



City of Woodland

REPORT TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR
AND CITY COUNCIL

DATE: April 13, 2010

SUBJECT: Water Resources Association Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
for January 2010

Report in Brief

Attached are the January 11, 2010 Water Resources Association Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. These minutes were approved at the March 15, 2010 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: January 11, 2010 Water Resources Association Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
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
Regina Cherovsky – Reclamation District 2035
Cecilia Aguiar-Curry – City of Winters
Ruth Asmundson – City of Davis
Sid England – UC Davis
Fritz Durst – Reclamation District 108
Gary Schaad – Dunnigan Water District
Don Peart - Colusa County Water District

Alternate members present: Kurt Balasek – City of Winters, WRA Treasurer
Donita Hendrix - Dunnigan Water District
Shelly Murphy – Colusa County Water District
Tim O’Halloran – Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Jacques De Bra – City of Davis
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County
Lewis Bair – Reclamation District 108

Associate members present: Lynnel Pollock – Cache Creek Conservancy

Members Agencies absent: City of West Sacramento

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

3. PUBLIC FORUM

Bob Schneider, Tuleyome, informed the WRA that he has been participating in the Delta mercury TMDL stakeholder group. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) meeting on April 22nd will cover that topic. Mercury issues are one of the items being highlighted by local representatives attending the upcoming Cap-to-Cap trip in Washington, DC. The WRA Technical Committee has been tracking this process.

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

- a. Approve Minutes: November 9, 2009 Board meeting
- b. Receive financial reports: November – December 2009
- c. Receive minutes of Executive Committee meeting: 11/3/09
- d. Receive minutes of Technical Committee meetings: 10/1/09 and 11/5/09

5. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. *Report from the WRA Chair* – Bill Marble reported on his attendance (co-sponsored by the WRA and the City of Woodland) at the December conference of the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA). He attended sessions on a variety of topics including the state legislation and bond package, groundwater management and the Delta. He found the conference extremely informative and appreciated the opportunity to represent the WRA and the City of Woodland.
- b. *WRA’s The Year in Review: 2009* – The second annual newsletter was included in the agenda packet. A color version was sent with the emailed agenda and hard copies will be mailed later this month. Suggestions are always welcome for future annual reports.

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

- c. *2010 Yolo County Water Awareness Calendar* – The 2010 calendar is available and will be distributed throughout the schools in Yolo County later this month. Donna thanked all the local sponsors for their generous contributions.

6. 2010 ANNUAL MEETING/OFFICER ELECTIONS

Tim O'Halloran was chair of the Nominating Committee along with Duane Chamberlain and Sid England. The Nominating Committee recommends the following Board elections and appointments: William Marble, Chair; Sid England, Vice-chair; Kurt Balasek, Treasurer; Jacques De Bra, Technical Committee Chair; Donna Gentile, Secretary; and Perry, Bunch, Battaglia & Johnson, Inc., Auditor. Ruth Asmundson moved to accept the Nominating Committee's recommendations. Bill Marble seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

7. YOLO COUNTY UPDATE

- a. *Water Committee Process Update*: Dirk Brazil, Deputy Yolo County Administrator, informed that Jeff Loux is preparing a draft progress report on the committee's research to advise the Yolo County Board of Supervisors on water policy, governance and management issues relating to protecting the County's water resources (e.g. groundwater monitoring, conjunctive use, water transfers). The report will be presented to the Board for directional purposes only in late January or February. Dirk will forward the draft report to the WRA and stakeholders when available. Although many WRA member agency representatives have been participating in the water committee, some of the WRA members are not as familiar with this process. Dirk gave an overview of the process for the benefit of those WRA members. WRA Board members commented that hopefully the Yolo County Board of Supervisors recognizes that more outreach and consensus is needed before they take action.
- b. *Discussion of possible WRA position relating to water committee proposal*: The WRA Board had not taken a formal position on the water committee's recommendations. The WRA Board requests a formal presentation from Yolo County when appropriate to their internal review process. The WRA Board will then discuss and comment as appropriate.

8. LEGISLATIVE WATER ISSUES UPDATE

- a. *State Water Legislative Package Review*: Tim O'Halloran, YCFCWCD, provided an informal update now that the legislature is back in session. He highlighted several issues of importance for the WRA Board. The SWRCB has begun hearings to determine flow criteria. The local concern is that they will apply the Delta Vision Plan flow suggestions. A fair, science based hearing is preferred by many stakeholders. The term "criteria" still needs to be defined. The entire SWRCB process is new and still being developed. They have 9 months to complete their determinations. Local input is being provided to the SWRCB through the Northern California Water Association and other agencies, such as ACWA, YCFCWCD and RD 108. Implementation of the water legislative package is also important. The WRA Technical Committee members are monitoring components that relate to local agencies and issues: groundwater monitoring, urban and agricultural water conservation, and water rights related fees. The \$11 billion bond obligation is a concern, because it creates a \$700 million annual obligation on the general fund. There is the potential that the State will try to backfill this burden through a fee structure, possibly on the backs of local government. Surface water fees of this nature could make local agriculture unsustainable. Warren Westrup informed about the Delta County Coalition and other Yolo County efforts to monitor and respond to these issues. The Delta County Coalition and ACWA are developing an organizational Delta flow chart and critical issue timelines to help make sense of the myriad of concurrent activities and agencies. Warren and Tim will share any flow charts developed with the WRA. Dirk Brazil reported on efforts to engage Senatorial representation on Delta issues and legislation.

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

As a member of ACWA, several YCFCWCD Board members along with Bill Marble accompanied Tim to meet with ACWA and air concerns about the controversial position they took on the Delta water package last year. The discussion is germane to the WRA to identify how ACWA will be supportive of local efforts in the future and what their future position may be on Delta issues. Yolo County representatives will continue to stay engaged in this process as things unfold.

Jacques De Bra mentioned the Build America bonds program established as part of the Federal stimulus effort which is expiring at the end of 2010. It offers an attractive funding vehicle for water agencies to implement some of the costly efforts discussed today. When speaking with Federal representatives, we may want to voice encouragement that this program be extended beyond 2010.

- b. *Consideration of Board direction regarding State water legislation:* The Board requested that the Technical Committee review the implementation of the groundwater and water conservation legislative components as it relates to WRA member agencies and report back to the Board at the next meeting.

9. WRA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE UPDATES

- a. *Technical Committee update:* Currently the Technical Committee is undertaking a review of the 2007 adopted IRWMP integrated actions. The IRWMP is a living document that needs to be periodically revisited and updated. The Technical Committee has a 3-step approach to the update process. First, all eight integrated lead partners have been asked to provide an update on the progress made on their integrated actions. The status of IRWMP foundational actions will also be reviewed. The second step is evaluating all the information once the compilation is complete. The third step is reporting to the WRA Board and seeking direction on how to implement updating the IRWMP document. The anticipated timeline for this entire process is 6 to 9 months.
- b. *Update on Proposition 84:* The Proposition 84 water bond passed at the end of 2006 and held great promise for over \$800 billion dollars of resource funds that has not yet materialized. Grant eligibility is dependent on being part of a California Department of Water Resources (DWR) approved funding area. Yolo County is part of the Sacramento Valley funding region which is comprised of 10 counties. The Westside Regional Water Management Group (Yolo, Solano, Lake, Napa, and Colusa counties) established an MOU and was accepted by DWR as a subset of the Sacramento Valley region. This process is subject to DWR's schedule and grant funds have not been released pending State budget challenges. The Westside RWMG plans to apply for a \$1 million planning grant and a \$1 million flood grant. Westside RWMG governance issues are still being discussed, such as, how to manage a regional funding process, who the lead entities will be, and who will serve as the fiscal agent for the projects. During the first 6-8 months of 2010, DWR will likely be continuing the pre-qualifying process until grant funds are ready to be allocated. DWR has not guaranteed or authorized any of the Proposition 84 funds at this time. The WRA TC will keep the Board informed as DWR's schedule changes.

The Board questioned the inter-relationship between the Yolo County IRWMP and the Westside RWMG. The Yolo County IRWMP is our local guiding document. Another layer of regional planning will need to be incorporated with the other Westside RWMG counties. The focus will be on identifying projects and benefits of watershed-based actions in order to pursue funding opportunities through the Westside RWMG MOU. The Westside RWMG has not yet begun identifying specific multi-county projects for grant funding yet. The group continues to focus on governance and organizational planning issues that are challenging in a 5 county process. Bob Schneider requested to be included in the meeting schedule for the Westside RWMG. The project selection and planning process will be an open process when begun. Ideally, we want to be well-prepared by the time grant funds are released.

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

- c. *Yolo County Groundwater Conditions Update:* Max Stevenson, YCFCWCD, manages the regional groundwater monitoring program. Max gave a groundwater conditions report as of fall 2009 on water quantity. Last January, Max presented a groundwater monitoring program budget and proposal to the WRA Board. The Board voted to support the ongoing countywide monitoring program by contributing funding based on agency size and level of benefit (this was in addition to WRA member dues). The YCFCWCD remains the main program contributor and manager. A map illustrated the 450 monitoring wells in the program (about 150 are YCFCWCD wells). About 100 of these wells have been monitored since the 1940-50's and have therefore captured information on 2 major drought periods in 1977 and the early 1990's. The program monitors well water levels twice a year – spring and fall. Max illustrated the historical changes in water quantity with 2 graphs. A hydrograph demonstrated the seasonal changes and drought impacts for a single well from 1950 to 2005. The early 1990's drought recharged the aquifer quicker than 1977 because Indian Valley Reservoir was built and increased storage capacity for the Cache Creek system. The second graph demonstrated the spring/high and fall/low percentages of groundwater depths (from 1975 to 2009) compared to the all-time low in fall 1977. As of fall 2009, the groundwater levels are about half-way to the lowest recorded depths in 1977. An overdraft early warning system is proposed if 75% of the wells reached a 75% depth to groundwater ratio low. Max showed a graph of groundwater storage in the Central Valley Region to give a broader groundwater conditions perspective (source: USGS data 1962-2002). Overall, the Sacramento Valley region's groundwater levels are faring better than other Central Valley regions. Max responded to questions. The YCFCWCD was acknowledged for their development and support of the monitoring program. If anyone has additional questions, they can contact Max at (530) 662-0265. He expects to publish an annual report in February.

Max was asked to briefly report on the AB 303 grant awarded to the YCFCWCD, including regional participation by the cities of Woodland and Davis. Grant funding has been suspended, however \$100,000 was recently released and YCFCWCD can request reimbursement for some of the work conducted that includes groundwater simulation runs, additional monitoring, water quality sampling, and active recharge. Chair Marble echoed that this cooperative venture wouldn't be successful without the commitment of local agencies and individual dedication.

10. PRESENTATION – Rich Marovich from the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee was unable to attend today's meeting.

11. PRESENTATION – Fran Borcalli, Program Manager, gave an update on the floodSAFE Yolo Pilot Program. The Program's second annual report was available at the meeting. The Program emerged from the Yolo County IRWMP development effort and implementation of the flood management element of the Cache Creek Integrated Project and the Yolo County Sloughs, Canals & Creeks Management Program (2 of the 8 IRWMP Integrated Projects). The YCFCWCD, City of Woodland and Yolo County recognized a need for a coordinated entity to deal with Cache Creek flood management issues. Those agencies entered into an MOU and jointly funded the floodSAFE Yolo Pilot Program for 2 years. The program is considered a "pilot" program because it does not cover the entire county. It focuses on the western part of the county – Colusa Basin Drain to Knights Landing Ridge cut to the west levee of the Yolo Bypass. floodSAFE Yolo is laying the groundwork for local cities and the County to comply with flood safety legislation adopted in January 2008 – the requirement to adopt a flood safety element as part of the general plan for rural and urban areas. The prerequisites to establishing an ongoing flood management entity are institutional structure and stable funding. It is difficult to establish an entity with funding without a project in place. The Cache Creek Flood Risk Reduction Project has been identified as the catalyst to move to the next implementation level.

floodSAFE Yolo has accomplished several important tasks since its inception. Accomplishments include: topographic mapping of Yolo County (an IRWMP foundational action), initiated arundo removal program,

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

completed a city/county drainage manual, a Cache Creek hydrology update, convened a Cache Creek Settling Basin symposium, preliminary analysis of Cache Creek flood risk reduction alternatives and published two annual program reports. Several activities are currently in progress: development of a US Army Corps of Engineers/Central Valley Flood Protection Board/Local cost share agreement to continue the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study, development of a public outreach program, and coordination with FloodSAFE California flood management planning. FloodSAFE California is conducting floodplain topographic mapping and surveys under the Central Valley Floodplain Evaluation and Delineation Program. Mapping will be done the early part of this year on Cache Creek, Putah Creek, Willow Slough and Dry Slough. The State is covering the cost for these elements and other investigations. This information provides value for our region, which is needed to implement some of the actions in the Yolo County IRWMP. Fran noted that State related activities have been slow to progress due to the State's budget problems that began last year.

Chair Bill Marble asked Fran to elaborate on the timing for completing the Cache Creek Feasibility Study and seeking Federal funding to assist in completing the study. The Cache Creek Feasibility Study was never completed. It began in 2000 and was stopped in 2003. The original federal and state authorization for that study is still in place. Fran reported that last year's USACE proposed budget for the study was greater than could be cost shared by the federal and state partners. floodSAFE Yolo has a meeting next week with the USACE and DWR to arrive at a figure everyone can agree upon for this year's appropriations request. It is important to present a consistent request by all the agencies to our congressional representatives.

Fran and Bill answered a question regarding the status of developing flood solutions for Woodland. A preferred solution has been identified by floodSAFE Yolo, which was presented and discussed by stakeholders at the Cache Creek Settling Basin Symposium in June 2009. The existing Settling Basin levee creates a dam that is a barrier for flood waters to reach the Yolo Bypass. The proposal to move the west levee in and the north levee farther north would allow for the creation of a floodway into the Yolo Bypass. Fran illustrated several historic flooding scenarios and the Settling Basin conceptual floodway in PowerPoint slides (based on 100-year flood protection). The proposed solution is an attempt to *manage* the floodplain by creating a floodway, not *eliminate* the floodplain by building higher levees. There are issues and funding agreements to be settled with the USACE and DWR, which the completion of the Feasibility Study would assist in mitigating. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mandates a 100-year flood protection standard. However, new State legislation will mandate a 200-year flood protection standard in General Plans for urban areas greater than 10,000.

Bob Schneider inquired about funding for mercury issues in the Settling Basin and the 2011 federal appropriations requests. Last year YCFCWCD was the lead agency in a federal appropriations request for Cap-to-Cap in Washington, DC. YCFCWCD agreed to be the lead again this year on the Cap-to-Cap lobbying trip in April. Tim informed that in order for a project to be eligible for an appropriation request, it must already have a federal authorization component. The Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study request is tied to a federal process asking for continued support for Remediation of Abandoned Mines (RAMS). The request is not specific to mercury mediation in the Cache Creek Settling Basin. It is a broader request that is beyond the boundaries of Yolo County. There is a nexus between the RAMS project and the Bay-Delta mercury TMDL process.

Lewis Bair reported on levee deficiencies from a 1986 flood event that includes the Knights Landing area which is now in the final design stage. RD 108 has been working with the USACE to complete about \$18 million in levee construction in 2011 and 2012. RD 108 will be asking for substantial federal funding for this effort. There can be challenges to requesting too much federal funding for one area and Lewis asked to meet with Yolo County and other local agencies to coordinate their requests. It was noted that there is a February deadline for federal appropriation request material to be submitted to congressional and senatorial representatives. Each has its own deadline date. The Sacramento Metro Chamber, the regional Cap-to-Cap trip sponsor, has its own timeline. Yolo

**MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

representatives attending this year's trip are striving to have local projects presented to the Chamber's delegation teams by their deadlines.

The cities of Davis and Winters are likely to be subject to flood management issues in the 200-year flood protection plan scenarios that they are currently not addressing. Both agencies were invited to discuss the opportunities to participate in the floodSAFE Yolo Pilot Program by meeting with Fran Borcalli.

12. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No member reports were given.

Future agenda items:

- Yolo County Water Committee presentation
- Delta Mercury TMDL Process presentation

13. NEXT MEETING DATE: March 15, 2010 from 3-5 pm, Woodland Community Center

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

Respectfully submitted,

Donna L. Gentile

Donna L. Gentile

WRA Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator