

**GLENN COUNTY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
For the Water Advisory Committee

Glenn County Department of Agriculture
720 North Colusa St., Willows, CA 95988
Phone: (530) 934-6501 Fax: (530) 934-6503
E-Mail: wateradv@countyofglenn.net
Web Page: <http://www.glenncountywater.org/>

MINUTES

MEETING DATE: Thursday, May 26, 2016
TIME: 1:40 P.M.
PLACE: Glenn County Department of Agriculture
720 N. Colusa Street, Willows, CA 95988

I. INTRODUCTIONS:

TAC Members Present:

Kevin Backus	Glenn Co. Env. Health
Matt Gomes	Glenn Co. PPWA
Lance Boyd	PID/PCGID-South Area
Allan Fulton (1:51)	UCCE

Others in Attendance:

Lisa Hunter	Glenn Co. Ag Dept.
George Pendell	Stony Creek
Bill Ehorn	DWR
Doug Ross	Mirror Newspaper
Sharron Ellis	
Kim Schumacher	
Will Martin	

TAC Members Absent:

Marcie Skelton	Glenn Co. Ag Dept
John Brooks	North Area
Erin Smith	DWR
Leigh McDaniel	Board of Supervisors
Anjanette Shadley	East Area, WCWD
Ben Pennock	Central Area

II. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The consideration of approval of the minutes was continued until the next TAC meeting due to lack of a quorum.

IV. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS:

- a. WAC report— Lisa Hunter reported that the WAC met May 10. DWR provided a Spring Groundwater Conditions presentation and the WAC also reviewed the Spring 2016 BMO levels, which will be reviewed under Item c. Larry Domenighini also presented a report on the BMO Policy ad hoc committee progress. Board of Supervisors activities were also reviewed and Minutes Orders were distributed. SGMA was also discussed.

The WAC met again on May 24 to rescind an action that was taken at the May 10 meeting to send a letter to the Board of Supervisors to remove the well permit moratorium county-wide. The action was rescinded and discussion took place regarding the item. Ultimately the WAC directed the TAC to work with staff to draft a letter to the Board of Supervisors for WAC consideration using the following statement as a guideline:

“The WAC cannot recommend that the well moratorium be continued based on lack of sound data/science and further studies are needed to be done to gather data by a third party consultant and funding is needed to complete these studies.”

This item will be placed on the next TAC agenda in order to take action.

- b.** BMO Revisions—Lisa Hunter reviewed County Code 20.03 and the BMO process. Ms. Hunter also reviewed excerpts of the Report on Groundwater Level Declines in Western Glenn County report that was created by an ad hoc committee of the WAC, approved by the WAC and the Board of Supervisors in May 2014. This type of report meets the requirements to investigate a BMO non-compliance. This report is also relevant to the recent discussions.

A handout was provided as a guide for a Brainstorming Session for the next several items in order to facilitate discussion and potential recommendations. Discussion took place reviewing some items on the handout including an update to the WAC on the proposed BMO methodology concept and the contour years that were presented at an earlier WAC meeting. It may be helpful to have the WAC approve the method in order to allow the TAC to move forward with the next steps. A vertical component for BMO compliance, and challenges associated with such a component, was also discussed. A recommendation was made to work with Stanford and Chico State to develop a groundwater model.

- c.** Review spring 2016 groundwater level measurements—The spring 2016 BMO groundwater level measurements and stage alert levels were reviewed. A summary spreadsheet and map were provided as handouts. The spreadsheet also provides a comparison between spring 2015 and spring 2016 measurements. The TAC members reviewed the brainstorming session handout reviewing potential recommendations that can be made to the WAC. Discussion was held regarding the three mile radius surrounding Stage 3 wells being a potential management area. Maps were shown detailing the potential options. The Stage 3 area was also compared to DWR’s groundwater level change map. Another option is to clip the radius to the BMO area in which the well belonged so as not to affect a neighboring BMO area. There may be difficulty to develop actions in areas in which there is no monitoring. Some felt the three mile radius is appropriate, others felt the radius is not a legally defensible boundary. It may be beneficial to use the radius or the change map as a guide, but use road locations

or other legal descriptions instead. There are also some challenges to address wells not in a stage alert that fall within the three mile radius from a Stage 3 well. Another suggestion would be to extend the Stage 3 area to the west to the Bulletin 118 boundary. The north and south boundary to the extension would need further review and consideration. It may also be helpful to create a decision tree, similar to the one being created in the BMO revision process, to help determine which actions would be appropriate. The group was encouraged to think about what actions would be reasonable to require in a Stage 3 BMO area for further consideration at the next meeting.

- d. Well Permit application process—Some potential ideas to add to the well permit are easily added, others would be more difficult. Ideas presented in the brainstorming sessions were ideas that have been discussed previously or have been included in other County permits. All items need further discussion prior to making recommendations. Items that received positive feedback to include on a well permit include: GPS location, section/township/range, distance from edge of stream, well registration, parcel(s) served, and acres served. Items that were more negatively received include: notice to surrounding parcels, and minimum review period. Other items that will need further discussion include depth requirements, sealing requirements, casing requirements, pump test information, pumping capacity, annual summaries of water use, more detailed type of use information, permitting based on land zoning type and general plan update. Some items that seem to take care of themselves included minimum well depth and two levels of well completion through environmental health department in order to receive timely well completion reports. Handouts were provided for the TAC members to review prior to the next meeting, but were not discussed at today's meeting including a well permit application and the application review process.
- e. Export of groundwater—There was discussion highlighting the importance of moving water throughout the county to help with irrigation needs and recharge needs. Export within the basin or within the county was positively received. There was positive feedback that no export in stage three areas seems reasonable. It is important to recognize the difference between transfers and export. It was also mentioned that surface water users should not be penalized for having a dual system. Some discussion also took place regarding requiring an export permit. It was generally agreed that wells being drilled purely for the purpose of export out of the area should be discouraged. More discussion on these items is needed.
- f. Other topics of interest—Doug Ross addressed the committee regarding his attempt to provide information to the public

V. COMMUNICATIONS:

None discussed.

VI. NEXT MEETING:

The next TAC meeting will be scheduled for June 2, 2016, location to be determined.
The next WAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 14, 2016.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.