

TEHAMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
AB3030 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MINUTES
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 25, 2008

Present: Bill Richardson; Allan Fulton; Walt Mansell; Roger Sherrill; Colin Klinesteker; and Mark Barthel. Absent: Bob Steinacher; Steve Kimbrough. Also present: Ernie Ohlin, Water Resources Manager; Bill Ehorn, DWR.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm by Vice Chairman Allan Fulton.
2. Motion by Roger Sherrill and second by Walt Mansell to approve the January 28, 2008 minutes. Carried 5-0 with 3 absent.
3. Introductions: Skip
4. Public Comment

Mark Barthel entered

Colin Klinesteker discussed the news articles regarding Lake Mead and the possibility of it drying in 20 to 30 years. Also in Kansas, due to draw down, lakes and streams are decreasing.

Ernie Ohlin announced the last two monitoring wells have a screen-zone around the 40-50 foot level. The locations are close to Brannon Creek, Evergreen School and the ACID Canal. This will provide information on draw down and it is agreed that we need to keep track of stream flow information.

Ernie Ohlin informed the members that the Sky View Water Company signatory to the MOU was approved by the Flood Control Directors. With regard to GCID's first proposal on the Negative Declaration, GCID was sued by the Butte County Environmental Council. Since that, GCID has rescinded the first Negative Declaration, added information and refiled to continue the project. With regard to the first suit still on file, Butte Environmental Council wanted legal fees paid by GCID. The Courts denied the claim by Butte County Environmental Council. Information is available for distribution.

Staff has prepared the press release to fill the TAC position Jim Lowden vacated. Applications are available at Gerber, Red Bluff and Corning.

Ernie updated the members on the data logger to be installed in the area west of Rawson Road on Rancho Tehama Road. Scheduled time is 2pm Wednesday. Members are invited.

Roger Sherrill discussed the Governor's Bond issue for November. If the legislature does not get behind the issue, the Governor said it will be completely balanced or not at all. Advertisements have been heard on the issue already.

5. **FOUR-COUNTY WATER COORDINATING GROUP FACILITATION:** Ernie Ohlin discussed that this group, established by the NCWA, was to share information. In unison with this, the Sacramento Valley Integrated Water Management Program was developed, and time driven due to grants. There has never been a consortium established of all people that make up water resources in the valley to add input toward any kind of plan. DWR is sponsoring a facilitator to bring together people and gather information on water issues in the Four-County area of Glenn, Butte, Tehama, and Colusa. This could assist in recommending guidance for an organizational procedure in implementing any kind of regional water management. Information was distributed and the TAC members will be updated at future meetings.
6. **SUBSIDENCE MONITORING NETWORK UPDATE:** Ernie Ohlin reviewed the plan. This issue, with Board support, has been to set a network up for grids to monitor subsidence. The grid to be set will be done by various people from DWR, Butte County, Glenn County, GCID, and staff. Volunteers are also accepted. This extensive project will begin April 2nd for approximately four weeks. Accurate information via satellite will be input into a database beginning in the Shasta County area and will move south through Colusa County. Without this valuable information, the issue of subsidence will not be known. This will also be useful for future land survey and levee information. Every four years, the information will be updated. A future presentation will be provided.
7. **AB3030 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW (Review of Pages 1-26).**

Roger Sherrill discussed the result wanted or needed of this review. Dates are not valid, but they are valid for information written in the Plan. Is it a revised edition of the Plan reflecting all current updates or an addendum to bring it forward?

Staff agreed, updates are necessary. This question could be answered after a review. It was also discussed that addendum's and reference information could cause reader problems. Clarity from County Counsel will be requested.

DISCUSSED CHANGES TO AB3030 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Revise Cover
 - a. Add Website

2. First Page after hard cover page - Figure2
 - a. Change grid - get info from DWR. A cross section was provided for the members. The lower and upper Princeton Valley fill should be added as well as other layers. Possibly text could be added to inform of the other formations versus replacing the whole Figure 2.

3. Page 1 - Introduction

Section 104-A (First line “...purpose of the Plan is to prevent long term overdraft of....”)

 - a. Need to replace the word “overdraft” with another term.
 1. Sustainable yield
 2. Operational yield

Section 104-B (Page 2): “Develop a comprehensive groundwater basin management program.....”

 - a. Reference the regional basin. This could acknowledge the regional affect or something to do with the word “regional”
 - b. Regional cooperation

4. Page 4 - Study Area
 - a. Section 202
 - a. Third line:”.....Tehama **and** the Western Tehama Highlands Area, Eastern Tehama Highlands Area (“areas”), **and** the Redding.....”
 1. It is not “and”. It is all encompassing the County of Tehama. Use: “.....Tehama to include: the Western Tehama Highlands Area; Eastern Tehama Highlands Area; and the Redding...” (replacing the word “and” with comma.
 2. OR just say Tehama County and remove the rest.
 3. Last two lines read” “...that they lie *within* the jurisdiction of the District, but do not include any land outside Tehama County”. QUESTION: Is this legal verbiage?

5. Page 6 - Section 206: “Beneath the valley floor, marine sediments form the basement of the study area, which acts as a structural trough.” Structural trough is discussed again in the document. Because of what was learned in the new DWR cross sections, is this correct?
 - a. ANSWER: Yes.

Section 207: “...this formation is of no significance.” True Statement?

 - a. ANSWER: Yes.

Section 209 discusses the Chico formation in the Western portion of the basin, and then in the last paragraph, “..... the two formations are equivalent in age.” Is that true?

- a. ANSWER: Yes.
- b. DWR has notes to add verbiage on upper and lower Princeton Valley fill somewhere between Sections 208 and 209.

6. Page 7 - Section 211 refers to (Bulletin 118-6, DWR, 1978). Questioned if there are enough overlap between the updates on Bulletin 118 to be able to include them?

- a. Could include as one reference with additional references of 118-7, but 118-7 not out as yet.
- b. Could add as , Bulletin 118-7 2008 if in fact it is out.

Section 212

- a. Reference cross sections from DWR

Page 7 - Figure 3

1. Update by DWR
2. Reference cross sections from DWR

QUESTION: Regarding this 1996 Plan, what was the mission behind this project? Was it designed for water professionals, designed as a guideline for the County to put together a program, or the general public use. How complex or simple to you make this?

ANSWER: Should not be detailed enough to lose the reader. If the Princeton Valley is added, possibly separate out the Modesto and Riverbank. It would have two or three more lines and refine the ages. The Plan was to give justification why we are doing, the reason and the background, giving guidance to come up with a methodology in order to understand the resource. Should not be overly technical. Factual, but simple.

Page 7 - Section 212: regarding “Alluvial deposits....”; In trigger level documents and groundwater inventory document, cross sections, DWR brakes out, in the cross sections, the Modesto and Riverbank formations. Do you want to add detail or leave “Alluvial deposits”?

- a. ANSWER: DWR to provide simple sentence.
- b. After Section 212, Reference cross sections from DWR.

Figure 2 to be revised by DWR.

7. Page 9 - Averages and data on Section 214: Update to current.

- a. Figure 4 on Page 9 can also add 2007 to make current. Include update to contour map (Page 10), and population information (Page 11).
8. Page 11 - Section 216: Allan Fulton needs to review this section.
- a. Population: Update by info from Department of Finance on projected growth.
 - b. Last paragraph regarding “three incorporated cities”.
 - 1. Add reference to the 2008 General Plan update that has recommended new specific plan areas in the County and name the areas. There are about 4-0 specific plan areas.
9. Page 12 - Economy:
- a. Bottom of first paragraph.. Review the Water Inventory Analysis, review total acreage, and perhaps the water use section has something more current.
 - a. Check with land and water use people on Section 218 with DWR for any changes.
 - c. Figure 6 - Check with Chamber of Commerce on employment profile or current agency handling information.
10. Page 13 - Question: Section 221a. Makes reference to Groundwater Task Force. Is that information around?
- a. Roger or Bill with research.
 - b. Remind people where we came from with information and add to website.
 - c. Add to Appendix

Page 13 – Section 220 at top of page, Local Interest: Question: What is “County Master Water Plan?”

- a. Unknown. Ernie will research.
11. Page 14: After Section 221c it discusses hiring a full-time professional.
- a. Add three paragraphs that reference the next three to four major steps taken.
 - b. Permanent TAC Committee.
 - c. MOU process, bylaws, etc.

QUESTION: Again, do we add to or reference?

ANSWER: Whether appropriate, need to update information. Add to paragraph or as an addendum needs to be decided. Possible wording, “Please see 2008 update in reference to the TAC, MOU, etc.”

Section 222: Amount of acre feet of water by District.

- a. Could update out of Water Inventory Analysis to 2002.

Section 223:

- a. Wording "...key civic groups will be contacted...." Change to "were contacted...."
 - b. Table 2-3 and 2-4: Leave out phone numbers, address and names? Would need to update often due to any changes in the organization. Maybe only list the name of the organization.
12. Page 16 - Table 2-5
- a. Add Bend area Water District? Staff will check with Barbara O’Keeffe of Public Works.
13. Page 18 - Section 228
- QUESTION regarding"authorized by "majority of votes"?
- ANSWER: According to a TAC member, one of the things that the TCFC and staff agreed upon, as related to development of the AB3030 Plan, was that they did not want to get into issues of imposing fees under the Flood Control District. That is why it was put into phases knowing the Plan would stay in Phase I for a long time. (Development and non-aggressive). The other phases mentioned would only be employed in times when necessary. The MOU’s were developed when the first objective of the TAC was to go after an MOU to bring Districts in. The MOU was also designed so there was no controversy. At the time, there was no District, including ours at the time, that would sign on with the idea that fees could be imposed by the TCFC District in some point in the future. The MOU was written so that as we went past Phase I, the MOU has to be renegotiated. On an independent basis, an addendum needs to be added to get to Phase II.
- a. Get copy of section 10754.3 of the Water Code.
 - b. Is there a regulatory authority? Through regulation?
14. Page 20 - Figure 8
- a. Red Bluff and Corning sub-basins east and west split as related to water inventory units.
 - b. Add secondary map - water sub-inventory units.
 - c. Show Red Bluff and Corning split.
 - c. Corning is not a sub-basin. (?yes it is)
15. Page 21 - Section 235:
- QUESTION: Is that since the recent Stony Creek Fan project? Is it correct saying"this area is southeasterly from Thomes Creek and northeasterly from Stony Creek towards the Sacramento River?"
- ANSWER: Bill Ehorn to check for accuracy after Stoney Creek Project.
- Section 238.
- a. No flow mentioned. Need to add for consistency.

- 16. Page 22 - Section 242:
 - a. Bill Ehorn to check accuracy of “.....the term “Western Tehama Highlands Area” is a staff designation only; Bulletin 118 does not formally name this area.”
- 17. Page 24 - Section 263: 4th line, “....as 30 feet....”.
 - a. Figures have changed from 19__ to __.
 - b. Now 45 feet. Update.
 - c. Check contour map.

Section 267: “.....levels have not changed throughout the period of record.”

- a. True?

Page 24 - to add:

- a. Discuss groundwater levels.
- b. Reference - update? How much information do we add?

- 18. Page 25 - Water Quality:
 - a. Have Perry with DWR review section of water quality and water quality problems and comment.

Section 287: What are the results of the issue?

- a. Have Perry review and comment.

- 19. Page 26 - Section 294: “Recent studies imply that the County does not appear to be in a state of groundwater overdraft⁵.” ALSO “Additional study of the basin characteristics is needed to better understand and evaluate.....”
 - a. Need to clarify or **revamp** this sentence regarding County overdraft.
 - b. Additional study sentence, the word “needed”.
 - 1. Rewrite to “.....ongoing and additional research and investigation is ongoing. Maybe mention what has been done to date.
 - c. The fifth word of Section 294 is “infinite supply”. **Finite** is better.

Reference Flood Control website (www.tehamacountywater.ca.gov) at least on the cover and possibly in document.

With review of Pages 1-27 complete for this meeting, the members will review Pages 28 thru 38 in March. Staff printed copies of the Plan up to Page 46, and document was distributed as needed. Review will proceed as accomplished today. DWR will prepare revised information of the above mentioned items.

8. ADJOURN: With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.