

**TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
AB3030 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2003**

Present: Gary Antone, Jim Lowden, Bill Richardson, Roger Sherrill, Walt Mansell and Bob Steinacher (2:08 p.m.). Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resources Manager, Bob Vince of CDM and Dan McManus of DWR.

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gary Antone at 2:03 p.m.
2. APPROVE APRIL 2003 MINUTES: With correction of spelling of Walt Mansell, Roger Sherrill motioned to approve the minutes. Second by Walt Mansell and carried 5-0 with 4 absent.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Ernie Ohlin announced the Sacramento Valley Water Forum meeting on the Ag Waiver on August 26th in Yuba City.

Walt Mansell had no direct knowledge, but from a news article gave information on over use of groundwater developers versus farmers in Santa Barbara.

Roger Sherrill discussed the news release by the San Joaquin Record regarding DWR=s comment on surface storage.

Bob Steinacher entered.

Discussion continued regarding the Environmental Water Account-Environmental Document EIR/EIS Workshop in Red Bluff. Bob Vince encouraged everyone to review the document for the information on groundwater substitution type of projects. The meeting date was not confirmed.

4. REVIEW AND COMMENT ON WATER INVENTORY & ANALYSIS REPORT: Bob Vince of Camp Dresser & McKee, reviewed the slide presentation given at a public meeting last month. (Exhibit A)

Walt Mansell questioned Page 5 on the Water Management picture with the figure of 10,354 wells in Tehama County and what the cut-off date was. This would be corrected.

Roger Sherrill questioned what makes up Ag use only, recreational use added, where does recreational fit? Bob answered that Ag is strictly Ag and recreational would not fall into that category. It may be filed under M&I. It should be noted that Roger said his area has very little Ag use.

Walt Mansell added that where does water fall for Ag processing such as in Corning? Answer M&I.

REVIEW OF THE DOCUMENT

§ Executive Summary not completed

First Section:

§ Bill Richardson: Page 17 (chart), nothing on Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy interview information. Ernie answered that not all Conservancy=s answered. Some information was taken later on from the website.

Jim Lowden: Between Mill Creek & Deer Creek, those were two conservancy=s that were ahead of others.

Ernie Ohlin pointed out that on Pgs. 66 and 67, Important issues on conservancy=s. If there needs to be additional information, Jim will add information.

§ Roger Sherrill discussed: Page 19, reference to the MOU and active participants and is the District solely responsible.

§ Roger Sherrill same page under bullets, line read Acontinued implementation of Phase I activities will allow Tehama County to move towards Phase II groundwater management activities@. Is that really the concept of the GWMP? If we were successful in Phase I, that would allow us to move to Phase II. It was agreed by the Board in the past that if Phase I was done really well, we would not move towards Phase II at all. We would pre-empt Phase II and hope we never got to Phase III. The concept is not a progression to each phase.

Gary Antone: Added that when you put the information, Phase I, II, II go together as part of the Plan, but Phase I provides us with a lot of this document. The ability and spring-board to implement as necessary these activities.

§ Gary Antone: Has typo=s to submit later. Page 17, the Axxx=s@ need to be taken out.

Section II

§ Ernie Ohlin: Page 22, next to drawing center page, should add ATehama County is located within the Sacramento River region@. Also early Calfed hearings the northstate certainly thought that storage was an important issue to them, and governance, etc., just for local flavor.

§ Roger Sherrill: Page 213, The 599 Process. Should call it Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program for California. This is now endorsed by Calfed and waits for legislation. Prop 50 funding source.

Roger was asked for written information to update this.

§ Bill Richardson: Page 29, Fig 2.2, Corning Canal goes further South then the graph shows. Liberal Avenue is where it stops.

§ Roger Sherrill: Page 226 & 227, Needs brief description of what is incorporated in a Phase II or Phase III progression and what it entails in the GWMP. How the County or any signatory responds and the Addendums required if it goes into Phase II.

Ernie: Pg. 2-26 Ernie changed to read AThe following T.C. Water Agencies have adopted a MOU with the District to participate in the Plan.@

§ Ernie: Page 2-28: Commented to Bob to include a graphic of the County where the Red Bluff arch is, the Sacramento Valley Water Basin, Redding Basin, show where ACID comes into T.C. More define the differences between the Redding Basin and that whole upper area of the County, how many acres it is, sub-totals of the Redding and Sacramento Groundwater Basin and then the County total for supply demand, etc.

§ Bill Richardson: You have a geology report in here and typically in Butte County, are you going to combine the two geology reports. Answer: It will be the same report. This is excerpts from Dan McMannus report. Less description and more results.

§ Bill: Looking forward to seeing lines of equalization from spring to spring. Will give the idea of what the recharge is. Dan answered: The spring contour map is included. That is what the graphs are for.

§ Jim Lowden: The east side conveyance losses, did you include ACID in those? Answer: Yes.

§ Roger questioned: Is there going to be an Appendix? Answer: We talked about putting the MOU. Ernie answered that the website for TCFC will have access to the AB3030 Plan, the MOU, Ordinance=s, soil report, and much more.

Reference to the above information regarding website will be in the document.

Chapter III - Bob Vince said this is not a complete section.

§ Walt: III 3.4 Anthony Peak wrong on boundary

Section IV

§ Walt: Atwo main sources@ are there other sources? Answer: Reclaimed, but reclaimed isn=t a major source.

§ Roger: Some are still pending, such as interviews. Are interviews, such as Kirkwood, still going to happen? Answer: It has been a challenge. Some groups not responsive.

Kirkwood: Dennis Bentz, lives on canal.

Roger said doing generic is better than nothing.

Jim: Prune orchard - Wright Brothers, Charlie Wright.

Regarding Independents, we will add info about who they are.

- \$ Bill/Jim: Adjudication part on Deer Creek, 43, Mill Creek - Cone Land Water Company was involved. Second paragraph, still a corporation, but inactive. After 1948, Los Molinos.
- \$ Jim Lowden: Los Molinos Mutual, last paragraph Pg. 430, A....and does not own any wells@. The Mutual owns two wells,
- \$ Jim: Cone Grove misspelled.
- \$ Jim: Next page, Red Bluff, I think you caught that one.
- \$ Jim: With external funding.....Jim said he was not sure, not practical. Ernie said@ Would replace appropriate sections of pipeline@.
- \$ Roger: Bowman totals and also on the 5.6, 5.8 or 5.9, like you said there was only one that has River Settlement Contract, ACID. Maybe it is the 3 or 500 a.f. that is Bureau of Recreation water that is used for lake replenishment. It used to be our contract, but no longer is. It is under the property owners association. There is not more than 30 acres of Ag land that is irrigated in the 600 acres.

Will review with Bob later.

- \$ Jim: Next to last paragraph, page 435: AResidents of Los Molinos use septic systems and therefore there is no need for wastewater treatment services@. I think this should be Asignificant need@.
- \$ Jim: Page 436: Says, AThe CSD typically does not use the third most recently constructed well@. It is not the most recent. It is 25 hsp now. #4 well is the most recent which is Stanford. Will get with Bob
- \$ Ernie: 4-37, bottom, Talked about permit just issued.
- \$ Bob/Jim/Ernie: Pg. 445 - Mineral Water District, actual physical boundaries are small? Answer, yes. Went from private to governmental ownership. Not sure of boundaries (Fig. 4-31). Need to make call to those interviewed. Or, Dick Heinrich in Redding, Lee Mercer or George Robson. Need to review.
- \$ Jim: Page 448: Draft document. Hasn=t been implemented or approved as yet. Shouldn=t use as reference when in draft form.

Section V

- \$ Roger: You show ACID (5-80) as groundwater component. Are you indicating that is what they would do, because they don=t have the capability to do that.

Bob Vince: If there is the understanding within the individuals within the District that have a groundwater supply.....

Roger: I understand, then there should be verbiage to clarify that.

Ernie: Pg. 5-7 maybe there is a way to put verbiage to talk about it.

Roger: Check on 5-6. We don=t have that amount of Sacramento River Settlement Contract available to us.

- \$ Roger: 5-12 will get with CDM later for corrections.

Section IV

§ Ernie/Jim: 6.6 - Last sentence, AProtect the Mill Creek Watershed. American Rivers Updated@. Is that a magazine? Answer: Not sure. Jim suggested taking out or find out if this is a magazine..

§ Jim: 6-11, Fish Passage; need to go back current exchange agreement. Reference as enhancement. Define program and reference as potential enhancement. Will get with Ernie

Section VII

§ Bob: Want some changes to this section. Will e-mail to all for comments.

§ Walt: Try to alleviate demands from Tehama County water from outside our County. This is to insure groundwater for Tehama and third party impacts.

§ Bob: References scattered - dedicate at end or section

§ Bob Steinacher: Easier section to section.

5. STAFF REPORT:

A. NCWA Month in Review for review

B. Another grant for Small Water System Inventory. Will be on GIS for comparison to draw down during drought time.

C. Soils document, rain gauges and other information being prepared for web-site.

6. NEXT MEETING: August 18 in Red Bluff.

7. ADJOURN: With no further business the meeting ended at 4:19 pm