

Water Resources Association of Yolo County Public Workshop Meeting Summary – May 8, 2006

Public Attendees

Approximately 70 interested persons attended the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) community workshop on May 8, 2006 at Heidrick Ag History Center in Woodland.

All members of the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA) Technical Committee were present as were many members of the Board of Directors.

WRA Technical Committee Member Attendees:

- ◆ Jacques DeBra, City of Davis Public Works and WRA Board
- ◆ Sid England, University of California, Davis and WRA Board
- ◆ Gary Wegener, City of Woodland
- ◆ Doug Baxter, City of Woodland
- ◆ Mark Cocke, City of Woodland
- ◆ Donita Hendrix, Dunnigan Water District
- ◆ Charlie Simpson, City of Winters
- ◆ Max Stevenson, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
- ◆ Tim O'Halloran, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
- ◆ Petrea Marchand, Yolo County Planning, Resources & Public Works
- ◆ Bill Brewster, Department of Water Resources
- ◆ Tasmin Eusuff, Department of Water Resources

WRA Board of Directors Attendees:

- ◆ David Scheuring, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
- ◆ Kurt Balasek, City of Winters

Local Electeds Attendees:

- ◆ Matt Rexroad, City of Woodland and WRA Board
- ◆ Duane Chamberlain, Yolo County Board of Supervisors and WRA Board

Consultant Team Attendees:

- ◆ Fran Borcalli, Wood Rodgers, Inc.
- ◆ Rob Beggs, Brown & Caldwell
- ◆ Steve Chainey, MIG
- ◆ Gerrit Platenkamp, MIG
- ◆ Dave Anderson, West Yost & Associates
- ◆ Lucy Eidam, Lucy & Company
- ◆ Josh Newcom, Lucy & Company

Media Attendees:

- ◆ Ben Antonius, Woodland Daily Democrat

Welcome/Introductions

Lucy Eidam, meeting facilitator, welcomed everyone and introduced the project team. She explained that the purpose of the meeting would be to provide information and answer questions about the IRWMP process and expected outcome. The WRA is requesting public input on the potential action list, the prioritization approach and other ideas to improve the plan. All input will be considered during the development of the IRWMP. Eidam then outlined simple ground rules for meeting conduct.

Presentation Summary and Overview

One public workshop was held from 4:30 to 7 p.m. on May 8, 2006. The workshop consisted of a brief project introduction by David Scheuring, WRA chair, including an overview of the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA), its members and the WRA Board of Directors.

Scheuring turned the presentation over to Jacques DeBra, City of Davis Public Works. DeBra provided a brief overview of the IRWMP, reiterating that developing an IRWMP is an important step toward inclusive, collective and improved management of Yolo County's water resources. Through the process of developing the IRWMP, issues and actions will be identified in five main areas: water supply and drought preparedness, water quality, flood control and storm drainage, riparian and aquatic ecosystem enhancement, and recreation. The plan will continue to include input from community workshops, individual stakeholder meetings, the WRA Board/Technical Committee and the WRA's website. A potential action list has been developed and distributed today for input. An IRWMP Action is defined as a program, policy or project. The next steps are to prioritize the actions, develop an implementation strategy and pursue funding when feasible. The purposes of Yolo County's IRWMP are to update past planning efforts from 1984 and 1992; provide a comprehensive resource planning effort; provide a regional blueprint that includes priority actions and good ideas requiring further study; and position the region for relevant funding opportunities. The IRWMP is being developed with the assistance of a \$500,000 planning grant from Proposition 50 and local matching funds. A project timeline illustrated the scheduled adoption of the completed plan by January 2007. The plan should be updated every 5-10 years. DeBra concluded his portion of the presentation by asking the group if there were any questions.

Tim O'Halloran, general manager for the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, continued the presentation by discussing how the list of actions was generated through WRA member agencies, public and stakeholder input. Initially actions have been organized by identifying: foundational actions, high priority/highly developed actions, and actions that need further development. Prioritization of the actions needs to allow for flexibility to reflect real world challenges and funding availability. Tim gave an overview of a typical action process from concept development to construction. Many of the actions in the IRWMP are in the concept/scoping or early feasibility stage. The current approach is to keep identified actions in the IRWMP and address through integration in implementation strategy.

Examples of foundational actions are Groundwater, Surface Water, Subsidence, or Environmental Monitoring Programs; and Ground and Surface Water Modeling Programs. A list of Draft Integrated Actions was handed out with descriptions that included:

- Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project
- RD 2035 Sac. River Diversion & Conveyance Project
- Cache Creek Flood Management Integrated Project
- Cache Creek Water Management Integrated Project

- Dunnigan Integrated Project
- Putah Creek Integrated Project
- Yolo Bypass Integrated Project
- Sacramento River Integrated Project
- Sloughs, Canals and Creeks Management Program

The initial steps in the IRWMP process are: identify issues/topic areas to establish plan framework; seek public/stakeholder outreach effort throughout; compile a potential action inventory/list; a prioritize actions by type – foundational, highly developed, integrated. The WRA Board of Directors will finalize IRWMP actions and priorities and a draft plan for public and agency review will in early fall 2006. The plan is scheduled for final adoption by WRA Board by January 2007 and submittal to state per the Proposition 50 grant agreement. Then an implementation strategy will be initiated.

O'Halloran concluded that the IRWMP Process is pliable, work in progress; always open for review/input; priorities will change/evolve over time; and is a blueprint for today, providing direction for future updates. He then turned the presentation back over to Eidam to describe the break-out sessions.

Breakout Sessions

Eidam explained the importance of gaining public input on the potential integrated and individual actions in each of the geographic areas. She directed the group to four distinct geographic area tables: Putah Creek/Yolo Bypass, Cache Creek, Sacramento River (inc. Dunnigan, Knight's Landing and Clarksburg), and Sloughs, Canals & Creeks. Individuals were encouraged to visit station(s) that most closely met their area of interest (referring to list of actions) and if possible, try and visit all of the stations. Members of the WRA Technical Committee were on hand to provide an overview and answer questions. Each table had numerous notepads and pens for people to write down their comments and concerns. Various maps highlighting actions throughout Yolo County were placed at each station for reference. Attendees placed their notes on the appropriate map. The break-out sessions lasted approximately 80 minutes.

Closing

Prior to breaking-out, Eidam outlined that the group would not be reconvening following the sessions. After attendees provided input in all intended areas, they were free to leave. Information on how to stay updated on the IRWMP process and provide public input throughout this process was highlighted. Meeting participants were reminded about the tools available for providing input includes: WRA's website, being added to the stakeholder database for mailings, and the times and dates of upcoming WRA Technical Committee and Board meetings. One additional public meeting will be held for public input later this year. All of the attendees were thanked for coming and providing their input.

APPENDIX - BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Verbatim comments from May 8, 2006 IRWMP Public Workshop

Sloughs, Creeks & Canals

- Integration – Two Types: 1) physical flood control & habitat; 2) Laws & regulations
- Flood control position – how to integrate with HCP
- Governance questions – How do you decide what's next? You need infrastructure to continue
- Prioritization integrates the projects that will be done no matter what. If you had no IRWMP what projects would happen? Prioritize and integrate those.
- Land owner interest driven projects should be a prioritization criteria
- June-July 2006 HCP public input process timeline
- Addressing landowner concerns when taking public money
- Federal 566 program – localized flood control, we want on-the-ground projects
- Hunt-Wesson development mitigation could be to widen Willow Slough
- HCP - preserve design could be integrated into flood control projects
- “Tree people” integrated planning mode in LA, this is a good example
- Prioritize the prioritization process – develop the capacity for cost/ benefit analysis
- Develop laws or standards for slough management
- WM6 & WM 14 – Chad Roberts – How to fund? Sustainability of funding
- Groundwater recharge from tailwater in sloughs – IGSM Model can quantify this in the future- add this recharge to benefit list
- Another project to add to your list of 170+
 - SW of intersection of Rd. 102 – Rd. 27: there are sustained flooding/drainage problems
 - Dig pond further past (near landfill) with soil going to landfill. Pond can receive drainage from the properties with a problem via putting a drain canal back where it was at Rd 103 & ~Rd. 28 going West to East
- Projects to improve water or resource use or condition are expensive. We all need outside funds to accomplish our goal & install projects.
- State or federal money comes with strings attached – mainly private landowners' very livelihood is exposed (through acceptance of public money) and they could be fined or sued or stopped from farming because of information about their farming being released. Their FEARS MUST be addressed & alleviated!
- Need to include a component to encourage or promote vegetation in the upper watersheds to increase water infiltration, reduce rain drop impact and erosive forces and slow down the flow down to the valley (more than in FM20)
- Regarding the 2-year experiment of doing storm/flood management within the flood control district: an assessment to support that effort seems appropriate, but NOT just the FARMERS. The people in the municipalities benefit from flood management too, so should also be included in the assessment.
- Demo Farm Project: Can this be done on actual farms? Use the UCD farmland or farm on Putah Creek (Audubon/Center for Land-Based Learning & farm & nature center)?
- Create storage by widening the sloughs and creating floodplains in other spots besides Willow Slough north of Davis (Willow Slough bypass)
- Rangelands also need more consideration possible to include hill ponds, riparian restoration, grassland restoration?
- Great to have all major sloughs for habitat enhancement, but potential actions include portions of the sloughs only. If these are to help with multiple problems (e.g. wildlife, flooding, water delivery/drainage etc.) need to consider how to do projects from top of watershed to end. Also need to consider how to widen restrictive points, especially road overpasses, for reducing flooding.
- What type of research/monitoring will take place in conjunction with implementation of actions?

- Probably an appetite for assessment to do drainage improvement, but need to make it clear what people are getting for their money.
- Yolo needs to develop a governance network that links together the regulations, agencies, funding streams, so you can identify and link opportunities.
- For streams, creeks & sloughs you need to integrate: 1) projects (flood control, wildlife enhancement, water quality) and you need to integrate 2) the various government effects – regulations, funding streams, agencies. Yolo needs to develop the capacity to aggregate the problems/ benefits.
- Add: Center for Land-Based Learning to agencies involved.
- Can we start in the upper watershed? More “off-channel” storage with ponds, small structures. This will have a huge effect on everything below.
 - Multiple methods
 - Assessments of landowners
 - Plus, habitat & water quality are improved too
- Integrate with HCP/NCCP plan – especially for permitting
- Change: agencies involved – it’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
- Priorities: I would pick one slough – Willow Slough – and get in all of the components that you want to make a complete program: flood control/drainage, habitat, water supply, recreation, water quality. I wouldn’t try to work in so many locations until you have the process, the regulations, the facilitation, permitting, etc.
- We need to build storage, storage, storage. 1) takes pressure off levees; 2) controls flooding; 3) elec. Generation; 4) water sales; 5) recreation; 6) drought control
- Napa River example of parkway development along Cache Creek where gravel extraction sites will be modified in some ways. A classic, more urban example is the Brush Creek Project in Kansas City – supported by grants from US Army Corps of Engrs. & local funding. This has enabled dramatic waterscapes in another hot, dry summer area. Low water dams can provide short-term storage and decrease flash run off. Lowering flood impacts down stream.
- Caution on clearing the sloughs too well. As water “backs-up” in sloughs, it is being retained for hours and days so all rainfall is not “flash” runoff to the rivers.
- Conservation strategies should be coordinated with the developing HCP/NCCP to take advantage of concurrent planning and to create close relationships going forward through implementation.

Putah Creek/Yolo Bypass

- Could oak woodland habitat restoration be a funding source for some projects?
- Please create an additional AR action item for a riparian corridor along YB waterways (Toe Drain) that could also protect levees from wind/wave erosion.
- Request a presentation to Yolo Bypass Working Group
- Put more emphasis on mercury concerns. WQ1 should include Yolo Bypass in its geographic area. The problem is larger than Cache Creek. Mercury should be mentioned in the Cache Creek & Yolo Bypass integrated actions.
- Add to prerequisite investigations list:
 - effects on mosquito production
 - effects on farming and grazing activity
 - effects on methylation of mercury
- Yolo Bypass Working Group is The stakeholder group for the bypass & must be included in the process as early as possible.
- Add: Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Mgt. Plan as a potential component action.
- Previous aquatic ecosystem restoration tech meetings (2005) defined bypass projects as fish passage projects only, yet these projects are now described with phrases like “andromous fish nursery area”. What was the purpose of the 2005 meetings?

- Include Frontier Fertilizer groundwater remediation project as a water quality action (in city of Davis)
- Yolo Wildlife Area description is inaccurate; I would like to re-write this paragraph.
- The IRWM does not adequately address low impact development practices that retain storm water on site (bioswales, pervious pavement etc.). Storm water represents one of the highest transports of pollutants to the bypass. The plan needs to address retaining the natural hydrograph of the landscape.
- Include additional information on each item (potential action list):
 - Sponsor (LPCCC, City, etc)
 - Status – conceptual to implementation
 - Grants – applied for? Granted?
 - Contact person(s)
- Include process to add projects during development of IRWMP. More importantly after completed IRWMP.
- Clear process for groups to upload information to WRA on status of projects & new projects (as described in bullet above).

Sacramento River (Dunnigan, Clarksburg, Knights Landing)

- FM8 change “from” the Knights Landing RC to “into”. Also check into who benefits – not sure Knights Landing benefits.
- High priority for Dunnigan – maximizing? Understanding of groundwater resources. What potentials for recharge? Some broader testing for toxics spectrum testing of water quality at infrequent multi-year (multi-seasonal?) tests of few randomly selected county wells – something at Dunnigan. Was there old, possibly problematic, upstream dumping? Slow release?
- Dunnigan Area – water level and water quality data in the Dunnigan area is limited. Groundwater monitoring efforts in the Dunnigan area needs to be enhanced.
- Habitat friendly levee program is a great idea. Possible to figure this out in a manner compatible with flood control and measure results as it’s implemented?
- No habitat that will undermine flood capacity and movement of flood waters within bypasses.
- FM5 – Add Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District to list
- Fremont Weir: removal of sediment needs to be followed to make sure it happens
- Tisdale Weir is NOT in Yolo County
- FM5 – very important
- WS22 – Colusa Drain Mutual Water Co. is the entity that controls/sells water in Colusa Drain – certain months – irrigation season
- Dunnigan Integrated Project - Obviously, water projects are needed if 7,000 to 10,000 new housing units are built in Dunnigan. But it seems like the ultimate of dumb growth to make a city there, far from jobs and on agricultural land. If the driving force for such growth is developer pressure or land speculation, it should be resisted at the county government level. If it is that we residents of Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento and Winters are anti-growth, as most of us are, we at least need to have it made clear to us that this is a consequence of our being anti-growth. And maybe we need to be coerced into accepting more growth than we would prefer in our own cities, so as to avoid this expansion of Dunnigan.
- Comments for Dunnigan:
 - If a “new town” is planned, the use of water and relocating a waterscape to landscaping
 - With improvements and using recycled waste water, the ephemeral creeks such as Bird Creek and others could be reshaped and renewed to provide a pleasing scenic ambience when normally dry and flood flow could be increased during winter spring
 - Brush Creek Parkway next to the Plaza area of Kansas City is an extremely attractive example achieved with aid of grants from the US Army Corps of Engrs. Reshaping allows for greater volume of flood flows. Low water dams create beautiful reflection pools

- Low Step wise falls are very attractive during the hot dry summer season. The waterscapes provide opportunity for recreation. Recycled water is used in fountains that augment the re-supply of water
- A small system called “the Living Machine” (info on the Internet) converts sewage to clean water at an environmental education center near the Plaza at Kansas City
- Also on the Internet, the Brush Creek Parkway describing the development of that example

Cache Creek/Yolo Bypass

- WS – the town of Yolo seems to have been forgotten – you’ve included Esparto & Madison but not Yolo.
- Please include mention/linkage with ongoing and potential landowner stakeholder/ neighborhood/ small watershed group efforts
- Yolo red tamarisk/ arundo program in Capay Valley starts this summer (2006)
- How does the plan address NP storm runoff?
- “On-site” retention. Keeping the natural hydrograph. Low impact solutions, i.e. “permeable concrete” bioswales
- Reference city of Portland and Seattle low impact development landscape technique
- FM24 – Clear Lake Operations Evaluation Program – This could provide a significant amount of protection to Woodland at minimal cost – it seems like the smartest of the proposed flood management measures. Whoever would be implementing it should, right away, start assembling political allies and planning legal strategies.
- R3 – Cache Creek Trail Nodes Program – For those of us who think that a long, streamside trail would be a great recreational asset to the county; this “trail nodes” approach is probably the best that we can realistically hope for, as a start. The initial trails should be designed as *potential* links in an eventual long, streamside trail. (“Only over my dead body” landowners should not be given veto power over planning the initial trails.)
- R1 – American River Parkway-Cache Creek Connection Project – Base on the attitude of whoever did the draft write-up for R3, it will be a very long time before there will be any trails along Cache Creek to connect with.
- R16 – Sacramento River-Barge Canal Park Project – Good for the West Sacramento people! They obviously have some vision!
- AR8 & WM13 – Cache Creek Anadromous Fish Reintroduction/Introduction Study – This deserves a high priority, staffed by fisheries, biologists, engineers, and representatives of the farmers who use the creek water for irrigation. It would be great to develop a salmon run in Cache Creek, regardless of the past history or endangered species status.
- AR10 – Yolo Bypass and Fremont Weir Fish Passage Project – This is an obvious high priority yes.
- AR11 – Agricultural Drains and Sloughs Riparian Habitat Enhancement Program – Developing sloughs as vegetation corridors for wildlife will require that at least some water flows during every summer, especially the driest ones. Will the farmers who need water for irrigation be willing to go along with this? Also, will the vegetation interfere with rapid drainage of winter floodwaters that farmers would prefer?
- FM16, FM17, FM18: There obviously is pressure on the WRA to take a fresh look at protecting Woodland from Cache Creek flooding. And it appears from your draft documents that you are hoping to assemble a collection of several projects to do the job rather than one cure-all project. But to ignore the work done by the Army Corps of Engineers, as described in their 1994 publication “Reconnaissance Report Westside Tributaries to Yolo Bypass, California” and to repeat studies on which they have good expertise would be a waste of the public’s money and might delay implementation of whatever is finally decided on.

Specifically:

FM16: The Corps did cost estimates for detention dams on Bear Creek that would temporarily capture all of either the 100-year or 200-year flood (Appendix C, Detention Storage Costs, pages C1-C4). The costs, in 1993 dollars, were \$96,330,000 and \$107,460,000. In each case, the dam would reduce the flow at Yolo by about 9% (Appendix C, pages 32 and 33). So it would take several times this amount of detention to bring the flows at Yolo down to the level for which the present levees were designed. In the same publication, the estimated cost in 1993 dollars of setback levees on the lower creek that would, by themselves, give Woodland 100-year and 200-year protection were \$53,000,000 and \$58,400,000. And you didn't even bother to mention the setback levees in your draft documents. Could the Corps possibly be so far off in their cost estimates that setback levees wouldn't immediately be preferable to a much more expensive set of alternatives?

FM17: It would take a substantial dam to span any part of Long Valley except the very upper end. Plus, there is a lot of recent and ongoing development on the floor of the lower and middle valley. The people who have built there wouldn't likely accept a dam just downstream of them.

FM18: According to the Corps' 1994 publication, if off-stream diversions of water were to be the *sole* flood control measure, it would require temporary storage of water equivalent to an area of 5.9 square miles at a depth of 20 feet (a total of 75,000 acre feet) in order to bring the flow at Yolo down to the designed capacity of the levees on the lower creek (chapter 4, page 30). It might be hard to find even a small fraction of the required area.