



Tehama County  
Thursday, March 26, 2026 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: Tom Walker Vice-Chairperson: Greg Jones  
Directors: Rob Burroughs, Matt Hansen, Steve Zane

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

### **Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance / Introductions**

10:00AM

<b>Present</b>	Director Matt Hansen, Vice Chair Greg Jones, Director Rob Burroughs, and Chairperson Tom Walker
<b>ABSENT</b>	Director Steve Zane

### **Public Comment**

A resident presented an ordinance and expressed their view on what it meant. They questioned the authority of the Groundwater Commission and continued to give their interpretation on the ordinance. They asked for the ordinance to be amended.

A resident stated that they were DWR's point of contact for Tehama County and offered to provide a conditions update at a future meeting. He gave an overview of what the presentation could look like.

A resident called in and provided an interpretation of the authorities of the Groundwater Commission and the Flood Board.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Flood Control BOD 10/20/2025**

**26-0428**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 10/20/2025

**RESULT:** APPROVE  
**MOVER:** Matt Hansen  
**SECONDER:** Greg Jones  
**AYES:** Director Hansen, Vice Chair Jones, Director Burroughs, and Chairperson Walker  
**ABSENT:** Director Steve Zane

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Flood Control BOD 11/17/2025**

**26-0429**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 11/17/2025

A resident commented on their opinion of the governance structure.

**RESULT:** APPROVE  
**MOVER:** Matt Hansen  
**SECONDER:** Greg Jones  
**AYES:** Director Matt Hansen, Vice Chair Greg Jones, Director Rob Burroughs, and Chairperson Tom Walker  
**ABSENT** Director Steve Zane

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Flood Control BOD 12/15/2025**

**26-0430**

a) Waive the reading and approve the minutes of the regular meeting held 12/15/2025

**RESULT:** APPROVE  
**MOVER:** Matt Hansen  
**SECONDER:** Greg Jones  
**AYES:** Director Hansen, Vice Chair Jones, Director Burroughs, and Chairperson Walker  
**ABSENT:** Director Steve Zane

**4. Accept December 2025 - February 2026 GSA Claims (603)**

**26-0425**

A resident called in asking about the amount in the bank account, shared their opinion on the water code, and asked who oversees the budget.

Jenson responded that the code referenced was not applicable. He explained that the negative balance reflects reimbursable grant funds and noted that the account balance can be included at the time the agenda is prepared.

Jones asked if funds for professional and special services could be itemized.

Jenson requested clarification on what level of detail is being requested, noting that consultants provide presentations outlining work completed to date.

Jones clarified that the request applies to each section.

Jenson stated he could provide a task expenditure list.

Hansen noted that the budget is reviewed annually as part of the process.

Jenson confirmed.

A resident commented on a payment to Swanson Law and shared their opinion on the appropriateness of releasing records.

**RESULT: APPROVE**

**MOVER:** Matt Hansen

**SECONDER:** Greg Jones

**AYES:** Director Matt Hansen, Vice Chair Greg Jones, Director Rob Burroughs, and Chairperson Tom Walker

**ABSENT** Director Steve Zane

**5. Accept December 2025 - February 2026 Flood Claims (604)**

**26-0426**

Jenson stated that these expenses are reimbursable by grant and are related to levee maintenance. He provided background on the project.

Walker asked about the negative balance.

Jenson explained that the Flood Fund covers costs until reimbursement is received and described the process.

Discussion followed regarding the process.

A resident commented on the budgetary process and the Board's role.

Walker asked whether the Board of Directors is a member of the GSA.

Jenson stated that the District is the GSA and the GSA is the District.

Walker asked who appoints members to the Commission.

Jenson stated that the Commission serves as a recommending body to the GSA for GSA-related actions and explained the authority of each entity.

Discussion followed regarding agency roles and applicable regulations.

A resident shared their opinion on overlapping authorities and questioned the credit fund.

Jenson clarified by explaining that Public Works performs labor on behalf of the District and is reimbursed, and noted that standard purchasing processes do not apply in these cases.

Discussion followed on the process.

A resident commented on the contract with LSCE.

Jenson stated that there is a contract for a specified amount approved by the Board, which includes listed subcontractors.

**RESULT:** APPROVE  
**MOVER:** Matt Hansen  
**SECONDER:** Greg Jones  
**AYES:** Director Hansen, Vice Chair Jones, Director Burroughs, and  
Chairperson Walker  
**ABSENT:** Director Steve Zane

## **6. Flood Flow Diversion Program**

**26-0433**

Jenson presented the Flood Flow Diversion Program, outlining how it would function. He noted that the program relies on a combination of new and existing California regulations to allow notification to users to divert water from streams during flood flows. He explained that, under certain conditions, users could utilize excess water without individual permits.

Jenson reviewed permit conditions, noting that the District holds the temporary permits, which would allow it to establish thresholds and manage the diversion system.

Jones asked how the thresholds are set.

Jenson provided clarification.

Walker asked about capturing water at flood level versus flood flow.

Jenson clarified that this is defined by law and that flow generally correlates with elevation. He explained the process and noted the distinction between permanent in-stream structures and the proposed approach.

Jones asked about variations in flow.

Jenson responded that flows do change over time, which is why monthly averages differ, and noted that the program will rely on long-term average data.

Hansen asked if the app already exists.

Jenson confirmed that it does exist, and clarified that this presentation is meant to show the process that would be implemented.

Hansen asked how beneficial the program would be.

Jenson responded that the benefit will depend on how many property owners participate, and that cost of service would vary based on actual water use. He noted that the program is intended to encourage landowners to offset costs and could help farmers shift from groundwater use to surface water use.

Walker asked if there is a system in place to notify the responsible party when it is time to remove the diversion.

Jenson responded that the program would rely on users following the guidelines, and that if they do not comply, the property owner would be responsible for any consequences.

Walker clarified that he wanted to confirm the District would not be the responsible party.

Jenson stated that this is why establishing a clear and structured program is important.

Jones asked about diversion volumes and whether they could be adjusted.

Jenson responded that he is working with higher-level state regulators to obtain approval for permits of that type, with assistance from DWR. He noted they are coordinating with the Water Board to develop a scenario that could allow for a higher-volume permit. He added that he has volunteered to serve as a pilot with DWR, and if successful, it could provide a significant benefit.

A resident asked whether the rules referenced were part of a mandate and where they originated. The resident also asked about the process for paying claims.

A resident asked about the approval of two temporary water right permits.

Jenson confirmed that the two temporary water right permits were approved.

Discussion followed regarding the temporary water rights.

A resident shared their opinion regarding who would be responsible for removing pumps once the flood diversion is lifted.

Jenson responded that the concerns raised were valid and noted that the item was for discussion only and not being voted on at this time.

## **7. CEQA NOE - CalSip**

**26-0442**

Jenson provided an update on a flood-related Notice of Exemption (NOE) and the CalSIP program, which allows local agencies to reinstate creek flow monitoring at previously monitored sites. He explained the background and application process, noting the program is state-funded with no cost share required, aside from staff labor.

Four locations were selected based on prior monitoring and current priority. A consultant will install sensors on bridges to measure creek levels and estimate flow volume, creating profiles and providing data for decision-making. He noted the equipment is non-intrusive, does not impact the stream, and involves no major construction. The work is generally considered CEQA-exempt as a minor change.

Burroughs discussed monitoring water flow and the return of flood water back into the creek.

Jenson provided a three-step response, stating that water can be stored on the surface in a pond to prevent return flow to the creek. He explained that water can also be stored

underground through injection in a manner that avoids contamination of other wells. He added that water can be diverted to locations that can accommodate additional inundation, reducing runoff.

Burroughs asked about constructing a pond and the definition of size requirements.

Jenson stated there are various regulations governing this and provided clarification.

Burroughs asked what the incentive would be for the landowner.

Jenson responded that the incentive is to use surface water instead of groundwater, noting that groundwater use will begin to incur costs.

Burroughs asked whether a general rancher would be able to use stored water.

Jenson stated that it would vary depending on the specific situation.

Walker added that the intent is to use stored water to offset groundwater use.

Jenson clarified and related the discussion back to SGMA, noting that the more water that can be recharged, the less groundwater restrictions may be needed. He stated this would provide a local benefit to water users.

Discussion followed regarding incentives.

Hansen asked how gage accuracy would be maintained given debris and changes in streamflow.

Jenson responded that evaluations are conducted every five years, at which point a study is completed to reassess conditions. He explained that streams can change over time, which can impact flow rates.

A resident spoke about ponds on their property and the history of recharge.

**RESULT: APPROVE**

**MOVER:** Greg Jones

**SECONDER:** Rob Burroughs

**AYES:** Director Hansen, Vice Chair Jones, Director Burroughs, and Chairperson Walker

**ABSENT:** Director Steve Zane

**8. Fees Update**

**26-0439**

Jenson presented preliminary fee information, noting that the figures are not final and that additional data is still needed. He stated the intent was to provide an overview of what the fee structure may look like.

He explained that fees are needed as current work and reporting have been funded by state grants, which are expected to decrease, requiring compliance with SGMA to be funded locally

moving forward. He reviewed the current status of fee development and noted that public input will be required, similar to a ballot process.

Jenson presented annual budget considerations and outlined two types of fees Administrative Fees and PMA Fees. He explained the differences between the two and noted that Demand Management Fees are not being proposed at this time.

He reviewed potential fee structures, including examples, and emphasized the need to generate sufficient funding to maintain SGMA compliance while keeping fees reasonable. He also discussed how fees may be applied, including a flat fee per parcel scenario.

Walker asked whether what was described referred to in-basin or total parcels.

Jenson responded that it applies to all parcels, minus those that cannot be charged. He explained how costs are distributed among users and clarified that the figures shown were not final fees, but estimates based on zoning potential. He described how the outcome could change and how it may affect different types of users.

Jones asked for clarification of the chart shown.

Jenson provided clarification.

Discussion followed regarding the chart and how fees would be distributed.

Jenson noted that staff are working to refine the data as closely as possible to accurately estimate the funding needed to cover program costs.

Hansen questioned the numbers presented.

Jenson stated that the figures shown were illustrative of how the data will be viewed and not final or exact numbers.

Hansen shared his thoughts on how the data was presented and stated that, if this is how the data will be shown, it should be clearly understandable without additional explanation.

Jenson acknowledged the comments and explained how the data would be presented in the upcoming fee study.

He presented estimated water use based on the GSPs, noting it reflects assumed usage and represents the upper range of potential fees. He provided a range of possible fees to illustrate how the final data may appear.

Jenson discussed PMA fees under a full cost recovery scenario, noting this represents the larger program option, and reviewed average cost estimates.

He explained potential fee structures based on total estimated use from the GSP and reviewed estimated annual water use by zoning categories, providing fee ranges.

Jenson presented a minimum PMA fee and overall fee range, and discussed potential impacts on the average user.

Jones asked about the fee range.

Jenson explained that the range is based on estimated project costs and expected expenses. He provided an update on current activities, including upcoming public outreach meetings, and shared the dates and locations. He noted that more detailed information will be available at those meetings.

He stated that final fee recommendations will be developed based on presentations to the Commission, with fees anticipated to be approved at the April Board meeting. He added that input from public outreach meetings, Working Group recommendations, and the consultant's fee report will be considered. He also reviewed how public meetings are noticed and noted that the final fee determination will occur during a public hearing.

Hansen stated that he does not see the process being close to setting a final fee and shared his opinion on the information presented.

Jenson explained that the fee methodology is still being developed. He noted that once finalized, each user will receive notice of their specific fee when the voting process begins.

He stated that a vote will follow the establishment of the fee structure, allowing users to approve or reject it through a public hearing process, including a reading of protests, public comment, and a final resolution to adopt the fees. He added that some modifications may still be made depending on feedback.

Burroughs stated that when the notice letter goes out, the average resident may not understand the information.

Jenson responded that the intent is to send out an actual number, with each APN receiving a specific amount showing what they will be charged.

Hansen asked whether volumetric use would be taken into consideration and discussed zoned parcels.

Jenson responded that billing would be based on submitted well registration information, and that reported use would determine how charges are applied.

A resident shared their opinion on the presentation and their interpretation of the budgets.

A resident asked about participation by agricultural users and requested a comparison of charges in other areas, including a comparison chart.

Hansen stated that the Farm Bureau may be able to assist and shared information from his research.

The resident continued to comment that it would be helpful to see what other GSAs are charging.

Jenson stated that comparisons have been provided in prior forums but can be included again, noting that they are not directly comparable since not all GSAs have the same programs or

responsibilities.

Discussion continued regarding timing and comparisons.

A resident asked about the decision to delay the fee setting timeline and who made that decision.

Walker asked why that was relevant.

The resident shared their opinion on the short timelines for decision-making and asked whether the Board felt pressured to adopt a fee mechanism, stating that groundwater users feel pressure to provide input on the matter.

Hansen stated that they recognize this is a process, noting that grant funding was received that the District is required to utilize, and that there are bandwidth constraints given the volume of work. He added that it is a significant amount of content for staff to manage.

The resident stated their opinion that the matter should have been discussed.

Jenson responded that the issue has been discussed on multiple occasions and explained the process of working in the public sector. He stated that the options presented were developed by professionals and not individually decided by him. He noted that consultants prepared the budget, after which discussions were held requesting revisions. He emphasized that staff are not making the decisions, but rather bringing forward recommendations developed by subject matter professionals.

Jones commented that the law has been in place since 2014 and stated he was satisfied with the progress made over the past year. He noted that government processes move slowly but expressed that he believes good work has been done moving forward.

Walker shared that there are pros and cons to the timing, noting that a benefit of waiting is the ability to see what other agencies are doing. He stated that his primary concern regarding SGMA, as a Board member since being elected, is that the public may not fully understand that if no action is taken, the state could intervene with significantly higher fees. He added that he believes everyone is acting in good faith and that the previous Board likely had valid reasons for waiting.

## **9. Fee Enactment Ordinances**

**26-0434**

County Counsel Daniel Klausner stated that there are two ordinances included within the item and clarified that it is not an either/or scenario. He explained that the ordinances were developed and recommended by outside counsel and that each requires a motion from the Board to waive the reading prior to general discussion.

He indicated he would begin with the Administrative Remedies Ordinance.

Klausner reiterated that the item was recommended by outside counsel and summarized the three main components it addresses. He explained that the procedure would allow minor adjustments to be made at the hearing and that the process ensures proper notice is provided, allowing time for review, protest, and discussion.

Burroughs asked about the two-thirds vote requirement, stating concerns about not wanting the proposed action and not wanting the state to step in, and asked where that would leave the Board if that occurred.

Klausner responded that the Board would then need to make a decision at that point.

Burroughs asked why proceed with the process if that is the case.

Klausner responded that they would not know the outcome until that stage and provided further clarification.

Burroughs expressed his thoughts on the process.

Klausner noted that he understood the concerns and stated that, in general, more than a majority of people agree that action is necessary. He expressed confidence that there is room to develop an approach that people can support, with allocations still needing to be determined.

Jones asked about the timeline for response.

Klausner clarified the timeline in response to Jones' inquiry and further explained what the ordinance would do for the County. He requested acceptance of the introduction of the ordinance and outlined the process for making any future changes.

Jenson noted that if changes are requested or required, a special meeting would need to be called to address them.

A resident expressed their opinion on the authority of the Flood Control Board.

Klausner clarified that the Flood Control District serves as the GSA for Tehama County and outlined the District's responsibilities and authority.

Discussion followed regarding the authority of the Flood Control Board.

A resident expressed their opinion on the wording related to the District's authority and discussed the resolution for Well Registration.

Burroughs asked if the Board's presence means it can be assumed they are the GSA.

Klausner confirmed.

A resident shared their opinion regarding GSA authority in California and the authority of Tehama County's GSA.

Jenson clarified that the Flood Control Board and the GSA are not separate entities, and stated that the Flood Control District is the GSA.

Discussion followed regarding the authority of the GSA.

Walker transitioned to the second ordinance in the item, the Water Extraction Fee Ordinance.

Klausner explained the purpose of the ordinance and how it would be used, noting that the Board would need to work on it and that edits are anticipated.

Jenson provided background and reasoning for the ordinance, explaining that items not requiring Board-level policy decisions may not need to come before the Board for every determination. He provided examples related to how appeals could be defined and handled.

Klausner added that the ordinance helps clarify that there are two distinct processes and explained the difference between the two ordinances.

Jenson noted that the ordinance provides an opportunity to define how the authority structure is intended to function and explained how that framework would operate. He added that it was originally developed based on decisions from a previous Board, and that the current methodology introduces a hearing officer to assist in the process.

Klausner asked if Jenson was referring to a hearing officer.

Jenson confirmed.

Klausner noted that this direction was established by a previous Board and that he has not been informed of any changes to that approach.

Walker stated that he was fine with the ordinance overall and discussed edits he would like to see in Section 4, Paragraph E, stating that de minimis users should not be included, and elaborated on his reasoning.

Jenson clarified Walker's concerns and explained how the current wording is stated in the ordinance.

Klausner provided clarification on the language and intent of the provision.

Discussion followed regarding the wording of the exemption in question.

Walker shared his opinion regarding the inclusion of certain users.

Klausner reiterated that he was requesting the Board waive the reading and introduce the ordinance.

A motion was made to introduce the second ordinance, Exhaustion of Remedies.

<b>RESULT:</b>	APPROVE
<b>MOVER:</b>	Greg Jones
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Matt Hansen
<b>AYES:</b>	Director Hansen, Vice Chair Jones, Director Burroughs, and Chairperson Walker
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Director Steve Zane

Jenson clarified the process for assigning ordinance numbers.

A resident expressed concerns regarding the water code and shared their opinion on the wording used.

Jones asked for clarification that the action was for introduction only and not adoption of the ordinance.

Jenson confirmed that this is not the fee itself, but the process for reaching it, including establishment of the appeals process. He further clarified the overall procedure.

Klausner added that the Board would still need to adopt the framework.

Discussion continued regarding potential changes to the ordinance language and clarification of which parties would fall under the language in question.

Jenson asked for clarification on whether the request was to remove item 3.

Burroughs disagreed and explained his reasoning.

Hansen provided his opinion on the proposed changes.

Walker also shared his opinion on which users should be included in the fee structure.

Klausner clarified that the Board was being asked to identify language changes for consideration and that the item would return at a special meeting for a formal vote on those changes.

Jenson confirmed, stating he was seeking confirmation that the Board supported requesting language changes.

Klausner reiterated that the matter would be brought back at a special meeting to consider the proposed language revisions.

Hansen asked for clarification that no changes were being made at this meeting.

Klausner clarified the process.

Hansen suggested retaining the language for the administrative fee and removing it from the PMA fee.

Discussion followed regarding what language should be included in the administrative fee versus the PMA fee.

Jenson clarified and agreed with the idea of having two Directors assigned to discuss the language and bring it back for review, noting this aligns with the planned special meeting.

Klausner clarified that this approach would not exclude any supervisor from making changes and explained how the process would proceed.

The consensus of the Board was to remove the language in question from the administrative fee but retain it in the PMA fee, with further discussion to be brought back at the next meeting.

## **10. Updates**

**26-0436**

### **Recharge**

Jenson stated that they have obtained permits for flood flow diversion and explained the importance of this approval.

### **Demand Management**

Jenson noted that the working group had a productive recent meeting and highlighted that input from attorney Joe Hughes, who has been attending the meetings, has been helpful. He explained that Hughes is preparing suggested revisions to bring back to the group. Jenson stated that while a final draft is not expected at the next meeting, the group is getting closer to completing the plan.

### **Outreach**

Jenson stated that there are two public meetings scheduled for April 1st and 2nd and reviewed what the meetings will include, along with the consulting firm's role in supporting outreach efforts.

He also discussed the outreach working group, noting they developed agreed-upon details for a flyer to ensure consistent messaging.

Jones asked whether it was costly to use the consulting firm for outreach and whether other outreach options were being considered.

Jenson clarified that the firm is currently funded directly through the state and noted that he is preparing an application for the next round of funding.

He reiterated an invitation for the Directors to attend the public outreach meetings in April.

## **11. Flood Related Items**

**26-0437**

Jenson noted that the District has been working with the County and CDWF on a project to address illegal grading, explaining the steps taken and stating that inspections determined the activity did affect water flows.

Walker asked how much dirt can be moved before a permit is required.

Jenson clarified the permitting requirements, and discussion followed on the topic.

## **12. Board Matters**

Walker recommended having the local DWR representative who spoke earlier in public comment present their spring and fall conditions presentation.

Quinn with DWR stated they could likely present in May.

Hansen asked what two months each year would be best for recurring presentations.

Discussion followed regarding the timing and scheduling of the presentations.

## **Adjourn**

12:32PM