



City of Woodland

**REPORT TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

AGENDA ITEM

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR  
AND CITY COUNCIL

DATE: March 17, 2009

SUBJECT: Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes for October 2008

**Report in Brief**

Attached are the October 6, 2008 Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes. These minutes were approved at the January 12, 2009 meeting.

**Background**

The Water Resources Association meets bi-monthly and submits meeting minutes to all jurisdictions attending the meeting. Meeting Minutes are then shared with Council.

**Recommendation for Action**

No action required. For information only.

Prepared by: Johanna Currie  
Management Analyst

Reviewed by: Gregor G. Meyer  
Public Works Director

---

Mark G. Deven  
City Manager

Attachments: October 6, 2008 Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2008 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.

Board members present: William Marble – City of Woodland, WRA Chair  
Sid England – University of CA Davis, WRA Vice-chair  
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County  
Ruth Admundson – City of Davis  
Regina Cherovsky – Reclamation District 2035

Alternate members present: Kurt Balasek – City of Winters, WRA Treasurer  
Jacques DeBra – City of Davis, Technical Committee Chair  
Helen Thomson – Yolo County  
Tim O’Halloran - Yolo County Flood Control & WCD

Members Agencies absent: City of West Sacramento  
Dunnigan Water District

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

**3. PUBLIC FORUM** – There were no comments from the public. Tim O’Halloran, YCFC&WCD, informed the WRA Board that a new YCFC&WCD representative to the WRA Board will be appointed at their October board meeting.

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

- a. Approve Minutes: July 1, 2008 Board meeting.
- b. Financial Reports: fiscal year end 6/30/08 and July – September 2008.
- c. Letter of Support for Cache Creek Conservancy funding application.

**5. AUTHORIZE SUPPORT LETTER TO STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

Rick Landon explained that under Proposition 84 there is \$8 million available through the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board for water quality projects relating to the agricultural irrigated lands program. An agency must be in an area that has a management plan in order to receive funding. The Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition has a plan submitted for this area. Grant administration procedures have been changed. Previously staff from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board administered the grant, but instead they will now be subcontracting this function and are accepting bid proposals. The Coalition for Urban Rural Environmental Stewardship (CURES) was one of three applicants that Yolo County and other local agencies have experience working with on the agricultural irrigated lands program. Yolo County would appreciate a support letter from the WRA’s in support of CURES administering the grant program. The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved sending a support letter. WRA staff will work with Rick Landon to draft an appropriate support letter for signature by the Bill Marble, WRA Chair.

**6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT AND INFORMATION**

- a) *Executive Committee Report:* The Committee met on 8/19 and 9/16.
  - 1) The Executive Committee is recommending that an annual association report be submitted each fiscal year with the budget approval process. The Committee is also recommending that a 5-year report on the association be prepared initially to start the process. The annual report should be brief, one double-sided page and the 5-year report approximately 8-10 pages in length. Preparing

an annual report helps keep the association on task and beneficial to present to member agencies representatives for funding purposes.

- 2) The Executive Committee also discussed the benefits of strategic planning for future association growth. Chair Marble asked for Board feedback on how to structure strategic planning. This could be discussed at the Executive Committee, organize a separate committee from WRA members or the entire WRA Board could participate in a strategic planning session. Several Board members expressed that the entire WRA Board should be involved in the process. The Executive Committee will discuss a draft outline and plan a session for early next year.

- b) *Administrative Coordinator Report:* Sponsorship requests for the 2009 Yolo County Water Awareness Calendar have been mailed. Approximately \$2,000 has been received to date and Donna thanked the agencies that have contributed. A few more donations are expected before the October 8<sup>th</sup> deadline.

## **7. UPDATE ON YOLO COUNTY WATER ORDINANCES PROCESS**

Rick Landon, Yolo County Agricultural Commissioner, informed that County Counsel is close to finalizing a contract with Jeff Loux to facilitate the stakeholder process of developing the water ordinances and a water agency. The WRA has requested a copy of the contract and scope of work be shared when finalized. It was suggested that this information be posted on the WRA or County website for public access. The timeline was altered to accommodate stakeholders involved in the harvest season and will begin after harvesting.

## **8. WRA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC) REPORTS**

- a) *Technical Committee Update 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2008 Activities, Jacques DeBra, Chair*

Jacques highlighted several items from the report included with the October agenda. The projects that are receiving funding contributions from the 2008-09 WRA Project Funds budget are listed in Table 1 (page 23). WRA's funding contribution is helping to implement activities as detailed in Table 1. Jacques gave an overview of the opportunities available in the upcoming Proposition 84 funding cycle. He foresees the possibility of two large funding applications that include Yolo County along with other regions: a \$1 million IRWMP application that will be a multi-county effort and an application for up to \$1 million for flood efforts (regional collaboration to be identified). Yolo County priorities would be designated from the IRWMP. The WRA Technical Committee and the Board will be engaged in conversations early next year. A group of 10 Northern California counties (including Yolo) have been meeting to discuss the ability to "pre-agree" on the allocation of limited grant funds for all of the Sacramento Valley region rather than compete for these funds.

An IRWMP Update subcommittee has been designated by the Technical Committee to review changing legislative guidelines as they relate to the Yolo County IRWMP update and future funding opportunities process. An update from this subcommittee will be included on the January WRA Board agenda.

DWR finished their regional subsidence project (including Yolo County). Reported results are not expected until spring 2009.

- b) *Presentations:*

- **Yolo County Groundwater Monitoring Program - Max Stevenson, YCFC&WCD**

The groundwater monitoring program is Foundation Action 1 in the IRWMP adopted in 2007. The largest water reservoir in Yolo County is in the groundwater aquifer, the equivalent of approximately three Lake Shastas. Max began with a history of groundwater monitoring in Yolo County. Groundwater levels have been monitoring since the 1940's and some of that data is shared through the State's Water Data Library (WDL). In 2002, a county-wide Water Resources Information Database (WRID) was established with an AB 303 grant to share water level and quality data. Partial grant funding has continued the WRID project to be expanded and improved since its inception. There are approximately 500 wells all over Yolo County that contribute data to the WRID. Some of this data goes directly to the WDL. The YCFC&WCD coordinates nine agencies who voluntarily contribute data to the WRID through informal agreements. The data gathered is not duplicated, so

the two databases complement each other. One of the benefits of groundwater monitoring includes tracking how much water is in the aquifer. Local Groundwater Management Plans (GWMP) have established an early overdraft early warning system to alert multiple agencies if groundwater levels drop too low. Groundwater data is also used in various planning activities for construction and excavation, water supply planning, local GWMPs, groundwater quality protection, research, environmental planning and real estate transactions. Max gave some examples of how the database is used. Historically the groundwater database has been funded in the following manner – grants, YCFC&WCD funds, WRA project funds, direct contributions from cities and in-kind contributions from agencies. He provided estimates of in-kind expenses and costs for the monitoring program since 2004 (see PPT handout attached to minutes). The program has been largely funded by grants received by the YCFC&WCD. In addition to the WRID, the YCFC&WCD's AB 303 grant funding included other groundwater monitoring tasks such as developing the groundwater model (IGSM), recharging canals, water quality sampling; information that is related to the database.

The WRA Technical Committee discussed whether the Yolo County Groundwater Monitoring Program (an IRWMP Foundational Action) should continue to rely on annual WRA project funds. The following reasons were given in support of creating a permanent sustainable funding mechanism for the program:

- Equitable cost share (no one agency burdened)
- Improve usefulness and availability with regional coordination/data sharing
- Establish a long term commitment to Foundational Action #1

The next step suggested is to re-establish a Technical Committee groundwater subcommittee to determine how to create a sustainable funding mechanism. One potential suggestion would be to raise WRA member dues based on value and usefulness of the groundwater program to each agency. The suggested timeline is next fiscal year's budget and the *potential* increase would be \$8,000 to \$10,000/agency.

Max asked for WRA Board discussion and input on next steps. Each member agency needs to understand the direct benefits from the groundwater monitoring program and how the information impacts each individual agency to justify increasing contributions. For example, how is the monitoring data used once it is acquired? How is the gathered data analyzed? Tim O'Halloran explained that each run of a groundwater model simulation costs \$15,000. An annual report on groundwater conditions could be produced now that the database has been improved. Currently Max has been reporting on aquifer conditions verbally on an individual basis with each agency. Bill Brewster informed that SB 1938 includes a groundwater monitoring requirement. Therefore a monitoring program would be a key element to achieving groundwater management basin objectives and securing grant funding. Max reminded that although Yolo County had a lot of historical data, it was inconsistent. The quality of the data has been greatly improved with the development of the WRID, which will provide better analysis of aquifer conditions.

Chair Marble asked for comments from each member agency to assist the technical committee moving in the desired direction. The cities of Woodland and Davis indicated that the groundwater monitoring data has definitive value to their agencies. RD 108, RD 2035 and Tuleyome expressed that monitoring indicates how well we are managing the aquifer. Water quality information would be useful for the cities and agricultural interests in regards to state regulatory requirements. The groundwater monitoring program also has regional benefits extending beyond county borders, because it provides information on the impact between neighboring stakeholder activities. A regional approach to groundwater monitoring emphasizes collaboration, which is especially important in light of the uncertain impacts of climate change.

The WRA Board directed the Technical Committee to convene a groundwater subcommittee and make recommendations at the January WRA Board meeting. The subcommittee is tasked with recommending an appropriate funding mechanism, developing a set of principles to assign cost/benefit to program partners and identifying the products to be delivered by the program.

- **Sacramento Valley Flood Control Action Work Group – Lewis Bair, Reclamation District 108; Julia McIver, Yolo County; Tim O’Halloran, YCFC&WCD**

Lewis Bair has been involved with the Sacramento Valley Flood Control Action Work Group (SVFCAWG) since its formation and provided background information on the group’s evolution. Julia McIver and Tim O’Halloran will comment on their respective agency’s perspective and role in the group as participants in the SVFCAWG. Lewis manages RD 108, Sacramento River Westside Levee District and Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District. The three “sister districts” came together to respond to legislation sponsored by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) during a time when the State was reacting to the Hurricane Katrina crisis. SAFCA proposed purchasing easements on agricultural land north of Sacramento in an attempt to find economical fixes to levee problems and protect Sacramento from flood risk (SB 930). The concern from the Districts’ perspective is that partial purchases would create a checkerboard of easements that would financially inhibit their ability to implement effective flood protection. The Districts voiced their opposition to the proposed legislation, but could not effectively leverage their position. The bill passed and SAFCA was granted the authority to purchase easements outside of their boundaries.

About 8 months ago, SAFCA’s Natomas levee improvement project was developed. The project includes a Army Corps of Engineer’s process to prove that others are not being negatively impacted by implementation of their project with an opportunity to receive comments. SAFCA’s project document states that it is not raising levees that could cause levee failures. However, many levee failures are foundational and not from overtopping. The District’s contacted SAFCA to express their concerns that this project will have an impact on rural areas and that the new flood management funding would go to urban areas, ignoring many rural areas also impacted by levees. SAFCA agreed that flood improvements needed to be implemented in urban and rural areas. In response to this process, the SVFCAWG developed a draft Statement of Principles to begin discussions on where areas of agreement could be mutually beneficial. Shortly after this, new legislation initiated the State’s flood protection plan. The Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) is an important milestone and will be a document governing flood protection in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Valley. SAFCA and the SVFCAWG recognized an opportunity to have the draft principles included in the CVFPP. The SVFCAWG decided that the Statement of Principles needs to be expanded to include broader regional representation and began outreach to other flood control agencies. The SVFCAWG now includes Yolo County, the YCFC&WCD and other representation throughout the Sacramento Valley geographic area, such as, West SAFCA, Feather River, Bear River, Upper Sacramento River, and RD 2068 to name a few. The expanded SVFCAWG will develop a policy document to assist the State with the development of the CVFPP. The State has a fast-track timeline for adoption of the CVFPP by 2011. A series of regional meetings are being conducted to gather information. Consultants have been hired to write a draft white paper with the concept of providing a unified document representing all the regional agencies. A copy of the draft Statement of Principles was available to those interested.

Lewis answered questions from the WRA Board and encouraged anyone with input to contact either himself, Tim or Julia with their ideas. The WRA extended a special invitation to reclamation districts with flood control responsibilities to today’s meeting specifically to bring awareness about the SVFCAWG’s regional efforts and advocate the biggest benefit for everyone in Yolo County.

One question raised was how this process is influenced by the adoption of Propositions 84 and 1E and funding for flood management activities. Julia McIver responded with input received from various DWR meetings she has attended on this topic. It is obvious to the State that there is not enough money to fix all the urban levees, not to mention the rural levees too. There is a lack of policy clarity for non-urban levee standards and therefore urban and non-urban levee projects will be addressed differently. Yolo County is assisting in developing policy clarity, because they coordinate both urban and non-urban areas. The SVFCAWG believes that a system wide approach should be used to justify flood projects, otherwise rural projects have a difficult time securing federal funding even though many of them are subject to federal levee design criteria and standards. Various flood funding is anticipated to be available through SB 1xx and Prop. 1E; some money is regulated through these grant

programs and some directly through DWR expenditure. Julia added that having flood projects in the Yolo County IRWMP is very important to DWR. Not only because flood funding will most likely flow through the IRWM program, but also because DWR views these as priority projects for our region to garner future bond funding. The Yolo County IRWMP was commended by DWR for including a flood element when other IRWMP's did not. It is important that any additional flood projects are included in amendments to the Yolo County IRWMP.

Tim explained that the SVFCAWG efforts intersect well with existing IRWMP Integrated Projects and the floodSAFE Yolo Pilot Program. Julia reminded that the CVFPP is also intersecting with the Delta Vision process and the focus on flooding and habitat in the Delta (in the lower bypass east to Sacramento River in Yolo County). Today's presentation was meant to provide information and awareness about the SVFCAWG, who will provide updates to the WRA Technical Committee regarding their progress.

**9. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

The YCFC&WCD and City of Woodland shared brief member reports.

**10. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

Monday, January 12, 2009, 3-5 pm, Woodland Community & Senior Center (availability to be confirmed).

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Donna L. Gentile*

Donna L. Gentile

WRA Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator