

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2013

Present: Directors; Dennis Garton; Steve Chamblin; Bob Williams; Burt Bundy; District 2 Vacant.
Also present: Executive Director Gary Antone; Arthur Wylene, County Counsel; DWR representative Roy Hull and Seth Lawrence.

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Garton.
2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None
3. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 18, 2012 MINUTES: Motion by Director Williams, second by Director Bundy to approve the December 18, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 4-0 with 1 vacant position.
4. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$17,143.28: Motion by Director Williams, second by Director Chamblin to approve the claims in the amount of \$17,143.28. Carried 4-0 with 1 vacant position.
5. CORRESPONDENCE:

- Siskiyou County Water Rights Court Ruling; Gary Antone reviewed this ruling which dealt with ag producers removing water out of creeks and Fish & Game (F&G) requiring permits to do so.

Arthur Wylene added a copy is available for review. F&G had begun requiring water diverters, through existing works, to get a 1602 Permit. The judge held that this is outside of their regulatory scope. They can require 1602 Permits to build new works, but not to appropriate based under an existing right under existing works. The appeal has just started, and there was internal controversy about whether that policy was legal to begin with.

- Butte County Bay Delta Plan Recirculated PEIR; The Butte County Board of Supervisor responded to the recirculated Bay Delta Plan draft and they recirculated the environmental document based on the fact they needed a few areas to correct. The underlying issue falls under the discussion of providing a more reliable water supply for California by protecting, restoring, and enhancing Delta ecosystem.

Director Williams requested staff contact Butte County and if another letter is completed, question if they need signatures from other counties.

6. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO REVISE THE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN:

- The public hearing was called to order at 8:20 a.m. Gary Antone presented information of the past history of the Plan and where we are at this point. The Plan was adopted in 1996. Stages within the Plan are
 - 1). Passive, data collection, studies;
 - 2) Developing what could become requirements at a later date as far as identifying low water levels, what to do and how to notify the public, and regulatory actions;
 - 3) Taking what comes from Phase 2 and at that point mandate efforts at such a time that water became a critical resource in our area. Our expectation is that we would never have the need to go past Phase 1. In order to put the plan together, each component must be in place to show how we would deal with a problem, should it arise. All efforts to this point are positive, and we have some areas in the County suffering some water loss issues, such as Antelope area. It is not necessarily an overall issue, because with the fluctuating groundwater levels, due to weather and use or over-use. The Plan continues to research and better understand resources, quantity, quality, and how it operates or functions within the County. That leads to working with other counties as well. The Plan continues to gain more information, provide it to the public and make it available for discussion with the end result of being able to defend water rights that we currently have. It is a document that gives us background information needed to support decisions that each of us make as we move forward with groundwater issues in the area. Small water districts within the county will need to sign on to the agreement or prepare their own Plan. Sometime ago, an MOU was prepared that Phase 1 activities were passive, but that is as far as they would sign on. The Phase 2 and 3 of the Plan requirements demand more. In order to be in compliance with the current water code changes, the District must go through this process. Discussions with DWR found that some of the changes we had not recognized were more affective in the Plan than we knew. The changes in the Plan indicate that you need to go through the same process as if it were the initial process of preparing the original Plan. The schedule has been presented to the Directors'.

With no comments received, the Public Hearing closed at 8:31 a.m.

Motion by Director Bundy, second by Director Williams to adopt the Resolution of Intent to revise the Groundwater Management Plan. Motion carried 4-0 with 1 vacant position.

7. APPROVAL OF TEHAMA COUNTY UC AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE AGREEMENT AMENDMENT NO. 1: Motion by Director Williams, second by Director

Chamblin to approve Amendment No. 1 to the Tehama County UC Agriculture Extension agreement. Carried 4-0 with 1 vacant position.

8. DWR FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT INFORMATION LETTER: Gary Antone presented a letter received by Director Williams identifying two properties within the levee flood protection zone and endanger of flooding. One area properties is the east half of the corporate Gerber yard that sits 10 to 12 ft. higher than most of the other property around. We will be contacting them to correct this portion of the map and clarify information. The Gerber Park is in a flood zone within the down-town area. This assessment is based on FEMA mapping.
9. AB3030 TAC REPORT, NOVEMBER 2012 MEETING: Gary Antone reviewed the information reviewed. The vacancy in the TAC and representative for the NSVIRWM TAC have not been filled. No applications have been received at this time. The antelope water issues were discussed and flyers distributed to all residents of the area. Expectations would be we could examine all basins in the County and do something similar, and provide information to the public making them aware there is information available.

Seth Lawrence of DWR discussed an extensometer for Tehama County funding by a grant, when available. This equipment can monitor changing ground surface elevation in relation to depth of the ground. Currently, we do not have one in the area.

10. ADJOURN: With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 a.m.