ANNUAL REPORT | APRIL 2024

RED BLUFF SUBBASIN (5-021.50) GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN ANNUAL REPORT – 2023

SUBMITTED BY

TEHAMA COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY

PREPARED BY

Luhdorff & Scalmanini
Consulting Engineers

DAVIDS
ENGINEERING, INC

Prepared by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers and Davids Engineering on behalf of the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District GSA for the Red Bluff Subbasin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ES-1 Executive Summary ES-1
1 General Information §356.2(a) 1
2 Groundwater Elevations §356.2(b)(1) 4
3 Water Supply and Use 8
4 Groundwater Storage 12
5 GSP Implementation Progress – §356.2(b)(5)(C) 19
6 Conclusions 28
7 References 29

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary ES-3
Table ES-2. Total Water Use by Water Use Sector ES-7
Table 3-1. Groundwater Use by Water Use Sector 9
Table 3-2. Surface Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2023 11
Table 3-3. Total Water Use by Water Use Sector 11
Table 3-4. Estimated Uncertainty in Water Use Estimates 12
Table 4-1. Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage 14
Table 5-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary 21
Table 5-2. Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Seasonal Groundwater Elevations of Representative Monitoring Site Wells 23
Table 5-3 Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, Undesirable Results for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water 26
Table 5-4. Summary of Project Implementation Status 27
Table 5-5. Summary of Management Actions 27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1. Red Bluff Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries ES-2

Figure ES-2. Groundwater Pumping, Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2023 ..... ES-6

Figure 1-1. Subbasins in the North Sacramento Valley 2

Figure 1-2. Red Bluff Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries 3

Figure 2-1. Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Spring 2023 (Seasonal High) 6

Figure 2-2. Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Fall 2023 (Seasonal Low) 7

Figure 3-1. Estimated Applied Groundwater – WY 2023 10

Figure 4-1. Groundwater Extraction and Change in Groundwater Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2023 16

Figure 4-2. Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 in the Upper Aquifer 18

Figure 5-1. Change in Subsidence from 10/2022 to 10/2023 25

APPENDICES

Appendix A Hydrographs of Representative Monitoring Site Wells

Appendix B Explanation of Sustainable Management Criteria

Appendix C GSP Annual Reporting Elements Guide

Appendix D DWR Portal Upload Tables

Appendix E Water Use Analysis Methodology

Appendix F Water Quality

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym	Meaning
AEM	Airborne electromagnetic
AF	acre-feet
AFY	acre-feet per year
AMSL	above mean sea level
Tehama County GSA	Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency
DWR	Department of Water Resources
DMS	Data Management System
eWRIMS	Electronic Water Rights Information Management System
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
GSA	Groundwater Sustainability Agency
InSAR	Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar
MO	Measurable Objective
MT	Minimum Threshold
PMA	projects and management action
RMS	representative monitoring site
RMSE	root-mean-squared error
SI	sustainability indicator
SGM	Sustainable Groundwater Management
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SMC	sustainable management criteria
Subbasin	Red Bluff Subbasin
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
UR	undesirable result
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
WY	Water Year

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Red Bluff Subbasin (Subbasin) (5-021.50) Annual Report was prepared on behalf of the Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District GSA (Tehama County GSA) to fulfill the statutory requirements set by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) legislation (§10728) and the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) regulations (§354.40 and §356.2) developed by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). The regulations mandate the submission of an Annual Report to DWR by April 1st after the reporting year, which spans the water year (WY) from October 1st to September 30th. This Annual Report includes information from the recent WY 2023 for the Red Bluff Subbasin, located within Tehama County, as shown in **Figure ES-1.**

Measured conditions in the Subbasin are in compliance with Minimum Thresholds (MTs) for all applicable sustainability indicators (SIs). An MT is the quantitative value that represents the groundwater conditions measured at a representative monitoring site (RMS) that, when exceeded individually or in combination with MTs at other monitoring sites, may define an undesirable result(s) (UR) in the Subbasin per DWR's definition. If groundwater levels are lower than the value of the. Measurable Objectives (MO) for that site, they are moving in the direction of the MT. On the contrary, for the groundwater quality Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC), as the value of the Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) concentrations increase from the MO established for that site, they are moving in the direction of the MT. The SIs and SMC, including MTs, are summarized in **Table ES-1.** Note that seawater intrusion is not an applicable SI in this Subbasin. Each SI is measured at the RMS.




Figure ES-1. Red Bluff Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries

Table ES-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2023 Status	**Undesirable Result Identification**	**Measurable Objective (MO) Definition**	**Minimum Threshold (MT) Definition**
Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at same RMS wells exceed the associated MT for two consecutive measurements.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Spring 2015 groundwater elevation minus five feet (for wells with increasing or no groundwater trends) or projected Spring 2042 groundwater elevation minus five feet for wells with declining groundwater elevations.	**Upper Aquifer:** Spring groundwater elevation where less than 10% or less than 20% of domestic wells could potentially be impacted. **Lower Aquifer:** Spring groundwater elevation minus 20 to 120 feet.
Reduction of Groundwater Storage			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	Same as the chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Amount of groundwater storage when groundwater elevations are at their measurable objective	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Amount of groundwater in storage when groundwater elevations are at their minimum threshold
Degraded Water Quality			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells that exceeded the MT in WY 2023.	At least 25% of RMS exceed the minimum threshold for water quality for two consecutive years at each well where it can be established that GSP implementation is the cause of the exceedance.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** California lower limit secondary MCL concentration for TDS of 500 mg/L measured at RMS wells	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** TDS concentration of 750 mg/L at all RMS wells

Table ES-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2023 Status	**Undesirable Result Identification**	**Measurable Objective (MO) Definition**	**Minimum Threshold (MT) Definition**
Land Subsidence			
No indication of undesirable results No InSAR pixel exceeded MT in WY 2023.	50% of RMS exceed the minimum threshold over a 5-year period that is irreversible and is caused by lowering of groundwater elevations	One foot over 20 years (Zero inelastic subsidence, in addition to any measurement error). If InSAR data are used, the measurement error is 0.1 feet and any measurement 0.1 feet or less would not be considered inelastic subsidence	Two feet over 20 years (i.e., no more than 0.5 feet of cumulative subsidence over a five-year period (beyond the measurement error), solely due to lowering of groundwater elevations
Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurement below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at RMS wells drop below the associated threshold during two consecutive years in the Upper Aquifer.	Same as chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Same as chronic lowering of groundwater levels.

Notes:

TDS is the primary water quality constituent of concern.

MO = Measurable Objective; MT = Minimum Threshold; RMS = representative monitoring site; mg/L = milligrams per liter; MCL = Maximum Contaminant Level; SMCL = Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level.

Current Groundwater Level and Storage Conditions

The current groundwater conditions in the Subbasin are characterized by groundwater elevations that have remained above the MO in four of the six measured RMS wells for Spring 2023 and two of the seven measured RMS wells in Fall 2023. However, all RMS wells remained above the corresponding MT in both Spring 2023 and Fall 2023, thus remaining within the Subbasin's established margin of operational flexibility for each RMS well. Importantly, none of the RMS wells experienced a decline below the MT for 24 consecutive months, hence avoiding undesirable results as defined in the GSP.

Generally, groundwater elevations are, on average, 66 feet above the MT throughout the Subbasin, and, on average, three feet above the MO in Spring 2023 and four feet below the MO in Fall 2023. Elevations are mostly near or slightly higher than those observed in recent years. This positive trend is attributed to the ongoing recovery in groundwater conditions, facilitated by increased surface water supplies due to reduced cutbacks and curtailments.

Fluctuations in groundwater levels and storage within the Subbasin are influenced by the balance between aquifer recharge and extraction. Groundwater levels serve as a proxy for estimating changes in groundwater storage, with observed patterns closely mirroring those in the broader Sacramento Valley. In years characterized by drought and low precipitation, diminished surface water supplies lead to increased extraction and reduced recharge, causing a decline in groundwater storage.

Contrastingly, WY 2023, classified as a Wet WY, marked an increase in cumulative groundwater storage, totaling approximately 66,000 acre-feet (AF) in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. For context, in the past 33 years, the largest decrease in groundwater storage is estimated to be -164,000 AF, and the highest increase was estimated to be 130,000 AF. **Figure ES-2** shows groundwater pumping, as well as annual and cumulative changes in groundwater storage from WY 1990 to WY 2023.




Figure ES-2. Groundwater Pumping, Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2023

Water Use

Groundwater extraction was approximately 97,000 AF in WY 2023, lower than the 122,780 AF extracted in WY 2022. The Subbasin receives surface water supplies from the Central Valley Project (CVP) through the Corning Canal to the Proberta Water District and portions of the Thomes Creek Water District that overlie the Red Bluff Subbasin. The annual volume of surface water delivered to the Subbasin was about 800 AF in WY 2023, higher than the 35 AF delivered in WY 2022.

Groundwater provides the majority (92%) of the water for agriculture in the Subbasin, and surface water is the source for the remainder (8%). Groundwater also met the demand for municipal and rural residential users. The volume of groundwater and surface water used on an annual basis within the Subbasin is summarized directly from measured and reported groundwater pumping and surface water diversions when available; however, a water budget approach has been used to estimate the remaining unmeasured volume of groundwater extraction. **Table ES-2** provides a summary of water use by water sector. Numbers are rounded to the nearest 100 except for totals which are rounded to the nearest 1,000.

Table ES-2. Total Water Use by Water Use Sector				
Sector	WY 2023 (AF)			
	Groundwater	Surface Water	Total	Total Irrigated Area (acres)
Agricultural	91,000	800	**92,000**	**31,000**
Municipal	4,000	0	**4,000**	**0**
Rural Residential	2,000	0	**2,000**	**0**
Total	**97,000**	**800**	**98,000**	**31,000**

GSP Implementation Progress

Since the previous Annual Report (Tehama County GSA, 2023), the Tehama County Subbasin GSA coordinated with stakeholders to seek funding through DWR's Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant (SGM) Program for projects and management actions (PMAs) previously identified in the GSP. DWR has been awarded a grant of approximately 3.5 million dollars for the Red Bluff Subbasin in September 2023. Additionally, several actions by the Tehama County GSA continue to fulfill GSP requirements, such as monitoring groundwater levels and quality, updating the Data Management System (DMS), and annual reporting to DWR.

Also, since the previous Annual Report, DWR has provided corrective actions to the Red Bluff Subbasin GSP. The Tehama County GSA acknowledges and is addressing the two key recommended corrective actions listed in the DWR's **GSP determination letter** (https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/service/gspdocument/download/9963) including:

1) Providing more detailed explanation and justification regarding the selection of the sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels, particularly undesirable results and minimum thresholds, and quantitatively describe the effects of those criteria on the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater.
2) The GSA should revise the GSP to provide a reasonable assessment of overdraft conditions and include reasonable means to mitigate overdraft.

In 2023, the Tehama County GSA in the Subbasin prepared to implement future projects to address recommended corrective actions, which will largely be funded by the SGM Implementation Grant Program. The ongoing implementation of PMAs, outlined in **Section 5**, aims to address these corrective actions effectively through the Periodic Evaluation of the GSP, which is due in January 2027.

1 GENERAL INFORMATION §356.2(A)

The Annual Report for the Red Bluff Subbasin (Subbasin) (5-021.57) was prepared on behalf of the Tehama Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the Tehama County Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama GSA) to fulfill the statutory requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) legislation (§10728) and regulatory requirements developed by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) included in the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) regulations (§354.40 and §356.2). The regulations require the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to submit an Annual Report to DWR by April 1st following the reporting year, which spans the water year (WY) from October 1st to September 30th. This Annual Report is the third Annual Report submitted on behalf of the Subbasin and includes data for the most recent WY 2023. For information on Red Bluff Subbasin and GSP Implementation, Technical Advisory Committee meeting schedules and recordings, and other resources, the public should visit the **Tehama County GSA** (https://tehamacountywater.org/gsa/).

1.1 Report Contents

This report is the third Annual Report prepared for the Red Bluff Subbasin GSP submitted in January 2022. The first Annual Report included data elements for the first reporting year, WY 2021, as well as a "bridge year," WY 2020. The second and third Annual Reports contain data only for the current reporting year, WY 2022 and WY 2023, respectively. Data elements presented in this report refer to WY 2023, the 12-month period spanning October 2022 through September 2023 unless otherwise noted. Pursuant to GSP regulations, the Annual Report includes:

- Groundwater Elevation Data
- Water Supply and Use
- Change in Groundwater Storage
- GSP Implementation Progress

1.2 Subbasin Setting

The Subbasin is a 425 square mile (271,800 acre) area on the southern side of Tehama County. The Subbasin is managed by the Tehama County GSA.

The Subbasin is shown in **Figure 1-1** and **Figure 1-2**. The Subbasin lies in the Northern portion of the Sacramento Groundwater Basin, **Figure 1-1**. The Subbasin's northern boundary is the Bowman Subbasin, on the east by the Bend Subbasin, the Antelope Subbasin, and the Los Molinos Subbasin, and on the west by the Coastal Mountain Range (DWR, 2018), **Figure 1-2**. Several surface water features are located in the Subbasin, including the Pine, Reeds, Red Bank, Elder, and Thomas Creeks. Groundwater generally flows from northeast to southwest.

The Red Bluff GSP estimates the sustainable yield of the Subbasin to be 150,000 acre-feet (AF) based on historical groundwater pumping averages of 80,000 acre-feet per year AFY and an annual decrease in storage of 272,000 AFY (Tehama County GSA, 2022). Water use in the Subbasin is dominated (94%) by agriculture. Municipal and household water use accounts for 6% of water used. Groundwater constitutes the majority (99%) of the Subbasin's water supplies, with surface water comprising the remaining portion (1%).




Figure 1-1. Subbasins in the North Sacramento Valley




Figure 1-2. Red Bluff Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries

2 GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS §356.2(B)(1)

Groundwater elevations in the Subbasin typically fluctuate seasonally between and within water years, particularly in groundwater-dependent areas or during drought years when groundwater is used to compensate for diminished surface water supplies. Seasonal fluctuations of groundwater levels occur in response to groundwater pumping and recovery, land and water use activities, recharge, and natural discharge. Sources of recharge into the groundwater system include precipitation, applied irrigation water, and seepage from local creeks and rivers.

Groundwater pumping for irrigation typically occurs from April to September, although depending on the timing of rainfall, it may shift earlier and/or later into the season. Consequently, groundwater levels are usually highest in the spring and lowest during the irrigation season in the summer months. Fall groundwater measurements (typically measured in October) provide an indication of groundwater conditions after the primary irrigation season.

Groundwater levels in the Subbasin are monitored in representative monitoring site (RMS) wells that were selected in the GSP to represent localized groundwater conditions for specified areas of the Subbasin. RMS wells include a mixture of domestic wells, irrigation wells, and dedicated observation wells. In total, 10 RMS wells are used to monitor conditions in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. **Appendix A** includes hydrographs depicting groundwater elevations and the approximate locations of the RMS wells. Sustainable management criteria (SMC), described in **Appendix B**, are assigned for groundwater levels at the RMS wells.

Certain RMS wells measured by DWR and Tehama County are equipped with data loggers and pressure transducers, which continuously monitor and record hourly changes in groundwater levels. These and the remaining wells in the network are measured by hand at least two times each year in March and October. Data from groundwater level monitoring wells is available from DWR's online SGMA Data Viewer tool (**https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewer**).

Spring and Fall 2023 groundwater elevation measurements for RMS wells in the Upper Aquifer and Lower Aquifer systems are summarized in **Table 5-2**. Groundwater elevation data in the Subbasin is collected by DWR and Tehama County and is publicly available from DWR's online SGMA Data Viewer tool (**https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewer**). The groundwater level monitoring methods are consistent with the protocols described in the Red Bluff GSP. Depending on the well, groundwater elevations are measured using steel tape, electric sounder, or pressure transducers. The accuracy of groundwater level measurements is typically either 0.01 feet or 0.1 feet, depending on the equipment used.

The following sub-sections provide a summary of groundwater elevations and conditions during WY 2023 through the presentation and description of groundwater elevation contours (**Section 2.1**) and hydrographs of groundwater elevations (**Section 2.2; Appendix A**).

2.1 Groundwater Elevation Contour Maps – §356.2(b)(1)(A)

Groundwater elevation contour maps for Spring and Fall 2023 were prepared for the Upper Aquifer, as shown in **Figures 2-1** through **2-2**. Spring contours are intended to generally represent seasonal high groundwater elevations (shallower depth to water), and fall contours are intended to generally represent seasonal low groundwater elevations (deeper depth to water). Groundwater elevation contours were developed by creating a continuous groundwater elevation surface based on available monitoring well data using the kriging interpolation method. Questionable groundwater elevation measurements were excluded, and minor adjustments to the contours were made based on professional judgment.

The contour maps of the Upper Aquifer (**Figures 2-1 and 2-2**) each show that groundwater elevations are generally higher in the western areas of the Subbasin versus the eastern, indicating a general gradient – and thus groundwater flow – from the west to the east. The contour maps illustrate several general features of the groundwater flow system in the Antelope Subbasin, including:

- Overall, west to east groundwater flow is consistent with recharge from the Northern Coastal Mountain Ranges.
- Movement of water towards the Sacramento River in both the fall and the spring.
- The higher concentration of contours in the central portion of the Subbasin indicates a steeper gradient and could suggest higher groundwater flow. Nonetheless, the contours are consistent with the current understanding of recharge coming from the Northern Coastal Mountain Ranges foothills. New sources of information and data may improve understanding of this area.




Figure 2-1. Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Spring 2023 (Seasonal High)




Figure 2-2. Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Fall 2023 (Seasonal Low)

2.2 Hydrographs of Groundwater Elevations – §356.2(b)(1)(B)

Groundwater elevation hydrographs for each RMS well are presented in **Appendix A**. **Appendix B** provides an explanation of the SMC terminology defined in Section 6 of the GSP (e.g., Minimum Threshold [MT], Measurable Objective [MO], Interim Milestone [IM]). **Table 5-1** summarizes the MOs, MTs, and identification of undesirable results for WY 2023, and **Table 5-2** contains a summary of the Spring 2023 (Seasonal High) and Fall 2023 (Seasonal Low) groundwater elevations measured at each well. **Table 5-2** also summarizes the established MO and MT for groundwater elevations, the changes in groundwater elevations from WY 2022 to WY 2023, and the differences between the 2023 groundwater elevations and the MO.

Historically, groundwater levels have typically remained at or above their respective MOs in the Subbasin. The GSP also established IMs to provide numerical metrics for GSAs to track the Subbasin's conditions relative to the overall sustainability goal, ensuring that the groundwater management of the Subbasin remains sustainable.

Spring and Fall 2023 groundwater elevations were generally near seasonal groundwater elevations in previous years. In WY 2023, the average seasonal high in the Upper Aquifer was 306feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the average seasonal low was 294feet AMSL. In WY 2023, the average seasonal high in the Lower Aquifer was 322 feet AMSL, and the average seasonal low was 311 feet AMSL. In WY 2021, the average seasonal high was 308 feet AMSL, and in WY 2022, the average seasonal high was 303 feet AMSL. Increases in groundwater levels are generally expected to result from decreased groundwater extraction in WY 2023 relative to WY 2022, as well as increased recharge due to wet climate conditions.

All but two wells remained at or above the MO as of Spring 2023, while 5 wells fell below the MO in Fall 2023. All measured groundwater elevations remained above the corresponding MT of that RMS well, avoiding undesirable results related to groundwater levels as defined in the GSP. On average, groundwater levels in RMS wells were roughly 62 feet higher than MT elevations in Spring 2023 and 53 feet higher than MT elevations in Fall 2023. All measured groundwater levels remained within the Subbasin's margin of operational flexibility and above the MT's.

3 WATER SUPPLY AND USE

As required by §356.2, this section summarizes water supply and use in the Subbasin, categorized by groundwater extraction volume, surface water supply, and total supply. The total water available for use in the Subbasin was tabulated from groundwater extraction volumes reported in **Table 3-1** and the surface water supply reported in **Table 3-2**. The total water available is summarized in **Table 3-3** for WY 2023. Groundwater extraction volumes are either based on measured data or are estimates from a water use analysis based on 2023 land use data and climate conditions. The water use analysis methodology is discussed in **Appendix E**. Surface water use was estimated from historic deliveries when records were not available.

Table 3-1. Groundwater Use by Water Use Sector	
Sector	**WY 2023 (AF)**
Agricultural	91,000
Municipal	4,000
Rural Residential	2,000
Total	**97,000**

3.1 Groundwater Extraction – §356.2(b)(2)

Groundwater extraction in the Subbasin is summarized in **Table 3-1**. Groundwater extraction is obtained from pumping records where available, and the remaining groundwater extraction is estimated using the water use analysis approach described in the previous section and **Appendix E**.

The majority of the Subbasin relies on groundwater supplies for agricultural irrigation. In years characterized by drought and low precipitation, diminished surface water supplies lead to increased extraction and reduced recharge, causing a decline in groundwater storage. Contrastingly, in wet years, such as WY 2023, wet climate conditions help to increase recharge and bolster groundwater storage.

Municipal water users extracted approximately 4,000 AF in the Subbasin in WY 2023. Municipal water supplies are measured and provided by the City of Red Bluff, the City of Tehama, the El Camino Irrigation District, and the Proberta Water District. The record of municipal supplies does not distinguish between urban and industrial water uses.

Rural residential water users rely on private domestic wells to meet their household water needs. Rural residential groundwater extraction was quantified based on average per capita water use and estimated population. The average per capita water use reported in the City of Red Bluff's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) 2020 water use (City of Red Bluff, 2020) is considered to be representative of the area. Water use in 2020 was 253 gallons per capita per day. Parcels were chosen within the Subbasin, except for those in municipal service areas. Residential parcels were selected based on Tehama County general plan zoning codes. Population estimates were derived from these zoning codes and average household sizes from the US census. The resulting population estimate was used to estimate residential groundwater pumping.

The total estimated groundwater extraction was approximately 97,000 AF in WY 2023, the majority of which was used to meet agricultural water demands (approximately 91,000 AF). The total groundwater extraction is equivalent to the historical groundwater pumping average (97,000 AFY; **Table 4-1**) but higher than 76,800 AF, which was the average annual extraction of the last four wet WYs on record (2006, 2011, 2017, and 2019). **Figure 3-1** shows the general areas where groundwater is applied in the Subbasin. About 94% of the total groundwater extraction was used by the agricultural sector, while the remaining 6% was used for municipal and rural residential water needs.




Figure 3-1. Estimated Applied Groundwater – WY 2023

3.2 Surface Water Supply – §356.2(b)(3)

Surface water supplies used or available for use in the Subbasin are summarized in **Table 3-2.** Surface water supplies are reported directly from water supplier records or collected from publicly available sources (water rights diversion records, etc.) where available. Missing surface water supply data was estimated based on available historical diversions data in similar water years.

Surface water provided about <1% of the agricultural water demand in the Subbasin for WY 2023. There are limited local supplies available within the Subbasin. Surface water Diversion records were accessed from the State Water Resource Control Board's (SWRCB) Electronic Water Rights Information Management System (eWRIMS; SWRCB, 2023) and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) Central Valley Operations (CVO) delivery tables (USBR, 2024). Total surface water diversions and deliveries for the Red Bluff Subbasin are estimated to be about 1,000 AF and 800 AF, respectively.

In contrast with the curtailments and reduced surface water supplies experienced in WY 2022, WY 2023 was a Wet WY with substantial surface water supplies. These, combined with wet climate conditions and increased stream flows, supported groundwater recharge and offset groundwater extraction volumes compared to WY 2022. However, less surface water was applied than in WY 2022.

Table 3-2. Surface Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2023

Sector	Diverted (AF)	Applied (AF)
Agricultural	1,000	800
Total	**1,000**	**800**

3.3 Total Water Use by Sector – §356.2(b)(4)

Groundwater supplied approximately 99% of the agricultural water demand in the Subbasin in WY 2023. Surface water supplied approximately <1% of the agricultural water demand in the Subbasin in WY 2023. The total water available for use in the Subbasin was tabulated from groundwater extraction volumes reported in **Table 3-1** and the surface water supply reported in **Table 3-2**. The total water available is summarized in **Table 3-3** for WY 2023. The results are either based on measured data or estimates, as described in the previous two sections.

Table 3-3. Total Water Use by Water Use Sector

Sector	WY 2023 (AF)			
	Groundwater	Surface Water	Total	Total Irrigated Area (acres)
Agricultural	91,000	800	**92,000**	**31,000**
Municipal	4,000	0	**4,000**	**0**
Rural Residential	2,000	0	**2,000**	**0**
Total	**97,000**	**800**	**98,000**	**31,000**

3.4 Uncertainties in Water Use Estimates

Estimated uncertainties in the water budget components are presented in **Table 3-4**. The uncertainty of these water budget components is based on typical accuracies given in technical literature and the cumulative estimated accuracy of all inputs used to calculate the components.

Table 3-4. Estimated Uncertainty in Water Use Estimates

Water Budget Component	Data Source	Estimated Uncertainty (%)	Source
Groundwater Water			
Agricultural	Measurement	20%	Typical uncertainty from water balance calculation.
Municipal/Industrial	Measurement /Estimate	5%	Typical accuracy of municipal water system reporting.
Rural Residential	Calculation	15%	Estimated from per capita water use and Census information.
Surface Water			
Agricultural	Calculation	10%[1]	Estimated from Senate Bill 88 measurement accuracy standards.

[1]*Higher uncertainty of 10-20% is typical for estimated surface water inflows, including un-gaged inflows from small watersheds into creeks that enter the Basin.*

4 GROUNDWATER STORAGE

Long-term fluctuations in groundwater levels and groundwater in storage occur when there is an imbalance between the volume of water recharged into the aquifer and the volume of water removed from the aquifer, either by extraction or natural discharge to surface water bodies. If, over a period of years, the amount of water recharged to the aquifer exceeds the amount of water removed from the aquifer, then groundwater levels will increase and groundwater storage increases (i.e., positive change in storage). Conversely, if, over time, the amount of water removed from the aquifer exceeds the amount of water recharged, then groundwater levels decline, and groundwater storage decreases. These long-term changes can be linked to various factors, including increased or decreased groundwater extraction or variations in recharge associated with wet or dry hydrologic cycles.

A review of the RMS well hydrographs (Appendix A) indicates that groundwater elevations are relatively stable or showing a declining trend over time. Declines may be influenced by the significant percentage of water years since 2006 that have been dry (i.e., characterized as Below Normal, Dry, or Critical). Since groundwater storage is closely related to groundwater levels, measured changes in groundwater levels can serve as a proxy for and be utilized to estimate changes in groundwater storage. Changes in groundwater storage in the Subbasin follow a pattern typically seen in the majority of the Sacramento Valley. During normal to wet years, groundwater is withdrawn during the summer for irrigation and replenished during the winter through recharge of precipitation and surface water inflows, allowing groundwater storage to potentially rebound by the following spring. During dry years and drought

conditions, this pattern is disrupted when more groundwater may be pumped to meet irrigation demand and less recharge may occur due to reduced precipitation, diminished or curtailed surface water supplies, and lower stream levels.

In WY 2023, a Wet WY, cumulative (Upper and Lower Aquifer) groundwater storage increased by approximately 66,000 AF. Decreased groundwater extraction in WY 2023 relative to WY 2022 contributed to the increase in groundwater storage, as well as increased recharge due to wet climate conditions. These and related factors, such as flood irrigation with surface water and increased stream flows, resulted in higher groundwater levels in Spring 2023 compared to Spring 2022.

The following sections present a summary of groundwater use and change in storage over time, along with a description of the uncertainty in storage change estimates.

4.1 Change in Groundwater Storage – §356.2(b)(5)(B)

Annual groundwater pumping, groundwater storage changes, and the cumulative change in storage over time are presented for WY 1990 through WY 2023 in **Table 4-1** and **Figure 4-1**. In contrast to WY 2022, WY 2023 was a Wet WY and saw a marked increase in groundwater storage, totaling approximately 66,000 AF in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. For context, in the past 33 years, the largest decrease in groundwater storage is estimated to be -164,000 AF, and the highest increase was estimated to be 130,000 AF.

The Tehama Integrated Hydrogeologic Model (TIHM) was used to estimate groundwater pumping, groundwater uptake, change in storage, and cumulative change in storage for WY 1990 through WY 2019 (Tehama County GSA, 2022).

It should be noted that the groundwater model was not used to estimate storage changes for WY 2020 through WY 2023. Therefore, future updates to the model may result in different estimates for WY 2020 through WY 2023 groundwater storage changes. The approach of using measured groundwater elevation changes to estimate storage changes is considered reasonable and cost-effective for the purposes of the Annual Report. **Table 4-1** includes estimates of annual groundwater pumping, annual storage change, and cumulative storage change for WYs 1990-2023. Estimates of annual groundwater pumping for WYs 2022-2023 are described in **Section 3** and **Appendix E.** Change in annual storage and cumulative change in storage for WYs 2020-2023 was estimated based on the methods described in **Section 4.2**. Groundwater extractions for the entire period include pumping for agricultural, municipal, and rural residential purposes.

The annual and cumulative changes in groundwater storage are both calculated for the period from WY 2020 through WY 2023 based on the methodology described below in **Section 4.2**. This methodology differs from the methodology reported in the GSP; however, it is anticipated that the methodology described in **Section 4.2** will be utilized for future Annual Reports.

Table 4-1. Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage			
Water Year (Hydrologic Year Type)	Groundwater Extraction[1] (AF)	Annual Change in Storage (AF)	Cumulative Change in Storage (AF)
1990 (C)	87,400	-77,000	-77,000
1991 (C)	86,300	-77,000	-150,000
1992 (C)	86,800	-41,000	-200,000
1993 (AN)	76,900	56,000	-140,000
1994 (C)	90,200	-53,000	-190,000
1995 (W)	76,000	99,000	-93,000
1996 (W)	85,000	37,000	-56,000
1997 (W)	92,000	-3,900	-60,000
1998 (W)	66,000	130,000	70,000
1999 (W)	84,000	-16,000	54,000
2000 (AN)	81,000	-9,500	45,000
2001 (D)	89,000	-61,000	-16,000
2002 (D)	97,000	-37,000	-53,000
2003 (AN)	79,000	31,000	-22,000
2004 (BN)	100,000	-1,000	-23,000
2005 (AN)	77,000	30,000	6,600
2006 (W)	87,000	44,000	51,000
2007 (D)	98,000	-93,000	-42,000
2008 (C)	107,400	-65,000	-110,000
2009 (D)	96,900	-65,000	-170,000
2010 (BN)	81,900	23,000	-150,000
2011 (W)	79,900	21,000	-130,000
2012 (BN)	93,800	-60,000	-190,000
2013 (D)	105,500	-41,000	-230,000
2014 (C)	102,800	-78,000	-310,000
2015 (C)[2]	103,200	-37,000	-340,000
2016 (BN)	95,400	19,000	-330,000
2017 (W)	90,600	88,000	-240,000
2018 (BN)	104,200	-74,000	-310,000
2019 (W)	88,300	75,000	-240,000
2020 (D)	129,300	-49,000	-290,000

Table 4-1. Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage			
Water Year (Hydrologic Year Type)	**Groundwater Extraction[1] (AF)**	**Annual Change in Storage (AF)**	**Cumulative Change in Storage (AF)**
2021 (C)[2]	148,100	-164,000	-450,000
2022 (C)[2]	237,300	-87,000	-537,000
2023 (W)	98,000	66,000	-471,000
Historic Averages (2000-2022)[3]			
2000-2022 (22 years)	97,000	-16,000	-149,000
W (9 years)	83,000	53,000	-72,000
AN (4 years)	78,000	27,000	-28,000
BN (5 years)	95,000	-19,000	-201,000
D (6 years)	103,000	-58,000	-134,000
C (9 years)	117,000	-75,000	-263,000

Notes:

Positive values indicate inflows to the groundwater system, and negative values indicate outflows from the groundwater system.

GW = Groundwater

Water Year Types Classified According to the Sacramento Valley Water Year Index: AN = Above Normal, BN = Below Normal, C = Critical; D = Dry, W = Wet

*[1]Groundwater extraction and storage for WY 1990 through WY 2019 are from the Tehama Integrated Hydrologic Model (TIHM), groundwater extraction values for WY 2020 through WY 2021 are from the TIHM; groundwater extraction values for WY 2022 through WY 2023 are described in **Section 3** and **Appendix E**. Annual change in storage values for WY 2020 through WY 2023 were estimated using the method described in **Section 4**.*

[2] Indicated cutback year with reduced surface water supply availability.

[3] The historical average calculation covers the period from 2000 to 2022, excluding the current water year.




Figure 4-1. Groundwater Extraction and Change in Groundwater Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2023

4.2 Groundwater Storage Maps – §356.2(b)(5)(A)

The spatial distribution of estimated changes in groundwater storage in the Upper Aquifer for the period from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 are shown in **Figure 4-2.** Since groundwater storage is closely related to groundwater levels, measured changes in groundwater levels can serve as a proxy for and be utilized to estimate changes in groundwater storage. Change in groundwater storage was estimated based on change in measured spring-to-spring groundwater levels at each RMS well. Change of groundwater levels from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 at measured wells screened in the Upper Aquifer were interpolated to estimate the groundwater elevation change in areas where sufficient data was available. The estimated elevation change was multiplied by a spatially variable aquifer storage coefficient (0.0065 – 0.062) available from the TIHM (Tehama County GSA, 2022) to estimate the groundwater storage change volume in the Upper Aquifer. The spatial extent of this estimate was limited to areas where measured groundwater levels were available (**Figure 4-1**). Therefore, an area-weighted adjustment was applied to the estimated storage to estimate the Subbasin-wide change in storage.

Sufficient groundwater level data were not available to interpolate water level changes in the Lower Aquifer. Therefore, Lower Aquifer storage change was estimated using the Upper Aquifer storage change

and the historical ratio of storage changes in the two aquifers for critical years. The summation of the changes in the Upper and Lower Aquifers provides the total groundwater storage change in the Subbasin.

Negative changes in storage values indicate lowering groundwater levels and depletion of groundwater storage, whereas positive changes in storage values represent rising groundwater levels and accretion of groundwater in storage. As shown in **Figure 4-2**, the change in storage within the Upper Aquifer from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 was between 0.053 and 0.405 AF per acre. The southeastern portion of the Subbasin experienced a larger positive change in storage, while the surrounding portions of the subbasin experienced a lower positive change in storage. Total groundwater storage change in the Upper Aquifer was estimated to be approximately 26,000 AF between Spring 2022 and Spring 2023. Total groundwater storage change in the Lower Aquifer was estimated to be approximately 39,000 AF between Spring 2022 and Spring 2023.




Figure 4-2. Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 in the Upper Aquifer

4.3 Uncertainty in Groundwater Storage Estimates

The uncertainty associated with the change in groundwater storage estimates depends in part on the underlying uncertainty of the groundwater level data, the representative area, and the calibrated storage coefficient parameter used to calculate the change in groundwater storage. As described in **Section 4.2**, the calibrated storage coefficient (0.0065 – 0.062) from the TIHM was used to calculate the change in storage. Based on a comparison of storage change estimates from the TIHM for similar water year types, the calculated storage change is reasonable; thus, the uncertainty of the estimated change in groundwater storage reported is typically 20-30% for integrated hydrologic models; therefore, the approach described in **Section 4.2** is considered to have similar uncertainty.

5 GSP IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS – §356.2(B)(5)(C)

5.1 Main Activities of Water Year 2023

The main activities and updates since the previous Annual Report are as follows:

- The Tehama County GSA completed the WY 2023 Annual Report and other critical tasks.
- The Tehama County GSA coordinated a proposal seeking funding through DWR's SGM Grant Program. Coordination efforts included planning and refinement PMAs, evaluating and ranking PMAs, and preparing and submitting the grant application. The grant application was submitted in December 2022, and a final award list was released by DWR in September 2023; results are summarized below in **Table 5.4**.
- An airborne electromagnetic (AEM) survey by DWR took place in the summer of 2022. The data collected provides a better understanding of aquifer characteristics and will help support future efforts to refine the current hydrogeologic conceptual model. Data is available at: **https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/aem**.
- All sustainability indicators (SIs) are above their MTs (see summary **Table 5-1**).
- Progress has been made on three PMAs the last Annual Report (**Table 5-4; Section 5.3**).

Several other actions continue in the Subbasin to fulfill the requirements of the GSP. These include:

- Monitoring and recording groundwater levels and groundwater quality.
- Maintaining and updating the Data Management System (DMS) with newly collected data.
- Annual reporting of Subbasin conditions and submission to DWR as required by SGMA.
- Ongoing intra- and inter-basin coordination.

Also, since the previous Annual Report, DWR has provided corrective actions to the Red Bluff Subbasin GSP. The Tehama County GSA acknowledges and is addressing the two key recommended corrective actions listed in the DWR's **GSP determination letter** (https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/service/gspdocument/download/9963) including:

- Providing more detailed explanation and justification regarding the selection of the sustainable management criteria for groundwater levels, particularly undesirable results and minimum thresholds, and quantitatively describe the effects of those criteria on the interests of beneficial uses and users of groundwater.

- The GSA should revise the GSP to provide a reasonable assessment of overdraft conditions and include reasonable means to mitigate overdraft.

5.2 Progress Toward Achieving Interim Milestones

All SIs are in compliance with their MTs (see summary **Table 5-1**). A MT is the quantitative value that represents the groundwater conditions at a RMS site that, when exceeded individually or in combination with MTs at other monitoring sites, may cause an UR in the subbasin per DWR's definition. If groundwater levels are lower than the value of the Measurable Objective (MO) for that site, they are moving in the direction of the MT. On the contrary, for the groundwater quality SMC, as the value of total dissolved solids (TDS) increases from the MO established for that site, they are moving in the direction of the MT. Seawater Intrusion is not an applicable SI.

Groundwater elevations remained near the MOs in Spring 2023; two wells fell below their MO in Fall 2023. No wells fell below their MTs in WY 2023 and avoided URs since less than 25% of wells fell below their MTs for two consecutive years, hence avoiding undesirable results as defined in the GSP.

Overall, groundwater conditions in the Subbasin are on track to meet the first 5-year 2027 Interim Milestones for groundwater levels at each of the RMS wells. Groundwater elevations are all above the MTs throughout the Subbasin, with elevations mostly near those observed in recent years (**Appendix A**). This positive trend is attributed to the ongoing recovery in groundwater conditions, facilitated by increased surface water supplies in WY 2023 following two recent years of cutbacks in WY 2021 and WY 2022. Spring 2023 groundwater elevations were above the MOs in all but 2 wells, although Fall 2023 groundwater elevations in 5 wells were below the MOs (**Table 5-2**), Spring 2024 groundwater conditions are expected to rebound.

Table 5-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2023 Status	**Undesirable Result Identification**	**Measurable Objective (MO) Definition**	**Minimum Threshold (MT) Definition**
Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at same RMS wells exceed the associated MT for two consecutive measurements.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Spring 2015 groundwater elevation minus five feet (for wells with increasing or no groundwater trends) or projected Spring 2042 groundwater elevation minus five feet for wells with declining groundwater elevations.	**Upper Aquifer:** Spring groundwater elevation where less than 10% or less than 20% of domestic wells could potentially be impacted. **Lower Aquifer:** Spring groundwater elevation minus 20 to 120 feet.
Reduction of Groundwater Storage			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	Same as the chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Amount of groundwater storage when groundwater elevations are at their measurable objective	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** Amount of groundwater in storage when groundwater elevations are at their minimum threshold
Degraded Water Quality			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells that exceeded the MT in WY 2023.	At least 25% of RMS exceed the minimum threshold for water quality for two consecutive years at each well where it can be established that GSP implementation is the cause of the exceedance.	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** California lower limit secondary MCL concentration for TDS of 500 mg/L measured at RMS wells	**Upper & Lower Aquifer:** TDS concentration of 750 mg/L at all RMS wells

Table 5-1. Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2023 Status	**Undesirable Result Identification**	**Measurable Objective (MO) Definition**	**Minimum Threshold (MT) Definition**
Land Subsidence			
No indication of undesirable results No InSAR pixel exceeded MT in WY 2023.	50% of RMS exceed the minimum threshold over a 5-year period that is irreversible and is caused by lowering of groundwater elevations	One foot over 20 years (Zero inelastic subsidence, in addition to any measurement error). If InSAR data are used, the measurement error is 0.1 feet and any measurement 0.1 feet or less would not be considered inelastic subsidence	Two feet over 20 years (i.e., no more than 0.5 feet of cumulative subsidence over a five-year period (beyond the measurement error), solely due to lowering of groundwater elevations
Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water			
No indication of undesirable results There were no RMS wells with spring or fall 2023 groundwater level measurement below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at RMS wells drop below the associated threshold during two consecutive years in the Upper Aquifer.	Same as chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Same as chronic lowering of groundwater levels.

Notes:

TDS is the primary water quality constituent of concern.

MO = Measurable Objective; MT = Minimum Threshold; RMS = representative monitoring site; mg/L = milligrams per liter; MCL = Maximum Contaminant Level; SMCL = Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level.

5.2.1 Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels and Reduction in Groundwater Storage SMC

The reduction in groundwater storage SMC utilizes the chronic lowering of groundwater levels SMC as a proxy (**Table 5-1**). Thus, groundwater conditions related to storage and chronic lowering of groundwater levels are discussed together. Groundwater conditions in the Subbasin are on track to meet the first 5-year (2027) IMs for groundwater levels at each of the RMS wells. In WY 2023, all groundwater elevations were above the established MTs (as indicated in **Table 5-2**). **Table 5-2** shows measurements from WY 2023 for spring seasonal highs and fall seasonal lows, along with MOs and MTs. It also compares the WY 2023 measurements to those from WY 2022 and to the MO. Higher water levels were observed in Spring 2023 compared to Spring 2022 due to wet conditions, which has helped to increase recharge and offset extraction, bolstering groundwater storage in the Subbasin.

Table 5-2. Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Seasonal Groundwater Elevations of Representative Monitoring Site Wells

Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) ID	Groundwater Elevation (feet above mean sea level)				Spring 2023 vs. MO	Fall 2023 vs. MO	Spring 2023 vs. Spring 2022 (seasonal high)	Fall 2023 vs. Fall 2022 (seasonal low)
	2023 Measurements		MO	MT				
	Spring (Seasonal High)	Fall (Seasonal Low)						
Upper Aquifer								
RB-1U	423.73	426.33	432.40	302.50	-8.67	-6.07	-7.10	6.20
RB-2U	243.64	240.94	241.50	207.40	2.14	-0.56	-0.67	-1.51
RB-3U	253.66	258.86	257.10	223.50	-3.44	1.76	-6.15	3.86
RB-4U	--	195.29	203.00	152.10	--	-7.71	--	--
RB-5U	237.84	210.39	224.20	177.50	13.64	-13.81	9.21	5.80
RB-6U	--	402.90	401.30	355.60	--	1.60	--	--
RB-7U	335.50	--	329.10	276.00	6.40	--	-7.25	--
RB-9U	342.33	323.71	NA	NA	NA	NA	--	7.10
Lower Aquifer								
RB-8L	214.94	197.33	202.00	92.00	12.94	-4.67	4.74	--
RB-10L	428.40	425.45	NA	NA	NA	NA	--	1.49

MO = Measurable Objective, MT = Minimum Threshold, -- = Indicates Missing or Questionable Measurement, NA = Indicates non-determined MO, MT due to insufficient history

5.2.2 Degraded Water Quality SMC

The degraded water quality MT and MO are summarized in **Table 5-1**. TDS are the main constituent of concern in the Subbasin. TDS is measured at RMS wells throughout the Subbasin, and data was collected

by the Tehama County GSA in 2024. TDS ranged from 120 mg/L to 810 mg/L. Well RB-10L was sampled using a HydraSleeve, which tore during collection, and the well was resampled (RB-10LG in **Appendix F**). The first measurement exceeded the MO, and the second measurement exceeded the MT respectively. A summary of groundwater quality monitoring data is available in **Appendix F**. Groundwater conditions are on track to avoid results related to water quality.

5.2.3 Land Subsidence SMC

The land subsidence MT and MO are summarized in **Table 5-1**. Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) data provided by DWR (DWR, 2024) was analyzed from October 2022 to October 2023 to track annual changes and from October 2015 to October 2023 to track net changes. Subsidence estimates based on InSAR methodology were reviewed and compared to continuous GPS measurements (Towill, 2023). The accuracy report found that a one-year measurement error, reported as a root-mean-squared error (RMSE), was approximately 0.025 feet. **Figure 5-1** shows a maximum vertical displacement between 0.01 feet and -0.07 feet within the RMSE and, therefore, undetectable, occurred within the Subbasin from October 2022 to October 2023. A positive change corresponds to a higher land surface elevation, and a negative change corresponds to a lower land surface elevation relative to a reference elevation. Groundwater conditions in the Subbasin are on track to meet the first 5-year 2027 IMs and avoid undesirable results for land subsidence. Conditions indicate that there has not been any inelastic land subsidence during the reporting period.




Figure 5-1. Change in Subsidence from 10/2022 to 10/2023

5.2.4 Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water SMC

The depletion of interconnected surface water SMC utilizes the chronic lowering of groundwater levels SMC as a proxy (**Table 5-1**). A subset of groundwater levels SMC RMS is used for this SMC (**Table 5-3**) and all groundwater elevations were above the established MTs. The Groundwater conditions in the Subbasin are on track to meet the first 5-year 2027 Interim Milestones for groundwater levels at each of the RMS wells.

Table 5-3 Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, Undesirable Results for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water

State Well Number /Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) ID	Groundwater Elevation (feet above mean sea level)				Spring 2023 vs. MO	Fall 2023 vs. MO
	2023 Measurements		MO	MT		
	Spring (Seasonal High)	Fall (Seasonal Low)				
RB-1U	423.73	426.33	432.40	302.50	-8.67	-6.07
RB-2U	243.64	240.94	241.50	207.40	2.14	-0.56
RB-3U	253.66	258.86	257.10	223.50	-3.44	1.76
RB-4U	--	195.29	203.00	152.10	--	-7.71
RB-5U	237.84	210.39	224.20	177.50	13.64	-13.81
RB-6U	--	402.90	401.30	355.60	--	1.60
RB-7U	335.50	--	329.10	276.00	6.40	--
RB-9U	342.33	323.71	--	--	NA	NA

MO = Measurable Objective, MT = Minimum Threshold, -- = Indicates missing or questionable measurements, NA = Indicates non-determined MO, MT due to insufficient history

5.3 Progress Toward PMA Implementation

The following sections summarize the Tehama County GSA's progress towards implementing PMAs that were developed to manage groundwater conditions in the Subbasin and achieve the groundwater sustainability objectives described in the GSP. Projects as outlined in the GSP are provided below and summarized in **Table 5-4.** Updates on the status of management actions are described below and summarized in **Section 5.4**.

Groundwater users in the Subbasin benefit from generally stable and shallow groundwater levels supported by the substantial recharge resulting from large volumes of surface water supplied throughout the Subbasin. Surface water supplies available to diverters in the Subbasin are used, when available, for irrigation and for the benefit of other recharge efforts and projects described in the GSP. Ongoing access to surface water supplies is crucial to preserving the sustainability of the Subbasin.

Table 5-4. Summary of Project Implementation Status			
GSP Section Reference	Project (Proponent)	Current Status	Notable Progress Since Last Annual Report
4.2	GSP Implementation, Outreach, and Compliance Activities	Funded	The DWR SGM Grant Program application submitted in December 2022 was funded during the planning phase.
4.2	Recharge Focused Projects	Funded	DWR SGM Grant Program application submitted in December 2022 was funded, to plan and roll out recharge projects identified in the GSP.

Table 5-5. Summary of Management Actions			
GSP Section Reference	Project (Proponent)	Current Status	Notable Progress Since Last Annual Report
7.3.2.1	Well Management Program	In Progress	Program is in its second year, well inventory is in progress.

5.4 GSP Project Implementation Progress

5.4.1 GSP Implementation, Outreach, and Compliance Activities (GSP Section 4.2)

Advancements since the last Annual Report include securing funding from the DWR SGM Grant Program application submitted in December 2022. This project is currently active and includes the development of WY 2023 Annual Reports, outreach to the community, and coordinating GSP corrections.

5.4.2 Recharge Focused Projects (GSP Section 4.2)

Advancements have been made on this project since 2022, including securing funding from the DWR SGM Grant Program application submitted in December 2022. This project is currently in the planning phase.

5.4.3 Recharge and Conjunctive Use Focused Projects (GSP Section 7.4.1.1 & GSP Section 7.4.1.2)

Advancements made on these projects since 2022, includes securing funding from the DWR SGM Grant Program application submitted in December 2022; Tehama County. These projects are currently in the planning phase, with 6 projects at different stages of implementation. Due to these projects being in the planning phase, both recharge and conjunctive use focused projects are discussed together for this annual report.

Wolf Ranch – Red Bluff: The Wolf Ranch project has existing water right off Thomes Creek and land available for recharge. Water would be diverted from Thomes creek to farmland for recharge. Current challenges include the lack of conveyance infrastructure. There is a potential to divert a maximum of 445 AFY. Additional recharge may also be possible with frost water when available.

Henleyville: This project would involve water pumped from Thomas Creek directly into basins. Potential recharge amounts are estimated to be a maximum of 40 AFY.

North Thomas Creek: This project would involve conveying water pumped from Thomas Creek directly into a recharge area + 3-mile ditch. Potential recharge amounts are estimated to be a maximum of 40 AFY + 3 miles.

Rancho Tehama: This project would involve water pumped from Elder Creek directly into recharge areas. Potential recharge amounts are estimated to be a maximum of 10 AFY.

Elder Creek Recharge Flood-MAR: This project would involve water pumped from Elder Creek directly into recharge areas. Potential recharge amounts have not been quantified.

Elder Creek Recharge Wells: This project would involve water pumped from Elder Creek directly into recharge wells. Potential recharge amounts have not been quantified.

5.5 GSP Management Action Implementation Progress

5.5.1 Well Management Program (GSP Section 7.3.2.1)

Tehama County GSA is in its second year of administering a well registration program that provides information about the location, number, and construction of wells. It will also eventually provide a source of funding for GSP implementation and a future well mitigation program.

6 CONCLUSIONS

The Tehama County GSA adopted and submitted the GSP to DWR in January 2022. Following the analyses of historical and current hydrogeological conditions presented in the GSP, the Tehama County GSA has been actively working on sustainable groundwater management in the Subbasin. As presented in **Section 5** of this report, recent progress made on activities applicable to the Tehama County GSA demonstrates the commitment of the Tehama County GSA to implement the GSP by allocating the necessary time and resources to achieve long-term sustainable management of the groundwater resources in the Red Bluff Subbasin.

7 REFERENCES

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2018. 5-021.74 Sacramento Valley-Red Bluff Basin Boundaries Description. Available at: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/ca-gw-basin-boundary-descriptions/resource/2385b4bd-4858-4902-b98d-19936ee3f21e.

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2023. Periodic Groundwater Level Measurements - Datasets - California Natural Resources Agency Open Data. Downloaded February 2023. Available at: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/periodic-groundwater-level-measurements.

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2024. TRE ALTAMIRA InSAR Subsidence Data. Available At: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/tre-altamira-insar-subsidence.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2023. Electronic Water Rights Information Management System (eWRIMS). Accessed March 13, 2023. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/ewrims/.

City of Red Bluff. 2020. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. https://cms5.revize.com/revize/redbluff/2020_UWMP_CERTIFIED.pdf.United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR).2023. Central Valley Operations. Accessed January 21st, 2024. https://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/deliv.html.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2022. Red Bluff Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Available at: https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/140.

Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2023. WY 2022 Red Bluff Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report. Available at: https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gspar/preview/208.

Towill. 2023. InSAR Data Accuracy for California Groundwater Basins CGPS Data Comparative Analysis January 2015 to October 2022. Available at: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/tre-altamira-insar-subsidence/resource/b9f6f30b-e998-4cf1-b4e1-5d530356f172.

United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR).2024. Central Valley Operations. Accessed February 2024. Available at: https://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/deliv.html.


Water Year 2023 Annual Report


Appendix A

Hydrographs of Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) Wells


Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 27N04W05G002M (RB−1U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 260 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 231 − 251 ft bgs







Statistics of spring water levels for past 19 years (2003 to 2022):
Change = −11.4 ft
Average rate of change = −0.6 ft/year
Average water level = 440.16 ft amsl




Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 27N04W36G001M (RB−2U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 155 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 135 − 155 ft bgs







Statistics of spring water levels for past 21 years (2002 to 2023):
Change = −12.5 ft
Average rate of change = −0.6 ft/year
Average water level = 253.82 ft amsl




Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 26N04W25J001M (RB−3U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 128 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 116 − 124 ft bgs







Statistics of spring water levels for
past 20 years (2003 to 2023):
Change = −31.5 ft
Average rate of change = −1.58 ft/year
Average water level = 281.42 ft amsl




Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 25N03W11B001M (RB−4U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 255 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 150 − 180 ft bgs







Statistics of spring water levels for past 17 years (2005 to 2022):
Change = −26.55 ft
Average rate of change = −1.56 ft/year
Average water level = 225.43 ft amsl




Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 25N03W19N001M (RB−5U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 370 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 135 − 358 ft bgs







Statistics of spring water levels for
past 20 years (2003 to 2023):
Change = −30.25 ft
Average rate of change = −1.51 ft/year
Average water level = 267.17 ft amsl





Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 25N05W24D001M (RB−6U)


Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 183 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 143 − 183 ft bgs













Statistics of spring water levels for
past 19 years (2003 to 2022):
Change = −36.3 ft
Average rate of change = −1.91 ft/year
Average water level = 436.4 ft amsl


Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) MW Well (RB−7U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 240 ft. Perforation top & bottom: Unknown







Statistics of spring water levels for past 9 years (2014 to 2023):
Change = −44.7 ft
Average rate of change = −4.97 ft/year
Average water level = 353.06 ft amsl




Red Bluff Subbasin − State Well Number (SWN) 25N03W11B002M (RB−8L)


Lower Aquifer Well Depth: 789 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 680 − 750 ft bgs








Statistics of spring water levels for past 18 years (2005 to 2023):
Change = −12.69 ft
Average rate of change = −0.7 ft/year
Average water level = 222.17 ft amsl





Water Year 2023 Annual Report

Appendix B

Explanation of Sustainable Management Criteria

Appendix B: Explanation of Sustainable Management Criteria

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to define Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) for the groundwater subbasin. The SMC offer guideposts and guardrails for groundwater managers seeking to achieve sustainable groundwater management. SGMA defines sustainable groundwater management as "the management and use of groundwater in a manner that can be maintained during the planning and implementation horizon without causing undesirable results," where the planning and implementation horizon is 50 years with the first 20 years spent working toward achieving sustainable groundwater management and the following 30 years (and beyond) spent maintaining it (California Water Code §10721).

"Undesirable Results" are associated with up to six Sustainability Indicators (SI), including groundwater levels, groundwater storage, water quality, seawater intrusion, land subsidence, and interconnected surface water. SGMA defines undesirable results as those having significant and unreasonable negative impacts. Failure to avoid undesirable results on the part of the GSAs may lead to intervention by the State. Once the sustainability goal and undesirable results have been locally identified, projects and management actions are formulated to achieve the sustainability goal and avoid undesirable results.



SI and associated undesirable results, if significant and unreasonable

The associated undesirable results for each SI have been defined similarly across the Butte Subbasin. In turn, the rationale and approach for determining Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives for each SI are the same across the Butte Subbasin.

The terminology for describing SMC is defined as follows:

Undesirable Results – Significant and unreasonable negative impacts associated with each SI.

Minimum Threshold (MT) – Quantitative threshold for each SI used to define the point at which undesirable results may begin to occur.

Measurable Objective (MO) – Quantitative target that establishes a point above the MT that allows for a range of active management to prevent undesirable results.

Margin of Operational Flexibility – The range of active management between the MT and the MO.

Interim Milestones (IMs) – Targets set in increments of five years over the implementation period of the GSP offering a path to sustainability.




Illustration of Terms Used for Describing Sustainable Management Criteria Using the Groundwater Level SI

The Figure above illustrates these terms for the groundwater level SI.

SI are intended to be measured and compared against quantifiable SMC throughout a monitoring framework of Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) wells. Ongoing monitoring of SI can:

Determine compliance with the adopted GSP

Offer a means to evaluate the effectiveness of projects and management actions over time

Allow for course correction and adaptation in five-year updates

Facilitate understanding among diverse stakeholders

Support decision-making on the part of the GSAs into the future

The SMC for the Red Bluff Subbasin is fully explained and defined in Section 3 of

the GSP available here: https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/140

Water Year 2023 Annual Report

Appendix C

GSP Annual Reporting Elements Guide

Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report Elements Guide

Basin Name	Red Bluff Subbasin		
GSP Local ID			
California Code of Regulations - GSP Regulation Sections	***Groundwater Sustainability Plan Elements***	**Document *page number(s) that address the applicable GSP element.***	***Notes: Briefly describe the GSP element does not apply.***
Article 5	**Plan Contents**		
Subarticle 4	***Monitoring Networks***		
§ 354.40	**Reporting Monitoring Data to the Department**		
	Monitoring data shall be stored in the data management system developed pursuant to Section 352.6. A copy of the monitoring data shall be included in the Annual Report and submitted electronically on forms provided by the Department.	34-37;68	
	Note: Authority cited: Section 10733.2, Water Code. Reference: Sections 10728, 10728.2, 10733.2 and 10733.8, Water Code.		
Article 7	**Annual Reports and Periodic Evaluations by the Agency**		
§ 356.2	**Annual Reports**		
	Each Agency shall submit an annual report to the Department by April 1 of each year following the adoption of the Plan. The annual report shall include the following components for the preceding water year:		
	(a) General information, including an executive summary and a location map depicting the basin covered by the report.	5-14	
	(b) A detailed description and graphical representation of the following conditions of the basin managed in the Plan:		
	(1) Groundwater elevation data from monitoring wells identified in the monitoring network shall be analyzed and displayed as follows:		
	(A) Groundwater elevation contour maps for each principal aquifer in the basin illustrating, at a minimum, the seasonal high and seasonal low groundwater conditions.	17-18	
	(B) Hydrographs of groundwater elevations and water year type using historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to current reporting year.	42-49	
	(2) Groundwater extraction for the preceding water year. Data shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be presented in a table that summarizes groundwater extractions by water use sector, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements, and a map that illustrates the general location and volume of groundwater extractions.	20-21	
	(3) Surface water supply used or available for use, for groundwater recharge or in-lieu use shall be reported based on quantitative data that describes the annual volume and sources for the preceding water year.	22	
	(4) Total water use shall be collected using the best available measurement methods and shall be reported in a table that summarizes total water use by water use sector, water source type, and identifies the method of measurement (direct or estimate) and accuracy of measurements. Existing water use data from the most recent Urban Water Management Plans or Agricultural Water Management Plans within the basin may be used, as long as the data are reported by water year.	22-23	
	(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:		
	(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.	29	
	(B) A graph depicting water year type, groundwater use, the annual change in groundwater in storage, and the cumulative change in groundwater in storage for the basin based on historical data to the greatest extent available, including from January 1, 2015, to the current reporting year.	27	
	(c) A description of progress towards implementing the Plan, including achieving interim milestones, and implementation of projects or management actions since the previous annual report.	30-39	

Water Year 2023 Annual Report

Appendix D

DWR Upload Tables

A. Groundwater Extractions

Total Groundwater Extractions (AF)	Water Use Sector Urban (AF)	Water Use Sector Industrial (AF)	Water Use Sector Agricultural (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Wetlands (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Recharge (AF)	Water Use Sector Native Vegetation (AF)	Water Use Sector Other (AF)	Water Use Sector Other Description
97,000	4,000	0	91,000		0	-	2,000	Rural Residential

B. Groundwater Extraction Methods

Meters Volume (AF)	Meters Description	Meters Type	Meters Accuracy (%)	Meters Accuracy Description	Electrical Records Volume (AF)	Electrical Records Description	Electrical Records Type	Electrical Records Accuracy (%)	Electrical Records Accuracy Description	Land Use Volume (AF)	Land Use Description	Land Use Type	Land Use Accuracy (%)	Land Use Accuracy Description	Groundwater Model Volume (AF)	Groundwater Model Description	Groundwater Model Type	Groundwater Model Accuracy (%)	Groundwater Model Accuracy Description	Other Method(s) Volume (AF)	Other Method(s) Description	Other Method(s) Type	Other Method(s) Accuracy (%)	Other Method(s) Accuracy Description
4,000	Metered Municipal Wells	Direct	5%	Metered connection maintained by the City of Red Bluff, the City of Tehama, the El Camino Irrigation District, and the Proberta Water District	0					91,000	Land use estimates were derived from crop mapping and CropScape survey results	Estimate	20%	Typical uncertainty for water balance calculation	0					2,000	Rural residential groundwater extraction is estimated based on City of Red Bluff's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan 2020 usage of an average per capita water use of 253 gallons per capita per day. Population data from the 2020 census was coupled with parcel data to identify total population not serviced by municipal supplies	Estimate	15%	Uncertainties are from population estimates and gallon per capita per day estimates

C. Surface Water Supply

Total Surface Water Supply (AF)	Methods Used To Determine	Water Source Type Central Valley Project (AF)	Water Source Type State Water Project (AF)	Water Source Type Colorado River Project (AF)	Water Source Type Local Supplies (AF)	Water Source Type Local Imported Supplies (AF)	Water Source Type Recycled Water (AF)	Water Source Type Desalination (AF)	Water Source Type Other (AF)	Water Source Type Other Description
800	Diversions for local supplies are estimated based on historic State Water Resource Control Board eWRIMS (Electronic Water Rights Information Management System) data for total diversions. Surface water delivery estimates are based on historic deliveries in the area that have occurred in dry and critical years	0	0	0	800	0	0	0	0	

D. Total Water Use

Total Water Use (AF)	Methods Used To Determine	Water Source Type Groundwater (AF)	Water Source Type Surface Water (AF)	Water Source Type Recycled Water (AF)	Water Source Type Reused Water (AF)	Water Source Type Other (AF)	Water Source Type Other Description	Water Use Sector Urban (AF)	Water Use Sector Industrial (AF)	Water Use Sector Agricultural (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Wetlands (AF)	Water Use Sector Managed Recharge (AF)	Water Use Sector Native Vegetation (AF)	Water Use Sector Other (AF)	Water Use Sector Other Description
98,000	Methods used are a combination of estimates based on land use and population/ per capita water use, metered municipal water use, and estimates based on historic water rights data for dry and critical years	97,000	800	0	0	0		4,000	0	92,000	-	0	-	2,000	Rural Residential

Water Year 2023 Annual Report

Appendix E

Water Use Analysis Methodology

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers

From: Davids Engineering, Inc.

Date: Friday, February 09, 2024

Subject: **DRAFT - Water Use Analysis Methodology**

1 Introduction

Pursuant to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) regulations (23 CCR[1] Section 356.2), the GSP Annual Report for the Red Bluff Subbasin (Subbasin) includes quantification of water supplies and water uses in the reporting year, including groundwater extraction by water use sector[2]. Water supplies and water uses in the Subbasin have been quantified based on the best available data sources and information, either collected from measured records or estimated where necessary.

While some groundwater extraction in the Subbasin is measured, most groundwater extraction is unmeasured, including extraction from privately owned wells. For the Red Bluff Subbasin Annual Report (Annual Report), the approach used to estimate unmeasured groundwater extraction for the agricultural water use sector is referred to as the Groundwater Extraction Estimates from Earth Observations (GEEEO) process. In this approach, a spatial water use analysis is computed on a monthly basis using current land use data, climate conditions (e.g., precipitation and evapotranspiration), crop water demands, and other local information, allowing for estimation of total water use and estimated groundwater extraction, after accounting for the use of other available water supplies.

This approach differs from the water budget methodology used in GSP development, where the Tehama Integrated Hydrogeologic Model (TIHM) was used to generate historical, current, and projected water budgets for the Subbasin. The shift toward the GEEEO process is due to the time and cost constraints associated with updating the GSP groundwater model annually. Despite this change, key inputs and results from the GEEEO process have been compared with those of the GSP groundwater model to ensure consistency in the water use analyses.

This technical memorandum (TM) describes the methodology and data sources used in the GEEEO process. Results of the GEEEO process are documented in the Annual Report.

[1] California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 1.5, Subchapter 2. Groundwater Sustainability Plans.
[2] Water use sectors are identified in the GSP Regulations as “categories of water demand based on the general land uses to which the water is applied, including urban, industrial, agricultural, managed wetlands, managed recharge, and native vegetation” (23 CCR Section 351(al)).

2 GEEEO Process and Computational Approach

2.1 Computational Approach

The GEEEO process utilizes available geospatial data and information to quantify water use, including groundwater extraction volumes, spatially across the Subbasin:

1. First, geospatial evapotranspiration (ET) information at a pixel-scale is used to quantify the total consumptive water use and total applied water requirements during a given time period in a given area of the Subbasin, and geospatial land use information is used to help identify where irrigation water may have been applied (i.e., whether the area in question features irrigated agricultural land, versus idled land or undeveloped vegetation).
2. After quantifying total applied water requirements, available surface water supply and groundwater extraction data is incorporated into the GEEEO process by distributing that water out to specific regions where that water is applied (e.g., irrigated lands in surface water supplier service areas).
3. The remaining groundwater extraction needed to meet applied water demands is then calculated based on the difference between total applied water requirements and available water supply information, with consideration for effective precipitation.
4. Finally, the pixel-scale results can then be aggregated to the desired spatial or temporal domains of interest.

The result is a spatially distributed water use analysis calculated with a finer spatial resolution than was possible in the GSP water budgets. The pixel-scale water budget results provide greater insight into where water use occurs in the Subbasin and are configurable to create water use summaries for any region of the Subbasin. Additional details about the GEEEO computational approach are provided in Attachment A, generally following the process described in Hessels et al. (2022).

2.2 Spatial Resolution

GEEEO quantifies water use and groundwater extraction volumes with pixel-scale resolution (30 meters (m) x 30 m), corresponding to the spatial resolution of satellite imagery used in developing many of the GEEEO inputs. For those inputs that are not available at the 30 m x 30 m resolution, available data and information is distributed as averages over the area where that information is applicable (e.g., district-reported surface water deliveries are distributed as an average acre-feet per acre (AF/ac) over irrigated lands in that district's service area[3]). Additional information about the spatial resolution of specific data sources is provided in Section 3.

The fine spatial resolution of the GEEEO inputs and computations allows for highly configurable GEEEO results summaries. For the Annual Report, results are summarized by subregions that are defined to roughly correspond with the boundaries of the water budget regions in the GSP groundwater model, with distinction between water districts, managed wetlands and refuge areas, and out-of-district lands.

[3] Future refinements to the GEEEO process could potentially incorporate field-scale surface water delivery records to improve spatial detail of results rather than equally distributing surface water deliveries across the irrigated lands within the district's service area.

2.3 Period and Timestep

For each Annual Report, the GEEEO process operates from 2016 through the current reporting year[4] on a monthly timestep, although only the results from the current reporting year are included in the Annual Report. The period and timestep are set according to data availability and reporting needs. However, the GEEEO process is configurable to operate on different timescales (e.g., daily or weekly). The start year is currently limited by the availability of geospatial ET information from OpenET, although further historical ET information is expected to be available in the near future.

3 Data Sources

The GEEEO process uses data sources and information that capture the unique, local conditions within the Subbasin to the extent available. Details about the data and information used in the GEEEO process are described below.

3.1 Evapotranspiration

ET, or consumptive water use, is the major driver of water use in the Subbasin, particularly agricultural use. In this context, consumptive water use is defined as "*the part of water withdrawn that is evaporated, transpired, incorporated into products or crops, consumed by humans or livestock, or otherwise removed from the immediate water environment*" (ASCE, 2016). Unlike surface runoff or infiltration of water into the groundwater system (through seepage, deep percolation, managed recharge, or other means), ET is water that cannot be recovered or directly reused in the Subbasin.

In the GEEEO process, ET is quantified from satellite-based remote sensing analyses available from OpenET. OpenET is a multi-agency web-based geospatial information system (GIS) utility that quantifies ET over time with a spatial resolution of 30 m x 30 m (approximately 0.22 acres). OpenET information is available in raster coverages of the Subbasin on both a daily and monthly timestep from 2016 through present.[5] The GEEEO process utilizes monthly rasters of the ensemble ET from OpenET to calculate total water use for the Annual Report.

While OpenET is a new utility, the underlying methodologies to quantify ET apply a variety of well-established modeling approaches that are widely used in government and research applications. The OpenET modeling approaches are also similar to the approaches used to quantify ET in the GSP groundwater model. Additional information about the OpenET team, data sources, and methodologies are available at: https://openetdata.org/.

3.2 Land Use

Areas in each water use sector in the Subbasin were identified using the most recent and reliable spatial land use data in the region, including:

1. Statewide crop mapping, available from the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (DWR, 2024)

[4] Annual Reports are required to be submitted by April 1 each year following the adoption of the GSP. The current reporting year for each Annual Report is the preceding water year (i.e., October 1 through September 30)
[5] OpenET raster information is typically available within about one month after the period has ended.

2. CropScape Cropland Data Layer coverage, available from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA, 2024).

Land use data from these sources were compiled into 30 m x 30 m raster coverages of the Subbasin. To prepare the GEEEO process inputs, DWR data, which includes extensive ground-truthing review of results, is preferentially used to identify agricultural land (including irrigated and non-irrigated lands) and urban areas, and then USDA data is utilized to back-fill gaps of non-irrigated, idled, and non-developed land in the Subbasin. Local refinements are also applied, as needed, to account for local land use information.

These land use data sources and applications were similar to those used in development of the GSP water budgets. Comparisons were made to evaluate the consistency of the datasets and with earlier land use analyses; good correspondence was found for the major land use classes found in the Subbasin.

DWR data is typically available in provisional form approximately two years after a given year has passed. USDA data is typically available for the prior year in early- to mid-February. When data for the current reporting year is not yet available, raster coverages of the Subbasin are generally assembled utilizing land use data from the most recent, hydrologically similar year (i.e., similar water supply conditions and similar cropping patterns, to the extent possible). Idling of annual and ponded crops in a given year may also be locally refined through comparison with USDA data for the current reporting year or through an analysis of vegetation coverage in the current reporting year. However, it is noted that land use data is only used in the GEEEO process to identify areas in each water use sector where water is applied. The total water use for lands in the agricultural and managed wetlands water use sectors are determined through an analysis of OpenET data, regardless of the precise land use classification.

3.3 Precipitation

Spatial precipitation estimates were extracted from the Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM), developed by the PRISM Climate Group at Oregon State University. PRISM quantifies spatial precipitation estimates, among other climate parameters, based on available weather station data and modeled spatial relationships with topography and other factors influencing weather and climate.

PRISM data is available in raster coverages of the Subbasin on both a daily and monthly timestep, with a spatial resolution of 4 kilometer (km) x 4 km. The GEEEO process utilizes monthly rasters for the Annual Report analysis, and the precipitation results for each 4 km pixel are applied to each of the 30 m pixels within it (i.e., downscaled) for which ET and land use data are available. Additional information about the PRISM data and methodologies are available at: https://prism.oregonstate.edu. PRISM precipitation data is consistent with the historical precipitation inputs to the GSP groundwater model.

PRISM precipitation data along with rooting estimated mean rooting depths from the rooting depth ranges listed in Appendix B of ASCE 70 (2016) is used to create pixel-level estimates of effective precipitation (ETPR). For crops not listed in ASCE 70, rooting depths are based on rooting depths of similar crops and professional judgement. ETPR is computed using the National Engineering Handbook Part 623 method (USDA, 1993).

3.4 Local Water Supply Data

As described in Section 2, available surface water supply and groundwater extraction data is incorporated into the GEEEO process to quantify the amount of known water supply available, prior to estimating the remaining groundwater extraction needed to meet demand. Water supply data is distributed as averages over the area where that information is applicable (e.g., average AF/ac over lands where that water is available for use).

Surface water supply and groundwater extraction data are collected from both publicly available and local sources. Information gathered may include, where applicable:

1. Water supply contract delivery records, from the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), State Water Project (SWP), or other publicly available sources as applicable.
2. Water rights diversions records, from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the Electronic Water Rights Information Management System (eWRIMS)
3. Data requests to local water agencies and water users, requesting surface water diversions, surface water deliveries, surface water outflows, groundwater pumping records, or other available water use data.

In cases where current surface water data is not available, general information on surface water inflows and outflows may be gathered from other local sources as available (e.g., Agricultural Water Management Plan water budgets). More information about surface water data sources is described in the Annual Report.

While groundwater extraction data is not available in many parts of the Subbasin, local data is requested each year so that new data can be incorporated into the GEEEO process as it becomes available. It is noted that while groundwater extraction for municipal water supply systems is generally reported for urban areas in the Annual Report based on SWRCB and locally provided data, groundwater extraction for municipal areas is not directly included in the GEEEO process due to underlying differences in how the majority of water is used in urban areas. This also applies to estimates of rural residential groundwater use (e.g., domestic water use pumped through private domestic wells) outside of urban areas. The data sources and approaches used to quantify municipal and rural residential groundwater extraction are described in the Annual Report.

3.5 Other Agronomic Data

Other agronomic and climate-related data that is incorporated into the GEEEO process includes:

1. Representative consumptive use fractions for crops (i.e., fraction of total applied water that is consumed through ET). Values are based on typical irrigation methods and efficiencies for crops.
2. Conveyance system fractions for subregions (i.e., fraction of diverted water that is delivered, accounting for losses).
3. Reuse fractions for subregions (i.e., fraction of delivered water that is reused).

Information gathered from local sources is used where available, otherwise representative values for agronomic practices in the region are used.

4 References

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). 2016. ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 70, Evaporation, Evapotranspiration, and Irrigation Water Requirements (Second Edition).

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2024. Provisional 2022 Statewide Crop Mapping GIS Data, Updated January 2024. Available at: https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/statewide-crop-mapping.

Hessels, T., Davids J. C., and Bastiaanssen W. 2022. Scalable Water Balances from Earth Observations (SWEO): Results from 50 Years of Remote Sensing in Hydrology. Water International, 47(6), 866-886.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2024. CropScape – 2023 Cropland Data Layer, Released January 2024. Available at: https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA); National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). 2024. 2023 Nationwide Crop Mapping GIS Data, Released January 31, 2024. Available at: https://croplandcros.scinet.usda.gov/.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1993. National Engineering Handbook. Chapter 2, part 623, Irrigation water requirements. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. Of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.

Attachment A. GEEEO Computational Approach Details

Figures A-1 and A-2, below, present a schematic of the GEEEO computational approach as it has been developed and is being generally applied to support Annual Report Development.




Figure A-1. Inflows and Outflows to Each 30 m x 30 m Pixel in the GEEEO Process.




Figure A-2. Solution Steps for Calculating Applied Groundwater (AGW) in Each 30 m x 30 m Pixel in the GEEEO Process.

Water Year 2023 Annual Report

Appendix F

Water Quality

Table X-X Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Water Quality of Representative Monitoring Site Wells				
Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) ID	TDS (mg/L)			
	MO	MT	2024	Notes
Upper Aquifer				
RB-2U	500	750	120	-
RB-4U	500	750	260	-
RB-6U	500	750	290	-
RB-7U	500	750	190	-
RB-9U	500	750	220	-
Lower Aquifer				
RB-8L	500	750	220	
RB-10L	500	750	810	Yes
RB-10LG	500	750	540	Yes