

**MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2009
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, William Marble. Chair Marble welcomed the new City of Winters' WRA Board representative, Cecilia Aguiar-Curry.

Board members present: William Marble – City of Woodland, WRA Chair
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County
Ruth Asmundson – City of Davis
Regina Cherovsky – Reclamation District 2035
Sid England – UC Davis
Jim Mayer - Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Cecilia Aguiar-Curry – City of Winters
Shelly Murphy – Colusa County Water District

Alternate members present: Kurt Balasek – City of Winters, WRA Treasurer
Jacques DeBra – City of Davis, Technical Committee Chair
Tim O'Halloran - Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Matt Rexroad – Yolo County
Donita Hendrix, - Dunnigan Water District
Tovey Giezentanner – Conaway Ranch / Reclamation District 2035
Don Peart – Colusa County Water District

Associate Members present: Lynnel Pollock – Cache Creek Conservancy
Fran Borcalli – floodSAFE Yolo

Members Agencies absent: City of West Sacramento
Reclamation District 108

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the agenda.

3. PUBLIC FORUM – There were no comments from the public.

4. CONSENT ITEMS - The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved all consent items.

- a. Approve Minutes: May 4, 2009 Board meeting
- b. Receive Financial Reports: April - May 2009
- c. Approve Request for Associate Membership – Fran Borcalli

5. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. Correspondence sent from WRA: Grant support letters and comments on SB 12. The cities of Davis and Woodland also commented on SB 12. Copies of those letters will be included with the next agenda packet.
- b. Editorial published: Cache Creek Flooding –Dr. Bill Marble
- c. Cache Creek Settling Basin Symposium hosted by floodSAFE Yolo Pilot Program on June 22, 2009, 8:30 am to 1:30 pm, Heidrick Ag History Center, Woodland. A tour of the settling basin will be included. Tim O'Halloran listed the speakers on the panel. People are requested to RSVP (meeting fliers were available).

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT AND INFORMATION

- a. Executive Committee Report: The Committee met on 5/26/09. Meeting minutes were attached to the agenda.

- b. Administrative Coordinator's Report: Other WRA administrative-related activities. Dues invoices will be sent out the beginning of July to WRA member agencies.

7. APPROVE REQUEST TO JOIN WRA VOTING MEMBERSHIP

The WRA Board motioned, seconded and approved Colusa County Water District's (CCWD) request to join the WRA membership. The CCWD was invited to give a short introductory presentation about their district.

Don Peart is on the board of directors for the CCWD. He gave a brief outline of the district and Shelly Murphy, General Manager, will give an overview of the District's operations. The CCWD was formed in 1954 by a group of Arbutle farmers. The CCWD signed a service contract agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) to deliver water from the Tehama Colusa Canal to approximately 40,000 acres of farmland between Williams and Dunnigan. Approximately 1,000 acres is located in Yolo County. Their distribution system is 105 miles of underground pipeline serving permanent crops (represents 60% of service area). CCWD's distribution system is so efficient that they have no drainage water and therefore does not need drainage districts. Due to CCWD's success in conserving water, their farmers have enjoyed full allocations. However, in the last several years the Bureau has reduced CCWD's allocations to 40%. The CCWD has been able to purchase/transfer water by collaborating with neighboring districts (RD108, Glenn-Colusa and River Garden Farms) to meet their allocation demands. CCWD's transfer water is rather expensive to deliver to their customers, costing \$154/acre foot. The CCWD is very concerned about the future of these limited water resources. A contributing factor for the District wanting to join the WRA membership is to collaborate regionally in maintaining water supplies adequate for present and future needs.

Shelly Murphy provided some additional CCWD operations details. The CCWD's gross acreage is approximately 45,000 of which 39,817 is assessed for water delivery. As Don mentioned, 60% of this acreage is permanent crops. The District serves 350 landowners and all water connections are metered (> 650 outlets). The District's conservation plan includes about 90% drip irrigation on the permanent crops. There are eight CCWD diversions on the Tehama Colusa Canal; a combination of gravity flow and pumping plants with several lift stations offsite of the Canal. The CCWD also operates with a small, but efficient field and office staff (6 employees). CCWD's neighboring districts include Westside Water District, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation, Reclamation District 108, Reclamation 2047 and Dunnigan Water District. Shelly and Don answered questions from the Board.

8. UPDATE DELTA WATER ISSUES

Warren Westrup, Yolo County, provided an update on Delta water issues. Julia McIver regrets that she was unable to attend today's meeting, however, she prepared a report on Delta and flood issues for Warren to share with the WRA. A transcription of that report is attached at the end of these minutes. Warren answered questions from the Board.

9. LEGISLATIVE TRACKING

At the last WRA meeting, the Board accepted Tim O'Halloran's offer to regularly report on water-related legislative issues (other than the Delta) to the WRA Technical Committee and Board. Tim shared the variety of sources he taps to provide information for his report (ACWA, NCWA, California Central Valley Flood Association and miscellaneous others). Tim welcomes suggestions for other sources from Board members. Tim is also tracking regulatory issues on topics related to TMDL and groundwater, for example. Tim acknowledged that the goal is to create a summary report to be included with the agenda packet with information such as: bill name/number, status, synopsis, and the positions of the various groups mentioned above. Currently the majority of legislative activity and bond measures have been suspended pending resolution of the state budget crisis.

- Safe, Clean, Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010, SB 456 (Wolk) - ag water efficiency (committee)
- Groundwater, SB 122 (Pavley)- endorses a local approach to groundwater management (suspense file)
- Water conservation, AB 49 (Feuer) – 20% urban conservation by 2020 (committee)
- Water diversion and use, SB 681 (Pavley)- SWRCB expanding their jurisdiction, (inactive file)

10. UPDATE ON YOLO COUNTY FACILITATED WATER RESOURCES PROCESS

Dirk Brazil, Assistant County Administrator, reported on discussions regarding the creation of a countywide water agency. The stakeholder group is still discussing and reviewing the options presented by a subcommittee (members from the larger group) tasked with researching various scenarios. The group is discussing the option of an enhanced WRA agency as a JPA connected to the YCFCWCD. The next step is for a technical advisory subcommittee (comprised of two water attorneys, several members of the stakeholder group, Jeff Loux and Dirk Brazil) to discuss the legal logistics of creating a JPA. This subcommittee is scheduled to meet on June 24th. Jeff Loux, the group's facilitator, will be away the month of July; therefore, the larger stakeholder group will not be reviewing the researched legal options until August. Yolo County is keeping the stakeholder group informed of all activities by email and phone.

11. WRA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMO

Technical Committee Report (TC) - Chair Marble asked Tim O'Halloran to brief the Board in Jacques DeBra's absence (Technical Committee Chair). Tim explained the TC report items included with the agenda that detailed project funds accounting for FY 2008-09 and approved allocations for 2009-10. The TC distributed a Project Funds Expectations outline to provide structure for fund utilization by the lead agencies allocated funding. This will provide a more efficient tracking mechanism for allocations in 2009-10. The TC is also developing a format to track the progress of all the integrated actions published in the 2007 IRWMP. The sample template included with the agenda packet is currently being refined by the TC and will be distributed to each of the eight Integrated Projects as a method to update the WRA. The IRWMP is a "living document" and the intention is that this process will assist with future prioritization of projects.

Tim was asked to update the Board on the Proposition 84 Region Acceptance Process (RAP). The WRA, in conjunction with other regional entities, submitted a RAP application in April 2009 to be considered for the Proposition 84 funding process. DWR has required statewide regional coordination in order to be considered for future planning and implementation funding. The WRA coordinated with neighboring counties to form a "watershed" based planning group for the RAP application - the Westside Regional Water Management Group (Solano, Yolo, Napa, Lake and Colusa counties). A follow-up interview with DWR is scheduled for July 9th to determine whether the Westside region will be accepted. West Yost Associates has been instrumental in the development and submittal of the application. Solano County Water Agency is also assisting by contributing a cost share to the WRA for this process. Tim answered questions from the Board. Chair Marble noted that this process has shifted the focus of the WRA updating the Yolo County IRWMP (and funds allocated for that purpose), in lieu of developing a regional IRWMP for the Westside group based on DWR's direction.

12. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Marble encouraged agencies to share their activities related to water conservation with the current drought conditions. They following agencies gave brief member reports: CCWD, Dunnigan WD, UC Davis, RD 2035, cities of Winters, Davis & Woodland and YCFCWCD. Fran Borcalli reported on a Central Valley Flood Protection Plan regional forum held recently in West Sacramento and how Yolo County can be involved in this planning to incorporate floodSAFE Yolo/IRWMP issues. Chair Marble asked the WRA TC to track this process.

13. NEXT MEETING DATE: The Board is requested to hold **August 17 and September 14, 2009** from 3-5 pm as potential meeting dates. The Executive Committee will notify the Board which dates are needed.

14. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna L. Gentile

Donna L. Gentile

WRA Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator

Transcript from Agenda Item # 8:

Delta and flood update from Yolo County for WRA Board Meeting 6/15/09

(Reported by Warren Westrup)

Julia McIver is out of town this week, but has provided me with some notes to update you on what is happening. In addition to an update on Delta related issues, I'm going to also give you an update on flood issues.

DELTA

Responding to the proposals generated in the working groups for Senator Simitian's SB 12, the Delta Counties Coalition has developed a Delta governance proposal. Our proposal pays particular attention to revising the mission and makeup of the Delta Protection Commission and the structure and mission of the proposed new Delta Conservancy, and assumes that there will be a Delta Stewardship Council, which seems to be the way things are headed. The Board of Supervisor's Delta legislative subcommittee reviewed and approved the proposal, and continues working with staff on our efforts to refine our concepts. This was a giant step forward for the Coalition, both in terms of working together and in getting something positive and definite in front of the Legislature.

The Counties continue to meet with State Secretary for Natural Resources Chrisman, and recently heard from his staff on the administration's contemplated proposals. Not unexpectedly, theirs are similar to the Coalition's proposal in some ways and differ sometimes substantially, in others. Supervisors Thomson and McGowan recently met with undersecretary Karen Scarborough on behalf of the Yolo Natural Heritage Program and the County to go through our adopted list of policies and desired outcomes to get a better understanding of them and figure out in which process they could be addressed, for example which were appropriate to consider under the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), which are legislative, and so on. We have not heard from Resources since that meeting, so it's not clear how effective that exercise was.

We have, however, had a subsequent meeting with consultants who are working on BDCP to discuss possible mutual benefits that could be realized. We have also been contacted by representatives of the water districts who are potentially regulated entities within BDCP regarding both BDCP and the project they are developing on the Yolo Ranch, the Westlands property in the lower Bypass. Bearing in mind that the water agencies have the most interest in the success of BDCP and the greatest ability to write checks, this appears to be a positive development.

BDCP discussed its first admin draft of the plan on June 5, 2009 and is expected to give direction to staff regarding revisions this Friday, June 19, 2009. The draft plan and EIR are still on track for release in coming months.

Last, the revised biological opinion (BO) for salmon required for the State and Central Valley water projects was recently released. The salmon BO calls specifically for modifications to operations and weirs in the Yolo Bypass.

FLOOD

The State Department of Water Resources (DWR) is getting going on the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP), mandated in legislation last year. DWR's flood staff is beginning to coordinate with BDCP staff, emphasis on "beginning". They expect to meet with staff of the Delta habitat conservation and conveyance program (DHCCP) a long title for the EIR/EIS for BDCP, and design of the Peripheral Canal (PC). Flood staff confirms that BDCP has not worked with them to consider flood control aspects, and stated categorically that "you won't see any preferred alternative for BDCP that doesn't account for flood considerations." When asked if that included the habitat proposals as well as the canal, the answer was "yes."

As the CVFPP cranks into gear, DWR will be forming regional "work groups" of locals, getting local knowledge and producing a first draft of "levee conditions" this fall. They're sending letters to all local elected officials in early July. Staff attended a local "forum" last week in West Sacramento, where DWR announced their plans.

The urban levee evaluations were delayed by the bond crisis, when the state put all bond funded projects on hold. Accordingly, the results of the urban levee geotechnical evaluations for Davis and Woodland are expected in December 2010.

The non-urban levee evaluations are about to begin. DWR is currently planning to use a cut off point of 1,000 people to decide priority – above 1,000 will be evaluated this season, the rest will wait till next year. They will categorize the levees as:

- Clearly deficient;

- No obvious deficiencies; and

- Not enough known about them.

The levees that protect “critical infrastructure”, such as those non-urban levees protecting infrastructure for Davis and the County, would wait till next year. If all goes according to plan, they would have evaluations, with remedial alternatives and cost estimates, by April 2010.

Staff is working to set up a follow up meeting with DWR to see if it’s possible to move up the evaluation of some of the Yolo County non-urban levees.