

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT COORDINATED AB  
3030 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES  
OF AUGUST 21, 2006

Present: Jim Lowden; Walt Mansell; Roger Sherrill; Allan Fulton; and Mark Barthel. Absent: Bill Richardson; Bob Steinacher; Kevin Borrer; Steve Kimbrough. Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resource Manager.

1. CAL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jim Lowden at 2:05 p.m.
2. INTRODUCTIONS: Tom McCovens, and Bill Ehorn of DWR.
3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Roger Sherrill discussed the Sacramento Valley Water Forum meeting to be held in Yuba City. Discussion will include the GAMA Program for four counties monitoring wells and establishment of baselines.

Ernie Ohlin informed the TAC of the new development, Morgan Ranch which would include 3950 units on 1300 acres of land. The property connects up to and borders the Del-Web property on the south and goes to Cottonwood Creek along I-5. Meetings have been completed to discuss any water investigative work. Presently, drilling of a 520 ft. deep pilot hole, 500 ft. deep production well and pump tested for three days producing 3,000 g.p.m.

Public meetings will be held for the Flood Mitigation efforts. Lassen View School on the 29<sup>th</sup> and Corning Vets Hall on the 31<sup>st</sup>. Detailed flood studies are planned in the Dairyville area and west and east of Corning, as well through the City of Corning. A presentation will be done at the Flood Control Board meeting tomorrow. Members are invited.

4. SUN CITY TEHAMA DRAFT GROUNDWATER MONITORING PLAN: Ernie Ohlin sent to the members the draft Groundwater Monitoring Plan. The revised EIR has been issued and the developer has stated they will develop/propose a Groundwater Mitigation Monitoring Plan and present it to the County for approval **prior** to approval of the tentative map. Once it represents what the Plan should be, with approval of the TAC, the document will then be sent to the Board for approval.

Questions regarding bonding for Pulte were answered by Staff saying that the first draft did include an amount for a bond. Those monies may be used to reimburse, for example, County time for independent investigations and studies. The developer is still responsible for any actions that would be a result of the studies. This is a pending action and still in discussion. It has yet to be determined what the amount of the bond would be or the method in which it would be used. Ernie continued that at this point, this issue is not mentioned in the Plan, but will be addressed through the Monitoring Plan or a separate agreement through the County. There is no Dispute Resolution mechanism.

Jim Lowden felt this should not be a part of the Monitoring Plan.

Roger Sherrill agreed and said it could be part of the development. Some go through the duration of the contract until it is complete.

Ernie Ohlin suggested going through the document for review and comments at this meeting.

5. SB1938 & BMO TRIGGER LEVEL DISCUSSION: Due to the absence of Mr. John Ayres of Brown & Caldwell this item will be held over for a future meeting.

Roger Sherrill questioned funding and where we will be for BMO criteria and trigger levels. Staff answered that after meetings with this Committee, the methodology for Bowman, Corning east, and Los Molinos will be available for SB1938 compliance. More monies will need to be budgeted for the other sub-basins, but once the template has been completed, we will know the methodology we need to use.

Walt Mansell discussed Phases and the terminology in the Plan: 1). Advisory Stage; 2). Warning Stage; and 3). Action Stage. Staff added the stages and information from the Consultant will be brought before the TAC for approval.

Roger Sherrill added that we should avoid changing language that could affect the original intent of the Plan.

Ernie Ohlin stated that in the modeling shown, pumping in the upper aquifer, where they are pumping for potable water, the developer would have an affect between 1 to 5 feet in a certain radius. If it is more, there should be a mechanism in the Monitoring Plan that would take it to the next step. Presently, there is nothing that would do this. In the document it stated they would run the modeling after the first thousand homes built. In the EIR, we wanted updating yearly.

Group discussion continued regarding the Draft Groundwater Monitoring Plan for Sun City Tehama.

Page 1, paragraph 2, regarding wells, refers to Table 2 on page 12. Staff felt this should include every well proposed and insure if called something previously in the initial investigative work, that it is noted in the document. Cross reference for clarity and expand Table 2.

Table 2, page 12, 4<sup>th</sup> column "Depth (ft)" needs to read "Depth of the Bottom Perforation". Also, if any private wells are used to monitor, this chart needs to address.

First Paragraph Page 1, line 9, ....quality parameters in on-site wells to detect signs of unexpected changes;.....should read .....quality parameters in on-site wells to detect signs of seasonal and long-term changes;

Map associated with this, needs improvement. Symbols making no sense. Need to change shape. Larger maps should be used.

Dataloggers mentioned on Page 1, should be installed as soon as wells are developed.

Screening should be mentioned on Page 1.

Page 2, second paragraph, mentions again, Well 3 and OB-2. One of these wells could be down in the

Tuscan Aquifer. This needs to be clarified.

Page 2/3 Monitoring Plan Elements. We may want to discuss triggers that could trigger mitigation action, but the actual implementation, who handles this, and authority is a separate entity possibly. Discussion should include what is reasonable and not reasonable in monitoring. If they re-run the model and it shows one to six feet instead of one to five feet, would this be an issue.

Discussions continued on the California Water District (CWD) formation and responsibilities. After a certain period, and if adverse impacts are in place, the responsibility of the developer turns over to the CWD and would be between the property owner and the CWD.

Ernie Ohlin added that a groundwater contour map is in the Plan of existing conditions. This will provide information for comparisons in later years. Also, we have requested a chart which includes projected water demands that refer to each year of build-out.

Roger Sherrill questioned if Staff had requested “how you want the County to interface with the project buildup and/or long-term project possibly past buildup. Meaning is the County going to be involved in the monitoring program. To have them put the program together, it is another for the County to be inactive.” This should be spelled out up front.

Ernie Ohlin answered there will be protocol on how they download dataloggers. When turned over to a CWD, with DWR’s assistance, education, spelling out the correct input of information, we will put this on our website. Signatory to the AB3030 Plan and has always been suggested.

The word “cooperators” was suggested and “deed restrictions” or “deed easement/agreement with DWR and the County” to enable the County to receive information from the dataloggers.

Maintenance for dataloggers should be addressed in the Plan. Staff mentioned that in the first

Information on hydrology does not tie back to specific monitoring wells. Should relate back to the actual wells. Information should include when drilled, “we found this....” information. Maintenance on the datalogger and after build-out, CWD responsibilities should also be included.

Page 4, (2) Project Setting: Summary of acres should be included, units, demand, developing groundwater model, predictions and assumptions.

Develop a cross-section through the property describing well depth, how they are screened, what aquifer they in and what is the well number.

Geological setting vague and broad. This needs site specific. Example on page 6, second paragraph discussed the Hooker Dome which most would not know it is a component of the Red Bluff arch area.

Hydrogeology, should include what was learned from e-logs and pump testing and how it relates to the overall.

Page 8 discusses again the Red Bluff arch area. This is an unknown area which appears to react as an

area of down water flow, but we are still learning. “It appears” to be, but they should qualify this.

Page 9, top, references figures 4 and 5. These are missing.

Page 10 discusses the chart and where the wells are located. This needs to expand and include a groundwater contour map. Should also include a contour map of the full buildup and what they predicted would happen.

Allen Fulton questioned if Staff felt there was adequate monitoring. Ernie answered the wells will be on the north, east, and south side. We will try and include the west boundary. Sunset Hills is also being monitored and to the north is Morgan Ranch which should also include monitoring. Investigative monitoring the developer did initially should be included.

Page 11, again clarifying where wells are. They only indicate by TW-1.

Page 12, contour maps, cross sections including Spring of 2005 groundwater levels. Expand chart to cover all the wells discussed in the document.

Page 13, third paragraph “New well pairs,...” adding five upper and lower. Clarify the upper and lower or triple completion, etc. Monitoring the two upper zones are important for those it could affect.

Dataloggers are set to monitor once per hour. This should also be done on the site. Could change later.

Page 13, 5.3 New Monitoring Well Installation, discusses a benchmark using an assigned elevation. This should be a true elevation.

Page 14, second paragraph, discusses a third monitoring well location. This is OB-5 upper and lower. These will be installed all at one time and not at a later date.

Page 14, third paragraph, should be a triple completion and DWR design, which is accepted by all, will be discussed with the developer.

Page 15, first paragraph discusses Mean Sea Levels (MSL). We want depth below ground level. MSL is difficult to interpellate.

Page 15, needs to expand on Automatic Water Level Measurements. A database for downloading information, maintained by whom and where, copied to who, County to be involved, etc. This should include the long-term maintenance and responsibilities.

Page 16, The water quality aspect, which we would rely on what DHS has to say being the regulatory authority, and how it should be set up on water quality issues and sampling times. DHS is the authority in this area.

Page 16, 6.3 Groundwater Monitoring Schedule, the proposal for six months ahead is good, but especially early on, monitoring monthly should be completed and quarterly later on.

Page 17, Table 1 missing.

Page 17, Information from the data should be stored locally.

Staff questioned the TAC as to what would be a trigger level appropriate to the model. Something needs to trigger the mechanism and a safeguard to the community.

Staff discussed the schedule at the end of the document may be changed on installation of wells. There will be a request to make larger maps, readable and possibly show wells outside the boundaries monitored early in the project.

Staff requested any other comments be sent as soon as possible so this document can be finalized. It was agreed by all that latitude, at County direction, be allowed in this document if there are adverse affects of pumping causing the revision of the model.

6. NEXT MEETING DATE: September 18, 2006
7. ADJOURN: With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.