## TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT AB3030 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 2005

Present: Gary Antone; Tom Heffernan; Roger Sherrill; Walt Mansell; Bill Richardson; and Kevin Borror. Absent: Jim Lowden; Bob Steinacher; and Steve Kimbrough. Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resources Manager and Bob Vince of C.D.M.

- 1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gary Antone at 2:06 p.m.
- 2. Introductions: None.
- 3. Approval of the December 2004 Minutes and January 24, 2005 Minutes. Motion by Bill Richardson and Second by Roger Sherrill to approve the minutes. Carried 5-0 with 4 absent.
- 4. Public Comment: Tom Heffernan announced he will not renew his application for his position on the TAC. He will continue attending future meetings.
  - Ernie Ohlin announced only one application for renewal, Bill Richardson, has been received. Newly appointed applicants will be approved at the Flood Control meeting in March. Members of the TAC were asked to contact interested people for the position.
- 5. 4-County Regional Water Resource Activities Public Meeting Review: Ernie Ohlin reviewed the meeting attended with regard to this item.

## Kevin Borror entered.

The meeting gave an overview of what each County is presently doing. This can provide networking for each County regarding water quality and coordination with agencies, such as Water Quality and Environmental Health.

Gary Antone added the meeting was well received and jurisdictional boundaries are being crossed.

Ernie Ohlin continued that Tehama County has not done too much with water quality. This is a step in the right direction.

6. Sun City Tehama - Update (Del Webb/Pulte): Ernie Ohlin presented an area map of the Sun City Tehama Project showing the area in which the college was to be located. The area is now dedicated for large/single family lots. A production well of 1,000 feet has been constructed on the project, with pump testing scheduled for Wednesday. A total of four production wells will be installed. Three for production and one for sewer treatment plant water. Monitoring will be done on one of the wells approximately 1,100 ft. from the production well. Wells located around the sub-division have dataloggers for

monitoring. Water quality has also been tested.

The draft EIR will be prepared shortly. Dan McManus of DWR has been involved in every aspect of the project. All information, including water quality, will go to a consulting firm for review once the draft is presented. This group will review the draft also.

Ernie Ohlin continued, with regard to long-term plans to leave the dataloggers, five are DWR's and some are on private property. It is not known what their plan is at this time.

Roger Sherrill questioned the closing of wells and the casing issues using no stainless steel and wire-wrap. Ernie Ohlin answered that from the County's position, the developer did not consult with us early on, nor did they use stainless steel in a well. The County may require a bond to protect the future residence from future issues that may arise.

7. Basin Management Objectives (BMO) Discussion: Ernie Ohlin distributed copies of Butte County's BMO Development Packet - Vina Sub-basin, that deals with trigger levels within each sub-basin of their County. This is the next step in Tehama County's Ground Water Management Plan, and planning the methodology and preparation to meet SB1938 compliance guidelines.

Bob Vince of CDM, discussed the BMO his firm developed for Butte County. Butte County has already passed their BMO export ordinance. Development of a water advisory committee has also taken place from 16-areas in Butte County within their groundwater basin. One role for this committee is to develop BMO's within each individual areas and locally lead by individual areas specific for their needs. The packets are intended for the person on the advisory committee to use as a tool and guide them towards development of BMO's for their particular area.

Given the recent work Tehama County has done, Bob Vince continued, your County has done most of the work needed. Examples of things needed: new figures; consolidating information; and DWR monitoring well information that would accurately understand where the aquifers were located in comparison to the wells. Butte County is concerned with water quality current problems, but did not add analyzing frequently for changes to their BMO. This would be recommended to any future BMO work.

Ernie questioned how this works with water quality. Specifically to water quality, Bob answered, Butte is concerned about early indications of water quality problems, consistent with local monitoring assisted by DWR. Analyzing, possibly yearly, for overall changes in water characteristics over time.

Ernie Ohlin added that this document is for the citizens to understand, we need to establish something in each of the sub-basins, to where normal ag users, urban development, etc., get into these awareness levels or trigger levels. It is not turning the

well off, but making them aware. Any project permitted by the County, the Board of Supervisors has the authority to turn the well off.

Roger Sherrill discussed that Tehama County should not wait too long to begin. From the standpoint of SB1938, if there were no other factors and being competitive in the arena, the County needs to be competitive. In 2007/08, groundwater quality monitoring will be coming our way. You need a baseline and framework to know where you are at.

Ernie Ohlin added that staff will seek approval from the Board for CDM, as sole source, to provide this document for Tehama County.

Gary Antone felt this was appropriate due to the public not understanding the process.

8. Annual Report: The report was submitted to the members for review. Consensus was that the following should be added and submitted to the Board for approval:

Recommend moving forward to develop a framework for basin management for Tehama County.

Consensus of the group was to encourage the Board to move forward on this item.

- 9. Next meeting date, March 21, 2005.
- 10. With no further business the meeting adjourned.