

Appendix G

Public Comments from Stakeholder Meetings

Appendix G: Comments Received on Draft Yolo County SWRP Sections

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
Juliana Tadano, City of West Sacramento, 12/8/2017	
... section 5.4.1.6 there's a turd where there should be a turf! Its in Project 4, analysis section.	Change made, page 5-27
Pg. 6-6 ... defining the terms in 6.1.6 such as broad agreement, reasonable time, etc. Maybe this won't be such a contentious process to bother with that though?	Comment noted. These terms have not been defined by the Westside RWMG.
... it seems to me that the model needs some factor to account for crop rotation. If tomatoes are only in 1 of 4 years, that's only 25% of the implementation of groundwater recharge efforts than the model would present, no? I understand they can't get further ahead than 2014 on the data that's available, so conversion to trees would be harder to predict, but it seems like crop rotation is a standard and known practice here.	Response provided by SEI: Every year, we have the ability to input any landuse we want in the model. For the historical period (1975-2014), we currently have, in the model, different landuse every year extracted from the Crop Reports from the county Ag Commissioner's office. So, assuming that the reports are capturing the rotation, we do have it in the model.
Kristin Sicke, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, 1/12/2018	
Page 1-5: 1.1.1.2 YSGA – website link should be home page because of changes – http://yologroundwater.org	Change made, page 1-5
Page 3-14: 3.4.2 YC ILP – Willow Slough Bypass at County Road 102 (becomes Pole Line Road just south at City boundary)	Change made, page 3-14
Page 4-2: Table 4-1 – Cities aren't considered water suppliers? Maybe because it's not their preliminary responsibility?	Change made, page 4-2
Please revise YCFC&WCD interests/responsibilities to be “water supplier” first, and add “storm water reuse” and “storm drainage control”.	Change made, page 4-2
Esparto CSD maintains detention basins within the newer development of Esparto, I think “storm drainage control” should be added to their responsibilities	Change made, page 4-2
Page 5-6: 5.1.1.8 Flood Monitoring Network Project – “install 4 ELEVATION (or stage) staff gauges in sloughs that interact with YCFC&WCD canals”; unfortunately, we can't put flow gauges into the sloughs because of technical difficulties. “These gauges will be used to monitor stage in the slough system and will assist YCFC&WCD's information management and decision-making process for storm	Change made, page 5-6

Comment	Response
conveyance through the canal and slough systems. The precipitation gauges will provide data for Yolo-County agencies to distinguish the type and quantity of rainfall events, providing information on where an increase in slough capacity is needed.”	
Page 5-8: 5.1.1.13 Moore Siphon Reliability/Restoration Project –“Due to the age and exposure of the 66” corrugated metal pipe, as well as Cache Creek erosion issues at both ends of the siphon, the siphon will need to be replaced in the near future.”	Change made, page 5-8
Page 5-9: 5.1.1.17 Russell Boulevard – needs to be carried forward to other parts of the document	Change made, global fix
5.1.1.21 Upstream Flow Management to Prevent Madison Flooding and to Facilitate GW Recharge – “The Canal system can potentially be used to convey water...”	Change made, page 5-10
Page 5-11: 5.1.1.22 West Adams Canal Renovation and China Slough Rehabilitation Project – Please round cost up to \$16M; needs to be carried forward in other parts of the document	Change made, global fix
Page 5-19: Knights Landing Drainage Study box – “... advancing the goal of achieving improved storm drainage and reducing flooding along with improving water quality and maintaining beneficial uses.”	Change made, page 5-19
Page 5-25: Project 8. Flood Monitoring Network Project – the range of 91-2,686 AF is quite large should we try to qualify the difference with additional information?	Change made, page 5-23 Addressed based on updated information in Appendix I
Page 6-3: 6.1.2.4 and 6.1.2.5 – labels need parity; either revise to “SWRP Project Proponents” or revise to “Stakeholders”	Change made, page 6-3
Kristin Sicke, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, 1/16/2018	
... include the following language [for the Winters North Area Retention Pond. “This project would offer an opportunity to measure rainfall-runoff relationships and the effectiveness of this size of retention pond in attenuating flood peaks and retaining sediment. Automation and SCADA control would allow for real-time decision making in pond operation and would allow pond stage and outlet flows to be tracked and controlled during and following storm events. Additionally, given the right conditions and appropriate storage in the pond, groundwater percolation can be monitored and tracked to ensure groundwater recharge in the region. If successful, a similar pond could be constructed and installed to capture storm flows in the low-lying areas of Yolo County.”	Change made, page 5-12

Comment	Response
Also, I believe it was on our original list of resources when we started the SWRP process, but in case not, please be sure to include the Yolo Slough Integrated Resources Management Plan in our reference list.	Added reference for Willow Slough Watershed Integrated Resources Management Plan to Section 8: References.
Juliana Tadano, City of West Sacramento, 1/17/2018	
Table 4-1 – West Sacramento cell should include the following as per Cities of Davis, Winters, Woodland: Water Quality Control, Water Resources Management, Storm Water Reuse, Pollution/Sediment Control, Public Education and Outreach (in addition to others already listed)	Change made, page 4-2
Page 6-3, section 6.1.2.5. – expand who the stakeholders are, not just what they do. Or, reference section 7 for further detail?	See Section 4 and Appendix C for description of stakeholders. Added reference, page 6-3.
Page 6-7, Table 6-2: Propose adding date somewhere in table to clarify when the “Secured?” assessments were taken (i.e. 90% funded as of ____) – might be easiest to include date in header or footnote rather than for each entry.	This information was not collected in the project information form. Project costs will be verified/updated at the time the project is included in a grant application or funding request.
Page 7-2, Section 7.5.1.1 Public involvement: Is there a way for volunteers to learn about project opportunities that could be described or linked here? Or instructions to how to reach out with interest in helping? Or is this not the target audience so doesn't need to be spelled out?	When projects are implemented, project proponents will be responsible for advertising/providing public information for volunteer opportunities as needed.
Page 3-3 has a remnant section title (I think?) at the bottom right: “local permits” just above 3.3 Other Permits.	Change made, page 3-12
Page 5-21 has a grammar inconsistency: Left column, first black bullet point, then first blue bullet point: A score of zero (0) was assigned if a project was not able to identify a benefits metrics (“identity a benefits metric” or “identify benefits metrics”).	Change made, page 5-20
Page 5-21, top of right column, this sentence seems to be missing a verb: Projects [are/were?] kept from a higher rating (see above) if the value quantities were low, the metrics had minimal....	Change made, page 5-22
Page 5-21, right column, first full green bullet, remove “s” in values: at least one corresponding quantified values.	Change made, page 5-22
Page 5-21, right column, first full green bullet, next sentence is missing a verb: Projects [are/were?] given this rating if they had higher quantity values or had more impactful or significant storm...	Change made, page 5-21
Page 5-21, right column, second green bullet: Section beginning: A score of 120 was assigned.. does not read well and there are more missing/inconsistent words than is worth typing up here. <input type="checkbox"/> email me if you	Change made, page 5-21

Comment	Response
want more specifics but I think a fresh read through will catch them.	
Page 5-21, general: This section does not read clearly, and could use a editorial read through in general. For example, there are five ratings categories, but the last category references the “3 prior ratings”. There are missing verbs, inconsistent uses of rating names, and confusing singular/plural inconsistencies. Email me if you need more detail, but again a fresh read through should catch these.	Change made, page 5-20
Page 6-2, propose changing sentence below (left column, first green bullet) to read as written below: Existing: New projects from stakeholders are received on a continuous basis, as well as revisions, updates, and removal (completed projects) of existing Projects. Proposed: Project revisions, updates, and completions, as well as new projects, are received from stakeholders on a continual basis.	Change made, pages 6-1 and 6-2
Page 6-2, right column, first black bullet, AND Page 6-3, left column, first black bullet: change Encouraging to encourage to match verb format for rest of list.	Addressed by other action, page 6-2
Page 6-5 section 6.1.4, propose changing sentence below to read as written below:	Change made, page 6-5
Existing: One of the most important aspects of Plan implementation is processes to ensure that the public and interested stakeholders continue to be involved.	
Proposed: Continuing public involvement, including interested stakeholders and the general public, is one of the most important aspects implementing the Plan.	
Page 6-5, section 6.1.4, midway through first paragraph: remove comma at end of this fragment: Community participation during Plan implementation,	Change made, page 6-5
Page 6-7, top of page, left column: “has be” should be “has been”:	Change made, page 6-6
A list of grant opportunities with storm water-related benefits has be generated and is included in Appendix H for reference.	
Page 6-7, Section 6.2.2.1, first sentence: This sentence doesn’t really introduce the bullet points that follow. Add a clarification sentence after that explains the following list? Or, add to front of this introductory sentence “The following...”	Change made, page 6-7
Page 6-8, left column, top paragraph: missing a word or table reference:	Change made, page 6-8
The intersection of the above data is shown in [missing word?] and can be used to identify locations for potential projects such as...	
Page 6-11, Section 6.2.3, first paragraph: inconsistent is/are use in this sentence:	Change made, page 6-12

Comment	Response
Page 7-1, left column, second paragraph, sentence is missing a verb.	Change made, page 7-1
Page 7-1, right column, Section 7.2 first sentence, remove comma after small: Individuals from disadvantaged, small, and rural communities, and other interested groups	Change made, page 7-1
Appendices – suggest adding Appendix A-1 type page numbers to footers	Change made.
Carol Scianna, City of Winters, 1/22/2018	
Pg 21: the creek is the county line so it flows into Yolo county too, should that be included?	Change made, page 2-3
Pg 24: Add Winters	Change made, page 2-5
Pg 30, the map of crops planted north of Winters is not showing all of the almonds that have been planted	Change made, page 2-10
App c: pg 4 of 12. this is not accurate, the City staff has been doing the O & M on our WW collection system for several years, pls delete this line re: SW water.	Change made, App. C, Page C-3
Dawn Calciano, City of Davis, 1/26/2018	
In the table of contents, Section 2 is listed twice.	Change made, TOC
Page 1-1, Section 1.1, should there be “the” in front of Westside-Sacramento. The selected boundary for this SWRP is Yolo County located in northern California. Yolo County falls within “the” Westside-Sacramento...	Change made, page 1-1
Page 1-6, last sentence of first paragraph, This study will fill provide useful data...	Change made, page 1-5
Page 2-6, Under 2.3.1, The Yocha Dehe... It currently says Yooha	Change made, page 2-6
Page 2-23, second paragraph in right column, Surface waters in the Yolo County are 303 (d) listed...	Change made, page 2-23
Page 3-12, spell out WDRs in the title for 3.3.1	Change made, page 3-12
Page 4-1, section 4.1, The Yolo WRA member agencies members are: City of Davis...	Change made, page 4-1
Page 5-21, under bullet at top of right hand column, Projects were assigned a yes..	Change made, page 5-21
Page 6-2, First bullet in right-hand column, Encouraging public engagement and maintain a contacts list of stakeholders. Under 7 th bullet, Working with local county and city officials and project proponents...	Addressed by other action, page 6-2
Page 6-8, second paragraph, there is an extra space between “in” and “and”	Change made, page 6-8
On table 6-2 on page 6-7 Russell is spelled “Russel”. Russell is misspelled a few other places in the document also.	Change made, global fix
Section 1.1.1 Relation to Other Planning Efforts (Page 1-1) Should the City of Woodland’s Water Recycling Program and Yolo WRA’s Groundwater Monitoring	Change made, page 1-1

Comment	Response
<p>Network be included in this list if they don't specifically address stormwater issues? "There is a list of on-going efforts to address stormwater issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FloodSAFE Yolo; • City of Woodland's Water Recycling Program; • Yolo WRA's Groundwater Monitoring Network; • Yolo WRA's Subsidence Network Monitoring • Westside IRWM grant to address mercury • contamination in watersheds above the SWRP area; and • Continued participation in the broader Westside IRWM" 	
<p>Section 2.2 Groundwater Resources (Page 2-5) Remove the word "small" prior to agriculture because there are also larger agricultural operations in the area. Update the information highlighted in blue below for Davis, Woodland and UC Davis in regards to groundwater as the sole supply source. It could say that historically groundwater was the sole supply with a recent transition to surface water from the Sacramento River as the primary source.</p> <p>"... Thousands of groundwater wells exist within the county, and most of these groundwater wells are used to supply individual domestic demands or small agricultural operations. ... Some of the communities within the county such as Davis, UC Davis, and Woodland currently rely on groundwater as their sole supply source.</p>	<p>Change made, page 2-5</p>
<p>Section 2.4.6 (Page 2-23) Same update as in section 2.2 above. In a normal year, nearly all urban water users in the county, except the City of West Sacramento, rely on groundwater as their primary source of water supply.</p>	<p>Change made, page 2-23</p>
<p><u>Section 3.2.2.1</u> (Page 3-8) The cities of Davis and Woodland were removed from Attachment G of the MS4 Permit, we are unsure if West Sacramento was also removed.</p>	<p>Change made, page 3-11</p>
<p><u>Section 3.2.2.2 Municipal Permits</u> (Page 3-8) Repeats portions of 3.2.2.1 on Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permits-suggest rewording or combining portions of the two sections.</p>	<p>Change made, pages 3-7 thru 3-11</p>
<p>5.1.1.16 DRetention Pond Feasibility Study (Page 5-9) This was our error but retention should be detention instead in the title above and description below. Looking to study feasibility for design enhancements for the seven separate storm drain dretention ponds to</p>	<p>Change made, page 5-9</p>

Comment	Response
improve evapotranspiration and water quality in the City's discharge.	
<p>5.1.1.17 Russel Boulevard Demonstration LID Project (Page 5-9) Updates to Project information are highlighted below. Capital Cost: \$42,763 \$667,200 Secured Funding/Source: None Yes Benefit Metrics Value(s): Treat 2,355 cu. Ft/24 hours, with up to 12,300 cu ft of infiltration/24 hours, 6,225 sq. ft. habitat, 7 trees, 500-1000 volunteer hrs/yr Project Summary: ... The surface area it will treat is 43,470 8,000 square feet. ...</p>	Change made, page 5-9
Community Benefits (Section 5.4.1.5) Replace "turd" with "turf"	Change made, page 5-29
Table 5-3 Update Russel to "Russell", permanent funding is allocated for this project so should be "Y" which would change the scoring to "80" from "40".	Change made, page 5-31
Table 5-4 Update Russel to "Russell", total score would be "232" with the additional 40 points added	The final score was is 192, pages 5-31 and 5-32
Table 6-2 Update Russel to "Russell", amount should be \$667,200.	Change made, page 6-7
Harish Bagha, State Water Resources Control Board, February 14, 2018	
Section 5.3.3 Scoring Category 3 – SWRP Quantitative Benefits Metric Analyses discusses that projects get a score of 90 or higher depending on the impact or significant storm water benefits. " Projects given this rating if they had higher quantity value or had more impactful or significant storm water benefit.." (p5.21) To make this planning effort as transparent as possible, I would request that you provide some additional discussion on how the "impact or significant storm water benefits" was defined, and what was considered a high quantity value vs. a low quantity value.	Change made, page 5-22
Per the guidelines section (VI.C.2.b) "The Plan should include an analysis of how collectively the projects and programs in the watershed will capture and use the proposed amount of storm water and dry weather runoff"(pg. 25 guidelines). I did see that the quantification were provided at the projects specific level, but I did not see an overall estimate of the amount of storm water and dry weather runoff captured. Please provide an estimate of the amount of stormwater and/or dry weather runoff captured by implementing the storm water capture and use projects in the plan.	Change made, page 5-25

Comment	Response