

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

**1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bill Marble.

Board members present: William Marble – City of Woodland, WRA Chair  
Cecilia Aguiar-Curry – City of Winters, WRA Vice-Chair  
Jim Mayer – Yolo County Flood Control & WCD  
Robert Thomas – Reclamation District 2035  
Matt Rexroad – Yolo County

Alternate members present: Tim O'Halloran – Yolo County Flood Control & WCD, WRA Treasurer  
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County  
Kurt Balasek – City of Winters  
Lewis Bair – Reclamation District 108

Associate members present: Jeanette Wrysinski – Yolo County Resource Conservation District  
Lynnel Pollock – Cache Creek Conservancy

Member agencies absent: Dunnigan Water District  
University of California Davis  
City of Davis  
City of West Sacramento

Public & Agency Staff: Elisa Sabatini, Yolo County, WRA Technical Committee Chair  
Cindy Tuttle - Yolo County  
Herb Niederberger – City of Davis  
Mark Cocke – City of Woodland  
Betsy Marchand – Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation  
Andrew Benware - Assemblymember Yamada  
Bob Schneider – Tuleyome  
Dave Pratt  
John McKean

Invited Speakers: Supervisor Jim Provenza, Yolo County  
Dana Carey, Yolo County Office of Emergency Services  
Tim Quinn, Association of California Water Agencies

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the agenda as presented.
3. **PUBLIC FORUM** – Lynnel Pollock, Cache Creek Conservancy, brought two fliers on upcoming events that are available by the door. A Riparian Restoration Workshop on April 16<sup>th</sup> and Conservancy free public events for 2014 Wacky Wilderness Days in the spring, summer and fall. Jeanette Wrysinski informed that the Yolo County RCD and the City of Woodland are holding four free water conservation workshops on Wednesdays in March from 7-8:30 pm at the Woodland Community Center. Cecilia recommended that public outreach event information be sent to the Winters city office as well and they will post it on their website, television station and public display case.
4. **CONSENT ITEMS** - The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved all consent items.
  - a. Approved minutes: November 18, 2013 Board meeting
  - b. Approved Nominating Committee Technical Committee Chair recommendation, Elisa Sabatini
  - c. Received financial reports: October 2013 – February 2014
  - d. Received minutes of Executive Committee: 10/15/13, 12/3/13, 1/6/14, 2/11/14
  - e. Received minutes of Technical Committee: 11/7/13, 1/9/14, 2/6/14

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

**5. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- a. Report from the WRA Chair: DWR published a good article on the Westside IRWMP in their Winter 2013-14 DWR News magazine. The League of California Cities has commissioned a water bond committee to make recommendations to the Board of the League. Bill also attended the recent annual NCWA meeting and commented on presentations heard regarding preservation of water rights.
- b. Report from the Treasurer: Tim O'Halloran reported that at the June WRA Board meeting, the Technical Committee (TC) will be presenting their recommendations for FY14-15 project fund allocations as part of the FY14-15 budget adoption process. He reminded that the membership dues were last increased by 1% in July 2008. The dues will remain unchanged for FY14-15 acknowledging current economic constraints and drought impacts. He explained that the WRA budget operates on a 57% / 43% split allocation of dues for the project fund and administrative fund respectively. The TC is further defining the project selection criteria for the FY14-15 budget.
- c. Save the Date: April 10 – Groundbreaking Regional Water Treatment Facility. Bill reminded everyone that they are invited to this long awaited ceremony by the Woodland Davis Clean Water Agency. Robert Thomas made a brief comment on the bid process for the Joint Intake Facility.

**6. UPDATE ON WATER LEGISLATION & REGULATORY ISSUES**

- a. Delta Update and FloodProtect: Cindy will let Supervisor Provenza give the update on the Delta. FloodProtect has finished Phase 2 of the Plan for the Lower Sacramento/North Delta region. Those three phases are: 1) problem identification, 2) regional improvement plan, and 3) financing plan and project prioritization. The Yolo County Board of Supervisors received an in-depth update a few weeks ago on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, the Biological Opinions, flood and water issues. The Board is supporting an integrated strategy with multi-benefit projects that integrate agricultural sustainability, habitat, flood protection and water resources.
- b. Legislation and Regulatory Update: Cindy and Tim attended a special groundwater meeting held at the Governor's office to get input from water managers regarding groundwater management and legislation. Representatives from the State Board, DWR and Department of Food & Agriculture were also in attendance. The Governor's Statewide Water Action Plan calls for legislation that would help local authorities manage groundwater especially in problem areas. The message relayed is that groundwater legislation will be a reality either this year or next. Northern California Water Association (NCWA) has been actively involved in groundwater at the State level for the last year. Various Yolo County agencies have been actively managing groundwater to maintain local control. Tim was asked to explain the groundwater monitoring triggers written into YCFC&WCD's AB3030 Groundwater Management Plan. Their Plan does not enforce management triggers for any local wells. Groundwater well levels are compared to the 1976 drought levels. If the groundwater level comes within 25% of the 1976 lowest level, it triggers a public education campaign and notification of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

Robert Thomas asked if Yolo County is following this issue and considering a countywide program that can represent to the state how well groundwater is being managed locally, especially if the state may someday impose statewide policies to manage groundwater as a result of current drought conditions. Bill Marble preceded the County's response by mentioning how the Yolo County Groundwater Monitoring Program has been recognized and lauded for its establishment statewide. Supervisor Rexroad is not aware of any recent conversations since the groundwater ordinance discussions several years ago. Cindy Tuttle corroborated his recollection.

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

Cindy and Tim O'Halloran have begun preliminary discussions on the next steps for local groundwater management, since they participated in the Governor's meetings on groundwater issues. This is a challenging discussion because many in the agricultural community are leery of groundwater regulation that could be imposed by the State of California. It is better to be proactive and have this thought out before the State sees a need to intercede. Yolo County has typically been ahead of the game in groundwater management with the development of the Yolo County Groundwater Monitoring Program and participation in the California Statewide Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM). In terms of process, the WRA Technical Committee (TC) will discuss groundwater management ideas and bring any recommendations to the WRA Board. The WRA Board can decide next steps and whether to present recommendations to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors. The TC is very engaged with the assistance of NCWA and their stakeholders. Lewis Bair informed that Colusa County is also actively engaged in groundwater issues. Colusa is proposing an MOU between the surface water districts and the county's multiple groundwater plan holding agencies. The TC has been tasked by the Board to monitor groundwater legislation development, formulate recommendations and present them to the Board at a future meeting.

- c. 2014 Water Bond Update: Jim Mayer was invited to comment on the water bond. Jim recapped the two major bills introduced by Wolk and Reardon at the beginning of the year. There are now several more proposed water bond bills introduced since January. Preliminary polling in January (pre-dating the severity of the drought) indicated that there was public confidence in water bond spending. Additional polling is being conducted. General momentum is toward a water bond on the 2014 ballot, although how the money will be allocated is still being discussed and determined. The recent emergency drought legislation is utilizing money from previous bond measures (Proposition 84 and 1E ~\$700 million).

**7. WRA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC) UPDATE**

- a. Technical Committee (TC) Activities Update and
- b. Westside IRWMP Implementation Update:

Elisa Sabatini, TC Chair, reviewed the activities updates included with the agenda.

- 8. PRESENTATION: Yolo County Perspective on Delta Issues**, Yolo County Supervisor Jim Provenza, discussed the County's participation in both the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and the Biological Opinions, primarily as they relate to the Yolo Bypass. They are both proposing similar projects involving gated channels through the Fremont Weir in order to deliver more water to the Bypass in times when water is not ordinarily available. The original proposal was proposing to flood about 17,000 additional acres. The County conducted an agricultural impact report<sup>1</sup> that showed a significant impact specifically to the rice industry, as well as other crops. Subsequent versions of the BDCP have reduced this proposed inundation acreage. However, the County is still negotiating the agricultural economic impacts that are dependent on the quantity of additional water into the Bypass and how late in the season this inundation happens. To summarize, Yolo County has been involved in the following areas with respect to these planning efforts:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Agricultural and Economic Impacts of Yolo Bypass Fish Habitat Proposals, Yolo County, April 2013*  
<http://www.yolocounty.org/general-government/general-government-departments/county-administrator/county-administrator-divisions/intergovernmental-affairs/delta-elibrary>

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

- *Agricultural preservation:* The County requested that any plan take into account the impact on agriculture based on the needs of agriculture and assure that there will not be any undue impact on agriculture.
- *Governance role:* The County has asked for a governance role in the BDCP and/or implementation of the Biological Opinions. Requested that this role include relatively equal representation for local, federal, and state government.
- *Economic mitigation:* There should be mitigation for any economic impact to Yolo County from these planning efforts. County counsel has researched various ways of addressing this compensation.

Supervisors Provenza and Villegas are participating in monthly meetings with Secretary Laird as part of the County's Water Committee. In addition to these monthly meetings, Yolo County staff is participating in a series of meetings with the BDCP designed to result in an agreement in each of the subject areas listed above. The State has agreed to complete this discussion process by August 2014. The County is also talking with the Federal government about the Biological Opinions. The Federal government goal is to have the Biological Opinions merged into the BDCP process once permits are granted.

Yolo County has not taken a position on whether the Delta water diversion tunnels should be built. They have restricted their activity largely to the Yolo Bypass and impacts on Clarksburg. Several studies have been completed that have provided useful information (reference Delta E-Library on Yolo County's website). More studies are pending completion. One will study potential BDCP impacts to the Clarksburg area. The Central Valley Flood Project is also looking to widen the Fremont Weir, but this project is still under development. Yolo County will investigate whether there is a multi-benefit project during this process as an alternative. Supervisor Provenza answered questions from the Board and public.

9. **PRESENTATION: Drought Conditions Update:** Dana Carey, Yolo County Office of Emergency Services (OES), summarized the various emergency drought declarations. Governor Brown declared a statewide drought emergency in January. The US Department of Agriculture and Small Business Administration also announced disaster declarations that allow funding assistance for areas affected by the drought. The Obama Administration has released new drought response actions, most of it in the form of funding. She distributed an agency matrix distributed by the State of 2014 Drought Assistance Programs identifying what groups are eligible for various state and federal programs. She also distributed a California OES matrix of state programs with additional information. The Yolo County OES website will have these matrices available along with other state and federal links to informational resources. Yolo OES grants administrator is also available to answer questions. At this time Yolo County has not officially proclaimed a drought, although they may later in the year. Per the standardized emergency management system, the County needs to exhaust as much of its local resources before making that proclamation to ask for state or federal resources. At this time the County has not been notified of any local needs that cannot access existing state and federal resources available. If local needs should change, then the County would make a proclamation recommendation to the Yolo County Board. The Board re-ratifies local proclamations every 30 days once they are in effect. Dana summarized new funding sources released since her last update to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.
- \$549 million for infrastructure grants to increase storm water capture & use of recycled water
  - \$40 million from the State's Cap & Trade Program to help local water agencies improve their water and energy efficiency

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

- \$25 million for emergency food assistance in areas hardest hit by the drought
- \$21 million for housing related assistance to drought victims
- \$15 million to help communities they are facing drinking water shortages & identify alternative supplies
- \$14 million to improve groundwater management statewide

Any agency that knows of other funding sources should contact Yolo OES to share that information. OES is willing to assist agencies with writing their project descriptions and reviewing the application process to ensure that as much funding flows into Yolo County as possible.

At this time, the counties that have issued a drought proclamation are Mendocino, Lake, Glenn, Sonoma, Yuba, Sutter, and San Joaquin. An updated map of disaster proclaimed counties will be listed on the Yolo OES website (<http://www.yolocounty.org/government/office-of-emergency-services>). In our immediate area, agencies have requested a voluntary 20% water use reduction; no one is on mandatory reduction at this time. Dana reviewed some triggers that would cause OES to recommend a drought proclamation: to provide full power and mutual aid; the need for extra legal authority; to obtain or commandeer any vital resources; or the need to proclaim on behalf of any special districts. Another trigger would be the release of the California Disaster Assistance Act in order to access that funding source. Also if any drinking water district has 60-120 days of remaining water supply that would also trigger a proclamation. Yolo County OES continues to focus on public outreach to distribute useful information. Dana answered questions from the board and public.

Bob Thomas discussed how Yolo farmers are experiencing 100% reduction, which is not voluntary and Bureau contractors may have a 60% reduction. He understands that M&I users are in a different category, but questioned why the County wouldn't issue a proclamation to assist the farmers/farm workers hardest hit. Dana reiterated that issuing a proclamation would not make any new funding from the state or federal government available to Yolo. If a special district requested an emergency drought proclamation that request would be forwarded to the Yolo County Board for consideration. She reviewed the reasons why some of the other counties made their proclamation, which are not relevant to our County. Tim O'Halloran commented that he questioned the State Board at a recent drought hearing about available assistance to districts. USDA has On-Farm Systems programs to assist landowners, but that money is not available to districts even though those districts are also part of the farming system. The State Board is working on a package for districts. Bob felt there wasn't a downside to the County issuing a proclamation given that the Governor has issued one statewide. He encouraged Yolo County to take that under consideration. Bill Marble asked that this question be discussed at the next WRA Technical Committee meeting and make a recommendation to the WRA Board at their next meeting.

**Water Conditions Update:** Tim O'Halloran, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, discussed the drought consequences that their District is facing. There will not be any water releases from Indian Valley Reservoir or Clear Lake this irrigation season and therefore water will not be available for sale to farmers in Yolo County. Clear Lake is at 1.83 on the Rumsey Gauge and until the water elevation reaches 3.22 they are not entitled to release water. Clear Lake needs to be at 7.56 feet for a full entitlement. Indian Valley is at 21,000 acre-feet and at least 60,000 acre-feet is needed before releases are allowed. District customers will be utilizing their groundwater for irrigation and using the District's canal system to move water. Tim explained the options available to farmers during a drought year, which are to pump water, fallow land, or shift to low water use crops.

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

Lewis Bair discussed how Reclamation District 108's operations are being impacted by the drought. This year the Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that they are unable to make the 75% delivery contract allocation. The Bureau updates the amount of water available monthly. The District will receive 40% of their contract based on the forecasted inflow into Lake Shasta. Typically the District has experienced a very reliable water supply before this year. RD 108 only has 5 production agricultural groundwater wells within their 75 square mile district area. The 40% reduction translates into 30,000 acre-feet of fallowed land in their District (out of 50,000 acre-feet total). Lewis described the intricate challenges of balancing the state and federal water contractors' needs against the Bureau's contracts and the State Board's Delta water quality standards. This scenario will play out over the next few weeks. Bob Thomas shared his comments on the Bureau's water operations and Conaway Ranch/Reclamation District 2035's challenge of balancing the water needs for habitat and agriculture during the drought. He is concerned that we are not talking enough about what will happen if we get another dry year and the drought continues. Tim O'Halloran mentioned that in his last conversation with Donita, Dunnigan Water District, that they are receiving zero allocations this year as a Central Valley Project contractor. Their Board is also assessing how to deal with this challenging condition. The Dunnigan Water District doesn't have very much groundwater available. They are working on negotiating shared water supplies from neighboring farmers or possibly other agencies. Tim noted that it is not just about water, but also revenue and sustainability. Without water the YCFC&WCD will not have hydroelectric income.

Bringing the conversation full circle, Bill Marble asked that the question of whether the County should issue a drought proclamation be discussed at the next WRA Technical Committee meeting and report back at the next WRA Board meeting.

**10. PRESENTATION: State Water Issues including ACWA's Statewide Water Action Plan,** Tim Quinn, distributed copies of the *Association of California Water Agency's (ACWA) Statewide Water Action Plan (SWAP)*<sup>2</sup>. ACWA convened a broad group of member water interests to develop a statewide plan addressing the state's overall water supply reliability and ecosystem health. The goal was to craft a plan that could be broadly supported by water interests throughout the state. This was not so much of a planning exercise, but a coalition building exercise. The Plan has been well received by many throughout the state. The Plan outlines 15 actions to improve water supply reliability, protect water rights, protect the integrity of the state's water system and promote better stewardship. The Actions should be implemented as a comprehensive package to be most effective. The Plan outlines 6 guiding principles for implementation of the SWAP. Chair Marble opened up the floor to questions from the Board. Supervisor Rexroad asked why the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) action item did not include mitigation for economic impacts, specifically for agriculture as discussed by Supervisor Provenza in his presentation earlier. (Additional discussion noted under agenda item 10a below.) Mr. Quinn noted that ACWA's Plan and the Governor's Plan are fundamentally consistent with each other. Tim O'Halloran reported that the TC discussed the SWAP at a previous Technical Committee meeting and Yolo County also presented their concerns about supporting the BDCP unless economic impact mitigation is included. Mr. Quinn stated that he would definitely appreciate WRA's endorsement of the Plan. He also distributed a list of organizations that have adopted support resolutions.

Mr. Quinn discussed his perspective on the severity of current drought conditions. He summarized how California agencies are coping with the drought throughout the state. Earlier in the year, ACWA

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.acwa.com/spotlight/SWAP>

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2014  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING  
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

established a Drought Action Group in partnership with DWR and other related groups to coordinate drought response education.

Mr. Quinn also gave a short update on the status of the 2014 water bond. There are currently 10 bills under development to amend the water bond. The water bond on the November 2014 ballot will be the original 2009 bill if left unchanged. The ACWA Board continues to advocate for key items that should be included in the bond, such as storage funded at 2009 levels, Delta restoration maintained at 2009 levels (this is not an endorsement of the BDCP), elimination of all earmarks, ensure substantial funding for disadvantaged communities' drinking water issues, groundwater cleanup, and targeted money for flood management. He anticipates a \$9 billion bond would accomplish the tasks identified. Mr. Quinn answered questions on the three topics he covered today. He elaborated on the activities of ACWA's Groundwater Sustainability Task Force. The Task Force is identifying and developing recommended strategies to achieve sustainable groundwater management and engage in groundwater legislation development.

a. WRA Endorsement of ACWA SWAP, Resolution #1401, The TC has not given a formal recommendation on WRA's endorsement of the SWAP, but had consensus agreement for the Plan. The resolution included with this agenda is presented for Board consideration to adopt. Bob Thomas and Matt Rexroad had the same concerns about voting to adopt Resolution #1401 without a conditional note explaining why certain agencies were not in agreement with the BDCP Action (SWAP Action #8). They want the Action to also include a statement of mitigation for economic impacts. It is not feasible to actually amend the plan, but the WRA can choose to adopt a resolution with a clarifying statement. Although the Board agreed that the SWAP was an excellent document, they were not ready to adopt the resolution today as presented. They directed the TC to discuss the concerns presented and return with a recommendation regarding an endorsement strategy that is agreeable to all members.

**11. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Lewis Bair, Lynnel Pollock, and Cindy Tuttle gave brief updates on upcoming activities.

**12. NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Monday, June 16, 2014** from 3-5 pm, Woodland Community Center.

**13. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Donna L. Gentile

Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator