

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
COORDINATED AB 3030 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JANUARY 23, 2006

Present: Jim Lowden; Roger Sherrill; Allen Fulton; Bob Steinacher. Absent: Bill Richardson; Steve Kimbrough; Walt Mansell; Kevin Borrer and City of Red Bluff Representative (unknown at this time). Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resources Manager; Dan McManus and Bill Ehorn of DWR; John Ayers of CDM.

1. Call to Order: Chairman Jim Lowden called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. There being no quorum, only informational items were discussed.
2. Introductions: None
3. Approve the Minutes: To be completed February 27th meeting.
4. Public Comment:

Ernie Ohlin announced the Flood Mitigation Plan public meetings. Corning will have the meeting January 24, 2006 and Red Bluff held their meeting at Lassen View School which was well attended.

With regard to the Sun City EIR draft, comments are still due. Deadline is the 6th of February. Ernie continued that affects from pumping may not begin to show until the sixth or seventh year in this project. They may realize they would have to install wells from the 1,000' aquifer and pump for potable water, and with that, installation of a treatment plant. It was suggested they should discuss how the developer should bond for the future and not pass the expense on to the California Water District which would levee the property owner.

Roger Sherrill discussed SB820, returning to legislation. This surface and groundwater reporting Senate Bill says that anyone pumping in excess of 25 a.f. per year of groundwater will report to the State Water Resources Board on an annual basis. If you are a member of a groundwater management program, as in Tehama County, it will be part of the Groundwater Management Program. This group should examine the overall requirements to meet the Bill. This will affect all ranchers and farmers in Tehama County.

Roger Sherrill reminded the members to watch for other bond issues coming.

5. Deer Creek Water Exchange: Dan McManus updated the members on the agreement which is not complete. Environmental work is also not complete. This year, a permit may be requested for a pilot well before the agreement is completed. This could be run if the Department of Fish and Game requested it. However, if Deer Creek made the request, they would need to pay the expense.

Ernie questioned the total amount of water required, and Dan answered, 60 to 80 days were run last year, and it is not expected to use that much.

Ernie suggested this be presented to the Flood Control Board for updated information, especially to new members.

6. SB1938 and BMO Discussion: John Ayers of CDM, reviewed Phase I of the Groundwater Management Plan and the titles associated with each Phase. Some items have been completed in Phase I. There are also items that could be moved to Phase I, as well as move other items to Phase II or III.

Discussions continued regarding assessment. Roger Sherrill added that domestic water and assessments exist now. The question is where would this issue become a problem.

Ernie answered that there are wells that are in areas that receive flood water. Along the Sacramento River, north of Gerber, is one example. This could be part of what to examine and what areas that may need assistance. Also, to prevent water from being contaminated, and the source water for them and their neighbors from adverse affects.

Allan Fulton suggested that Rick Gurolla be contacted for information on wellhead protection plans.

Ernie Ohlin discussed coordination in Phase II be moved into Phase I. Lack of communication between agencies is the same in all counties. With the updating of the General Plan, zoning and areas of flooding, coordination with Planning should be done.

Concurrence of the members present to leave Protection in Phase III.

Water Transfer issues in the Plan is also, at some point, an issue the committee will discuss.

Water conservation and education, Ernie continued, should be moved into Phase I. Regulation of groundwater contamination may also need to be moved to Phase I. This will be reviewed by the members. Signatories to the Plan are signatory to Phase I activities. The District can do investigative work on all Phases.

Roger Sherrill added that the Plan itself should not hold you to a standard and you need to address problems where they exist. With an MOU level, an agency or area may have to go to Phase II with an additional addendum or agreement with their County. But, if a District is in Phase I, and it is working well, they should be able to remain there.

Trigger levels were discussed and the draft document was distributed for review and comment.

Roger Sherrill felt setting levels could be a large issue and where you would stop with the regulation.

Ernie Ohlin added that understanding of what is happening in the area is the prime issue. The BMO process is to be informative and educational to citizens and private pumpers and what is happening in areas around them. They have the right to pump water, however, when there are proponents of a project conditioned through the County, that is the regulatory authority. The process can be somewhat the same. We can require that they comply with "awareness" levels and if violated, there can be three different types of actions the County can condition that project to comply with. Not the private pumper to comply with.

Jim Lowden felt that with regard to bringing stakeholders together, someone has to facilitate the process and be consistent between sub-basins. To develop trigger levels and comply, this is moving to all phases and there is work to be done to show how it all ties together.

Discussion continued on who will set the levels and recommended actions. At what point do you define where the regulatory starts and use of an ordinance.

7. Next meeting February 27, 2006.
8. Adjourn: With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.