

ANNUAL REPORT | APRIL 2026

**BOWMAN SUBBASIN (5-006.01)
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN
ANNUAL REPORT – 2025**

SUBMITTED BY



TEHAMA COUNTY
FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

**TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT GROUNDWATER
SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY**

PREPARED BY



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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
1 General Information §356.2(a).....	1
2 Groundwater Elevations §356.2(b)(1)	4
3 Water Supply and Use	1
4 Groundwater Storage	6
5 GSP Implementation Progress – §356.2(b)(5)(C)	14
6 Conclusions	26
7 References.....	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary	3
Table ES-2. Bowman Subbasin Total Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025	7
Table 3-1. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025.....	2
Table 3-2. Bowman Subbasin Surface Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025	5
Table 3-3. Bowman Subbasin Total Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025	5
Table 3-4. Bowman Subbasin Estimated Uncertainty in Water Use Estimates	6
Table 4-1. Bowman Subbasin Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage	8
Table 5-1. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary.....	16
Table 5-2. Bowman Subbasin Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Seasonal Groundwater Elevations of Representative Monitoring Site Wells.....	18
Table 5-3. Bowman Subbasin Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, Undesirable Results for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1. Bowman Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries	2
Figure ES-2. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Pumping, Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2025	6
Figure 1-1. Subbasins in the North Sacramento Valley	2
Figure 1-2. Bowman Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries	3
Figure 2-1. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Spring 2025 (Seasonal High).....	1
Figure 2-2. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Fall 2025 (Seasonal Low)	2
Figure 2-3. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Lower Aquifer, Spring 2025 (Seasonal High).....	3
Figure 2-4. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Lower Aquifer, Fall 2025 (Seasonal Low)	4
Figure 3-1. Bowman Subbasin Water Use Sector and Source – WY 2025	3
Figure 3-2. Bowman Subbasin Estimated Applied Groundwater – WY 2025	4
Figure 4-1. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Extraction and Change in Groundwater Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2025	10
Figure 4-2. Bowman Subbasin Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025 in the Upper Aquifer.....	12
Figure 4-3. Bowman Subbasin Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025 in the Lower Aquifer	13
Figure 5-1. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 10/2024 to 10/2025	21
Figure 5-2. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 10/2020 to 10/2025	22
Figure 5-3. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 06/2015 to 10/2025	23

APPENDICES

Appendix A Characteristics and Hydrographs of Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) 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
Appendix G Project and Management Action (PMA) Updates

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
GPS	global positioning 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
SI	sustainability indicator
SGM	sustainable groundwater management
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SMC	sustainable management criteria
Subbasin	Antelope Subbasin
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TDS	total dissolved solids
TIHM	Tehama Integrated Hydrogeologic Model
UR	undesirable result
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
WY	water year

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bowman Subbasin (Subbasin) (5-006.01) 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 2025 for the Bowman 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 a 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 cause an undesirable result(s) (UR) in the Subbasin per DWR's definition. Whether the MT represents a minimum or maximum value is dependent on the SI. As an example of a minimum value, 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. As an example of a maximum for the groundwater quality sustainable management criteria (SMC), as the value of the total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations increases from the MO established for that site, it moves 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. Bowman Subbasin and Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries

Table ES-1. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2025 Status	Undesirable Result Identification	MO Definition	MT Definition
Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels			
No indication of undesirable results. No RMS well spring or fall 2025 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at the 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 2025 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: The 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 with spring or fall 2025 TDS measurements above the MO or MT.	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. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2025 Status	Undesirable Result Identification	MO Definition	MT Definition
Land Subsidence			
No indication of undesirable results. No InSAR pixel exceeded MT in WY 2025.	50% of the RMS exceed the minimum threshold over a 5-year period, which is irreversible and is caused by a 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 2025 groundwater level measurements 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 the chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Same as the 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 the spring of 2025, with only one well falling below the MO in the fall of 2025. However, water levels in all RMS wells remained above the corresponding MT and remained within the Subbasin's established margin of operational flexibility in WY 2025. 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 across both aquifers, 56 feet above the MT throughout the Subbasin and 9 ft above the MO in spring 2025 and 3 ft above the MO in fall 2025. Elevations are mostly near or slightly lower than those observed in recent dryer years despite above-normal hydrologic conditions in WY 2025. Typically, with above normal years, increased surface water supplies will result in a decreased groundwater extractions, allowing for the recovery of groundwater conditions experiencing in dry periods such as those that occurred from WY 2020 to WY 2022.

The balance between aquifer recharge and extraction influences fluctuations in groundwater levels and storage within the Subbasin. 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.

WY 2025, classified as an above-normal WY, saw an increase in cumulative groundwater storage, totaling approximately 2,300 acre-feet (AF) in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. For context, over the past 36 years, the largest decrease in groundwater storage is estimated at -47,000 AF, and the highest increase was estimated at 54,000 AF. **Figure ES-2** shows groundwater pumping, as well as annual and cumulative changes in groundwater storage from WY 1990 to WY 2025.




Figure ES-2. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Pumping, Annual and Cumulative Change in Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2025

Water Use

Groundwater extraction was approximately 12,400 AF in WY 2025, higher than the 4,900 AF extracted in WY 2024. The annual volume of surface water delivered to the Subbasin from surface water features such as Little Dry Creek, South Fork Cottonwood Creek, Pine Creek, and Hooker Creek was about 14,600 AF in WY 2025, lower than the 15,200 AF delivered in WY 2024. The increase in groundwater extraction estimates in WY 2025 compared to WY 2024 was influenced by a variety of factors, including decreased surface water and effective precipitation in WY 2025 (relative to WY 2024).

Surface water provides the majority (54%) of the total water use in the Subbasin, and groundwater is the source for the remainder (46%). Groundwater 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.

Sector	Groundwater (AF)	Surface Water (AF)	Total (AF)	Percent of Total Water Use	Total Sector Area (acres)
Agricultural	2,500	14,600	17,100	63%	3,800
Municipal	4,700	0	4,700	18%	0
Rural Residential	5,200	0	5,200	19%	n/a*
Total	12,400	14,600	27,000	100%	
Percent of Total Water Use	46%	54%	100%		

*Rural residential water use is calculated based on population from census data, not area.

GSP Implementation Progress

The main activities and updates since the previous annual report are as follows:

- The Tehama County GSA completed the WY 2025 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 of PMAs, evaluating and ranking PMAs, and preparing and submitting the grant application. The grant application was submitted in December 2022, and DWR released a final award list in September 2023; results are summarized in **Appendix G**.
- 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 are 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 4 PMAs since the last annual report **Appendix G**).

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.

Since 2024, the Tehama County GSA in the Subbasin has been 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 Bowman Subbasin (Subbasin) (5-006.01) was prepared on behalf of the Tehama Flood Control and Water Conservation District and the Tehama County Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County 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 fifth annual report submitted on behalf of the Subbasin and includes data for the most recent WY 2025. The public seeking information on Bowman Subbasin and GSP Implementation, Technical Advisory Committee meeting schedules and recordings, and other resources should visit the (<https://tehamacountywater.org/gsa/>) website.

1.1 Report Contents

This report is the fifth annual report prepared for the Bowman 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, third, and fourth annual reports contain data only for the current reporting year, WY 2022, WY 2023, and WY 2024, respectively. Data elements presented in this report refer to WY 2025, the 12-month period spanning October 2024 through September 2025 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 192-square-mile (122,300-acre) area in the Redding Area Groundwater Basin in northern 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 Redding Area, **Figure 1-1**. The Subbasin’s northern boundary is the Anderson Subbasin, the southern boundary is the Red Bluff Subbasin, the eastern boundary is the South Battle Creek Subbasin, and the western boundary is the Northern Coast Mountain Ranges (DWR, 2018), **Figure 1-2**. Several surface water features are located in the Subbasin, including Cottonwood Creek and the Sacramento River. Smaller local streams entering and traversing the Subbasin include Little Dry Creek, Pine Creek, and Hooker Creek. Groundwater generally flows from west/northwest to east/southeast.

The Bowman GSP estimates the sustainable yield of the Subbasin to be 10,000 acre-feet (AF) based on projected long-term groundwater pumping averages of 6,200 acre-feet per year AFY and an annual decrease in storage of 122,425 AFY (Tehama County GSA 2021). Water use in the Subbasin is dominated by agricultural uses (63%); the remaining uses include municipal (17%) and rural residential water uses (19%). Surface water constitutes the majority (54%) of the Subbasin’s water supplies, with groundwater comprising the remaining portion (46%).




Figure 1-1. Subbasins in the North Sacramento Valley




Figure 1-2. Bowman 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 in 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 in the season. Consequently, groundwater levels are usually highest in spring and lowest during the irrigation season in the summer months. Fall groundwater measurements (typically taken in October) provide an indication of groundwater conditions after the primary irrigation season.

Groundwater levels in the Subbasin are monitored at representative monitoring site (RMS) wells that were selected in the GSP to represent localized groundwater conditions in specified areas of the Subbasin. RMS wells include a mixture of domestic wells, irrigation wells, and dedicated observation wells. In total, seven (7) RMS wells are used to monitor conditions in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. RMS wells are identified in **Table 5-2. Appendix A** includes hydrographs depicting groundwater elevations and the approximate locations of the RMS wells. Sustainable management criteria (SMC), as described in **Appendix B**, are assigned to groundwater levels at the RMS wells.

Certain RMS wells, measured by DWR and Tehama County, are equipped with data loggers and pressure transducers that continuously monitor and record hourly changes in groundwater levels. These, along with the remaining wells in the network, are measured by hand at least twice 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 2025 groundwater elevation measurements for RMS wells in the Upper Aquifer and Lower Aquifer systems are summarized in **Table 5-2**. The groundwater level monitoring methods are consistent with the protocols described in the Bowman Subbasin GSP. Depending on the well, groundwater elevations are measured using steel tape, an electric sounder, or pressure transducers. The accuracy of groundwater level measurements is typically either 0.01 ft or 0.1 ft, depending on the equipment used.

The following sub-sections provide a summary of groundwater elevations and conditions during WY 2025 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 2025 were prepared for the Upper Aquifer and Lower Aquifer, as shown in **Figures 2-1** through **2-4**. Spring contours are intended to generally represent seasonal high groundwater elevations (shallower depth to water), while 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 and Lower Aquifer (**Figures 2-1 through 2-4**) each show that groundwater elevations are generally higher in the western areas of the Subbasin versus the eastern areas, indicating a general gradient – and thus groundwater flow – from the west/northwest to the east/southeast. The contour maps illustrate several general features of the groundwater flow system in the Bowman Subbasin, including:

- Overall, west/northwest to east/southeast 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. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Spring 2025 (Seasonal High)




Figure 2-2. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Upper Aquifer, Fall 2025 (Seasonal Low)




Figure 2-3. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Lower Aquifer, Spring 2025 (Seasonal High)




Figure 2-4. Bowman Subbasin Contours of Equal Groundwater Elevation for the Lower Aquifer, Fall 2025 (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**. The pink trendline on each hydrograph illustrates general groundwater level changes during the spring months, a period typically free from groundwater pumping, thereby reflecting the least-influenced groundwater levels. Groundwater level records from recent spring seasons were used to calculate changes in groundwater levels, the average water level, and the average annual rate of change. The trendline was developed based on the available data and historical records for each specific monitoring site. While most sites have data spanning the past 22 years (Spring 2003 to Spring 2025), some long-established monitoring wells contain extended historical records (over 22 years), whereas newly installed wells have more limited datasets. **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 (URs) for WY 2025, and **Table 5-2** contains a summary of the spring 2025 (seasonal high) and fall 2025 (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 2024 to WY 2025, and the differences between the WY 2025 groundwater elevations and the MO/MT.

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 2025 groundwater elevations were generally near seasonal groundwater elevations in previous years. In WY 2025, the average seasonal high in the Upper Aquifer was 431.53 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the average seasonal low was 426.56 feet AMSL. In WY 2025, the average seasonal high in the Lower Aquifer was 403.14 feet AMSL, and the average seasonal low was 394.85 feet AMSL. In WY 2024, the average seasonal high in both aquifers was 437.99 feet AMSL, and in WY 2025, the average seasonal high was 424.43 feet AMSL. Increases in groundwater level elevations are generally expected to result from decreased groundwater extraction as well as increased recharge due to above-normal climate conditions.

All wells remained above the MO as of spring 2025, and only one lower aquifer well (Bow-6L) fell below the MO in fall 2025 by 1.75 feet. 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 in WY 2025. On average, groundwater levels in RMS wells were roughly 59 feet higher than MT elevations in spring 2025 and 53 feet higher than MT elevations in fall 2025. 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 2025.

Groundwater extraction volumes are either based on measured data or are estimates from a water use analysis based on 2025 land use data and climate conditions. Water use data is presented in **Appendix D**. 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. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025		
Sector	Applied Groundwater (AF)	Percent of Total Groundwater Use
Agricultural	2,500	20%
Municipal	4,700	38%
Rural Residential	5,200	42%
Total	12,400	100%


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, with the remaining groundwater extraction estimated through the water use analysis approach described in the previous section and in **Appendix E**. The majority of the Subbasin relies on a combination of surface water and groundwater supplies for agricultural irrigation (85% surface water/15% groundwater).

Municipal water users extracted approximately 4,700 AF in the Subbasin in WY 2025. Municipal water supplies are measured and provided by the Rio Alto 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) (City of Red Bluff, 2020) is considered to be representative of the area. Water use in 2020 was 253 gallons per capita per day. Population estimates were based on average household sizes from the US census and aggregated to those living outside city water district boundaries. Population estimates from the 2020 Census were used to estimate residential groundwater pumping.

The total estimated groundwater extraction was approximately 12,400 AF in WY 2025. The total groundwater extraction is about 3,400 AF more than the historical groundwater pumping average (9,000 AFY; **Table 4-1**) and more than 7,700 AF, which was the average annual extraction of the last five above-normal WYs on record (1993, 2000, 2003, 2005, and 2024 **Figure 3-1** shows the water use sector and source. **Figure 3-2** shows the general areas where groundwater is applied in the Subbasin. About 20% of the total groundwater extraction was used by the agricultural sector, while the remainder was used for municipal (38%) and rural residential (42%) water needs.






Figure 3-2. Bowman Subbasin Estimated Applied Groundwater – WY 2025

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 were estimated based on available historical diversions data in similar water years.

Surface water provided about 85% of the agricultural water demand in the Subbasin for WY 2025. Diversions from surface water features such as the Sacramento River and Cottonwood Creek were estimated based on the historic State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) California Water Accounting, Tracking, and Reporting System (CalWATRS) (SWRCB, 2025) data for total diversions or direct requests from diverters. There are currently no surface water supplies for municipal use in the Bowman Subbasin. Total surface water diversions and applied surface water for the Bowman Subbasin are estimated to be about 24,200 AF and 14,600 AF, respectively. Despite receiving similar precipitation in WY 2025, surface water use decreased in WY 2025 (14,600 AF) compared to WY 2024 (15,200 AF).

Table 3-2. Bowman Subbasin Surface Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025			
Sector	Diverted (AF)	Applied (AF)	Percent of Total Surface Water Use
Agricultural	24,200	14,600	100%
Municipal	0	0	0%
Total	24,200	14,600	100%

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

Total water demand in the subbasin for WY 2025 was divided between surface water (54%) and groundwater (46%). 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 2025. The results are either based on measured data or estimates, as described in the previous two sections.

Table 3-3. Bowman Subbasin Total Water Use by Water Use Sector for WY 2025					
Sector	Groundwater (AF)	Surface Water (AF)	Total (AF)	Percent of Total Water Use	Total Sector Area (acres)
Agricultural	2,500	14,600	17,100	63%	3,800
Municipal	4,700	0	4,700	18%	0
Rural Residential	5,200	0	5,200	19%	n/a*
Total	12,400	14,600	27,000	100%	
Percent of Total Water Use	46%	54%	100%		

*Rural residential water use is calculated based on population from census data, not area.

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. Bowman Subbasin 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 the Senate Bill 88 measurement accuracy standards.

¹Higher uncertainty of 10-20% is typical for estimated surface water inflows, including ungauged 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 either relatively stable or showing a declining trend over time (despite positive trends in recent years). 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 typical 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 as 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 2025 (an above-normal WY), cumulative (Upper and Lower Aquifer) groundwater storage increased by approximately 2,300 AF. Despite similar climatic conditions in WY 2025 compared to WY 2024, increased groundwater usage and decreased surface water usage contributed to a smaller increase in groundwater storage in WY 2025 compared to WY 2024.

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 2025 in **Table 4-1** and **Figure 4-1**. Like WY 2024, WY 2025 was an above-normal WY and saw an increase in groundwater storage, totaling approximately 2,300 AF in the Upper and Lower Aquifer. For context, the past 36 years, the largest decrease in groundwater storage is estimated at -47,000 AF, and the highest increase is estimated at 54,000 AF.

The Tehama Integrated Hydrogeologic Model (TIHM; Tehama County, 2021) was used to estimate groundwater pumping, groundwater uptake, change in storage, and cumulative change in storage for WY 1990 through WY 2019. It should be noted that the groundwater model was not used to estimate storage changes for WY 2020 through WY 2025. Therefore, future updates to the model may result in different estimates for WY 2020 through WY 2025 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 WY 1990 through WY 2025. Estimates of annual groundwater pumping for WY 2022 through WY 2025 are described in **Section 3** and **Appendix E**. Changes in annual storage and cumulative change in storage for WY 2020 through WY 2025 were 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 2025 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. Bowman Subbasin Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage			
Groundwater Storage Change (AF)	Groundwater Storage Change (AF)¹	Groundwater Storage Change (AF)	Cumulative Change in Storage (AF)
1990 (C)	8,600	-27,000	-27,000
1991 (C)	7,400	-28,000	-55,000
1992 (C)	7,100	-6,000	-61,000
1993 (AN)	7,200	41,000	-20,000
1994 (C)	7,600	-28,000	-48,000
1995 (W)	6,600	49,000	1,000
1996 (W)	8,100	16,000	17,000
1997 (W)	10,500	-11,000	6,000
1998 (W)	8,000	54,000	60,000
1999 (W)	7,700	-14,000	46,000
2000 (AN)	7,800	-10,000	36,000
2001 (D)	9,200	-30,000	6,000
2002 (D)	10,600	-7,600	-1,600
2003 (AN)	9,000	20,000	18,400
2004 (BN)	12,200	-3,500	14,900
2005 (AN)	9,900	13,000	27,900
2006 (W)	9,700	15,000	42,900
2007 (D)	11,100	-47,000	-4,100
2008 (C)	11,800	-19,000	-23,100
2009 (D)	9,300	-18,000	-41,100
2010 (BN)	10,400	21,000	-20,100
2011 (W)	9,400	17,000	-3,100
2012 (BN)	8,300	-30,000	-33,100
2013 (D)	10,000	-13,000	-46,100
2014 (C)	8,600	-29,000	-75,100
2015 (C) ²	10,500	-3,800	-78,900
2016 (BN)	9,000	23,000	-55,900
2017 (W)	8,200	43,000	-12,900
2018 (BN)	9,700	-37,000	-49,900
2019 (W)	8,900	36,000	-13,900
2020 (D)	9,200	2,000	-11,900
2021 (C) ²	9,600	-31,000	-42,900

Table 4-1. Bowman Subbasin Annual Groundwater Extraction and Change in Storage			
Groundwater Storage Change (AF)	Groundwater Storage Change (AF)¹	Groundwater Storage Change (AF)	Cumulative Change in Storage (AF)
2022 (C) ²	15,100	-17,000	-59,900
2023 (W)	5,000	22,000	-37,900
2024 (AN)	4,900	12,200	-25,700
2025 (AN)	12,400	2,300	-23,400
Historic Averages (1990-2024)³			
1990-2024 (35 years)	9,000	-700	
W (10 years)	8,200	22,700	
AN (5 years)	7,800	15,200	
BN (5 years)	9,900	-5,300	
D (6 years)	9,900	-18,900	
C (9 years)	9,600	-21,000	

Notes:

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

AF = Acre-feet

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; groundwater extraction values for WY 2023 through WY 2025 are described in **Section 3**, and **Appendix E**. Annual change in storage values for WY 2020 through WY 2025 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 1990 to 2024, excluding the current water year.




Figure 4-1. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Extraction and Change in Groundwater Storage from WY 1990 to WY 2025

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 2024 to spring 2025 is 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. Groundwater level data obtained from the DWR Water Data Library (DWR, 2025) were generally recorded on a monthly to quarterly basis. For WY 2025, a raster surface representing seasonal high groundwater level changes was generated by spatially interpolating (kriging) data from selected wells across the subbasin. These seasonal high changes were calculated by subtracting groundwater levels recorded in spring 2024 from those recorded in spring 2025.

The selected wells represent sites with groundwater level records that are considered representative of subbasin conditions. In areas—mostly near the subbasin boundaries—where polygon-specific groundwater data were unavailable, interpolated raster pixel values from the selected wells were used for groundwater storage change calculations. In cases where multiple groundwater level records existed within a single polygon, an average groundwater level was assigned to that polygon. Groundwater storage change was then calculated by multiplying the change in seasonal high groundwater level (WY 2025 minus WY 2024) by the

specific yield value assigned to each polygon, and by the polygon area (in acres), resulting in groundwater storage changes from WY 2024 to WY 2025 expressed in acre-feet. It should be noted that the groundwater model as described in the GSP was not used to estimate storage changes for WY 2021 through WY 2025 (**Figure 4-1**). 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.

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. 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 2024 to spring 2025 was between 0 and 5,000 AF. The western and eastern portions of the Subbasin had a larger positive change in storage. Total groundwater storage change in the Upper Aquifer was estimated to be approximately 2,000 AF between spring 2024 and spring 2025. As shown in **Figure 4-3**, the change in storage within the Lower Aquifer from spring 2024 to spring 2025 was between 0 and 500 AF. Total groundwater storage change in the Lower Aquifer was estimated to be approximately 300 AF between spring 2024 and spring 2025.




Figure 4-2. Bowman Subbasin Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025 in the Upper Aquifer




Figure 4-3. Bowman Subbasin Change in Groundwater Storage from Spring 2024 to Spring 2025 in the Lower 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 (0.007 – 0.0259) 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 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 2025

The main activities and updates since the previous annual report are as follows:

- The Tehama County GSA completed the WY 2025 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 of project and management actions (PMAs), evaluating and ranking PMAs, and preparing and submitting the grant application. The grant application was submitted in December 2022, and DWR released a final award list in September 2023; results are summarized in **Appendix G**.
- 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 are 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 4 PMAs since the last annual report (**Appendix G**).

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 on Subbasin conditions and submission to DWR as required by SGMA.
- Ongoing intra- and inter-basin coordination.

5.2 Progress Toward Achieving Interim Milestones

All SIs are in compliance with their MTs (see summary **Table 5-1**). An MT is the quantitative value that represents the groundwater conditions at an 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. Whether the MT represents a minimum or maximum value is dependent on the SI. As an example of a minimum value,

if groundwater levels are lower than the value of the MO for that site, they are moving in the direction of the MT. As an example of a maximum for the groundwater quality SMC, as the value of total dissolved solids (TDS) increases beyond the MO established for that site, it moves in the direction of the MT. Seawater Intrusion is not an applicable SI.

Groundwater elevations remained above the MTs in spring and fall of 2025, avoiding 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 IMs for groundwater levels at each RMS well. Groundwater elevations are all above the MTs throughout the Subbasin, with elevations mostly near or above 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 2025 following two recent years of cutbacks in WY 2021 and WY 2022. Spring 2025 groundwater elevations were above the established MOs; one lower aquifer well fell below MO in fall 2025 (**Table 5-2**).

Table 5-1. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2025 Status	Undesirable Result Identification	MO Definition	MT Definition
Chronic Lowering of Groundwater Levels			
No indication of undesirable results. No RMS Well spring or fall 2025 groundwater level measurements below the MT.	25% of groundwater elevations measured at the 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 2025 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: The 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 with spring or fall 2025 TDS measurements above the MO or MT.	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. Bowman Subbasin Sustainability Indicator Summary			
2025 Status	Undesirable Result Identification	MO Definition	MT Definition
Land Subsidence			
No indication of undesirable results. No InSAR pixel exceeded MT in WY 2025.	50% of the RMS exceed the minimum threshold over a 5-year period, which is irreversible and is caused by a 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 2025 groundwater level measurements 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 the chronic lowering of groundwater levels.	Same as the 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.

Table 5-2. Bowman Subbasin Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Seasonal Groundwater Elevations of Representative Monitoring Site Wells												
State Well Number	Groundwater Elevation (feet above mean sea level)				2025 vs. MO (ft)		2025 vs. MT (ft)		2025 vs. 2024 (ft)			
	2025 Measurements				MO	MT	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring (seasonal high)	Fall (seasonal low)
	Date Measured	Spring (seasonal high)	Date Measured	Fall (seasonal low)								
Upper Aquifer												
29N03W18M001M (Bow-1U)	3/10/2025	395.14	8/6/2025	391.04	386.30	318.50	8.84	4.74	76.64	72.54	0.52	--
29N04W28D001M (Bow-2U)	3/26/2025	403.84	8/7/2025	399.74	395.10	372.50	8.74	4.64	31.34	27.24	2.30	--
29N05W33A004M (Bow-3U)	3/13/2025	495.62	8/11/2025	488.91	484.90	419.60	10.72	4.01	76.02	69.31	0.36	--
28N04W04P001M (Bow-4U)	--	--	--	--	404.80	377.50	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lower Aquifer												
29N03W21F001M (Bow-5L)	--	--	--	--	338.50	294.00	--	--	--	--	--	--
29N04W20A002M (Bow-6L)	3/13/2025	403.14	9/19/2025	394.85	396.60	351.80	6.54	-1.75	51.34	43.05	0.24	-1.64
29N05W21H001M (Bow-7LR)	--	--	--	--	NA	NA	--	--	--	--	--	--

MO = Measurable Objective, MT = Minimum Threshold, -- = Indicates Missing or Questionable Measurement, NA = Indicates non-determined MO, MT due to insufficient history;¹ No longer monitored by DWR. Well has been removed from the groundwater monitoring network.

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 2025, all groundwater elevations were above the established MTs (as indicated in **Table 5-2**). **Table 5-2** shows measurements from WY 2025 for spring seasonal highs (the highest measurement at each well between February and May of 2025) and fall seasonal lows (the lowest measurement at each well between September and November 2025), along with MOs and MTs. **Table 5-2** also compares the WY 2025 measurements to those from WY 2024 and to the MOs and MTs. Higher water levels were observed in spring 2025 compared to spring 2024 due to above-normal conditions, which have helped to increase recharge and offset extraction, bolstering groundwater storage in the Subbasin.

5.2.2 Degraded Water Quality SMC

The degraded water quality MT and MO are summarized in **Table 5-1**. TDS is the main constituent of concern in the Subbasin. TDS is measured at RMS wells throughout the Subbasin, and data was collected by the LSCE in the fall 2024 and spring 2025. For WY 2025, five (Bow-2U, Bow-3U, Bow-4U, Bow-7L, and Bow-7LR) of the nine RMS wells were not available for monitoring in fall 2024 and three (Bow-2U, Bow-4U, and Bow-7L) of the nine RMS wells were not available for monitoring in spring 2025. TDS ranged from 150 mg/L to 200 mg/L in fall 2024 and 130 mg/L to 190 mg/L in spring 2025. None of the wells exceeded MO or MT for TDS in WY 2025. 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**. Only inelastic subsidence, solely due to lowered groundwater elevations, will be considered relevant to the SMC. Data from monuments in the Sacramento Valley Global Positioning System (GPS) Subsidence Monitoring Network were utilized to track cumulative subsidence in the area in 2008 and 2017 (DWR, 2024a) and were used for identifying undesirable results in the GSP; however, these sites have not been measured since then. Observations from the Sacramento Valley GPS Subsidence Monitoring Network are supplemented by Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) data provided by DWR (DWR, 2024b) to assess this SMC. InSAR data were analyzed from October 2024 to October 2025 to track annual changes (**Figure 5-1**), from October 2020 to October 2025 to track net 5-year changes (**Figure 5-2**), and from June 2015 to October 2025 to track net 10-year changes (**Figure 5-3**).

Conditions indicate that there has been minimal land subsidence over the period of record. Subsidence measured by InSAR ranged from -0.06 feet of subsidence to 0.00 feet within the Subbasin from October 2024 to October 2025. Subsidence and uplift measured by InSAR over the 5-year period from October 2020 to October 2025 ranged from -0.13 feet to 0.20 feet. Subsidence and uplift measured by InSAR over the 10-year period from June 2015 to October 2025 ranged from -0.16 feet to 0.11 feet. Groundwater conditions

in the Subbasin are on track to meet the first 5-year 2027 IMs and avoid undesirable results for land subsidence.




Figure 5-1. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 10/2024 to 10/2025




Figure 5-2. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 10/2020 to 10/2025




Figure 5-3. Bowman Change in Subsidence from 06/2015 to 10/2025

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 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 IMs for groundwater levels at each of the RMS wells.

5.3 Progress Toward PMA Implementation

The Bowman Subbasin GSP includes a description of the projects and management actions the GSAs have determined will achieve the sustainability goal for the basin, including projects and management actions to respond to changing conditions in the basin. A description of progress towards implementing projects and management actions in the GSP is included in the PMA Module in **Appendix G**.

Groundwater users in the Subbasin benefit from generally stable, shallow groundwater levels supported by 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 5-3. Bowman Subbasin Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, Undesirable Results for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water										
State Well Number	Groundwater Elevation (feet above mean sea level)				2025 vs. MO (ft)		2025 vs. MT (ft)			
	2025 Measurements				MO	MT	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
	Date Measured	Spring (seasonal high)	Date Measured	Fall (seasonal low)						
29N03W18M001M (Bow-1U)	3/10/2025	395.14	8/6/2025	391.04	386.3	318.5	8.84	4.74	76.64	72.54
29N04W28D001M (Bow-2U)	3/26/2025	403.84	8/7/2025	399.74	395.1	372.5	8.74	4.64	31.34	27.24
29N05W33A004M (Bow-3U)	3/13/2025	495.62	8/11/2025	488.91	484.9	419.6	10.72	4.01	76.02	69.31
28N04W04P001M (Bow-4U)	--	--	--	--	404.8	377.5	--	--	--	--

MO = Measurable Objective, MT = Minimum Threshold, -- = Indicates missing or questionable measurements

6 CONCLUSIONS

The Tehama County GSA adopted and submitted the GSP to DWR in January 2022. Following the analysis 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 Bowman Subbasin.

7 REFERENCES

- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2018. 5-021.74 Sacramento Valley-Bowman 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). 2024. Periodic Groundwater Level Measurements - Datasets - California Natural Resources Agency Open Data. Downloaded December 2024. Available at: <https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/periodic-groundwater-level-measurements>.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2025. TRE ALTAMIRA InSAR Subsidence Data. Available at: <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/tre-altamira-insar-subsidence-data>.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2024. California Water Accounting, Tracking, and Reporting System (CalWATRS). Available at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/upward/calwatsr/>.
- City of Red Bluff. 2020. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. https://cms5.revize.com/revize/redbluff/2020_UWMP_CERTIFIED.pdf.
- Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2022. Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Available at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/137>.
- Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2023. WY 2022 Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report: Available at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gspar/preview/207>.
- Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2024. WY 2023 Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report. Available at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gspar/preview/366>.
- Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (Tehama County GSA). 2025. WY 2024 Bowman Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report. Available at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gspar/preview/468>.



Water Year 2025 Annual Report

Appendix A

Characteristics and Hydrographs of Representative
Monitoring Site (RMS) Wells

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N04W27A001M

Well Depth: 225 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 205 – 225 ft bgs







MO GWE: NA ft amsl
MO DTW: NA ft amsl

MT GWE: NA ft amsl
MT DTW: NA ft amsl


Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 21 years (2003 to 2024):
Change = -12.9 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.61 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 375.6 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2020–2024):
= -3.55 ft/yr



Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N04W35B001M

Well Depth: 759 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 130 – 160 ft bgs




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: NA ft amsl
MO DTW: NA ft amsl


MT GWE: NA ft amsl
MT DTW: NA ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 22 years (2003 to 2025):
Change = 2.83 ft
Avg. rate of change = 0.13 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 451.83 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):
= 1.13 ft/yr




- - - GSE
- MO
- MT
- 5-year Interim milestone
- Spring WL trend (2003–2025, 22 yrs)



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N04W20A003M

Well Depth: 194 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 154 – 164 ft bgs



- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: NA ft amsl


MO DTW: NA ft amsl

MT GWE: NA ft amsl


MT DTW: NA ft amsl

Acronyms:
 GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
 GWE: Groundwater Elevation
 MO: Minimum Objective
 MT: Minimum Threshold
 DTW: Depth to Water
 bgs: Below Ground Surface
 amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
 NA: Not Available
 WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 17 years (2008 to 2025):
 Change = -3.38 ft
 Avg. rate of change = -0.2 ft/yr
 Avg. water level = 412.85 ft amsl
 5-yr Avg. rate (2021-2025):
 = 0.07 ft/yr





- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2008–2025, 17 yrs)
- MT
- Transducer data



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N05W21H001M (Bow-7L)

Lower Aquifer Well Depth: 280 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 250 – 280 ft bgs






MO GWE: 458.2 ft amsl
MO DTW: 164.35 ft amsl

MT GWE: 417.6 ft amsl
MT DTW: 205 ft amsl


Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 17 years (2003 to 2020):
Change = -8.3 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.49 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 481.66 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2016–2020):
= -0.95 ft/yr



Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N04W28D001M (Bow-2U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 134 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 114 – 134 ft bgs




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 395.1 ft amsl
MO DTW: 107.44 ft amsl


MT GWE: 372.5 ft amsl
MT DTW: 130 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 22 years (2003 to 2025):
Change = 0.9 ft
Avg. rate of change = 0.04 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 402.85 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):
= 0.86 ft/yr




- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2003–2025, 22 yrs)
- MT



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N05W33A004M (Bow-3U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 210 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 110 – 210 ft bgs




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 484.9 ft amsl
MO DTW: 49.66 ft amsl


MT GWE: 419.6 ft amsl
MT DTW: 115 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 22 years (2003 to 2025):
Change = -0.54 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.02 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 495.03 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):
= 0.69 ft/yr




- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2003–2025, 22 yrs)
- MT



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N05W33A003M

Well Depth: 392 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 210 – 392 ft bgs



- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: NA ft amsl

MO DTW: NA ft amsl

MT GWE: NA ft amsl

MT DTW: NA ft amsl

Acronyms:

GSE: Ground Surface Elevation

GWE: Groundwater Elevation

MO: Minimum Objective

MT: Minimum Threshold

DTW: Depth to Water

bgs: Below Ground Surface

amsl: Above Mean Sea Level

NA: Not Available

WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for

past 22 years (2003 to 2025):


Change = -3.31 ft

Avg. rate of change = -0.15 ft/yr


Avg. water level = 492.65 ft amsl

5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):

= -0.5 ft/yr




- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2003–2025, 22 yrs)
- MT



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 28N04W04P001M (Bow-4U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 270 ft. Perforation top & bottom: Unknown




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 404.8 ft amsl
MO DTW: 132.74 ft amsl


MT GWE: 377.5 ft amsl
MT DTW: 160 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 19 years (2003 to 2022):
Change = -3 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.16 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 414.05 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2018–2022):
= 1.17 ft/yr




- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2003–2022, 19 yrs)
- MT



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N04W20A002M (Bow-6L)

Lower Aquifer Well Depth: 451 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 360 – 430 ft bgs




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 396.6 ft amsl
MO DTW: 55.15 ft amsl


MT GWE: 351.8 ft amsl
MT DTW: 100 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 17 years (2008 to 2025):
Change = -1.9 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.11 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 403.05 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):
= 0.21 ft/yr




- GSE
- 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2008–2025, 17 yrs)
- MT
- Transducer data



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N03W18M001M (Bow-1U)

Upper Aquifer Well Depth: 234 ft. Perforation top & bottom: Unknown




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 386.3 ft amsl
MO DTW: 32.24 ft amsl


MT GWE: 318.5 ft amsl
MT DTW: 100 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 20 years (2005 to 2025):
Change = -1.2 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.06 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 393.39 ft amsl
5-yr Avg. rate (2021–2025):
= 0.42 ft/yr




- - - GSE
- - - 5-year Interim milestone
- MO
- Spring WL trend (2005–2025, 20 yrs)
- MT
- Transducer data



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: ■ Wet ■ Above Normal ■ Below Normal ■ Dry ■ Critical

Bowman Subbasin – State Well Number (SWN) 29N03W21–XXX (Bow–5L)

Lower Aquifer Well Depth: 760 ft. Perforation top & bottom: 390 – 750 ft bgs




- Graphed Well
- ⊕ Other Well

MO GWE: 338.5 ft amsl
MO DTW: 285.5 ft amsl


MT GWE: 294 ft amsl
MT DTW: 330 ft amsl

Acronyms:
GSE: Ground Surface Elevation
GWE: Groundwater Elevation
MO: Minimum Objective
MT: Minimum Threshold
DTW: Depth to Water
bgs: Below Ground Surface
amsl: Above Mean Sea Level
NA: Not Available
WY: Water Year

Statistics of spring water levels for past 8 years (2014 to 2022):
Change = -0.28 ft
Avg. rate of change = -0.04 ft/yr
Avg. water level = 344.68 ft amsl
5–yr Avg. rate (2018–2022):
= -0.2 ft/yr



- GSE
- MO
- MT
- 5–year Interim milestone
- Spring WL trend (2014–2022, 8 yrs)



- Sacramento Valley Water Year Index
- WY Type: Wet Above Normal Below Normal Dry Critical

Water Year 2025 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 Bowman Subbasin. In turn, the rationale and approach for determining Minimum Thresholds and Measurable Objectives for each SI are the same across the Bowman 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 Bowman Subbasin is fully explained and defined in Section 3 of the

GSP available here: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/137>

Water Year 2025 Annual Report

Appendix C

GSP Annual Reporting Elements Guide

Groundwater Sustainability Plan Annual Report Elements Guide

Basin Name	Bowman		
GSP Local ID	5-006.01		
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.	39-44	
	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.	5-15	
	(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.	16-21	
	(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.	22; 47-59	
	(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.	22-25	
	(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.	26	
	(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.	26-27	
	(5) Change in groundwater in storage shall include the following:		
	(A) Change in groundwater in storage maps for each principal aquifer in the basin.	33-34	
	(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.	31	
	(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.	35-44	

Water Year 2025 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
12,400	4,700	0	2,500			-	5,200	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
600	Metered Municipal Wells	Direct	5%	Metered connection maintained by Rio Alto Water District	0					2,500	Land use estimates were derived from crop mapping and CropScape survey results	Estimate	20%	Typical uncertainty for water balance calculation	0					5,200	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 water district boundary 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
14,600	Diversions for local supplies are estimated based on historic State Water Resource Control Board CalWATRS (California Accounting, Tracking, Reporting 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. Note: values reflect applied water only.	0	0	0	14,600	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
27,000	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	12,400	14,600	0	0	0		4,700	0	17,100	-	0	-	5,200	Rural Residential

Water Year 2025 Annual Report

Appendix E

Water Use Analysis Methodology

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers
From: Davids Engineering, Inc.
Date: March 3, 2025
Subject: **Water Use Analysis Methodology**

1 Introduction

Pursuant to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) regulations (23 CCR¹ Section 356.2), the GSP Annual Report for the Bowman Subbasin (Subbasin) includes quantification of water supplies and water uses in the reporting year, including groundwater extraction by water use sector². 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 Bowman 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(a)).

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 area³). 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 year⁴ 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.

To calculate effective precipitation and, subsequently, evapotranspiration from precipitation (ETPR), PRISM precipitation data, estimated crop rooting depths, and soil property information are used as inputs. Estimated rooting depths are taken from the ranges listed in Appendix B of ASCE 70 (2016). For crops not listed in ASCE 70, rooting depths are based on the rooting depths of similar crops and professional judgement. Relevant soil properties include total soil depth, depth to restrictive layer, and available water holding capacity. Estimated soil properties are aggregated from the USDA soil survey geographic database (SSURGO) (Soil Survey Staff, 2025). ETPR is computed using the input parameters

(soil, precipitation, and rooting depth) and either the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) method (Stamm, 1967) or the National Engineering Handbook Part 623 method (USDA, 1993), depending on local data availability, results, and conditions. For the USBR method, the effective precipitation bins have been modified from the original bins outlined in the USBR method documentation to match regional hydrology patterns..

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. Where field-scale delivery measurements are available, the water supply volume delivered was distributed evenly across all irrigated areas of that field. Where field-scale delivery measurements are not available and only diversion volumes or aggregated delivery volumes for a larger area are available, water supply data is distributed evenly over the area where that water can be delivered for irrigation (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. At the most detailed possible level, these include field-scale volumetric delivery measurements taken by Water or Irrigation District water operators, as required per the Water Conservation Act of 2009.

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 (SWE0): Results from 50 Years of Remote Sensing in Hydrology. *Water International*, 47(6), 866-886.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for California. Available online. Accessed January 15, 2025.

[Stamm, G.G. \(1967\). Problems and Procedures in Determining Water Supply Requirements for Irrigation Projects. In *Irrigation of Agricultural Lands* \(eds R.M. Hagan, H.R. Haise and T.W. Edminster\). <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr11.c45>](https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr11.c45)

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 (NEH). 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.

Abbreviations
 AGW – Applied Groundwater
 ASW – Applied Surface Water
 AW – Total Applied Water
 BSWI – Boundary Surface Water Inflow
 BSWO – Boundary Surface Water Outflow
 CSF – Conveyance System Fraction
 CUF - Consumptive Use Fraction
 DPAW – Deep Percolation of Applied Water

ET – Evapotranspiration
 ETAW – Evapotranspiration from Applied Water
 ETPR – Evapotranspiration from Precipitation
 P – Precipitation
 RF - Reuse Fraction
 TAW – Tail Water of Applied Water

(2) Monthly effective precipitation
 SCS scientists analyzed 50 years of rainfall records at 22 locations throughout the United States to develop a technique to predict effective precipitation (USDA 1970). A daily soil moisture balance incorporating crop evapotranspiration, rainfall, and irrigation was used to determine the evapotranspiration effectiveness. The resulting equation for estimating effective precipitation is: [2-84]

$$P_e = SF \left(0.70917 P_m^{0.82424} - 0.11556 \right) \left(10^{0.02428 D} \right)$$

 where:
 P_e = average monthly effective precipitation (in)
 P_m = monthly mean precipitation (in)
 ET_c = average monthly crop evapotranspiration (in)
 SF = soil water storage factor
 The soil water storage factor was defined by: [2-85]

$$SF = (0.531747 + 0.255164 D - 0.057697 D^2 + 0.003804 D^3)$$

 where:
 D = the usable soil water storage (in)
 The term D was generally calculated as 40 to 60 percent of the available soil water capacity in the crop root zone, depending on the irrigation management practices used.
 The solution to equation 2-84 for $D = 3$ inches is given in table 2-43 and figure 2-38. For other values of D , the effective precipitation values must be multiplied by the corresponding soil water storage factor given in

The procedures used to develop equations 2-84 and 2-85 did not include two factors that affect the effectiveness of rainfall. The soil infiltration rate and rainfall intensity were not considered because sufficient data were not available or they were too complex to be readily considered. If in a specific application the infiltration rate is low and rainfall intensity is high, large amounts of rainfall may be lost to surface runoff. A sloping land surface would further reduce infiltration amounts. In these cases the effective precipitation values obtained from equations 2-84 and 2-85 need to be reduced.

A recent comparison (Patwardhan, et al. 1990) of the USDA-SCS method (USDA 1970) with a daily soil moisture balance incorporating surface runoff highlighted the need for this modification. The authors concluded that the USDA-SCS method was in fairly good agreement with the daily water balance procedure for well drained soils, but overpredicted effective precipitation for poorly drained soils.

The USDA-SCS method is generally recognized as applicable to areas receiving low intensity rainfall and to soils that have a high infiltration rate (Dastane 1974). The method averages soil type, climatic conditions, and soil-water storage to estimate effective precipitation. This provides reasonable estimates of effective precipitation, especially for project planning. Further, the procedures were designed for a monthly time step. If additional detail is needed for a more thorough project analysis or for irrigation scheduling purposes, a daily time step would be required. In this case more sophisticated techniques can be used to estimate effective precipitation. Computer-based soil




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

Water Year 2025 Annual Report

Appendix F

Water Quality

Measurable Objectives, Minimum Thresholds, and Water Quality of Representative Monitoring Site Wells

Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) ID	TDS (mg/L)				
	MO	MT	Fall 2024	Spring 2025	Exceed MT?
<i>Upper Aquifer</i>					
BOW-1U	500	750	150	130	No
BOW-2UR	500	750	160	160	No
BOW-3U	500	750	NS	170	No
<i>Lower Aquifer</i>					
BOW-5L	500	750	200	190	No
BOW-6L	500	750	190	170	No
BOW-7LR	500	750	NS	140	No

NS = not sampled

November 12, 2024

Lab No. : CH 2479968

Customer No. : 7010503

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting
 Attn: Eddy Teasdale
 550 Salem Street, Suite 3
 Chico, CA 95928

Laboratory Report

Introduction: This report package contains a total of 6 pages divided into 3 sections:

- Case Narrative (1 page) : An overview of the work performed at FGL.
- Sample Results (4 pages) : Results for each sample submitted.
- Quality Control (1 page) : Supporting Quality Control (QC) results.

Case Narrative

This Case Narrative pertains to the following samples:

Sample Description	Date Sampled	Date Received	FGL Lab No.	Matrix
BOW 1U	10/21/2024	10/23/2024	CH 2479968-001	GW
BOW 2UR	10/23/2024	10/23/2024	CH 2479968-002	GW
BOW 5L	10/22/2024	10/23/2024	CH 2479968-003	GW
BOW 6L	10/23/2024	10/23/2024	CH 2479968-004	GW

Sampling and Receipt Information:

All samples were received in acceptable condition and within temperature requirements, unless noted on the Condition Upon Receipt (CUR) form. All samples were received, prepared and analyzed within the method specified holding times. All samples arrived on ice. All samples were checked for pH if acid or base preservation is required (except for VOAs). For details of sample receipt information, please see the associated Chain of Custody and Condition Upon Receipt Form.

Quality Control: All samples were prepared and analyzed according to established quality control criteria. Any exceptions are noted in the Quality Control Section of this report.

Test Summary

SM 2540 C Preparation and analysis performed by FGL-Santa Paula (FGL-SP ELAP# 1573)

Certification: I certify that this data package is in compliance with ELAP standards, both technically and for completeness, except for any conditions listed above and in the QC Section. Release of the data contained in this data package is authorized by the Laboratory Director or his designee, as verified by the following electronic signature. This report shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written approval of the laboratory.

KD: SMH

Approved By **Kelly A. Dunnahoo, B.S.**



Digitally signed by Kelly A. Dunnahoo, B.S.
 Title: Laboratory Director
 Date: 2024-11-12



November 12, 2024

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : BOW 1U
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2479968-001
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : October 21, 2024 at 10:20
Sampled By : Christian H./Leeah S
Received On : October 23, 2024 at 16:10
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	150	20	mg/L		1		10/25/2024	15:45	ctl	SM 2540 C	10/28/2024	11:15	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



November 12, 2024

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : BOW 2UR
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2479968-002
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : October 23, 2024 at 09:33
Sampled By : Christian H./Leeah S
Received On : October 23, 2024 at 16:10
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	160	20	mg/L		1		10/25/2024	17:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	10/28/2024	11:15	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



November 12, 2024

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : BOW 5L
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2479968-003
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : October 22, 2024 at 11:15
Sampled By : Christian H./Leeah S
Received On : October 23, 2024 at 16:10
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	200	20	mg/L		1		10/25/2024	15:45	ctl	SM 2540 C	10/28/2024	11:15	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



November 12, 2024

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : BOW 6L
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2479968-004
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : October 23, 2024 at 09:37
Sampled By : Christian H./Leeah S
Received On : October 23, 2024 at 16:10
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	190	20	mg/L		1		10/25/2024	17:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	10/28/2024	11:15	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution

November 12, 2024

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Lab No. : CH 2479968

Customer No. : 7010503

Quality Control - Wet Chem

Constituent	Method	Date/ID	Type	Units	Conc.	QC Data	DQO	Note
Wet Chem								
Solids, Total Dissolved	2540CE	10/25/2024:212117CTL (CH 2479969-008) (CH 2479969-008)	Blank	mg/L		ND	<20	
			LCS	mg/L	991.1	97.1%	90-110	
			Dup	mg/L		2.02%	5	
		(CC 2484133-002) (CC 2484133-002)	Dup	mg/L		0.4%	5	
			Blank	mg/L		ND	<20	
			LCS	mg/L	991.1	102%	90-110	
		Dup	mg/L		0.8%	5		
		Dup	mg/L		1.20%	5		

Definition

- Blank : Method Blank - Prepared to verify that the preparation process is not contributing contamination to the samples.
- DQO : Data Quality Objective - This is the criteria against which the quality control data is compared.
- Dup : Duplicate Sample - A random sample with each batch is prepared and analyzed in duplicate. The relative percent difference is an indication of precision for the preparation and analysis.
- LCS : Laboratory Control Standard/Sample - Prepared to verify that the preparation process is not affecting analyte recovery.
- ND : Non-detect - Result was below the DQO listed for the analyte.

2479968

Inter-Laboratory Condition Upon Receipt (Attach to COC) Sample Receipt at:

CC CH STK VI

- Number of ice chests/packages received: 07C Shipping tracking #(s): _____
- Temp IR Gun ID #: Jcliw
- Were samples received on ice? Yes No Temps: 5.3°C / _____ / _____ / _____ / _____
Surface water SWTR bact samples: A sample that has a temperature upon receipt of >10°C, whether iced or not, should be flagged unless the time since sample collection has been less than two hours.
- Do the number of bottles received agree with the COC? Yes No N/A
- Were samples received intact? (i.e. no broken bottles, leaks etc.) Yes No
- VOAs checked for Headspace? Yes No N/A
- Were all analyses within holding times at time of receipt? Yes No
- Verify sample date, time and sampler name Yes No

Sign and date the COC, place in a ziplock and put in the same ice chest as the samples.

Sample Receipt Review completed by (initials): YON

Sample Receipt at SP:

- Number of ice chests/packages received: 3 Shipping tracking #(s): 502171895
502171904
502171891
- Temp IR Gun ID #: TH2UA
- Were samples received on ice? Yes No Temps: 7°C / _____ / _____ / _____ / _____
Acceptable is above freezing to 6°C. If many packages are received at one time check for tests/H.T.'s/rushes/
- Do the number of bottles received agree with the COC? Yes No N/A
- Were samples received intact? (i.e. no broken bottles, leaks etc.) Yes No

Sign and date the COC, obtain LIMS sample numbers, select methods/tests and print labels.

Sample Verification, Labeling and Distribution:

- Were all requested analyses understood and acceptable? Yes No
- Did bottle labels correspond with the client's ID's? Yes No
- Were all bottles requiring sample preservation properly preserved? Yes No N/A FGL
[Exception: Oil & Grease, VOA and CrVI verified in lab]
- VOAs checked for Headspace? Yes No N/A
- Have rush or project due dates been checked and accepted? Yes No N/A
- Were all analyses within holding times at time of receipt? Yes No

Attach labels to the containers and include a copy of the COC for lab delivery.

Sample Receipt, Login and Verification completed by (initials): YON

Discrepancy Documentation:

Any items above which are "No" or do not meet specifications (i.e. temps) must be resolved.

- Person Contacted: _____ Phone Number: _____
Initiated By: _____ Date: _____
Problem: _____
Resolution: _____
- Person Contacted: _____ Phone Number: _____
Initiated By: _____
Problem: _____
Resolution: _____

(7010503)
Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting
CH 2479968

iv 10/25/2024 07:47:17



CH 2479968

May 30, 2025

Lab No. : CH 2574337

Customer No. : 7010503

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
 550 Salem Street, Suite 3
 Chico, CA 95928

Laboratory Report

Introduction: This report package contains a total of 8 pages divided into 3 sections:

- Case Narrative (1 page) : An overview of the work performed at FGL.
- Sample Results (6 pages) : Results for each sample submitted.
- Quality Control (1 page) : Supporting Quality Control (QC) results.

Case Narrative

This Case Narrative pertains to the following samples:

Sample Description	Date Sampled	Date Received	FGL Lab No.	Matrix
Bow - 1U	05/12/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-001	GW
Bow - 2UR	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-002	GW
Bow - 3U	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-003	GW
Bow - 5L	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-004	GW
Bow - 6L	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-005	GW
Bow - 7LR	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	CH 2574337-006	GW

Sampling and Receipt Information:

All samples were received in acceptable condition and within temperature requirements, unless noted on the Condition Upon Receipt (CUR) form. All samples were received, prepared and analyzed within the method specified holding times. All samples arrived on ice. All samples were checked for pH if acid or base preservation is required (except for VOAs). For details of sample receipt information, please see the associated Chain of Custody and Condition Upon Receipt Form.


Quality Control: All samples were prepared and analyzed according to established quality control criteria. Any exceptions are noted in the Quality Control Section of this report.

Test Summary

SM 2540 C Preparation and analysis performed by FGL-Santa Paula (FGL-SP ELAP# 1573)

Certification: I certify that this data package is in compliance with ELAP standards, both technically and for completeness, except for any conditions listed above and in the QC Section. Release of the data contained in this data package is authorized by the Laboratory Director or his designee, as verified by the following electronic signature. This report shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written approval of the laboratory.

KD: SMH

Approved By **Kelly A. Dunnahoo, B.S.**  Digitally signed by Kelly A. Dunnahoo, B.S.
 Title: Laboratory Director
 Date: 2025-05-30



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 1U
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-001
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 12, 2025 at 09:35
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	130	20	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	11:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 2UR
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-002
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 13, 2025 at 11:55
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	160	10	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	10:15	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 3U
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-003
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 13, 2025 at 11:15
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	170	20	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	11:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 5L
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-004
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 13, 2025 at 10:35
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	190	10	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	10:15	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 6L
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-005
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 13, 2025 at 11:50
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	170	20	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	11:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution



May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Attn: Eddy Teasdale
550 Salem Street, Suite 3
Chico, CA 95928

Description : Bow - 7LR
Project : Bowman

Lab No. : CH 2574337-006
Customer No. : 7010503

Sampled On : May 13, 2025 at 11:20
Sampled By : E Davis
Received On : May 14, 2025 at 11:58
Matrix : Ground Water

Sample Results - Inorganic

Constituent	Result	RL	Units	Note	Dil.	DQF	Sample Preparation			Sample Analysis			
							Date	Time	Who	Method	Date	Time	Who
Wet Chemistry													
Total Dissolved Solids (TFR)	140	20	mg/L		1		05/16/2025	12:00	ctl	SM 2540 C	05/19/2025	12:00	ctl

DQF Flags Definition:

ND=Non-Detected, RL=Reporting Level , Dil.=Dilution

May 30, 2025

Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting

Lab No. : CH 2574337

Customer No. : 7010503

Quality Control - Wet Chem

Constituent	Method	Date/ID	Type	Units	Conc.	QC Data	DQO	Note
Wet Chem								
Solids, Total Dissolved	2540CE	05/16/2025:205380CTL	Blank	mg/L		ND	<20	
	2540CE	05/16/2025:205381CTL	Blank	mg/L		ND	<10	
			LCS	mg/L	991.1	99.3%	90-110	
	2540CE	05/16/2025:205380CTL	LCS	mg/L	991.1	104%	90-110	
		(SP 2507959-001)	Dup	mg/L		0.2%	5	
	2540CE	(SP 2508092-001)	Dup	mg/L		3.26%	12.2	
		(SP 2508092-001)	Dup	mg/L		0.2%	12.2	
	2540CE	(SP 2507959-001)	Dup	mg/L		1.99%	5	
			Blank	mg/L		ND	<20	
			LCS	mg/L	991.1	102%	90-110	
		(VI 2543351-001)	Dup	mg/L		3.26%	5	
		(VI 2543351-001)	Dup	mg/L		0.4%	5	

Definition

- Blank : Method Blank - Prepared to verify that the preparation process is not contributing contamination to the samples.
- DQO : Data Quality Objective - This is the criteria against which the quality control data is compared.
- Dup : Duplicate Sample - A random sample with each batch is prepared and analyzed in duplicate. The relative percent difference is an indication of precision for the preparation and analysis.
- LCS : Laboratory Control Standard/Sample - Prepared to verify that the preparation process is not affecting analyte recovery.
- ND : Non-detect - Result was below the DQO listed for the analyte.

Client: Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Customer Number: 7010503 Address: Attn: Eddy Teasdale 550 Salem Street, Suite 3 Chico, CA 95928 Phone: (530)661-0109 Fax: Email Address: eteasdale@lsce.com Contact Person: Eddy Teasdale Project Name: Bowman Purchase Order Number: Quote Number:				Lab Number: 2574337		TEST DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSES REQUESTED																									
Rush Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Day <input type="checkbox"/> 24 hour Rush pre-approval by lab (initials): _____ Electronic Data Transfer: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> Client Other: _____ Sampler(s): Christian Hoover Leah Jackson E Davis Sampling Fee: _____ Pickup Fee: _____ Compositor Setup Date: _____ Time: _____				Method of Sampling: Composite (C) Grab (G)	Number of Containers	Type of Containers: (G) Glass (P) Plastic (V) VOA (MT) Metal Tube	Potable (P) Non-Potable (NP) Ag Water (AgW)	(SW) Surface Water (MW) Monitoring Well (GW) Ground Water (TB) Travel Blank (WW) Waste Water (DW) Drinking Water (S) Soil (SLG) Sludge (SLD) Solid (O) Oil	Bact: (Sys) System (SRC) Source (W) Waste	Bact: (ROUT) Routine (RPT) Repeat (OTH) Other (RPL) Replace	(LT) Leaf Tissue (PET) Petiole Tissue (PRD) Produce	Preservative: (1) NaOH + ZnAc, (2) NaOH, (3) HCl (4) H2SO4, (5) HNO3, (6) Na2S2O3, (7) Other	Total Dissolved Solids																		
Samp Num	Location Description			Date Sampled	Time Sampled																										
1	Bow-1U			5/14/25	0935	G	1	P	NP	GW																					
2	Bow-2UR			5/13/25	1155		1																								
3	Bow-3U			↓	1115		1																								
4	Bow-5L			↓	1035		1																								
5	Bow-6L			↓	1150		1																								
6	Bow-7LR			↓	1120		1																								
Remarks						Relinquished		Date:		Time:		Relinquished		Date:		Time:		Relinquished		Date:		Time:									
						CA		5/14/25		11:58		KHL		5-14-25		1700		GALS		5/15/25		1405									
Received By:						Date:		Time:		Received By:						Date:		Time:		Received By:						Date:		Time:			
						KHL		5-14-25		1158		GCS						5-14-25		1700		CDA						5/15/25		1405	

2574337

Inter-Laboratory Condition Upon Receipt (Attach to COC) Sample Receipt at:

CC CH STK VI

- Number of ice chests/packages received: 046 Shipping tracking #(s): _____
- Temp IR Gun ID #: 2
- Were samples received on ice? Yes No Temps: 4.1 / _____ / _____ / _____ / _____
Surface water SWTR bact samples: A sample that has a temperature upon receipt of >10° C, whether iced or not, should be flagged unless the time since sample collection has been less than two hours.
- Do the number of bottles received agree with the COC? Yes No N/A
- Were samples received intact? (i.e. no broken bottles, leaks etc.) Yes No
- VOAs checked for Headspace? Yes No N/A
- Were all analyses within holding times at time of receipt? Yes No
- Verify sample date, time and sampler name Yes No

Sign and date the COC, place in a ziplock and put in the same ice chest as the samples.

Sample Receipt Review completed by (initials): KPL

Sample Receipt at SP:

- Number of ice chests/packages received: 6 Shipping tracking #(s): 63012820/2/7/8/05/796
- Temp IR Gun ID #: 269
- Were samples received on ice? Yes No Temps: 2 / _____ / _____ / _____ / _____
Acceptable is above freezing to 6°C. If many packages are received at one time check for tests/H.T.'s/rushes/
- Do the number of bottles received agree with the COC? Yes No N/A
- Were samples received intact? (i.e. no broken bottles, leaks etc.) Yes No

Sign and date the COC, obtain LIMS sample numbers, select methods/tests and print labels.

Sample Verification, Labeling and Distribution:

- Were all requested analyses understood and acceptable? Yes No
- Did bottle labels correspond with the client's ID's? Yes No
- Were all bottles requiring sample preservation properly preserved? Yes No N/A FGL
[Exception: Oil & Grease, VOA and CrVI verified in lab]
- VOAs checked for Headspace? Yes No N/A
- Have rush or project due dates been checked and accepted? Yes No N/A
- Were all analyses within holding times at time of receipt? Yes No

Attach labels to the containers and include a copy of the COC for lab delivery.

Sample Receipt, Login and Verification completed by (initials): CDA

Discrepancy Documentation:

Any items above which are "No" or do not meet specifications (i.e. temps) must be resolved.

- Person Contacted: _____ Phone Number: _____
Initiated By: _____ Date: _____
Problem: _____
Resolution: _____
- Person Contacted: _____ Phone Number: _____
Initiated By: _____
Problem: _____
Resolution: _____

(7010503)
Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting
CH 2574337

iv 05/15/2025 06:46:29



CH 2574337

Water Year 2025 Annual Report

Appendix G

PMA Progress

