



*City of Chico*  
**Stormwater Resource Plan**  
**TAC Meeting 1 Meeting Minutes**



Date: April 25, 2017

Attendees:

Name	Initials	Affiliation
Angela Spain	AS	City of Chico
Richard Burgi	RB	City of Chico
Matt Thompson	MT	City of Chico
Eric Gustafson	EG	City of Chico
Skyler Lipski	SL	City of Chico
Tom Fossum	TF	Butte County
Doug Moore	DM	West Yost
Millie Cowley-Crawford	MCC	West Yost
Richard Perrelli	RP	Chico State
Debbie Spangler	DS	DWR, ND
Erick Burre	EB	SWRCB
Susan Mason	SM	Public, Friends of Comanche Creek
Timmarie Hamill	TH	Public, The Stream Team

Presentation began at 1:36 pm. Doug Moore presenting.

MT: Asked who designated HUCs (on watershed maps). Noted that in the west, the sheds are unreliable because the topography is too flat.

VN: Asked if the county should change their boundaries in the IRWMP to match the City's watershed boundaries.

DM: Replied that it is not necessary for the County to change boundaries.

MT: Is there a problem if local storm drains to another subwatershed?

- DM: We can change subshed boundaries, if needed, without impacting the definition of the area covered by the SWRP.
- MCC: Confirmed that external boundaries are the most important in terms of defining what the SWRP covers and completing the justification delivery to the State.
- RB: With regard to potential projects, asked whether it makes sense to include IRWMP projects since the SWRP is submitted back to IRWM anyway.
- DM: Indicated that we should include them. The priorities might be different, but any potential project should be reflected.
- VN: Indicated that the projects in the IRWMP had to meet a different criteria: “Does it meet the goal of IRWMP”?
- RP: Confirming whether or not the City or County want projects with a long-term O&M component.
- DM: Not sure if City and County want long-term O&M responsibilities for any given project. They will take on O&M for their projects. Other advocates may support projects or other funding may be available.
- DM: Regarding EC/WV, Doug noted that everyone should fix the scoring for flood control to match the previous slide value.
- VN: Where did the benefits on table come from?
- DM: Benefits came from the Guidelines.
- RB: Asked where EC/WV came from.
- DM: Said it came from the West Yost proposal.
- RP: Asked about whether potential projects to address MS4 would be appropriate. Chico State is a non-traditional MS4 that complies with multiple programs and has high outreach and education goals.
- VN: Commented that SGMA is another potential area where a project may help address multiple programs and multiple goals.
- MT: Commented on the Teichert Pond area is a potential project. An old quarry from the freeway raise collects residential/commercial property drainage – it’s not designated as a detention pond. Need to add trash capture at inflow and work at outfall of LLC. Other addition features may need to be added to reduce homeless camps and clearing of underbrush.
- RB: Asked about a 200-year compliance with the Urban Levees criteria of SB 5.
- TF: Commented that a 200-year flood is discussed in the CVFPP Mid and Upper Sac River Regional Flood Management Plan. Projects include Mud Creek, Rock Creek and Keifer

Slough and that the County has obtained small community funds to try to address some of these issues with a study.

EB: Noted that it is important when reaching out to the public to make sure the term “Potential” projects is used and to alphabetize the projects to avoid confusion that would suggest any projects have already been given a priority.

RB: Levee repairs are needed at Mud Creek LS. Need to raise levees for ULOP.

MT: Large subbasins need to be retrofitted for trash and infiltration (potential water quality, flood, recharge benefits).

5 mile recreation area headwaters come from the canyon. There is gravel deposition that reduces channel capacity. Dredging permits are required. Telemetry could be added at BCC/Lindo gates and Bypass and the project could have a recreation benefit as well. Telemetry is needed upstream for greater warning times.

Detention basins are not encouraged in the BCC shed. The peak hits about 8 to 16 hours after a storm passes – water needs to drain from urban areas at the start of the hydrograph to make room for the peak. Would that put us at a disadvantage to compete because of a non-traditional hydrograph?

DM: No, as long as benefits are there and a project meets criteria, it can be considered.

VN: Informed the group that Christine Buck is the contact for gage information.

MT: Lindo diversion gage has no telemetry. Asked about SDMP, mentioned it has lots of benefits.

DM: Agreed with MT about SDMP.

TF: Agreed that SDMP would have many benefits.

EG: Other benefits are trash, flood control, many outfall improvements, list goes on and on.

DM: Asked if RP has any CSU projects

RP: Answered DM that some professors have ideas and have been doing work in the shed.

AS: Noted that we need to also reach out to Habitat for Love Chapman contacts

MT: BCC Ecological Preserve also needs to be invited to be a stakeholder

RB: SDMP should be considered for a project.

RP: For the evaluation criteria, should CEQA/permitting needs be a criteria?

DM: Indicated that yes, it has a significant impact on cost and ability to implement.

MT: H, M, L would be good levels to rate permitting.

MCC: Asked for a list of outreach methods used by TAC members.

Group:

- PW Counter
- Facebook
- Nextdoor?
- Butte County monthly newsletter
- Radio PSA – Millie should send a script to Angela
- Website
- Libraries
- Public parks
- Utility bills
- Fleet Feet shoe store

SM: Suggested Arundo Donax removal in the LLC channel for flood control benefits, as well as Yellow Flag Iris removal on Comanche Creek.

EB: Concurred that Paseo Campaneros has trash from Fair Street Detention Basin, where there is a large gate but no small trash capture. Issues are private property, transients, dams (private) and ag diversion.

TF: There are large property owners: M & T, Llano Seco who need to be involved. Comanche is a conveyance for them from Butte Creek water on the right and Ranch on the west side of town – the water is shared. Stakeholder on the water right is Les Harringer with M&T.

VN: Says Melind family has many potential stakeholders, will get in contact with them.

EB: Said East Comanche Creek has lots of issues.

TH: Asked if there will be a way to submit potential projects in writing.

DM: Answered that, yes you will be able to submit in writing.

MCC: There will be a way to submit on the website, but it's not built yet. It's in progress.

TH: Schools in the area have several LID projects – 9 campuses. More schools means more education. LID projects with Prop 84 grants can do more residential outreach for pesticide reduction. Also, need USGS gages. Golf courses do not have low flow/high flow. Rose Avenue has no published data. Environmental education/outreach is needed to promote trash education.

TH: Is Comanche Creek included in the SWRP?

DM: Answered, yes Comanche Creek is in.

TH: Asked if anyone is taking minutes.

MCC: Answered, yes, I am taking minutes.

TH: Key stakeholders need to be included on the TAC or it will be difficult for public to provide feedback. TH called people to invite them to the meetings. Would like to see more input from the public. It's good for people to start at the beginning of the process. However, it is difficult to engage the public.

MT: Suggested charrettes for the public meeting – stations around the room with different concepts; small group discussions.

TH: Indicated that she will do outreach on her own, as well.

RP: Asked how much money is available and is there a match?

DM: Answered RP, \$184K; City 50% match.

DM: \$80M for 2018 value round 2 implementation grants.

VN: Indicated there is also IRWM money.

TF: There is also flood money, DWR food protection money.

TH: SWRP includes public involvement in implementation, is that a requirement of the plan or a benefit of the plan?

MT: Answered TH, public involvement is a benefit.

VN: Indicated that she can provide IRWM Contacts for DACs including Katie Burdick, NSV; and Liz Manfield, Mountain

MCC: Will send VN an email to request contacts