for the shared costs.

Mr. Lester expressed concerns with having separate consultants for the Corning Subbasin and the other four Tehama County subbasins.

Mr. Jenson encouraged the members of the public in attendance to submit comments and feedback via email to include in future meetings.

Following discussion, Mr. Jenson stated the original estimated costs could be presented to the CSAB at the September meeting to be reviewed by task category.

## **7. Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Member Reports and Comments**

Ms. Hunter discussed the need to develop an RFP for consultant services for the Water Year 2022 Annual Report.

Ms. Hunter stated it will be important to begin discussing and prioritizing projects and management actions (PMAs). This will also support discussions on the upcoming grant funding opportunity which is expected to open in September 2022. She clarified the application opens this fall, but the execution of the agreements is not expected until Summer 2023. Only one application is allowed per subbasin and the GSAs will need to coordinate on the process.

Mr. Turnbull commented on the projects and the types of information and costs that are included in the GSP. He suggested additional information and further outreach may be needed. Mr. Jenson encouraged those with project ideas to contact him. Mr. Gruenwald suggested reaching out to Sustainable Conservation.

Mr. Ward asked if the grants are dependent on the PMA list in the GSP. Mr. Jenson responded that funding can be applied for projects that benefit a PMA. Mr. Ward suggested that a feasibility assessment of projects be included and noted there is an interest in recharge projects. Mr. Jenson highlighted the

results from the airborne electromagnetic study will be useful to help with these studies; however, the data is not yet available.

## **8. Next Meeting**

The next CSAB meeting is scheduled for September 7, 2022.

## **9. Adjourn**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:06 PM.

DRAFT

# Corning Subbasin Advisory Board

## 2022 Meeting Schedule

---

Corning Subbasin Advisory Board Meetings will be held at **1:30 p.m.** unless otherwise noted. Meetings are expected to be held at the City of Corning Council Chambers at 794 Third Street, Corning, CA 96021. Meeting locations will be confirmed and included on each agenda.

April 6, 2022

June 8, 2022

September 7, 2022

[October 5, 2022](#)

[November 2, 2022](#)

[December 7, 2022](#)

## Corning Subbasin Agency Cost Allocation Approaches

<b>Gross Acres Cost Share</b>		
	Acres (% of Total)	Annual Cost (\$ Total/Year)
TCFCWCD	161,727 (78%)	\$780,000
CSGSA	45,615 (22%)	\$220,000

<b>Irrigated Acres Cost Share</b>		
	Acres (% of Total)	Annual Cost (\$ Total/Year)
TCFCWCD	40,997 (66%)	\$655,840
CSGSA	21,548 (34%)	\$344,520

<b>Groundwater-Using Acres Cost Share</b>		
	Acres (% of Total)	Annual Cost (\$ Total/Year)
TCFCWCD	40,997 (66%)	\$673,843
CSGSA	21,548 (34%)	\$326,157

<b>Average Groundwater Use Approach (Acre Feet)</b>		
	AF Water (% of Total)	Annual Cost (\$ Total/Year)
TCFCWCD	104,500 (67%)	\$667,732
CSGSA	52,000 (33%)	\$332,268

<b>Staff Recommended Approach</b>		
TCFCWCD		
CSGSA		

## Estimated Panning-Level Cost for First 5 Years of Implementation- Based on GSP Table 8-6

Activity	Budget Categories and Tasks	Annual Cost	Lump Sum Items	5-year Total	Annualized Cost (5 years)	Notes
1 and 2	GSA Administration, Program Management, and Funding	\$610,500	\$143,000	\$3,195,500	\$639,100	Includes costs for GSA administration, communication, outreach, (Section 8.1) and funding mechanisms (Section 8.2) per Tables 8-4 and 8-5.
<b>3</b>	<b>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</b>					
	Groundwater Conditions Monitoring	\$50,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$50,000	Placeholder costs for groundwater level monitoring
	Annual Reports (\$50,000 for first report, \$30,000 for subsequent reports)	\$34,000	\$0	\$170,000	\$34,000	Assumes \$50,000 for first report, \$30,000 for subsequent reports
	GSP 5-year Update	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$30,000	
<b>4</b>	<b>Address HCM and Groundwater Conditions Data Gaps</b>					
	AEM or other geophysical testing to refine hydrogeologic conceptual model	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	Placeholder costs. Expect majority of work to be funded by DWR.
	Aquifer testing to refine hydrogeologic conceptual model	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$20,000	Placeholder costs
	GDE mapping	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$30,000	Placeholder costs
<b>6</b>	<b>Expand Existing Monitoring Networks</b>					
	Videologging of wells with unknown screen intervals	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$2,000	Placeholder costs. Expect work to be funded by DWR TSS grant. GSA responsibilities: administer grant; coordinate with DWR
	Install 5 new observation wells	\$0	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$25,000	Placeholder costs. Expect work to be funded by DWR TSS grant. GSA responsibilities: administer grant; coordinate with DWR and landowner; identify well locations; obtain property access; review and coordinate execution of agreements. Recent TSS applications showed a GSA contribution* of \$25,000 for 1 observation well cluster.

	Coordinate with DWR to continue groundwater quality monitoring	\$2,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$2,000	Placeholder costs. The GSAs will coordinate with DWR to explore the continuation of regular groundwater quality monitoring in observation well clusters in the Subbasin
	Assess modification or replacement of surface water gages on Thomes Creek	\$0	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$8,000	Placeholder costs
<b>6</b>	<b>Update Data Management System</b>					
	Routine Data Management System Updates	\$10,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$10,000	Placeholder costs.
	Well Database Update	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	Placeholder costs for updating Tehama Co well database similar to Glenn Co update, in collaboration with the other Tehama County GSPs and updating the Glenn County database.
	Well Registration Pilot Program	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$10,000	Placeholder costs for developing a pilot well registration program.
<b>7</b>	<b>Update and Refine Groundwater Model</b>	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$30,000	Placeholder costs
<b>8</b>	<b>Evaluate, Prioritize, and Refine Projects and Management Actions</b>	\$60,000	\$0	\$300,000	\$60,000	Depends on projects and management actions pursued; Could be grant or project match; Will be coordinated with agencies that benefit. <b>THIS COULD INCLUDE CONSULTNAT SUPPORT INCLUDING GRANT WRITING</b>
	Contingency (10%)	\$76,650	\$106,800	\$490,050	\$98,010	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$843,150</b>	<b>\$1,174,800</b>	<b>\$5,390,550</b>	<b>\$1,078,110</b>	

**CORRECTED FIGURES**

**PRIORITY SHARED COSTS FOR YEAR 2022/2023**

Notes:

Some of the line items may be optional costs, such as well registration pilot program and well database updates.

Some of the implementation activities may be delayed beyond the first few years to allow for funding to be arranged.

\*GSA contribution is expected to encompass in-kind staff time to collect and manage data and maintain equipment over the useful life of the well (approximately 20 years)

Corning Subbasin Project List for Grant Planning Discussion

On electronic version, please use zoom function to ready more clearly.

Project # (not ranking)	Project Name	Brief Description (including project objective(s)) (GSP Purpose/ Description) (DWR Eval Criteria Points= 4 points)	Proposed Tasks and Subtasks (3 points)	Project Status (GSP)	Quantifiable Benefits (GSP Expected Benefits/Evaluation of Benefits) (at least 3 to get full points) (4 points)	Notes
1	Well Management Program	Better understand domestic and small ad well issues in the subbasin and protect well owners from future impacts. Includes various projects, incentives, and actions noted in proposed tasks/subtasks.				GSP Section 7.3.2.1
1.a			Well Inventory			
1.b			Education and Outreach			budget is annual estimate
1.c			Well Incident Reporting System			
1.d			Well Mitigation Program			budget is annual estimate
2	Grower Education	Grower education relating to on-farm practices for sustainable groundwater management. This includes promoting conjunctive water use and water use efficiency. Provide information on water resource management for more flexible use. Educate growers on the value of using surface water over groundwater when available, replacing inefficient wells, adding organic amendments to improve moisture retention, soil mapping for custom irrigation timing and duration. Explore starting a groundwater users cooperative to coordinate pumping schedules (this could also happen in the Capay Area).				GSP Section 7.3.2.2; budget is annual estimate
2.a			Maximize surface water use			
2.b			Manage soils to improve infiltration and root zone soil moisture storage			
2.c			Reduce/minimize non-beneficial ET			
2.d			Establish groundwater user cooperative			
3	Policies and Ordinances	Establish water and land use management restrictions on future well pumping and new agricultural growth, for better sustainable groundwater management. Coordinate with counties to establish or revise county well permitting, water use, and land use ordinance or policies to align with GSP.			Policies and ordinances regarding land use restrictions (such as to curb new agricultural growth expansion), water use (such as pumping restrictions during certain water year types), and well permitting (to reduce effects in shallow wells), all provide benefits to beneficial users and uses in the Subbasin by reducing pumping growth and lessening the impacts on all well owners	GSP Section 7.3.2.3
3.a			Well tracking data			
3.b			Domestic well management			
3.c			Design criteria for new agricultural wells			
3.d			Requirements for deeper seals and/or placement of well seals at certain depths			
3.e			Restrict new pumping in specific areas			
4	Use of Full Surface Water Allocation	Incentivize growers within districts to use all contracted surface water for better conjunctive use. Implementation-Ready project in Corning WD. Needs infrastructure improvements in OUWUA, Thames Creek WD, and Kirkwood WD.			Expected benefits from project implementation were evaluated using a groundwater model scenario that aims to simulate effects of Water Districts utilizing their full surface water allocations in the future. 10,500 AF decrease in annual gw pumping, 900 AF/yr additional gw storage (42,700 AF cumulative gw storage over 50 years), increase in gw level by up to 20 feet.	GSP Section 7.3.2.4
4 (cont)						
5	OUWUA Infrastructure Improvements for In-lieu groundwater pumping	Improve surface water conveyance and irrigation infrastructure for surface water use in lieu of groundwater pumping		Pre-Design/Planning Stage	12,000 to 25,000 AF/yr additional surface water use in-lieu of gw pumping	GSP Section 7.4.3.1
5.a			Northside Phase II Modernization Project			
5.b			Lateral Pipeline Conversions			
5.c			Data Collection and Management			
5.d			Tehama-Colusa Canal Interties			
5.e			Potential Land Annexations			
5.f			Grower Outreach and Education			
6	Regional Surface Water Transfers for In-Lieu	Incentivize the use of surface water within the subbasin by transferring water into the Subbasin from other CVP districts		Implementation-Ready	Maximizing water transfers with the intent of facilitating in-lieu groundwater recharge has the benefit of increasing groundwater levels and groundwater storage. This stored groundwater can be extracted in years when no transfer water is available, or if delivery systems are capacity constrained	GSP Section 7.4.3.2
7	Invasive Plant Removal	Invasive plant removal to reduce shallow groundwater use and restore native habitat		Pre-Design/Planning Stage	The primary benefit of this project is increased surface water available for environmental flows, irrigation, and groundwater recharge due to reduced evapotranspiration. In addition to water savings and fire risk reduction, invasive plant removal has other benefits. Thick stands of invasive plants can over time lead to a narrower river channel, increase flow velocities, erode channel banks, and damage bridges when large portions of vegetation break loose. Removal of arundo would help restore the natural braided stream profile, which would in turn decrease flooding and improve conveyance in the Subbasin. Invasive species also crowd out native species and remove valuable	GSP Section 7.4.3.3; benefit to cost ratio 1.4 to 1.7
8	Groundwater Recharge through Unlined Canals	Groundwater recharge through unlined canals and natural drainages including ephemeral streams		Conceptual	Increase groundwater recharge in the Subbasin, that would benefit areas with groundwater pumping for irrigation and declining groundwater level trends. Increasing in-stream flows would benefit priority species, such as salmon and steelhead, by increasing stream stage, improving rearing habitat, and providing potential spawning habitat.	GSP Section 7.4.3.4

Project # (not ranking)	Project Name	Brief Description (including project objective(s)) (GSP Purpose/ Description) (DWR Eval Criteria Points= 4 points)	Proposed Tasks and Subtasks (3 points)	Project Status (GSP)	Quantifiable Benefits (GSP Expected Benefits/Evaluation of Benefits) (at least 3 to get full points) (4 points)	Notes
9	Off-stream Surface Water Storage	Off-stream temporary storage of flood waters on private lands		Conceptual	Surface water storage and subsequent use for irrigation will provide a new surface water supply source that would reduce groundwater pumping, while increasing in-lieu groundwater recharge. This project may also provide flood reduction benefits to the extent high flow events are reduced by diversions.	GSP Section 7.4.3.5
10	City of Corning Stormwater Recharge	City of Corning stormwater improvements/ groundwater recharge		Conceptual	Decrease flood risks in areas where recent flood impacts have been noted. Improve stormwater capture and prevent flooding, while providing a source of groundwater recharge for the aquifer. More reliable groundwater supply.	GSP Section 7.4.3.6
11	Recycled Water Use for Crop Irrigation	Use treated wastewater from local cities for agricultural irrigation purpose for in-lieu groundwater		Conceptual		GSP Section 7.4.4.1
12	Groundwater Recharge Pond South of Corning	A 2-4 AF pond managed by USBR collects stormwater and could be used to store 215 water for use during the irrigation season or for direct recharge.		Conceptual		GSP Section 7.4.4.2
13	TNC multi-benefit recharge projects	TNC is interested in partnering with growers for an on-farm, multi-benefit groundwater recharge program that provides critical wetland habitat for migratory birds.				GSP Section 7.4.4.3
14	California Olive Ranch Groundwater Recharge	Artificial recharge project diverting water from the Tehama Colusa Canal through existing irrigation canal into an existing unlined basin where it can percolate to groundwater.		Feasibility analysis ongoing		GSP Section 7.4.4.4; considering on-farm ponding test in winter 2022
15	Thomes Creek flood water diversions for recharge	Evaluate the potential and feasibility of diverting flood flows on Thomes Creek to store off-stream to satisfy irrigation needs, or divert to a recharge pond.				GSP Section 7.4.4.5
16	Groundwater Substitution Transfers from other basins	Capture surface water flows that were left upstream in streams tributary to the Sacramento River in the Los Molinos Subbasin for habitat restoration projects. 2 projects currently being evaluated conceptually before going into a feasibility study.		Conceptual	Habitat benefits; improve streamflow conditions for fish passage and other environmental	GSP Section 7.4.4.6
16.a			Trout Unlimited groundwater substitution transfer on Deer Creek			
16.b			TNC groundwater substitution transfer on Mill Creek- or release water down the creek for habitat benefits that can be diverted to Corning Canal			
17	GSAs Administration, Communication, and Outreach					GSP Section 8.1.1
17.a			Subbasin GSA Coordination			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.b			Internal GSA Coordination			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.c			Inter-basin Coordination			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.d			Public outreach and notification			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.e			Advisory Board and GSA Board meetings			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.f			Budget planning and funding oversight			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.g			Oversight of consultants or contractors			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.h			Collecting data and reporting sustainability progress			Unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
17.i			Filling data gaps			
17.j			Implementation of PMAs			
18	Refinement of GSP Implementation Funding Sources and Mechanisms					GSP Section 8.2; unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
19	Monitoring and Reporting					GSP Section 8.3
19.a		GSAs will coordinate with DWR and others to ensure data collection from the GSP monitoring network continues without interruption using the protocols specified in the GSP. Data collected will be compiled and stored in the DMS. Data quality will be assessed routinely to confirm it meets the in accordance with GSP Regulation §356.2, annual reports will be submitted to DWR starting on April 1, 2022. The purpose of these reports is to provide monitoring and total groundwater use data to DWR, compare monitoring data to the SMC, and provide an update on adaptive implementation of projects and actions to achieve sustainability. Development of an annual report will begin following the end of the water year, September 30, and will include an assessment of the previous water year. The annual reports may also serve as amendment(s) to the GSP as the monitoring	Monitoring			GSP Section 8.3.1; unlikely to be eligible for grant funding.
19.b		Five-Year GSP assessment reports will be provided to DWR starting April 1, 2027. The GSAs will evaluate the GSP at least every 5 years to assess whether it is achieving the sustainability goal in the Subbasin. The assessment will include a description of significant new information that has been made available since GSP adoption or amendment and whether the new information or understanding warrants changes to any aspect of the plan. The 5-Year updates will also include	Annual Reports			GSP Section 8.3.2
19.c		Address HCM and groundwater conditions data gaps	5-Year GSP Assessment Reports			GSP Section 8.3.2
20	Address HCM and Groundwater Conditions Data Gaps					GSP Section 8.4
20.a		There is some uncertainty where the western boundary of the alluvial basin is located, as there is anecdotal evidence that some wells in this portion of the Subbasin are drilled into fractured rock	Western Boundary of the Subbasin			GSP Section 8.4.1
20.b		The geologically complex environment created by the contemporaneous deposition of the Tehama and Tuscan Formations is not entirely understood in all areas of the Subbasin. The interfingering of these heterogeneous formations could be mapped with greater certainty to improve the conceptual understanding of the principal aquifer. This information would be useful to better assess whether confining layers impede vertical movement of groundwater in some areas.	Tehama-Tuscan Transition Zone			GSP Section 8.4.1

Project # (not ranking)	Project Name	Brief Description (including project objective(s)) (GSP Purpose/ Description) (DWR Eval Criteria Points= 4 points)	Proposed Tasks and Subtasks (3 points)	Project Status (GSP)	Quantifiable Benefits (GSP Expected Benefits/Evaluation of Benefits) (at least 3 to get full points) (4 points)	Notes
20.c		Existing knowledge of aquifer parameters can be considered incomplete for some of the Subbasin's formations, namely the Tuscan and Tehama Formations. Existing aquifer testing results are limited and sometimes potentially misleading, as described in Section 3.1.5. The aquifer properties of these heterogenous and interfingered formations could be refined to improve the groundwater model calibration, making it a more accurate tool for projecting future groundwater conditions and	Hydrogeologic Parameters			GSP Section 8.4.1
20.d		The location and extent of GDEs is estimated based on vegetation mapping and regional groundwater level data. Actual rooting depth data are limited and will depend on the plant species and site-specific conditions such as soil and aquifer types, and availability to other water sources. There are areas in the Subbasin with potential GDEs where insufficient data exist to say with certainty if GDE vegetation is supported by shallow groundwater or if vegetation is supported by surface water. This distinction is important as GDEs supported only by surface water are not subject to the depletion of interconnected surface water SMC. Priority species that are known to utilize	Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems			GSP Section 8.4.1
20.e		Analysis of groundwater elevations in the western Subbasin is limited by the low number of wells screened and monitored Corning Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. See Section 8.5.2 for the implementation plan for expanding the groundwater level monitoring network in the western	Groundwater Elevations in the Western Area of the Subbasin			GSP Section 8.4.1
20.f		Groundwater quality is not measured in many wells in the western area as most of the wells are private domestic wells and are not part of groundwater quality monitoring programs. See Section 8.5.2 for the implementation plan for collecting additional groundwater quality data in the western	Groundwater Quality in the Western Area of the Subbasin			GSP Section 8.4.1
20.g		Coordinate with DWR to improve understanding of the subsurface geology, including the complex interfingering of Tehama and Tuscan Formation. In addition, a better understanding of the edge of the western Subbasin boundary is necessary to assess if the most western areas are truly part of the alluvial aquifer as defined by DWR. Additional data gathering could be useful to support a future Basin Boundary Modification request to refine the Subbasin boundary, if appropriate. Build on DWR's planned state-wide AEM study and the Butte County AEM pilot project.	May include AEM or geophysical surveys (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.4.2
20.h		Identify wells for aquifer testing to develop better estimates of aquifer properties, to help improve the groundwater model calibration and better understand subsurface characteristics as described above. In addition, aquifer testing could help with project and management action feasibility studies	May include Aquifer testing (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.4.2
20.i		GDE mapping for this GSP was based on GDE-indicator vegetation mapping and historical groundwater level measurements. The GDE analysis may be refined should new wells be installed or added to the GSP monitoring network, or other sources of groundwater level data become available. This data gap investigation will focus primarily on the areas where insufficient groundwater level data exists near the potentially interconnected reaches of Thomes Creek. Additionally, remote sensing tools such as the Nature Conservancy's GDE Pulse or Google Earth Engine may be used to assess impacts to GDE vegetation vigor from groundwater level declines (if	May include GDE mapping (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.4.2
<b>21: Expand and Refine Existing Monitoring Networks</b>						
21.a		The well depth is known for each well used in the GSP groundwater level monitoring network; however, 14 of the 98 total wells have unknown well screen intervals. Since there is only 1 principal aquifer in the Subbasin, the lack of well screen data for some groundwater level monitoring wells does not preclude these wells from being used to understand and manage groundwater in the basin. However, understanding of relative water levels, pumping areas, and vertical gradients is	Lack of Well Screen Information for some RMP Wells			GSP Section 8.5.1
21.b		There are a few localized spatial data gaps identified in Section 5 where monitoring wells at 1 or more depths could be used to help further refine the understanding of groundwater conditions in areas of high groundwater use. These data gaps are noted near Thomes Creek to the northeast of Corning, and in the western third of the Subbasin in the limited areas where land is used for	Localized Spatial Data Gaps for Groundwater Level Monitoring Wells			GSP Section 8.5.1
21.c		Monitoring well data gaps were identified that would help characterize groundwater and surface water interaction adjacent to Thomes Creek and the northern boundary of the Subbasin. The data gap locations are co-located with those identified in the shallow RMP network for monitoring water	Localized Spatial Data Gaps for Shallow Groundwater Level Monitoring Near Streams			GSP Section 8.5.1
21.d		The primary data gap for the groundwater quality monitoring networks is that the DWR is currently evaluating potential plans to continue monitoring the groundwater quality well network in the Subbasin. The GSAs recommend that the DWR continue to monitor groundwater quality in the network of observation well clusters in the Subbasin in the future. Groundwater quality is also not measured in many wells in the western portion of the Subbasin as there are no wells in active groundwater quality monitoring programs. In addition, most water supply wells at the cities are only monitored sporadically for TDS, and the GSAs will work with the cities to implement annual	Localized Spatial Data Gaps for Groundwater Quality Monitoring			GSP Section 8.5.1
21.e		Many of the formerly active stream gages in the Subbasin are no longer available for monitoring. Replacing or modifying the 2 stream gages on Thomes Creek would provide more complete spatial coverage for streamflow monitoring. There is 1 existing gauge at the upstream portion of Thomes Creek that is not capable of measuring low flows below 3 feet, and there is 1 gauge on the lower	Localized Spatial Data Gaps for Surface Water Monitoring			GSP Section 8.5.1
21.f		The GSAs will seek to videolog wells with unknown screen intervals used for groundwater level monitoring. There are currently 14 wells with unknown screen intervals in the GSP monitoring network. Videologging will be conducted, focusing first on the RMP wells, followed by other less critical GSP monitoring network wells as funding allows. If a downhole pump is installed in the well in question, the pump will be removed prior to lowering a video camera. While the survey is being completed, the GSAs will note the screen intervals and conduct a well condition assessment to determine whether the well construction information and current condition support collection of	May include Videologging of Wells with Unknown Screen Intervals (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.5.2

Project # (not ranking)	Project Name	Brief Description (including project objective(s)) (GSP Purpose/ Description) (DWR Eval Criteria Points= 4 points)	Proposed Tasks and Subtasks (3 points)	Project Status (GSP)	Quantifiable Benefits (GSP Expected Benefits/Evaluation of Benefits) (at least 3 to get full points) (4 points)	Notes
21.g		During the first few years of GSP implementation, the GSAs will seek to identify existing wells that are suitable and accessible for monitoring groundwater levels in the data gap areas for chronic lowering of groundwater levels and depletion of interconnected surface water sustainability indicators. There are 5 general areas with spatial data gaps shown in the shallow and deep groundwater level RMP networks shown in Figures 5-4 and 5-5, respectively. If an existing well cannot be identified, or permission to use data from an existing well cannot be secured, then a new monitoring well will be drilled and added to the monitoring network, provided permission will be granted by the landowner. The GSAs will work with DWR to obtain TSS agreements to install new observation wells, as needed. In addition, groundwater level analysis near the Corning Subbasin boundaries will be supplemented in GSP annual updates with data from neighboring subbasin wells, as necessary, while the GSAs will coordinate with DWR to explore the continuation of regular groundwater quality monitoring in observation well clusters in the Subbasin, as this information would be extremely helpful for the Subbasin. Additionally, domestic wells in the western area of the Subbasin may be added to the current supply well monitoring network to collect TDS samples in those areas. The GSAs will also coordinate with the City of Corning and Hamilton City on annual TDS monitoring at Thomes Creek to address data gaps on this stream reach. This activity will be coordinated with applicable state and federal agencies. Thomes Creek is the only major surface water body in the Subbasin that is classified by the TNC Gage Gap webmap as a poorly gaged stream. The active DWR stream gauge on Thomes Creek near Paskenta only records creek stage and discharge when there is greater than 3 feet of water in the creek. There is also an inactive, former USGS stream gauge location on Thomes Creek to the west of I-5 that could be revived or replaced to improve monitoring on this reach. The DMS that will be used to store, review, and upload data collected during GSP development and implementation. As new information is collected during monitoring and provided by local stakeholders, the DMS will be updated. The regular updates will also coincide with the review of new data and development of GSP annual reports. After the initial data upload and GSP submission, new data will be compiled in the input Excel tables, which are based on GSP and Annual Report upload templates provided by DWR. The monitoring data will be imported at least annually to the DMS Access database as part of the annual report process. GIS data in the web mapping application will also be updated annually, as needed. These annual updates will be completed by the GSAs. During GSP implementation, a more robust well data tracking and a well registration program may be developed to better assess wells in use and amount of pumping in the Subbasin. Should this program would be aimed at improving overall county well data management. The GSA could assist each county in developing improved well tracking databases. This would involve reviewing well completion reports and GIS data currently available through DWR's Well Completion Report Application and SGMA Data Viewer and the County Environmental Health Departments. Since much of this data is incomplete or places wells at the center of public land survey system (PLSS) sections, additional research could be conducted to refine the data. For example, the counties could check with well owners about data accuracy and compile information on new wells, including location, purpose, construction information, and hydrogeology. The counties could also identify abandoned wells or wells no longer in use. A similar effort has already been undertaken in Glenn County and enhanced with DMS improvements using Proposition 1 grant funding as described in Section 7.3.2.1. This effort could therefore focus on refining well data within the Tehama County portion of the Corning Subbasin and continuing to refine the Glenn County portion of the data included in its countywide well DMS. This effort will be coordinated with the GSPs being developed within Tehama and Glenn Counties to produce 2 county-wide well completion report databases, containing robust	May include Identify or Install additional Groundwater Level Monitoring Wells (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.5.2
21.h			May include Groundwater Quality Data Gap Implementation Plan (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.5.2
21.i			May include Surface Water Monitoring Data Gap Implementation Plan (Implementation Plan for addressing data gaps)			GSP Section 8.5.2
22	Update Data Management System					GSP Section 8.6
22.a			Well Database Update			GSP Section 8.6.1
22.b			Well Registration Program			GSP Section 8.6.2
23	Update and Refine Hydrologic Model					GSP Section 8.7
24	Refine and Implement Projects and Management					GSP Section 8.8