

Technical Advisory Meeting Notes – August 16, 2001

Dan Keppen, Chairman, opened the meeting with self-introductions followed by public comment and activity updates. Dan reminded the group of the Sacramento Water Forum meeting at the Heidrick Center in Woodland later that day. Tom Evans informed the group that the August 21st Comp. Study meeting location has changed from the Entry Office to Atwood Hall at the Colusa Fairgrounds. Henry Rodegerts provided copies of the final Biological Opinion to make available to the Board. The final report covers RM149 only - no decisions yet on the others. Burt noted Lt. Col. O'Brien and Field Supervisor White will be at the Board to discuss the Biological Opinion but have limited time for discussion because of the full agenda. Henry suggested this is an important issue and there should be more time allotted for discussion. Marie Sullivan announced a final assessment will be out this week on Boeger-Ward properties in Colusa County for 30 day review period.

- **Handbook Amendment Recommendations** - On August 8th the TAC Handbook amendment group met and recommended the following: (1) The committee determined that the most appropriate placement of the new language for the Reach 3 IRZ Guidelines was at the end of the text of the section, Inner River Zone Guidelines, Chapter 1, page 6 as a new paragraph. The new wording would also be removed from its location in the Reach 3 IRZG. Les Heringer talked to the Committee about the evolution of the language he had proposed, why it happened the way it did. He noted that the July 16th Princeton meeting on the inner river zone language for Reach 3 was the catalyst; he drafted a letter prior to that meeting indicating concern that the language was not sufficient. Les stated he and PCGID had sent suggested changes to the language in Reach 3; their suggestions had been included in the language presented at the July 16th TAC meeting but he did not feel the wording adequately expressed his concerns. He told the Committee he would re-work it and forward it to the SRCA staff for inclusion in the attachment that would be forwarded to the Board. At the July 26th Board Meeting Les discussed the reasons behind the additional proposed language for Reach 3.

Burt advised the Committee that John Merz, SRPT, unable to attend the meeting, had sent an e-mail that noted his objection to the insertion of the proposed language, he felt it goes above and beyond what the intent of the organization is - it needs to be brought up in a more timely manner for more discussion and that he was concerned about the process. Paul Ward, DFG, stated that the TAC was charged only with finding the best placement of the proposed language, not the language itself. Paul also noted he had the impression that the process was flawed here, that the TAC was not involved in the discussion as it should have been. Tom Evans noted the distinction of "being accepted and "being adopted", that the proposed amendments have been accepted to move forward for possible adoption. The proposed Handbook amendments will be referred to the Advisory Council for discussion, notification, but the final decision will be made by the SRCA Board. Discussion moved on to the Sacramento River Conservation Area and the suggestion from the sub-committee that (2) the glossary item be changed by deleting the last part of the definition and that the proposed new language be rescinded and that the Board give direction to the TAC to continue discussions of a definition for that area between the IRZ and the outer boundary of the Conservation Area. Process, again, was the issue; there was a feeling there had not been enough discussion. Burt also noted that the Handbook amendments will impact other areas in the Handbook including maps and acreages. Stacy Cepello, DWR, noted some areas of the Handbook will have to be changed to accommodate the amendments; how much latitude is there to change the Handbook to accommodate? He suggested possibly bringing back for review? Stacy also suggested using the website which could reflect changes in a month or two rather than printing hard copies. Henry asked

about SRCA staff having a master version of the Handbook available for reference in recognizing changes; now would be a good time to start tracking because current Handbook is the first one after the draft. Carol Wright, SRP, suggested that when making changes, should not try to attempt to identify every possible concern but use a broader latitude. Tom noted the process of "hammering out" is necessary. Shirley noted landowner fears have also prompted the detailed discussions. The TAC committee recommended moving forward to the Board with both recommendations, with concerns from John Merz and Paul Ward noted.

- **CALFED Proposal Presentations** - Paul Ward noted that in the past projects in the SRCA had to give prior official notification, if they did not, they would not be approved. That is not required now, nor do counties need to be notified. Burt noted, however, that there will be a 30-day period to review through the Board and the TAC those proposals that have been screened by CALFED. Marie suggested taking the issue back to Dan Castleberry for clarification on changes in the notification process. She also noted there is language in there that coordination with the SRCA is a priority with CALFED. The hard copies should be out this week or early next week, and are also available on the website calfed.water.ca.gov; proposals will be accepted electronically only. It was noted that although it is not required, proponents that are serious will bring to the SRCA Board. Stacy noted he would like to think that a project proponent would think the TAC and Board would be constructive and equitable in their review and would be recognized as a credible party to facilitate their project.
 1. Mike Roberts gave an overview of the TNC Proposals
 - a) Colusa Sub-Reach – area from Princeton to Colusa – Developing balanced conservation strategies and other uses of the floodplain.
 - b) Acquisition Proposals - Involves willing sellers, properties are erosion and flood prone. 3 parcels in Tehama County total approximately 400 acres in walnuts and prunes; 4 parcels in Butte County also approximately 400 acres, some row crops but predominately walnuts. Will talk with adjacent landowners and supervisors in respective counties.
 - c) Restoration Proposal for parcels in Hamilton City area - current ownership TNC & F&WS. Will contract out with local farmers to do the work – will be approximately 60% grassland. Will do scientific assessment on pests.
 - d) Monitoring Proposal – Will evaluate ecosystem response to restoration efforts, what have been the accomplishments, what needs to be changed?
 - e) Identifying balance of water needs – Looking at a series of workshops for stakeholders to look at ecosystem needs, and human needs to see if they are compatible and if all needs can be met.
 2. Lewis Bair, RD 108, discussed their proposal which would consolidate three pumping facilities into one. The facility would be centrally located, would be screened and would be out of the river except the screen. Will apply to CALFED for the final design.
 3. Stacy Cepello, DWR, discussed two proposals:
 - a) DWR has been trying to stabilize 70 acres south of Murphy Slough but the acreage is adjacent to 300 acres that are not managed and have been take over by star thistle. Will talk with Sacramento River Partners to see ERP proposal; makes sense to try to develop a long- term management plan. The property is in the flood plain, would use grassland approach.

Les Heringer, M&T, indicated they would like to talk to DWR about doing the work on this project when it reaches that point.

b) Sacramento River Science Program – Funding is in CALFED Science, not in DWR budget yet, hoping to apply to start the program with U.C. Davis, and Chico State.

- Burt Bundy gave the **Manager's Report** beginning with an update on the M&T/Llano Seco Pumps. A meeting was held on August 14 to discuss possible funding solutions for dredging the gravel bar. Plans are being developed and the costs to take the bar back to 1995 configuration are being determined. Work will be done mostly in the “dry” and the spoils placed on M&T property with the possibility of using for spawning gravel. Funding will be provided by the ranches and City of Chico. At Bloody Island, BLM has indicated that the second phase will probably start soon which will include some additional easements and acquisitions. Burt also discussed the Landowner Assurances Committee which met in July and August to discuss the scope, objectives and deliverables of the Committee. Issues discussed included “Safe Harbor”, Good Neighbor Policy, HCP, Incidental Take, and County planning policies. The PILT/Economic Impacts Committee chaired by Denny Bungarz will meet on August 17th; the Committee will be looking at solutions for PILT and economic impacts of land conversion.

Les Heringer reported to the TAC Committee that he had not received a response to a letter that had been sent to Patrick Wright requesting CALFED funding to assist with a short-term solution to the gravel bar situation. The letter had been sent under the Sacramento River Conservation Area letterhead in November, 2000. Les expressed his disappointment at the lack of funding and the failure of receiving a timely response.

The next meeting was set for September 20th at 9:30 a.m., Willows City Hall, Willows, Ca.