

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
AB3030 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF AUGUST 20, 2001

Present: Serge Birk, Steve Kimbrough, Gary Antone, Bill Richardson and Tom Hefferman. Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resources Manager, Bob Vince of Camp Dresser & McKee, Dan McManus of DWR and Allen Fulton, UC Davis Extension. Absent: Jim Lowden, Roger Sherrill, Kevin Borrer and Bob Steinacher.

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Birk at 2:04 P.M.
2. Introductions
3. Motion by Bill Richardson and Gary Antone to approve the minutes. Motion carried 5-0 with 4 absent.
4. Public Comment: Bob Vince, Consultant for the Butte County Water Inventory report attended the meeting to learn as much about Tehama County as possible.
5. Staff Report: Ernie Ohlin distributed copies of the well monitoring completed for July and NCWA managers letter. Measurements from well monitoring compared to present are from ground down and show a difference. DWR staff has done Butte County and Glenn County.

With regard to the AB303 grant, it is still anticipated the contracts should be fully executed by DWR in November/December of this year. The possibility of the Sacramento Valley Settlement Partners to possibly provide an additional \$135,000 in funding to augment the Water Inventory/Analysis. \$90,000 of those funds would be used to have DWR conduct a detailed groundwater analysis similar to the document prepared for Butte County.

Information with regard to Jewett Creek area project: Bridges on Kirkwood Road and Columbia Avenue will be replaced due to sheet flow flooding that can impact wells. Public Works has moved bridge replacement projects to the top of their priority list. The Flood Control Board will be presented with the need of \$6,000 matching STIP funds to use toward the hydraulic study for the bridge projects. The hydrology is needed for the bridges, but will also assist in the drainage situation of that area.

Staff distributed copies of the DWR Water Inventory for Butte County and Dan McManus reviewed.

6. By-Law Review: Serge Birk brought before the TCFC a recommendation to open the membership to other affiliates. This would have to be completed by amending the by-laws and receiving approval by County Counsel and the Board. The TCFC suggested the TAC draft language that would allow the Board to act on the recommendation and it was suggested by the Chairman that the membership be open to those that qualify as surface water provider. The third issue is to provide the guidance as to the appointment date for this person.

Roger Sherrill provided information and suggestions in correspondence form.

Suggestions:

- < 10 members total in TAC
- < 3rd party impact person admission

- < surface water person admission
- < surface diverters
- < address additional needs in Water Inventory Analysis
- < stakeholder involvement
- < bring those interested people to meetings and not change structure of TAC
- < bring in interested people as consultants

Serge Birk asked for final decision by the TAC. The Committee having reviewed the issue of amending the by-laws and adding new membership finds:

Having reviewed the By-laws and issue at hand, a decision was made not to amend the By-laws nor add another member at this time.

Motion by Steve Kimbrough and Tom Heffernan to approve the decision of the TAC. Motion carried 5-0 with 4 absent.

8. **Dye Creek Test Wells Status:** Serge Birk began by stating the Dye Creek well is in the Dye Creek Preserve and services the Mill Creek Water Exchange Program.

Dan McManus added the well was drilled approximately in 1991. A detailed report was done on the well in a thesis by Katie Harrison with regard to geology, pumping tests, and the Tuscan formation. This 500' well was a water exchange program and pump during low flow years and provides supplemental irrigation water allowing the fish and water to go down stream for transportation flows. The perforations were such that it was below the typical agriculture pumping levels. In most of DWR-s programs, they try to seal the upper part of the aquifer and in this case, about 200' was sealed off and the total depth of the well was about 600'. The well also had salt and boron issues. The well produces 2200 gallons per minute. Groundwater is pumped in lieu of diverting from the stream and as a result fish are not trapped because of lack of flows in Mill Creek.

9. **Sub Committee Review/Working Session Butte County Water Inventory/Analysis Report:** Ernie discussed the report that addresses many issues. Tehama County-s Water Analysis needs to address the same issues such as districts, diverters, amount of water used and not used, historic needs, etc. Suggestions were requested of the TAC members.

Bob Vince confirmed that the document needs to state your needs, identify your objectives and give all necessary information to the consultant.

Suggestions of what is needed and Questions:

- < DWR input
- < Review Butte County Inventory - what can we get out of this?
- < Define objectives
- < Objectives of funding -
- < Gathering of stakeholders
- < After this document is complete, will it be used for NEPA?
- < Information gathering by water entities in County
- < Basin Management Objectives
- < Retention basins for peak flow and use water for reflow objective
- < Possibly not look as sub-basin level - subdivide County
- < Use our Groundwater Management Plan and break down information further
- < List and let Board prioritize
- < Finance issues
- < Outreach part of the RFP
- < Inform the public

Dan McManus suggested that part of the report would give you recommendations for further funding and after reviewing sub-basin boundaries versus water user area districts, the recommendation was a better approach by dividing the areas up in the County for groundwater management. Data that was given in the Butte report was broke the county into inventory units, inventory units corresponded with sub-basin boundaries. With sub-inventory units which were district and city based, it gives data in two

different ways.

Steve Kimbrough was interested in those users that impact the City of Corning's pumping for instance, and knowing what the impact on them would be when drilling a production well.

Serge questioned if the Butte report included analysis of normal and dry years, which it did. Do we want it during normal, wet, critical dry and is there a need? What is normal and what are the definitions?

Bob Vince advised the one thing Butte County was interested in, with two scenarios, was what are our uses, demands, supplies and in normal times and critical situations. To discuss the wet side, as a group you need to consider future management tools for water resources. Specifically, at some point in time, you may move towards a groundwater model as a management tool for the County. Data for this document needs to seriously examine various input data to develop that sort of a tool in the future and consider making sure you are collecting the data for this effort. What are you going to be doing in the next 1, 2 or 3 years, how will you manage these resources. When you consider that, look at the information you will need to examine to manage that resource and make sure you collect the information now. The outputs would likely be what additional work you need to do to get the rest of the data that isn't available now to develop those management tools.

9. Meeting Schedule: The meeting for September 17, 2001 approved.
10. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.