

Glenn County RCD  
 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
 Lower Stony Creek Project  
 June 12, 2008

In attendance:

Kandi Manhart	GCRCD	Cory Scott	GCRCD
Claudia Street	GCRCD	Margie Graham	DWR
Barry Cavanna	Syar Industries	Guy Chetelat	RWQCB
Lee Smith	Landowner	Joe Green	River Partners
Jessica Gibbs	River Partners	Dan Efseaff	River Partners
Mike Tucker	NMFS	Rob Vlach	NRCS
Craig Isola	USFWS	Bonnie Pryor	Anderson & Assoc
Jeff Anderson	Anderson & Assoc.	Graham Matthews	GMA
Donnan Arbuckle	Landowner	Bruce Roundy	GCRCD

Meeting began at 10:00 with a brief introduction by Kandi Manhart, GCRCD. All in attendance introduced themselves.

Dan Efseaff, River Partners, gave an overview of the 20 acre demonstration site on Lower Stony Creek. Beginning in 2006, River Partners began assessing seven separate techniques used to eradicate Arundo and Tamarisk and compared the techniques for efficacy and relative costs. As a result, the most effective techniques are: (#1) foliar spray and (#2) a cut/spray combination. A slide show was presented showing a variety of bioengineering techniques used on the Smith-Baker property. Biotechnical controls are effective and have the ability to perpetuate and self maintain. Lee Smith talked about his planting successes including sites he needs to irrigate and other sites close enough to the active stream and alluvium where natural sub-irrigation is capable of maintaining the plantings. Manhart and Scott noted that information regarding the project is currently posted on the GCRCD website ([www.glenncountyrcd.org](http://www.glenncountyrcd.org)).

Graham Matthews gave a presentation of engineered design plans. Last summer they identified significant erosion sites within a two mile reach. A continuous profile of the creek is now available through the use of LiDAR information from the Black Butte Dam to the Sacramento River. They have gathered useful background information which includes hydrologic, geomorphic, GIS layers and aerial photos. There are eight sets of aerial photos from 1937-2006 and they have identified the center line in each set and have reviewed the cross sections and mapped profile changes. From this information they have developed a design channel alignment from per-2006 planform and developed a design channel profile based on the existing slope. Matthews noted within this project area, very little incision has occurred in comparison to areas above the Diversion Dam and further downstream making it a favorable area for projects. Briefly, to date the accomplishments include:

1. Computing typical dominant dimensions from a selection of cross sections;
2. Develop design channel contours using AutoCAD;
3. Evaluate Existing and Design conditions;
4. Prepare preliminary grading plans;
5. Present preliminary results to TAC and Landowners.

Discussion was held regarding the constraints of the Design Concepts and the need to focus on low cost approaches using bioengineering for stabilization and utilizing techniques the property owners would be capable of implementing on their own.

Discussion was held regarding Design Elements:

1. Removal of exotic vegetation is crucial;
2. Define central floodway corridor;
3. Floodway alignment is based on a more stable channel form;
4. Use of vegetative deflectors in key areas on floodplain to reduce future risk at critical locations along with revegetation with natives to form a vegetated buffer.

The primary goal is to train the creek back into the center and eliminate the islands created by the Arundo and Tamarisk, slightly lowering the central corridor and planting natives outside the central corridor. The risks involved with a “soft” revegetation approach include the length of time required for plantings to become established and the challenges posed by the lack of soils which are important for the success of bioengineering techniques. The use of longitudinal trenches filled with cuttings along banks have the potential to create a hedge effect appear to be effective. Another suggestion for the success of bioengineering was to establish our own nursery stock using local plant varieties. Including the use of local conservation camps and CCC would provide an economic source of labor.

Scott asked if dense forests of Arundo and Tamarisk were removed, would the creek eventually move itself through the central channel. Matthews thought this was a good place to start, given the financial implications of an engineered channel realignment.

Matthews presented a review of LiDAR photos and Long Profile graphs. The design would create a more consistent velocity field with the capacity to distribute velocities and the planned riparian buffer zones will eventually deflect water back into the main channel. He estimates 450,000 cu yards would be moved using the channel realignment design with a positive net of 150,000 cu yards which could provide a source of revenue, although the sale of excess dirt has significant permitting implications. Section 7 would need to be revisited to address the altering of channels. He estimated a 5-6 month permitting process when dirt is to be moved in waterways and figures ranging from \$1-\$2.50/yard were noted.

Matthews asked if the RCD wants them to proceed with the design process at this point. Scott noted the current priority is removal of Arundo and Tamarisk and an estimation of start time, should funding occur, would be the end of August, 2008.

Scott asked for comments regarding the Lower Stony Creek Watershed Restoration Plan.

1. Mike Tucker asked for (#1) softening of language pointing to Black Butte Dam as a cause of current erosion issues with Lower Stony Creek; (#2) was concerned about the alternative solution of lowering Black Butte Lake and the significant impact on fish, etc.; (#3) suggested exploring the possibility of mining the delta area of Black Butte.
2. Margie Graham (#1) encouraged all TAC members to take the time to read the Plan as considerable investments have been made by various agencies; and (#2) urged the use of language which speaks to the landowners.

3. Rob Vlach suggested (#1) simplifying the Plan to read more like a “How To” manual.

Lee Smith gave an update on his project area. The Arundo has been sprayed 2 times and one more spray will be performed this Fall. The “Mother Arundo” was originally cut with a chain saw but unfortunately there was some miscommunication and the Mother plant was not sprayed. Smith is enjoying seeing the progress and changes in the creek area. Some cuttings have been collected with the assistance of River Partners. Smith asked Matthews for suggestions on stabilizing methods for a rip rap site. The recommendation of preferred practice for such a site is to dig trenches at the toe of the area and establishing plantings in this fashion.

Scott gave an update on the status of the Tamarix Leaf Beetle in Lower Stony Creek. Last September collections were made at Cache Creek and released at 2 sites. Upon inspection the beginning of this year, no beetles could be found. She explained the research indicates the need for releases to be made for 3 to 5 years before populations become established. More collections will be made this summer and Smith and Street will be involved in the effort.

Scott presented information on the current NRCS WHIP funding opportunity. The RCD would apply for funding on behalf of the landowner. Currently the direction is to present the idea to the RCD meeting on Monday and the area on Stony Creek would be defined by the areas where consent has been given. The proposed project area would begin at the Smith/Baker property and extend along a 2 mile stretch through the Baker property, with the exclusion of property owned by the City of Orland and Glenn County. The RCD has rewritten a landowner consent agreement letter with altered language which is more landowner friendly. Within the 2 mile reach are 11 landowners and currently 6 have agreed to the current opportunity which will focus on removal of Arundo and Tamarisk. Vlach recommended maintaining the focus of the current WHIP funding opportunity for removal of invasive species and then consider the realignment phase as a second step, but suggested going forward with the permitting processes required for realignment work. Scott requested suggestions for future funding sources for stream realignment and the suggestion was made to investigate WCB opportunities.

Matthews asked if there was going to be a formal request for feedback on the Preliminary Draft Designs for Bank Stabilization and Stream Realignment concepts from the TAC. He is looking for approval of his project and would appreciate feedback. He suggested attending a RCD Board Meeting to present his current plan and receive instruction from the Board on how to proceed. He will be awaiting contact regarding a meeting date.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Claudia Street