

## **Technical Advisory Committee Notes for June 21, 2001**

Chairman Dan Keppen opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. followed by self-introductions, announcements and public comment. Dawit Zeleke, TNC, talked about funding they have received in the amount of \$20,000.00 for a "Compatible Land Issues" project. The idea behind the grant is to look at issues that continue to come up as a result of diverse land use activities and the resultant impact on adjoining landowners. The money will be used to hire a professional facilitator and solutions to issues will be explored and, if no solutions, will try to do research to come up with solutions. Will e-mail the grant to anyone who would like a copy. Joe Silveira from USF&WS announced that public scoping meetings had been held the last week of May, first week of June in Willows, Chico, Red Bluff, and Colusa. The meetings were marginally attended with Chico the largest with 55 attendees. The common theme was concern about public access expressed by hunting and fishing groups. The public comments will be analyzed and there will be another public comment period on the plan after it is drafted. He noted that the Environmental Assessment Document is also out for public comment.

Scott Clemmons, WCB, met with representatives from Glenn County and the public works department concerning site 21 which is a public access site, one of a very few on state property. The county has managed the site for 25 years. The current agreement expires the middle of July and the county is looking at renewing that agreement and possibly making some improvements to the parking area. Dan announced a meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup> at the Heidrick Ag. Center from 1 –3 p.m. (Sacramento Valley Water Forum). Topics to be discussed will include the Klamath and ESA requirements. The Biological Opinion on riprap sites will also be discussed as well as the recent court decision in Tule Lake on "Take" issues. Marie Sullivan noted there is no date yet for the USF&WS Biological Opinion. Ernie Ohlin, Tehama County Flood Control, mentioned the Repanich place which was purchased two years ago by TNC and how well the planning process is working there. Dawit explained that after it was acquired, TNC realized not all the property needs to be restored; they are working on the draft to determine what will be restored and what will kept in agriculture. They may put an ag easement on the agricultural property and put it back on the market for private landowners to manage.

**MANAGERS REPORT** – Burt Bundy, SRCA Manager, was unable to attend the meeting; Pat Brown gave the report in his absence. Regarding the M&T/Llano Seco & Refuge Pumps, a letter was sent to Stillwater Sciences requesting answers to several questions raised at the May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and a more comprehensive report is expected soon. The Sacramento River Conservation Area has sent a letters of support for Tehama County's request that the Corps initiate a Section 1135 project at Woodson Bridge. It was noted that the SRCA newsletter will be expanded to include a section for updated project reports. It was asked that brief descriptions be provided to Pat or Burt by the date of the Board Meeting for inclusion in the next mailer. There will be a workshop on June 26<sup>th</sup> at the Veterans Hall in Meridian from 7-9 p.m. to discuss the IRZG in Reach 4 and on July 16<sup>th</sup>, a workshop will be held at the Princeton High School, Princeton to discuss the IRZG in Reach 3. The outline of time frame for providing amendments to the Handbook was noted. The Economic Impact Study has been finalized and copies were made available as well as copies of the letter to Tom Ellis that responded to concerns he raised at the February TAC meeting.

**COMMITTEE REPORT ON RIPRAP LANGUAGE IN HANDBOOK** - Dan reported on the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the riprap committee on the alternatives for the language on page 1-5 of the Handbook. Although none had unanimous support, some committee members felt that Alternative #2 was the one that most agreed was acceptable. After a lengthy discussion it was determined that consensus was still not there on any of the suggested alternatives. It was decided there should be

another meeting of the Bank Stabilization Committee as soon as possible to try to resolve and then bring to the next TAC meeting.

**HANDBOOK DEFINITIONS – REACHES 1, 3, & 4** - Stacy Cepello, DWR, discussed the IRZG in the 3 reaches noting there has been no suggested changes to the language in Reach 1. A proposed change on Reach 4 was brought to the meeting. During discussion a change was made to that language and was agreed upon by the Committee. The result was the following: “The Inner River Zone guidelines within Reach 4 consist of the floodway within the federally authorized flood control levees, which does not compromise the integrity of the levee structure or conflict with the operation and maintenance jurisdiction of local maintaining entities, as designated by The Reclamation Board”. A handout was made available by Stacy that included a suggested modification to Alternative #1, first proposed for discussion on May 17. Following discussion additional language was included which resulted in the following proposed definition: “The Inner River Zone Guidelines within Reach 3 consist of the area of the 100-year meanderbelt combined with 50-year erosion projections, which does not compromise the structural integrity of the federally authorized flood control levees or conflict with the operation and maintenance jurisdiction of local maintaining entities, as designated by The Reclamation Board”.

There was some discussion on the new proposed language for the conservation area that included the suggestion to call the area the Agricultural Habitat Conservation Area. There was a question raised about calling it an “agricultural area” when it also included areas that were not agricultural. It was determined that more discussion was needed on this issue. Tom Evans repeated the Family Water Alliance’s request to eliminate the area in Reach 4 from the SRCA.

**SAFE HARBOR PRESENTATION** - Vickie Campbell, USFWS, began with a discussion defining Safe Harbor agreements between USF&WS or National Marine Fisheries Service and landowners. She also discussed the definition of “Incidental Take and Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), which must accompany applications for incidental take permits. The purpose of the HCP with the permit is to ensure there is adequate minimizing and mitigating of the effects of the authorized incidental take. Vickie noted that the Federal “take” definition goes further than the California ESA; [www.fws.gov](http://www.fws.gov) was given as a good source of information on Safe Harbor and HCPS. Becky Miller, DF&G, discussed some of the regulations involved in the CESA “Incidental Take” and talked about NCCPS (Natural Community Conservation Plans) which are large general plans as opposed to project by project. The development of NCCPS is guided by an initial agreement between state and federal wildlife agencies, local jurisdictions, and other stakeholders and has to have maximization of wildlife benefits. Questions from the audience followed the presentation and included concerns about consequences to landowners should endangered species move onto their property as a result of habitat restoration efforts on adjacent lands.

Scott Clemons requested that the Activities Report section of the agenda be moved to the beginning of the meeting because too many people are unable to stay for the entire meeting and are leaving before hearing the updates.