



Tehama County
Monday, November 17, 2025 10:00 AM
Flood Control and Water Conservation
District
Meeting Minutes

Tehama County Board of Supervisors
Chambers
727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
<https://tehamacounty.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

10:00 AM

Chairperson: Matt Hansen Vice-Chairperson: Pati Nolen
Directors: Greg Jones, Rob Burroughs, Tom Walker

Justin Jenson, Deputy Director of Public Works-Water Resources; Lena Sequeira,
Administration

Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance / Introductions

10:00AM

Present Vice Chair Matt Hansen, Director Greg Jones, Director Rob
Burroughs, and Director Tom Walker

Public Comment

None

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - August 18, 2025** **25-2011**
 - a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 8/18/2025

RESULT: APPROVE
MOVER: Tom Walker
SECONDER: Greg Jones
AYES: Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, Director Burroughs, and Director Walker
ABSENT: Nolen

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 15, 2025** **25-2015**
 - a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 9/15/2025

RESULT: APPROVE
MOVER: Greg Jones
SECONDER: Tom Walker
AYES: Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, Director Burroughs, and Director Walker
ABSENT: Nolen

3. Accept August 2025 and September 2025 Flood Claims 25-2013

Request acceptance of Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District claims paid from August 2025 through September 2025 in the amount of \$27,674.54.

RESULT: APPROVE
MOVER: Tom Walker
SECONDER: Greg Jones

AYES: Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, Director Burroughs, and Director Walker

ABSENT: Nolen

4. State Assistance with Flood Plain Modeling 25-2018

Jenson stated that significant surface water flows during the recent rainy season have caused flooding. He has contacted a state-funded program to conduct a floodplain survey, which would model the Antelope Creek Floodplain and define the affected area. He noted that authorization would be requested to proceed with this work.

Walker asked what approving the item would authorize or accomplish.

Jenson explained that after the assessment, the area could be classified as a flood zone, allowing for potential federal relief if sufficient damage occurs over time.

Walker asked whether residents would be required to carry flood insurance if the area is declared a flood zone.

Jenson stated that residents would most likely be required to carry flood insurance.

Jones asked whether the District would be required to proceed if the funding request is denied, or if it would return to the Board to request funding.

Jenson responded that he is almost certain the funding request would be approved.

Hansen clarified what approving the item would entail.

RESULT: APPROVE
MOVER: Rob Burroughs
SECONDER: Greg Jones

AYES: Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, Director Burroughs, and Director Walker

ABSENT: Nolen

5. Well Mitigation Presentation 25-2009

Jenson presented recommendations from the working group, emphasizing that no action was being requested at this time and asking the Board to review the information and return prepared to make decisions. He outlined the well mitigation document, noting it fulfills a GSP

commitment, would be overseen by the District, and funded by groundwater user fees, and referenced a separate state-funded grant program administered by the North Valley Community Foundation for well-related assistance. He reviewed the guiding principles in detail.

Burroughs asked how drinking water situations would be addressed.

Jenson stated that drinking water situations would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and noted that the NVCF program may apply depending on the circumstances.

Jenson continued explaining the well mitigation program, outlining additional eligibility criteria. He also reviewed the well age proration details.

Jones asked whether costs could exceed the \$40,000 cap.

Jenson confirmed that they could not.

Jenson discussed situations where a well lacks documentation and the associated appeals process. He also addressed requirements for well abandonment and temporary drinking water access, including who would provide it.

Walker asked whether there are income requirements for the proposed program.

Jenson stated that application fees apply, and if they cannot be afforded, a separate low-income assistance program is available for well mitigation, though it is not permanent.

Jenson explained that well construction would include necessary equipment and temporary drinking water support. He noted that the District would conduct assessments and investigations, review applications, and develop eligibility checklists, and he outlined the application process and timeline.

Walker asked whether the District has the equipment needed to conduct inspections.

Jenson responded that the District has most of the equipment and is awaiting well inspection cameras through a grant.

The group discussed using local water levels to monitor well conditions.

Jenson explained that the program will identify dry wells, noting that many areas, particularly on the west side, have depressed groundwater levels, making applicants from those areas likely eligible. He clarified that wells drilled into isolated water, outside the main aquifer, would be the well owner's responsibility, not the District's. He continued reviewing program criteria and the application process in detail.

He highlighted that staff recommends adopting the program before the end of the year and passing the related legislation afterward, explaining the legislative process.

Jenson discussed the \$40,000 cap, explaining how the figure was determined, including consultation with Environmental Health and local drillers, and noted that some wells may cost more than the proposed amount.

Jones asked about the 500 impacted well calls and what would happen if the costs exceeded

available funds.

Jenson explained that the fee structure includes a set amount to help cover costs, supplemented by the one million dollars already allocated to start the program. He stated that if those funds are insufficient, the Board would be approached for emergency funds. He outlined how the funds would be accessed and emphasized that the combined efforts aim to prevent a situation with excessive dry wells.

He discussed the data used to estimate the number of dry wells in the county.

The group discussed investigating dry wells accurately.

Walker asked whether the price is calculated per drilled foot and who determines the depth of a new well.

Jenson clarified that the well cost is determined between the driller and the well owner. He explained that rules for well depth in different areas prevent wells from being drilled too shallow.

The group discussed well drilling and the associated requirements.

Jenson stated that the plan would be adopted before January 2026, with the Supervisors completing all necessary steps within 160 days to implement it.

He added that he is committed to providing monthly updates on the progress of the program.

Jenson presented the members of the working group and explained that the information shared with the Board reflects the group's recommendations. He noted that similar programs exist elsewhere in the state and reviewed the key principles of the program.

Walker asked for an estimate of the application fee.

Jenson responded that it would likely be between \$300 and \$500, emphasizing that the program involves trade-offs and is designed to comply with groundwater sustainability plans. He noted that if a well goes dry due to depressed groundwater, the District is responsible for replacement, and the program's goal is to respond to groundwater issues.

Walker asked why a cap on the casing was not included.

Jenson replied that the \$40,000 cap is intended to address that concern.

Jenson reviewed the proration for the 40-year age cap on wells as outlined in the program, noting that this was the working group's recommendation but that the Board will make the final determination.

He stated that there would be no further meetings before bringing the item forward in December for a final vote. The program would take effect in 2026, with 160 days required to complete the necessary legislation. Jenson noted that input from legal in December will address potential risks associated with the program.

He asked the group to consider all aspects of the program and bring back items for discussion at the next meeting, noting that the Groundwater Commission is doing the same. He emphasized that the December meeting's outcome will be to adopt a plan and then proceed with creating the legislation within 160 days.

Public Comment

A resident commented on the program process, referencing new wells drilled by neighbors, and asked where the funding would come from.

Jenson responded that the program does not cover previously drilled wells; it only addresses wells determined to be dry at the time of application. He noted there is no way to verify if a well went dry after a new well has been drilled and added that a community outreach meeting in December will provide more information to the public about the program.

A resident stated that wells on the west side have been monitored, including wells that have gone dry, and expressed their opinion that this data could serve as proof of a dry well.

Jenson commented that this could potentially be considered but noted it would be difficult to apply in other scenarios.

A resident shared their opinion on the fairness of the program for individuals who had already paid to drill new wells, noting their experience with having to lower pumps in their wells.

Hansen stated that he would address this issue in his presentation.

Hansen presented research to the group, including well completion reports and well drilling timelines. He reviewed the first well completion report in detail and raised questions about how much of a well should be funded for a well owner, discussing the parameters for defining a dry well. He noted an example of a well that initially produced 100 gallons per minute but declined over time, questioning what qualifies as functionally dry in the well mitigation program.

Burroughs shared his experience with a commercial well in relation to these concerns.

Hansen continued his presentation, discussing the west side of Tehama County, noting that deeper wells may encounter natural gas or brackish water. He highlighted current well levels compared to when they were first drilled, emphasizing that significant recharge is not being observed on the west side and illustrating concerns about the rate of overdraft.

Jenson agreed with Hansen, noting that some program parameters could be set within the 160-day timeframe. He emphasized that decisions should consider whether the goal is to restore groundwater levels to the minimum thresholds or if they will continue to decline, stressing the importance of this perspective for the future of well mitigation.

The group discussed declining water levels.

Jenson explained that the program includes minimum floor levels, and if those floors are breached and levels continue to drop, the state would intervene.

Hansen added that if the county funds a well, there is an expectation that water conditions can

be improved. He reviewed a well completion report for a replacement well drilled in 2022, comparing the original well depth to the new well depth.

Jones asked what qualifies as a replacement well, referencing the Groundwater Commission and in-kind well replacement, and suggested that the District's responsibility should be limited to providing a functional replacement.

Hansen agreed, emphasizing the goal of providing the same type of well.

The group discussed well replacements in the agricultural community, considering what is appropriate for agricultural versus domestic wells. Concerns were raised about liability if drilling encounters salt water or natural gas, and whether the county would need to cover additional costs for deeper drilling in such cases.

Hansen asked the Board to consider the evaluation process and suggested that some form of declaration from the pump installer should be acceptable.

Jenson responded that allowing well replacement based solely on the well driller's recommendation could present a conflict of interest.

The group discussed the driller's responsibility and how well reports would be obtained. They also continued discussing the 40-year proration of wells, with Hansen sharing his opinion on this stipulation.

Hansen asked the group to consider the report for Well #1, which had a depth of 180 feet. He presented a hypothetical scenario in which a well owner notices the water level nearing the bottom, limiting access for livestock, and suggested that the county should have a mechanism to replace such wells. He proposed that the county could inspect the well and submit a new well report afterward. Hansen agreed that there should be one replacement per parcel and shared his thoughts on additional program criteria.

Jenson clarified the well education stipulation.

Hansen continued to discuss his concerns regarding well replacements and the criteria he would like to see incorporated into the program.

Jones commented that any approved regulation should have an expiration date, sharing his perspective on the matter.

Jenson discussed built-in regulations and clarified the review process.

Hansen provided his overall comments on the well mitigation plan as presented.

The group discussed what well functionality would look like and the process for well assessments.

Hansen continued sharing his thoughts and opinions on the program.

Jenson cautioned that the program must focus on what is functionally feasible and verifiable. He emphasized the importance of being confident that any repairs or replacements are the

correct solution and suggested that regulations include a checklist to confirm compliance. He noted that if staff must make judgment calls, those decisions could be questioned and should instead be brought before the Board.

Walker asked about specifying well types and questioned why large agricultural users causing the problem shouldn't be excluded.

Jenson responded that excluding agricultural wells would make smaller, non-commercial farmers ineligible and noted that broad restrictions could raise legal issues in California.

The group discussed limiting well size for replacements.

Jenson clarified that once the program is adopted, each component of the legislation will be brought forward for review.

Hansen outlined what he would like the Commission to review and provided a recap of the discussion.

Public comment

A resident discussed the geology of the Central Valley and shared their opinion on groundwater recharge on the west side. They also expressed their views on reimbursing homeowners who had already paid to drill new wells.

6. Confirmation of intent to retain District 3 Groundwater Commissioner through the January 4, 2027 Term as indicated in the Commission bylaws. 25-2017

Jenson explained that he brought this item forward due to public concern, aiming to clarify the purpose and reasoning behind it.

He provided background on the matter and reviewed the current bylaws, noting that the most recent bylaws appoint members through the District Director.

Klausner elaborated on the District's authority.

The group discussed the appointing authority.

Jenson commented that, in this example, District 3's representation remains until the completion of the term and that this process will continue. He sought confirmation of intent.

Jones shared his opinion, emphasizing that the law should be followed as written.

Jenson confirmed that no action was required and that he was providing a public statement for clarity.

State of California
Well Completion Report
 Form DWR 188 Complete 10/6/2022
 WCR2022-009924

Owner's Well Number _____ Date Work Began _____ Date Work Ended 08/25/2022
 Local Permit Agency Tehama County Environmental Health Department
 Secondary Permit Agency _____ Permit Number w 195/22 Permit Date 08/10/2022

Well Owner (must remain confidential pursuant to Water Code 13752)	Planned Use and Activity
Name <u>[REDACTED]</u>	Activity <u>New Well</u>
Mailing Address <u>[REDACTED]</u>	Planned Use <u>Water Supply Domestic</u>
City <u>Corning</u> State <u>CA</u> Zip <u>96021</u>	

Well Location	
Address _____	APN <u>061-210-046</u>
City _____ Zip _____ County <u>Tehama</u>	Township <u>24 N</u>
Latitude <u>39</u> <u>57</u> <u>15.48</u> N Longitude <u>-122</u> <u>21</u> <u>37.8</u> W	Range <u>04 W</u>
Deg. Min. Sec. Deg. Min. Sec.	Section <u>07</u>
Dec. Lat. <u>39.9543</u> Dec. Long. <u>-122.3605</u>	Baseline Meridian <u>Mount Diablo</u>
Vertical Datum _____ Horizontal Datum <u>WGS84</u>	Ground Surface Elevation _____
Location Accuracy _____ Location Determination Method _____	Elevation Accuracy _____
	Elevation Determination Method _____

Borehole Information	
Orientation <u>Vertical</u> Specify _____	
Drilling Method <u>Direct Rotary</u> Drilling Fluid <u>Bentonite</u>	
Total Depth of Boring <u>430</u> Feet	
Total Depth of Completed Well <u>430</u> Feet	

Water Level and Yield of Completed Well	
Depth to first water _____ (Feet below surface)	
Depth to Static _____	
Water Level <u>159</u> (Feet) Date Measured <u>08/25/2022</u>	
Estimated Yield* _____ (GPM) Test Type _____	
Test Length _____ (Hours) Total Drawdown _____ (feet)	
*May not be representative of a well's long term yield.	

Geologic Log - Free Form		
Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Description
0	8	gravel
8	55	clay
55	58	gravel
58	73	clay
73	85	gravel
85	102	clay
102	110	gravel
110	168	clay
168	192	gravel
192	205	clay
205	210	gravel
210	225	clay
225	234	gravel
234	242	clay

242	260	gravel
260	275	clay
275	294	gravel
294	335	clay
335	347	gravel
347	354	clay
354	373	gravel
373	394	clay
394	400	gravel
400	415	clay
415	430	gravel

Casings										
Casing #	Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Casing Type	Material	Casings Specifications	Wall Thickness (inches)	Outside Diameter (inches)	Screen Type	Slot Size if any (inches)	Description
1	0	280	Blank	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625			
1	280	300	Screen	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625	Milled Slots	0.04	
1	300	360	Blank	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625			
1	360	380	Screen	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625	Milled Slots	0.04	
1	380	410	Blank	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625			
1	410	430	Screen	PVC	OD: 6.625 in. SDR: 17 Thickness: 0.390 in.	0.39	6.625	Milled Slots	0.04	

Annular Material					
Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Fill	Fill Type Details	Filter Pack Size	Description
0	20	Bentonite	Non Hydrated Bentonite		3/8 chip
20	430	Filter Pack	6 x 16		

Other Observations:

2

STATE WELL IDENTIFICATION NO. _____

WELL IDENTIFICATION NO. _____

WELL DEPTH _____ FEET

WELL TYPE _____

Page 1 of 1
Owner's Well No. _____ No. **756983**
Date Work Began 10-21-02 Ended 10-22-02
Local Permit Agency Calhan County, California Dept.
Permit No. 10-313/02 Permit Date 10-25-02

GEOLOGIC LOG

ORIENTATION: VERTICAL HORIZONTAL ANGLE _____ (SPECIFY)
DRILLING METHOD: air rotary FLUID: air

DEPTH FROM SURFACE

DEPTH FROM SURFACE (Feet)	DESCRIPTION
0 - 31	Clay & Gravel
31 - 72	Clay
72 - 75	Gravel
75 - 103	Clay
103 - 173	Gravel

Describe material, grain size, color, etc.

Name: _____
Mailing Address: _____
City: Corning STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
County: _____

WELL LOCATION

Address: 5110 Appleton Way
City: Corning
County: Trinity
APN Book: 311 Page: 213 Parcel: _____
Township: _____ Range: _____ Section: _____
Latitude: _____ Longitude: _____

LOCATION SKETCH

ACTIVITY

Monitor
 Production
 Injection
 Other: _____

PLANNED USES

WATER SUPPLY
 Domestic _____
 Irrigation _____
 Industrial _____
 Other: _____

MONITORING: _____
TEST WELL: _____
CANNOT PROTECT: _____
PUMP AND LIFT: _____
DIRECT PUSH: _____
WET PUMP: _____
NATURAL FLOW: _____
SPRING: _____
REMEDIATION: _____
OTHER: _____

WATER LEVEL & YIELD OF COMPLETED WELL

DEPTH TO FIRST WATER: 72 FEET BELOW SURFACE
DEPTH OF STATIC WATER LEVEL: 103 FEET DATE MEASURED: 10-21-02
ESTIMATED YIELD: 100± GPM & TEST TYPE: air lift
TEST LENGTH: _____ FEET TOTAL DRAWDOWN: _____ FEET
** May not be representative of a well's long-term yield.*

DEPTH FROM SURFACE (Feet)	BORE-HOLE DIA. (Inches)	CASING (S)					DEPTH FROM SURFACE (Feet)	ANNULAR MATERIAL	
		TYPE (X)	MATERIAL GRADE	INTERNAL DIAMETER (Inches)	GAUGE OR WALL THICKNESS	SLOT SIZE (If Any) (Inches)		TYPE	TYPE SIZE
0	1730-173	BLANK	Steel	5"	.13"	0	CEMENT	5"	
		SCREEN							
		CON							
		PLUGGER							
		PIPE							

ATTACHMENTS (X)

Geologic Log
 Well Construction Diagram
 Geophysical Logs
 Soil/Water Chemical Analyses
 Other: _____

ATTACH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF IT EXISTS.

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I, the undersigned, certify that this report is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NAME: V.S. Veitman Drilling
FIRM, FIRM OR CORPORATION, TYPE OR TITLE: _____
ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1010 Pal Bluff, CA 96280
CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
Signed: _____ DATE: 10-25-02 316987
WELL DRILLER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

State of California
Well Completion Report
 Form DWR 188 Submitted 12/22/2022
 WCR2022-014955

Owner's Well Number _____ Date Work Began 02/26/2022 Date Work Ended 03/01/2022
 Local Permit Agency Tehama County Environmental Health Department
 Secondary Permit Agency _____ Permit Number W-43/22 Permit Date 02/24/2022

Well Owner (must remain confidential pursuant to Water Code 13752)	Planned Use and Activity
Name _____	Activity <u>New Well</u>
Mailing _____	Planned Use <u>Water Supply Domestic</u>
City <u>C</u> _____ State <u>CA</u> Zip <u>96021</u>	

Well Location	
Address <u>5450 Ashton WAY</u>	APN <u>61-210-45</u>
City <u>Corning</u> Zip <u>96021</u> County <u>Tehama</u>	Township <u>24 N</u>
Latitude <u>39 57 24.6279</u> N Longitude <u>-122 21 41.6448</u> W	Range <u>04 W</u>
Deg. Min. Sec.	Section <u>07</u>
Dec. Lat. <u>39.9568411</u> Dec. Long. <u>-122.361568</u>	Baseline Meridian <u>Mount Diablo</u>
Vertical Datum _____ Horizontal Datum <u>WGS84</u>	Ground Surface Elevation _____
Location Accuracy _____ Location Determination Method _____	Elevation Accuracy _____
	Elevation Determination Method _____

Borehole Information	Water Level and Yield of Completed Well
Orientation <u>Vertical</u> Specify _____	Depth to first water _____ (Feet below surface)
Drilling Method <u>Other - Air Rotary</u> Drilling Fluid <u>Foam</u>	Depth to Static _____
Total Depth of Boring <u>312</u> Feet	Water Level <u>159</u> (Feet) Date Measured <u>03/01/2022</u>
Total Depth of Completed Well <u>312</u> Feet	Estimated Yield* <u>75</u> (GPM) Test Type <u>Air Lift</u>
	Test Length _____ (Hours) Total Drawdown _____ (feet)
	*May not be representative of a well's long term yield.

Geologic Log - Free Form		
Depth from Surface	Feet to Feet	Description
0	29	Clay
29	34	Pea Gravel
34	67	Clay
67	71	Pea Gravel
71	117	Clay
117	120	Pea Gravel
120	158	Clay
158	175	Gravel
175	204	Clay
204	206	Pea Gravel
206	246	Clay
246	256	Gravel
256	260	Clay
260	267	Pea Gravel

JAN 17 2022
 TEHAMA COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

267	285	Green Clay
285	301	Brown Clay
301	312	Gravel

Casings										
Casing #	Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Casing Type	Material	Casings Specificatons	Wall Thickness (inches)	Outside Diameter (inches)	Screen Type	Slot Size if any (inches)	Description
1	0	312	Blank	Low Carbon Steel	Grade: ASTM A53	0.156	6.725			

Annular Material					
Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Fill	Fill Type Details	Filter Pack Size	Description
0	22	Bentonite	Non Hydrated Bentonite		
22	312	Other Fill	See description.		No Fill

Other Observations:

Borehole Specifications		
Depth from Surface Feet to Feet		Borehole Diameter (inches)
0	22	10
22	312	6

Certification Statement			
I, the undersigned, certify that this report is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief			
Name	W.S. HEITMAN WELL DRILLING		
	Person, Firm or Corporation		
623 BUCKINGHAM PLACE	CHICO	CA	95973
Address	City	State	Zip
Signed	<i>electronic signature received</i>	12/22/2022	386577
	C-57 Licensed Water Well Contractor	Date Signed	C-57 License Number

DWR Use Only			
CSG #	State Well Number	Site Code	Local Well Number
		N	W
Latitude Deg/Min/Sec		Longitude Deg/Min/Sec	
TRS:			
APN:			

ORIGINAL
File with DWR

JUL 1 1997

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WELL COMPLETION REPORT
Refer to Instruction Pamphlet

DWR USE ONLY - DO NOT FILL IN
24N05W-01M
STATE WELL NO. STATION NO
LATITUDE _____ LONGITUDE _____
APN TRS OTHER _____

Page _____ of _____
Owner's Well No. _____ No. **502964**
Date Work Began **5/20/97** Ended **5/22/97**
Local Permit Agency **Tehama County Dept. of Environmental Health**
Permit No. **W-89/97** Permit Date **4/25/97**

GEOLOGIC LOG WELL OWNER _____

ORIENTATION (Z) VERTICAL _____ HORIZONTAL _____ ANGLE _____ (SPECIFY)
DEPTH TO FIRST WATER _____ (FT) BELOW SURFACE

DEPTH FROM SURFACE		DESCRIPTION
FT	to FT	
0	20'	Sand, Gravel
20	50	Clay
50	55	Gravel
55	70	Clay
70	75	Gravel
75	85	Clay
85	90	Gravel
90	135	Clay
135	140	Gravel
140	153	Clay
153	160	Gravel
160	185	Clay
185	193	Gravel
193	208	Clay
208	222	Gravel
222	240	Clay
240	255	Gravel
255	260	Clay
260	263	Gravel
263	280	Clay
280	305	Clay, gravel streaks
305	310	Gravel
310	318	Firm sand
318	338	Gravel
338	340	Clay

Address **Florknot**
City **Florknot**
County **Tehama**
APN Book **61** Page **150** Parcel **17**
Township **24N** Range **05W** Section **01**
Latitude _____ Longitude _____

LOCATION SKETCH (NORTH, SOUTH, WEST, EAST)

ACTIVITY (Z)
 NEW WELL
MODIFICATION REPAIR
____ Deepen
____ Other (Specify)
____ DESTROY (Describe Procedures and Materials Under GEOLOGIC LOG)
PLANNED USE(S)
(Z)
____ MONITORING
WATER SUPPLY
 Domestic
____ Public
____ Irrigation
____ Industrial
____ TEST WELL
____ CATHODIC PROTECTION
____ OTHER (Specify)

DRILLING METHOD **Air Rotary** FLUID **Mud**
WATER LEVEL & YIELD OF COMPLETED WELL
DEPTH OF STATIC WATER LEVEL **140** (FT) & DATE MEASURED **JUL 4 - 6-97**
ESTIMATED YIELD **80** (GPM) & TEST TYPE **Air**
TEST LENGTH **4** (Hrs) TOTAL DRAWDOWN **240** (FT)
* May not be representative of a well's long-term yield

TOTAL DEPTH OF BORING **340** (Feet)
TOTAL DEPTH OF COMPLETED WELL **340** (Feet)

DEPTH FROM SURFACE	BORE-HOLE DIA. (Inches)	CASING(S)					ANNULAR MATERIAL					
		TYPE (Z)	MATERIAL GRADE	INTERNAL DIAMETER (Inches)	GAUGE OR WALL THICKNESS	SLOT SIZE IF ANY (Inches)	DEPTH FROM SURFACE	TYPE	CEMENT (Z)	BEN TONITE (Z)	FILL (Z)	FILTER PACK (TYPE-SIZE)
0	200	12	X	pvc	6	c1-200	0	25	XX			
200	310	12	X	pvc	6	c1-280	25	340			XX	Birdseye
310	340	12	X	pvc	6							

- ATTACHMENTS (Z)
- ____ Geologic Log
 - ____ Well Construction Diagram
 - ____ Geophysical Log(s)
 - ____ Soil-Water Chemical Analyses
 - ____ Other _____
- ATTACH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF IT EXISTS

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I, the undersigned, certify that this report is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NAME **Sullivan Drilling**
(PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION) (TYPED OR PRINTED)

ADDRESS **P.O. Box 1448** **Corning, CA 96021**
CITY STATE ZIP

Signed **Charlie Sullivan** DATE SIGNED _____
WELL DRILLER (AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE) EST. LICENSE NUMBER **656504**

DWR 12/85 REV 7/94

IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, USE NEXT CONSECUTIVELY NUMBERED FORM

3

2 2' d/w

3' d/w

Well Number	Completion Date	Total Completion Depth	Static Water Level	Season 2021	2021 Water Level	Historical Decline 2021	Oct-24 Water Level	Historical Decline 2024	Distance to Bottom
71	2000	230	130	Fall	179	-49	191	-61	39
62	2001	240	80	Spring	153	-73	186	-106	54
89	2003	280	75	Fall	151	-76	184	-109	96
73	2005	277	110	Fall	150	-40	184	-74	93
74	2002	235	95	Fall	158	-63	161	-66	74
68	2003	270	140	Fall	175	-35	202	-62	68
64	2017	275	140	Fall	149	-9	183	-43	92
78	2005	265	140	Fall	202	-62	234	-94	31
40	2001	220	80	Spring	115	-35	132	-52	88
38	1998	237	80	Winter	113	-33	135	-55	102
91	1997	340	140	Spring	228	-88	259	-119	81

46	1996	180	90	Spring	138	-48			
----	------	-----	----	--------	-----	-----	--	--	--

2022-replaced

							165		-75
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----	--	-----