



Tehama County  
Monday, August 18, 2025 10:00 AM  
Flood Control and Water Conservation  
District  
Meeting Minutes

Tehama County Board of Supervisors  
Chambers  
727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080  
<https://tehamacounty.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

**10:00 AM**

Chairperson: Matt Hansen Vice-Chairperson: Pati Nolen  
Directors: Greg Jones, Rob Burroughs, Tom Walker

Justin Jenson, Deputy Director of Public Works-Water Resources; Lena Sequeira,  
Administration

**Present** Director Pati Nolen, Vice Chair Matt Hansen, Director Greg Jones,  
and Director Rob Burroughs  
**ABSENT** Director Tom Walker

### **Public Comment**

A resident shared that they have a well and expressed their opinion regarding a large document. They also commented on meeting attendance and asked whether golf courses are permitted to use groundwater.

Hansen informed the resident that while concerns may be shared, this portion of the meeting is not designated for questions and answers.

The resident asked where members of the public could go to get answers to questions regarding water.

Jenson provided information about the meetings, and the resident continued asking questions.

Hansen interjected, letting the resident know he can contact Jenson directly for specific questions if the information is not available online.

The resident proceeded to ask multiple questions.

Nolen commented that counties experiencing water issues are implementing similar measures.

Jenson stated that he could address the resident's questions after the meeting.

Jones stated that comments made during Public Comment are for citizens to share statements and that the board cannot engage in discussion during this time.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **25-1468**  
**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 5/19/2025

**RESULT:** APPROVE

**MOVER:** Pati Nolen

**SECONDER:** Greg Jones

**AYES:** Director Nolen, Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, and Director Burroughs

**ABSENT:** Director Walker

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **25-1469**  
**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 6/16/2025

**RESULT:** APPROVE

**MOVER:** Pati Nolen

**SECONDER:** Greg Jones

**AYES:** Director Nolen, Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, and Director Burroughs

**ABSENT:** Director Walker

3. **Approve Calsip Consultant Services Agreement for Davids Engineering Inc.** **25-1477**

Jenson explained that the item was approved with Calsip to expand the creek data network to better monitor creek levels and flows. While some work is being done under Prop 68 Round 2, this project is fully state-funded and aims to fill data gaps, with a five-year maintenance commitment. He noted that Prop 68 Round 2 funds were used to hire David's Engineering to assist with the grant application and define project needs. Jenson stated that David's Engineering will give a presentation today, with the goal of obtaining approval to sign a contract with them.

Cassie Clark and Jeff Davids from David's Engineering presented to the group. Davids reviewed the presentation outline and provided background on the company. He explained that they are collaborating with LSCE on groundwater sustainability and with other groups on various objectives. He also described Calsip as the California Stream Gage Improvement Program and explained that stream gages are devices used to measure water levels in streams.

Clark reviewed the overall project scope and timeline, noting that the schedule will follow the executed agreement already in place. She highlighted that one key requirement is to have the stream gages installed by October 2026.

Discussion took place on how the streams were selected and the funding sources associated with the project.

Clark reviewed the contract requirements with DWR for the stream gages, explaining that once sites are selected and approved, the team will move into the design and permitting phase. She noted that David's Engineering will oversee the entire process, including installation, and will begin collecting data beforehand to address any existing gaps. They will also handle all reporting to DWR as required. The next steps include reviewing preexisting data and having the infrastructure team develop concept designs to determine the most effective installation approach.

Discussion followed regarding the monitoring that was previously conducted by the state and what monitoring activities are currently being performed.

A resident asked who is responsible for determining what monitoring is currently being conducted and who is overseeing that effort.

Jenson explained that LSCE received information on existing and historical monitoring at the start of the research. He added that the current goal is to identify and fill data gaps to better understand water sources and movement throughout the system.

Discussion followed regarding data monitoring efforts and the associated costs.

**RESULT:** APPROVE  
**MOVER:** Greg Jones  
**SECONDER:** Rob Burroughs  
**AYES:** Director Nolen, Vice Chair Hansen, Director Jones, and Director Burroughs  
**ABSENT:** Director Walker

#### **4. Estimated Funds Required Presentation**

**25-1473**

Commentary on prioritizing expenditures

Jenson began by noting that in the previous meeting he presented steps for funding decisions for GSA-based activities. He explained that this is the first step in determining how much funding is needed. With the assistance of a consultant, a proposed long-term agency budget has been developed. Since this is the first time a long-term methodology has been created, much of the budget is based on estimates.

He outlined two cost categories: the first includes mandatory activities required for groundwater management, detailing what those entail, and the second covers discretionary activities, where the agency decides how much to implement. Jenson reviewed the individual proposed categories within this section in detail.

Discussion took place regarding the data sources and the estimates related to 200 acre-feet.

Jenson clarified the approach for incentive-based items, explaining in detail how they are allocated. He elaborated on the cost savings of incentives compared to building infrastructure and noted that there are two methods for dividing or charging these costs, which the board will need to decide. He emphasized that the state will not continue funding these programs, so fees will be necessary, and that the proposed approach will be compared to similar programs in other parts of the state.

Discussion took place regarding estimates, data collection, and the timeline for moving forward.

Jones asked about conducting funding in a way that would tax the larger users more.

Jenson replied that baseline costs would be shared across all users, emphasizing that the goal is to address the problem, with recommendations coming from the Demand Management program. He further explained the different layers of costs in various areas.

Hansen asked about the legal implications of basing decisions on estimates, questioning how assumptions can be made when costs are uncertain and how such issues can be addressed.

Jenson responded that they have reliable cost estimates based on charges per acre-foot. He provided examples of dividing the costs among different groups and explained that, once incorporated into the framework, the proposed fees would be presented for public vote. The fee would remain in place until it is reassessed five years later.

Discussion took place regarding the cost of the periodic evaluation and the work involved in completing it.

Hansen shared his opinion on the estimates, expressing that he believes replacing a single dry well is insufficient for well mitigation. He offered his thoughts and recommendations for that portion of the budget.

Jenson responded that it is impossible to predict how many wells will go dry over a five-year period, so a conservative estimate was used to keep costs as low as possible. He emphasized the need to ensure sufficient funding for well mitigation obligations and noted that this involves risk. Jenson stressed that input from the board is crucial to determine how much risk they are willing to accept, and this feedback is necessary to finalize and gain approval for the plan.

Discussion took place regarding the one-million-dollar reserve for dry well replacement and the influence of DWR on related decisions.

Burroughs clarified that these efforts are intended to be proactive in addressing state mandates.

Discussion took place regarding potential litigation and the resources the county has to review and protect itself.

Jenson reiterated that he believes the incentive-based approach will be effective.

Hansen requested that the discussed changes be implemented.

A resident asked if there is a plan for how the public will cover the costs.

Jenson explained that this is currently being addressed, as they are working to determine how the public will pay fees associated with SGMA.

A resident commented on others' water usage and asked what the estimated charges for the public will be.

Jenson addressed and clarified the resident's concerns.

A resident asked if there is an approximate estimate of the charges.

Jones stated that the majority of fees will be applied to larger water users.

Burroughs asked if Jenson could provide a breakdown of domestic versus commercial use to help people better understand their respective portions.

Jenson stated that the breakdowns will be presented when that portion of the discussion occurs.

A caller shared their opinion on the documents and requested additional information.

## **5. Flood Related Items**

**25-1470**

Open discussion for flood related items.

Jenson began by stating that he wanted to discuss potential solutions for flood-related issues in the county. He reviewed infrastructure costs and outlined the district's authorities, referencing FEMA's flood insurance costs and going through the district's powers as detailed in the official document.

Jones asked about the funding.

Jenson explained that the discussion specifically concerns implementing measures and provided examples. He continued reviewing the district's authorities and reiterated that the purpose of the presentation is to outline what the district can do to address flood-related issues.

Hansen stated that since this gives the authority to address the problems, it raises the question of why action can't be taken.

Jenson clarified that the authority does not allow the district to enter private property or

mandate creek clearing; it does not provide the power to perform the work directly. He explained that this is why having a list of potential projects with cost estimates is useful in case grant funding becomes available.

Hansen asked what actions could be taken if a resident constructs a berm that causes flooding.

Jenson explained that a letter could be sent requesting the resident to remedy the situation, and they could face a civil suit. He also outlined the process involved in taking such action.

Hansen noted that residents are frustrated because they feel no assistance is being provided and expressed his opinion that the district should be more responsive.

Jenson stated that if the district is made aware of such issues, they can investigate and outlined the potential problems that could arise.

Discussion took place regarding dedicating a flood zone and the associated costs. The conversation then shifted to legal options for clearing vegetation on private property and determining responsibility for maintenance.

Jenson stated that he could create a guidance document for the website outlining property owners' responsibilities and what actions they can take.

Burroughs shared his thoughts on the importance of educating the public in this manner.

Jenson discussed areas experiencing significant repetitive flooding that should be designated as flood zones and explained how FEMA could intervene in locations with repeated claims within those zones.

Discussion took place regarding water rights.

Hansen asked what factors determine the creation of a flood zone.

Jenson explained that establishing a flood zone requires a vote by the people who benefit and would be charged. He detailed different scenarios and described how such decisions are made.

Hansen asked how the flood maps are updated.

Jenson explained that flood maps are updated through surveys, which can be requested, and noted that flood zone mapping is available on FEMA's website. Discussion took place regarding zoning and how zoning decisions are determined.

**6. Updates**

**25-1471**

**Well Mitigation**

Jenson stated that they are working on scheduling to get the working group together for their first meeting.

Discussion on who is involved in that meeting.

**Recharge**

They actively have a contract with a legal sub consultant to track down water sources for recharge. They are waiting to hear back from them to move forward.

**Demand Management**

They have a STRAW proposal in place. There is a list of issues to address and they are going to schedule a meeting to discuss. After that they will have something to bring to the commission at next months meeting.

Discussion on the domestic well monitoring.

**7. Board Matters**

None

**Adjourn**

11:51 AM



APPROVED   
Chairperson

Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
Board of Directors

By   
Deputy