

**GLENN COUNTY
WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
Glenn County Department of Agriculture

720 North Colusa St., P.O. Box 351, Willows, CA 95988

Phone: (530) 934-6501 Fax: (530) 934-6503

E-mail: wateradv@countyofglenn.net Web Page: www.glenncountywater.org

MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 9, 2010

Time: 1:30 pm

Place: Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
344 East Laurel Street
Willows, CA 95988

Water Advisory Committee Members Present:

David Alves	Princeton-Codora-Glenn ID
Donnan Arbuckle	Resource Conservation District
Thad Bettner	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Gene Clark	Reclamation Dist # 2106 & 1004
Larry Domenighini	Glenn County Farm Bureau
Mark Lohse	BOS District 5 Private Pumpers
Larry Maben	BOS District 3 Private Pumpers
Ken Sullivan	Orland Unit Water Users Assoc.
Ted Trimble	Western Canal Water District
Mike Vereschagin	Orland-Artois Water District
James Weber	E. Corning Basin Private Pumpers
Jere Schmitke	City of Orland
Elwood Weller	Provident Irrigation District
Rosanna Marino	City of Willows
Del Reimers	W. Colusa Basin Private Pumpers

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Mark Black	Glenn Co. Dept. of Agriculture
Kevin Backus	Environmental Health
Lance Boyd	South Area
Ben Pennock	Central Area
George Wilson	North Area
Kelly Staton	DWR

Water Advisory Committee Members Absent:

Bob Coruccini	Willow Creek Mutual Water Co.
Jack Baber	Reclamation District No. 1004
Wade Danley	Kanawha Water District
Joel Mann	Glide Water District
Leigh McDaniel	Glenn Co. Board of Supervisors
John Viegas	Glenn Co. Board of Supervisors

Others in Attendance:

Eugene Massa Jr.	Colusa Basin Drainage District
Bruce Roundy	City of Orland
Rick Massa	OUWA
Eric Miller	MPM Engineering
Rachelle Valverde	GCID
Dan Ramos	Capay Area Rancher
Huston Carlyle	Glenn County Counsel
Jeff Sutton	Tehama Colusa Canal Authority
Mark Atlas	PCGID & PID
John Ayres	Brown and Caldwell
Sue King	Orland/Artois Water District
Lester Messina	Glenn Co. Dept. of Agriculture

- I. INTRODUCTIONS: Those in attendance introduced themselves.

- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes for January 12, 2010 were approved with corrections.

III. AGENDA ITEMS:

A. **Public Comment:** None.

B. **Discussion & Action Items:**

1. **Continue Discussion on Strategic Planning for Water Resources –**

- a) **Water Transfer Guidelines based on County Counsel's response:** At the January 12, 2010 WAC meeting a joint letter from GCID, PID and PCGID to the Board of Supervisors presenting their views on the proposed water transfer guidelines was presented. From that discussion, the letter was forwarded to County Counsel for review and comment. At the meeting County Counsel, Huston Carlyle, discussed the approach the County would be taking to address the concerns raised in the letter. It was noted that the water transfer guidelines was labeled as guidelines but read more like an ordinance, which we already have in place. Huston indicated that a revised ordinance is being drafted which will amend the current 10-year old ordinance. Based on his discussion, it could be feasible that the proposed ordinance may be drafted in time for the next WAC meeting for input, then to the Board of Supervisors probably at its second meeting in May; the second reading could be as soon as June 1st, at which point the new ordinance could be in place 30 days later. Considering the suggestions from the letter, the water transfer guidelines will be updated. The ordinance is still in the working stages. Huston clarified that it is not the intent of the Board of Supervisors to re-write contracts or to intervene regarding water transfer but to focus on the sale of surface water and subsequent groundwater pumping in its place.

Given the work that was put in the original ordinance, a request was made that the WAC be able to review the proposed ordinance before it went to the Board of Supervisors and that if finalized, be adopted in the Fall instead of Spring. The members wanted to emphasize that the Board of Supervisors thoroughly review the ordinance and give the WAC members enough time to be comfortable with it.

- b) **Well Spacing Document Review:** Lester Messina discussed the well spacing document review he performed for Supervisor McDaniel (who was in Washington, D.C. and not able to attend the meeting). Members of the Technical Advisory Committee were contacted regarding existing documents and Allan Fulton sent Lester in the right direction as most documents discussing well spacing are from Texas, Nebraska and other places in the Midwest. In reviewing the documents with Supervisor McDaniel, Lester wanted to ensure that a valid criterion was looked at since the hydrology and hydrogeology of Glenn County varies from area to area. Lester also looked at Butte County's well spacing ordinance but did not find the criteria used in the development of the ordinance. Tehama County also has a well spacing ordinance but it is only a narrative criteria. If poor criteria are utilized, a well spacing ordinance would not move forward in our county. A combination of aquifer performance test and well development specific capacity, along with well depth and location should be viable. Kelly Staton mentioned that the University of Oregon had done a test which involved magnetic resonance imaging and a control well. But the method needed constant calibration and was expensive, even prohibitive to a well spacing document. Kelly agreed that an aquifer performance test will help along with looking at well logs in the vicinity. Additional information from PG&E could be helpful.

2. **Tehama Colusa Canal Authority (TCCA)-Area of Origin—** Mark Atlas, TCCA Counsel, reported on the complaint filed by the TCCA against the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) on February 11th to enforce area of origin protections as it relates to the TCCA water districts' CVP water service contracts. The TCCA asserts that in operating the Central Valley Project, the BOR violated the watershed protection act by failing to maximize the amount of water allocated under

the Water Service Contractors held by the districts within the Sacramento River Watershed while still exporting water outside of the region where the water originates.

When allocating CVP water supply, the BOR has focused first on Endangered Species Act (ESA), instream flow requirements, and water quality obligations. Next are settlement contract supplies, and lastly, equally allocated between the Contractors North and South of the Delta whatever was left from storage, with the North of Delta Contractors only benefitting in an increased allocation once regulatory restrictions in the Delta limit exports. If TCCA prevails, the circumstances would remain the same, except the BOR would have to prioritize/maximize the contract quantities of the CVP Contractors within the area of origin prior to exporting the water resources of the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley.

3. **Orland Unit Water Users Association-Initial Steps for Taking Title to Orland Project—** Frank Demick of Demick Water Resource Engineering was retained by the Orland Unit Water Users Association (OUWUA) to provide some assistance and feasibility in taking title of the Orland Project from the Bureau of Reclamation. Rick Massa, General Manager, discussed this study, listing the specific criteria of the title transfer, the general guidelines for applying for the title transfer, and the pros and cons of taking title. There appears to be no big deterrents in going ahead with the title transfer and at the last shareholder's meeting, while there was a perception of increased liability, there weren't any big disagreements either. Mr. Demick concluded that taking title would be feasible. If completed, the title transfer will allow the OUWUA to participate in local and regional water transfers providing the district with an income to improve existing systems or proceed with deferred maintenance. Other benefits of taking title would be more flexibility in operating reservoirs and integrating with other water districts.

4. **Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program-Alternatives for Long Term Program by Larry Domenighini—**The focus of the Irrigated Land Regulatory Program for the past eight years has been the discharge of agricultural waste on surface waters; now the program is looking at extending regulations to groundwater as well.

At the start of the program in the north state, there was no solid baseline and only random monitoring was done in drainages and upstream by some groups. Currently, the Colusa Glenn Subwatershed Program monitors Walker Creek and Stony Creek in Glenn County and Freshwater Creek and Logan Creek in Colusa County, and Colusa Drain at Knights Landing. Starting 2002, the Central Valley in the north state and Sacramento Valley banded together to form the Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition. Eleven watersheds are in this coalition. Glenn and Colusa counties are together. With drainages being tied together, it was beneficial to team up. Alone, each county would have had to come up with perhaps 6-8 monitoring stations each and would have cost \$30, 000-\$50,000 to run as opposed to 5 stations total for the two counties together.

Larry Domenighini discussed the need for a management plans in 2010-2011 due to multiple exceedances of Dissolved Oxygen (DO), pathogen indicators (e.coli), pH, salinity (total dissolved solids and electrical conductivity) and legacy pesticides (DDT breakdown products found in monitoring sites. There is currently a management plan for Stony Creek for toxicity and Walker Creek for chlorpyrifos and toxicity. In 2010-2011, management plans need to be developed for Colusa Basin Drain, Freshwater Creek, Logan Creek, Lurline Creek, Stone Corral Creek, Sycamore Slough, and Walker Creek (for other than chlorpyrifos). The management plans will increase cost of operation but reserves from previous years should help cover the additional costs.

The current Irrigated Lands program will be replaced by a Long Term program in 2011. Listing five alternatives and the requirements for each alternative, Larry indicated that as the individual and reporting requirements go up, the costs will go up. Regional Board staff is currently

evaluating the alternatives for an economic impact report and a hearing period before the Regional Board is coming up next winter.

- 5. 2010 Water Transfers Based on Allocations to Date** - The next announcement for allocations will be announced on March 15th.

C. Communications: None.

D. Member Reports:

1. Thad Bettner invited everyone to the open meeting sponsored by Northern Sacramento Valley Water Forum discussing the Delta Water Plan and SB1 in Chico from 2pm-4pm the next day.
2. Lester Messina provided some monitoring updates to the committee. He reported levels at the dedicated monitoring well on Rd. D and South of Rd. 35 are 8 feet deeper in the deep zone, 10 feet deeper in the mid zone (most pumping from this zone), and 6-7 ft. deeper in the shallow zones and the mid-shallow zones this spring vs. last spring. Overall it appears that groundwater levels are approximately 4 ft. lower this year than last year. DWR will be out the week of March 23rd and we are anticipating the release of their change report to see if there has been any further recharge in the 2-3 week period.
3. Kelly Station reported that DWR is continuing with its SB6 sub-committee groups; they are developing monitoring protocol guidelines. She will provide more updates to the committee as they move further in the process.

The next WAC Meeting was scheduled for April 13th at 1:30 pm.

The next TAC Meeting has not been scheduled.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,
Gaylee Curcio