

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION
DISTRICT MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 2012

Present: Directors'; Bob Williams; George Russell; Gregg Avilla; Dennis Garton; and Ron Warner. Also present, Gary Antone, Executive Director, and Arthur Wylene, County Counsel.

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Bob Williams. All present.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: Gary Antone attended a Kopta Slough meeting last week. The project is moving again with the local group including DWR. This project is the realignment of the channel in the Woodson Bridge area to protect the State Park and boat ramp area and consequently the bridge, which has had deterioration.

Director Warner added he represents the County on the Sacramento River Conservation Forum. The group wanted this project and funding for the past six years. The Army Corps of Engineers and DWR are partners in the Sacramento River Conservation Forum. If we continue to have high water, the river will move to the east and Woodson Bridge will be over dry land causing the need for a new bridge. They are examining removal of old rock work and letting the river go back into its old channel which would be Kopta Slough.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 20, 2012 MINUTES: With the corrections of removing 6-0 with 5-0, motion was made by Director Avilla, a second by Director Warner to approve the minutes of March 20, 2012 with said corrections. Carried 5-0 with 0 absent.
4. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,778.89: Motion by Director Garton, second by Director Russell to approve the claims in the amount of \$16,778.89. Carried 5-0 with 0 absent.
5. SENATE BILL 1146 INFORMATION; PROPOSES TO MAKE CONFIDENTIAL GROUNDWATER INFORMATION PUBLIC: Gary Antone discussed the last meeting and letters approved for sending to property owners allowing access to wells for measurements. As a part of that, permission was also requested for authorization to post information on the website at the County offices regarding general well location, depth of groundwater and monitoring activities on that specific site. Senate Bill 1146 intends to release confidential information for public view. Under California State Law, well logs are confidential and are accessible only to individuals in State agencies and that meet a certain criteria. Staff believes privacy needs to be respected regarding the issues proposed.

Director Garton questioned if this needed to be returned to the Board for action. It was concurred by all to address this issue at the next meeting.

Staff will work with County Counsel and address the issue at the next meeting for action.

6. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION; URBAN LEVEL OF FLOOD PROTECTION CRITERIA: Gary Antone discussed the urban level of protection that is necessary, according to the document, to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year. Tehama County is considered a non-urban levee area, however, Staff sees this as one more step forward to increasing flood responsibility issues for the public. When you make a levee 200-year proof, your significantly increasing the height, width and depth and there is concern once this is established down south, it could come north to our area.

Director Williams added this is only one piece of the Flood Protection Plan. The level of protection for urban areas is the 200-year flood protection and designed to protect areas such as Yuba City. In the more rural areas, they are discussing removal of levees, setbacks, and taking 40,000 acres of farmland out of production, and giving 10,000 acres back to habitat.

Director Warner commented that the Sacramento River Forum discussed this issue and for those people south of here, it would pertain to hay barns or any structure on their land.

7. NORTHERN SACRAMENTO VALLEY INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN PROPOSED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES DISCUSSION: Gary Antone discussed the progress of this issue. The Advisory Committee meets every third Thursday in Willows and the goals and objectives of the plan are being worked through. This information gives you the advantage to review what has been discussed to date, but the expectation is the recommendation and approval to the Board will be in May.

8. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION; CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD ENCROACHMENT PERMIT PROGRAM. Gary Antone discussed the flyers sent to various County departments for distribution. The creeks listed are covered by this program requiring encroachment permits, and conditions and requirements. There is no work permissible between November 1st and April 15th which is the wet season. Other parts of the year, work can be done, but if anything is put in it could require an encroachment permit.

Director Williams questioned if there was a map available for the Sacramento River Floodway and Gary Antone confirmed there was, although there is more than one set of maps, and the hard issue is which one to use.

Arthur Wylene added, if you look at the flyer, Need for an Encroachment Permit, which says "If your proposed work or work plan may impact the current or future state plan of flood control..." I find this is a broad statement. This could lead to

a large expansion of their jurisdiction depending how they could choose to interpret it, especially with regard to the changes in the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan.

9. 2012 CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION PLAN INFORMATIONAL: Gary Antone provided copies of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan draft program. The entire document is available to all on the DWR website. Staff has been involved in this project and although it does not have a direct affect on our area, it is close enough that they are looking at stream flow, levee setbacks and taking out the production of farmland and letting them go back to a flood plane-type issue. There are many potential issues and concerns. The intent here is to keep you aware of what is occurring.

A member of the public said she moved here 35-years ago and they surveyed Cottonwood Creek for a dam and even removed trees. I can't understand why they are drawing up a plan for levees when they don't try to control the water here so it isn't so ferocious down there. I haven't heard anything about a dam in anything today.

Director Williams answered by saying this is not about storage in the document.

10. OCID MILL CREEK SURFACE WATER SALE: Gary Antone brought this item back to the Board regarding the 2100 a.f. of surface water to be sold to the Napa Pipe Project. The documentation on this is significant and long. Many comments have been received and the project is 50% supported by the area and 50% opposed. Bottom line for our County is the potential water sale out of Mill Creek of that amount of water and it is water that would not be able to flow down Mill Creek or used for other purposes. Certainly, the owner, OCID, who worked this agreement out, has the right to do it due to the 1914 Water Right Law. There are some conditions with regard to transport to the Napa Valley. One issue is the route they have to take. Staff has been communicating with County Counsel and the potential for transport. Any transport or sale of water of this type, moving from one particular area of any significant distance, it is the conveyance factor, and especially if it goes through a system overseen or controlled by the State or DWR. DWR would need to make a determination as to if it were viable or appropriate and in Water Code Section 1810, subsection D, it indicates an analysis must be done based on the conveyance issue and potentially the local economic impact of moving the water. That has yet to be completed. In speaking with DWR in Sacramento, a finding would have to be made and they are aware of it, but they have not been asked. There is no formal agreement at this time with clearance from DWR for an approved project. Los Molinos Water is very involved and attending the planning meetings in Napa to oppose the project.

Director Garton questioned if this Board needs to send correspondence supporting Los Molinos Mutual Water in their endeavors of non-support and staff

agreed to support this Board's decision.

It was the concurrence of the Board to put this on the agenda for approval at the next available meeting.

11. SHASTA LAKE WATER RESOURCES INVESTIGATION: The information provided gives an overview of this project which is raising of the Shasta Dam. Gary Antone informed the Board that this project is down to three potentials which are a 6-1/2 ft, 12-1/2 ft. or 18-1/2 ft. raising of the dam. Staff feels the 12-1/2 ft would be their preferred height. This is increasing storage, additional use down stream, keeping the Delta clean, but when you examine all the documentation you can see how this grows. Specifically, our area is not "affected by this", but we are in the middle.

Director Warner attended meetings when this project came out. One question was in the flood control part, they might increase the maximum releases up to 200+ cubic feet per second. Bend Bridge was designed for only 110,000 c.f. They have never returned our calls for more information.

Gary Antone continued by saying, they are looking at a completion of the project in 2021.

A member of the public added, I know it probably doesn't mean that much, but I am for all the storage we can get. I am against the principle of this global warming where there isn't suppose to be snow to fill the dam. That is what Prop AB32 is about.

12. ADJOURN: With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:16 a.m.