

## **APPENDIX E**

**E-1 – IRWMP Stakeholder Meeting Summaries**

**E-2 – Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project  
Action Meeting Summaries**

## APPENDIX E-1

### IRWMP Stakeholder Meeting Summaries

## **Appendix E**

### **Stakeholder Meeting Summaries**

WRA organized six stakeholder meetings to solicit input on potential actions and priorities for the IRWMP. A total of 32 stakeholder representatives were interviewed. Summaries of each meeting are provided below.

#### **Putah Creek Stakeholder Meeting**

April 13, 2006, 2:30 – 4:00, Hattie Webber Museum, Davis

Stakeholders present: John Vickrey (land owner), Dennis Kilkenny (land owner), David Okita (SCWA), Rich Marovich (LPCCC), Dawn Lindstrom (Putah Creek Council), Andrew Fulks (UCD P.C. Reserve), Mitch Sears (City of Davis), Harold Anderson (City of Winters).

WRA representatives: Jacques DeBra, Petrea Marchand, Donna Gentile

Consultants: Steve Chainey, Gerrit Platenkamp

#### Brief notes regarding potential actions:

##### R14: Develop Winters Putah Creek Park

- Need to provide access
- Removal of blackberries
- Bank is too steep
- Public land
- R project with AR and FM benefits
- Make this into separate action because of multiple benefits

##### AR30 and AR 32: Flood Plain Restoration

- Combine AR30 and AR32
- Remove eucalyptus that can be used for bank protection

##### AR 33: Fish Passage

- Work from the downstream end first
- Most downstream barrier is around Los Rios Dam
- Other barriers include Diversion Dam near Winters

##### FM2: Sediment Control From Tributaries

- Bigger problem than sediment sources from the creek – tributaries suffer large scale bank failures in some cases
- Includes Dry Creek, Pleasant Creek, Pleasant Creek
- Tributary to Lake Solano from North (at middle) contributes large quantities sediment to the creek

New: Route 106A Earthen Crossing

- Should be replaced by another structure
- Washes out every year and contributes sediment
- Fish passage problem

Foundational Action: HEC-RAS Model that SCWA is developing for the Creek should be completed later in 2006

AR34: Putah Creek Salmon Spawning Habitat

- Include in description that this involves creating rock weirs to retain gravel
- Land owners are generally supportive
- Rock slides onto road can be used for material (Caltrans)

New: Vegetation Removal below Putah Creek Diversion Dam

- Channel conveyance is substantially below design capacity
- There is a potential for overtopping of the dam and flooding

AR 7: Exotics Removal

- May want to include this as an FM action instead
- Channel capacity has been much reduced by exotic plants
- DWR has responsibility for channel maintenance but has no funds for maintenance

New: Develop Recreational Opportunities on Public Land

- Putah Creek land owners propose that more recreational opportunities be developed on public lands along Putah Creek (e.g., Winters)
- Include stocking of fish in public areas
- Reduces illegal access to private lands
- Winter Putah Creek Park is an example, there may be others

New: Widen Riparian Corridor of Lower Putah Creek

- LPCCC is aware of locations where riparian habitat zone could be widened and where land owners would be potentially supportive if a conservation easement would be purchased, for example
- This was recommended in the USFWS Reconnaissance Study (1990s)
- Some of this would be in area of Fairfield Ditch or University Ditch

New: Increase Capacity of Mace Boulevard Bridge (Rt. 104)

- Concern of City of Davis (Sears)
- Too little conveyance capacity

R14: Putah Creek Trails Program

- UC Davis and land owners both are concerned that this action is not geographically specific, both have trespass issues.

Not an Action: Wetland in Solano Reach

- Both City of Davis and UCD brought up planned habitat restoration in Solano Reach (Reach 6 in UCD PC management plan) (off-channel wetland)
- This would be outside the IRWMP study area – attendees suggest “coordination” on this, but it is not clear what that would be.

FM 3 City of Winters Storm Drainage Diversion

- Land owners are concerned that the additional proposed flows (up to 1,000 cfs) would cause flooding on their land and affect infrastructure.

**Cache Creek Stakeholder Meeting**  
**April 18, 2006, 1:00 – 2:30, Cache Creek Nature Preserve, Woodland**

Stakeholders present: Bob Schneider (Tuleyome), Ben Adamo (Granite Construction),  
Lynnel Pollock (Cache Creek Conservancy, farmer)

WRA representative: Donna Gentile

Consultants: Fran Borcalli, Steve Chainey, Holly Kuljian

Brief notes regarding potential actions:

**1. Comments Relating to Specific Actions**

WS4: Esparto Water Supply Project

- Mentioned as being an important project

WS16: Comprehensive Conjunctive Water Use Program

- Flood control an issue
- Where are the best recharge fields?
- Surface and ground water
- Must start at upper end
- Look into other distribution facilities.
- Property mining (wet mode) conjunctive use
- Mercury
- Chloroform
- Aggregate producers
- Wet mining – a few additional feet in water rise (10'-15')
- Conveyed not pumped
- Distribution facilities- West Adams Canal, Granite, Teichert Reef, Teichert-Mueller Site, Granite-Woodland, Rinker, Madison-south?
- Turbidity-clogging
- Divert selectively
- Other recharge sites?
- Into wet pits wait for reclamation
- Start shallow

WQ1: Mercury Clean-Up Cache Creek

- Remediation upstream
- Involvement from local agencies
- Shallow reservoirs – where is it used, trace amounts in agriculture areas are okay
- Do you dredge it out (on farmlands)?

WQ9: Yolo (town) Waste Water Treatment Infrastructure Improvements

- Yolo community (not County) is “being dropped off the map”
- People are on individual septic tanks, and have a community well
- There are health concerns with contaminants due to this condition
- Supply also a concern, as well as poor back-up and electricity

FM14: Settling Basin Cache Creek

- Methylation –wetlands
- Look at CDM study for Caltrans- Draft Feb.
- Filling up and remove soils (combo of both)
- Raise Levee

FM16: Bear Creek Detention Basin Project

- Attenuation
- Detention basin-unregulated
- Army Corps looked at issues, now looking at dry detention and other smaller projects to solve bigger issues

FM32 & FM33: Sutter and Tysdale Bypass

- Include in Yolo County, they have potential downstream effects

AR 8: Cache Creek-Yolo Bypass Anadromous Fish Passage Project *and*

AR 12: Lower Cache Creek Salmon Introduction Program

- Feasibility analysis for these projects should be conducted as before moving forward, public input should be solicited during the process.
- Attached issues: How fish can pass, especially salmonids.
- Refer to NHI draft study.
- It was brought up that the titles of the projects are important, ex. Fish Reintroduction may really be Fish Introduction in reality.

AR25: Small Sloughs Revegetation Project

- Modified system
- Diversion
- Raise efficiency
- Provide adequate water supply to slough
- Listed species

R5& R7: Knights Landing

- Recreational use issues including; kayaking/canoe/bike access
- Concerns over possible vandalism and trespassing
- Boat launching-needs improvement
- *Comment: R5 has been removed*

## **2. Comments Not Relating to Specific Actions**

### Riparian Water Use Issue

- Water availability throughout the entire Cache Creek system is needed

### Erosion Control

- Bank stabilization as action for Cache Creek

### Detention Basins

- Water management recharge issues
- Floodway project- City of Woodland, confusion as to what floodway exactly meant.
- It is important to find a project where enough people can agree on.
- Identify and combine old and new solutions
- Manage spill
- Containment, past
- Cut maximum flow- through conveying
- Look at all options, which agree with factual information
- When do you fill detention?
- can't fill detention basins too early or you lose capacity

### Yolo County Tie In

- Enhancements to Yolo county
- Sediment current- upstream
- Water too high, sediment accumulation
- Subsidence due to pumping increase?
- Fine grain sediment
- Surface water

### Aquatic Restoration Project Issues

- Diversions play a role
- Reintroduction-fisheries vs. natives vs. exotics

### Suggestions Concerning Formatting of Action List

- Use separate column for different waterways, and action types.



**West Yolo County Stakeholder Meeting  
April 19, 2006, 2:00 – 3:30, Yolo County Flood Control & Water  
Conservation District, Woodland**

Stakeholders present: Chad Roberts (Yolo County Audubon Conservation Chair), Vance Russell (Audubon California)

WRA representative: Donna Gentile

Consultants: Fran Borcalli, Holly Kuljian

Brief notes regarding potential actions:

**1. Comments Relating to Specific Actions:**

AR20: Cottonwood Slough Riparian Restoration and Levee Setback

- Possibly include: Oak, Cache, and Putah Creeks and Willow Slough
- Get together with as many landowners as possible
- Identify specific projects
- Identify feasibility studies to be done first
- Landowner incentives- for farmland that is taken out of production, a compensation, provide a fund statement, look at sources, on ballot?
- Habitat restoration- enhancement

WS2: Water Storage Project

- Concern: Pondered water in Dunnigan Hills, Tiger Salamander
- *Question*- How do we continue to work with land owners so restoration projects are compatible- landowner input (so projects are also programs.)

FM20: Rangeland Stewardship Program

- Flood run-off
- Restoration included
- Sediment accumulation
- Vegetation management
- Connecting riparian to rangeland
- Riparian fencing is needed
- Weed control included
- Western Hills are an important area for this

AR36: Canal Bank Habitat and Maintenance Program

- Management should be cost effective with emphasis on low herbicide use
- Provide benefits for landowners
- Integrated site specific projects

## 2. Comments Not Relating to Specific Actions

### West Yolo County

- Integrate sloughs (Cottonwood, Willow, and possibly Bear and Chickahominy) with Cache Creek management
- Enhancement consistent with others
- Where does planning come in? Must do focused studies early on
- More information about resources
- Applied research agenda (listed by category –with funding for aquatic and fish monitoring program, that have actual recommendations)

*Question-* What assumptions are we making?

### Overall Environmental aspects to IRWMP

- Commitment and Integration (Directly in Vision Statement)
- Identify biologically rich “hotspots” in streams especially in the Coast Range foothills aquatic habitat
- Protect habitat from exotic species- to lay ground work in order to restore native habitats
- From a watershed perspective we can't segment projects by county lines

### Contact for further input:

Scott and Casey Stone

Blake Harlen

Charlie Rominger

Tom Muller

**North Yolo County Stakeholder Meeting  
April 20, 2006, 6:00 – 7:30, Yolo County Farm Bureau, Woodland**

Stakeholders present: Lewis Bair (RD 108, General Manager), Fritz Durst (landowner), Tom Ellis (landowner, RD 108), Denise Sagara (Yolo County Farm Bureau), Frank Sieferman, Sr. (landowner)

WRA representative: Donna Gentile

Consultants: Fran Borcalli, Gerrit Platenkamp

Brief notes regarding potential actions:

**1. Comments Relating to Specific Actions:**

FM20: Watershed Management Program

- Reduce runoff by
  - rotational grazing
  - crop management
  - not ripping
  - rows of grasses
  - capturing runoff in ponds

New: Demonstration Farm Project

- Establish a demonstration farm to demonstrate agricultural practices that reduce runoff (see above) and reduce water use (e.g., drip and certain land treatments)
- Experienced farmers should be the ones who give advice about these practices to other farmers
- Demonstrate how FM20 would be implemented
- Fritz Durst implements these practices on his farm

WM3: Yolo County Subsidence Monitoring Program

- Subsidence in Yolo-Zamora Area
- Freeboard is lost on canals of RD 108
- Long-term effects of subsidence should be assessed

FM32: Sutter Bypass Vegetation Removal Program

- Vegetation in has caused a reduction in conveyance capacity
- Vegetation at Sutter National Wildlife Refuge has been responsible for levee failure
- Yolo County is affected because water that is not captured in the Sutter Bypass can put additional pressure on Yolo County
- There is a concern that vegetation in the Yolo Bypass will also increase and result in reduced capacity

FM33: Yolo and Tisdale Bypasses Sediment Removal Program

- Capacity has been reduced due to sediment buildup
- DWR has deferred maintenance of bypasses
- Portion of Sutter Bypass between Tisdale Weir and Fremont Weir requires maintenance and has flood flows that are above design capacity

New: Increase Capacity of Fremont Weir

- Sediment has built up at Fremont Weir which reduces conveyance capacity
- DWR has deferred maintenance

FM14: Cache Creek Settling Basin Project

- Preventative maintenance is needed on Cache Creek to reduce erosion

New: Vegetation Maintenance Permit Program

- Landowners who have to remove vegetation for levee maintenance and repairs should not be required to obtain costly permits and implement mitigation
- Landowners should not be penalized with mitigation requirements and potentially costly delays for allowing habitat on their lands and levees when they need to do maintenance
- Landowners who have completely removed trees and shrubs from their land and levees do not have to deal with these requirements
- The existing regulations encourage farmers NOT to allow habitat on their land

## **2. Comments Not Relating to Specific Actions**

### Regional Coordination

The stakeholders expressed that the WRA coordinate with other regions  
RD 108 participates in the Sacramento Valley IRWMP, but is also partly in Yolo  
County

### Restoration Efforts Compatible with Flood Management

- Restoration efforts need to be compatible with flood control first when they are in bypasses and channels that affect flood control

### Sacramento River Channel Capacity at Rio Vista

- Channel capacity at Rio Vista has declined
- Maintenance is required to move flood flows out of the Sacramento flood control system

### Cooperation between Counties to Improve Flood Management

- Sutter, Colusa and Yolo Counties should cooperate to improve the Sacramento River flood management system.

### Support for Senator Sam Aanestad's Flood Management Bond Bill (SB1166).

The stakeholders are proposing that the WRA support SB1166, for example by sending a letter of support.

The bill is cosponsored by Sen. Aanestad and Sen. Machado

The Governor wants to see the bill on the June ballot

RD 108 is supporting this bill

DWR is supporting this bill

The bond would fund removal of sediment from the Tisdale Bypass

## **Non-WRA Agencies Stakeholder Meeting**

**April 24, 2006, 9:00 – 10:30**

**Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Office, Woodland**

Stakeholders present: Al Barth, Dennis Chambers (Ag. Commissioner's Office), Phil Hogan (NRCS), Steve Macauley (CUWA), Paul Robins (Yolo County RCD), Maria Wong (Yolo County HCP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency)

WRA representative: Donna Gentile

Consultants: Fran Borcalli, Gerrit Platenkamp

Brief notes regarding potential actions:

### **1. Comments Relating to Specific Actions:**

New: Removal of Arundo from Small Sloughs

- Removal of Arundo from small sloughs should be included as a flood management action
- Should be part of flood management integrated action
- Permitting of removal of arundo and tamarisk should be streamlined
- RCD is preparing a permit assistance program for bank protection and slough maintenance (covers sloughs, Cache Creek and tributaries to Putah Creek)
  - Permit does not cover anadromous fish
  - Permit does not cover vernal pools

### **2. Comments Not Relating to Specific Actions**

Coordination with the Yolo County HCP/NCCP

- IRWMP should be coordinated with the HCP/NCCP
- HCP/NCCP will cover many actions that affect non-fish species
- HCP/NCCP is interested to use IRWMP actions list as a starting point for actions that should be covered
- HCP/NCCP is expected to be completed by 2008
- Activities will need to be defined to a level where a CEQA/NEPA analysis can be done – an EIR/EIS will be prepared for the HCP/NCCP
- Project proposals will be more likely to be funded if they are covered under the HCP/NCCP
- HCP/NCCP will identify BMPs

Coordination with the RCD and NRCS

- IRWMP should coordinate with the NRCS and RCD because action will overlap
- Individual RCD actions may be integrated with IRWMP actions
- Paul Robins (RCD) is on steering committee of HCP/NCCP
- See letter about NRCS programs from Phil Hogan

#### Coordination with California Urban Water Agencies (CUWA)

- Aging water supply and treatment infrastructure is a serious problem state-wide and in Yolo County (e.g., Madison, Esparto, Yolo)
- IRWMP should include O&M actions
- Drinking water systems need upgrades in small communities

#### Water Supply Storage in Cache Creek Watershed (Barth)

- Why are no actions for new water supply storage in the Cache Creek watershed included?
- Farmers need this

#### Farmland Conversion is a Concern (Hogan)

- Effect of actions on farmland conversion should be scored (e.g., effect of new water supply)
- IRWMP follows general plans
- General plans do not go out far enough into the future (Macauley)

#### NRCS Assistance Programs (Hogan)

- Technical assistance
- Financial assistance
- See letter from Hogan, covers all 5 water management categories of IRWMP
- NRCS programs could be a potential funding source for IRWMP

**Yolo Bypass Stakeholder Meeting**  
**April 24, 2006, 1:00 – 2:30, Yolo Wildlife Area Headquarters, Davis**

Stakeholders present: Jack DeWit (DeWit Farms), Chuck Dudley (landowner), Dave Feliz (Yolo Wildlife Area, DFG), Butch Hodgkins (Reclamation Board), Marianne Kirkland (DWR), Robin Kulakow (Yolo Basin Foundation), James Navicky (DFG), Jeff Weaver (DFG).

WRA representative: Donna Gentile

Consultants: Steve Chainey, Gerrit Platenkamp

Brief notes regarding potential actions:

**1. Comments Relating to Specific Actions:**

FM29: Yolo Basin Drainage Project

- Stakeholders present agree that there is no evidence for water staying longer on the Bypass than in the past due to drainage problems.
- A study was already done by hydrologist Gus Yates, that has shown that there is no evidence for slower drainage (see Yolo Basin Management Strategy Report 2001)

New: Lisbon Weir Improvement Project

- Lisbon Weir captures tidal flow for irrigation
- Fish passage could be improved here
- Farmers would benefit from a more efficient structure

AR28: Yolo Bypass Fish Habitat Enhancement Program

- Some stakeholders feel that this action should be combined with AR31 Bird Habitat Improvement (Hodgkins), but others disagree (Feliz).
- Bird and fish habitat improvement may not always be compatible
- Bird and fish habitat improvement do not have the same level of stakeholder support
- Navicky (DFG) offered to rewrite the fish actions for the Bypass (Chainey OKed)

AR31: Yolo Bypass Bird Habitat Improvement Project

- Stakeholders felt that the description was much too vague
- Concerned about the phrase “bird-friendly farming practices” would that limit what farmers can do?

New: Preserve Agricultural Buffer along Yolo Wildlife Area

- Yolo County could preserve a buffer of agricultural land along the Yolo Wildlife Area outside the Yolo Bypass to provide upland refugia for wildlife, this would enhance the wildlife habitat function of the Yolo Wildlife Area.

New: Incentives for Agriculture to Protect or Enhance Habitat



- This should probably be a separate action
- NRCS has ongoing programs that the WRA could be enhancing potentially

#### AR33: Putah Creek Fish Passage

- Has been dealt with in Yolo Basin Management Strategy document already

#### AR10 and AR27: Fremont Weir Fish Passage

- These are the same action but not described properly
- Navicky will rewrite
- There is virtually no fish stranding this is not an issue according to DFG
- There is an existing group that is discussing fish passage issues in the Yolo Bypass
- Passage in the Toe Drain can be an issue – push up dams block access

## 2. Comments Not Relating to Specific Actions

#### WRA Should Involve Yolo Bypass Working Group

- WRA should involve landowners and other stakeholders in planning projects in the Yolo Bypass
- A well-working long-standing stakeholder group the Yolo Bypass Working Group should be involved – the WRA should do a presentation to them about the IRWMP – cannot make this group feel like they are being bypassed.

#### Tule Canal Railroad Trestle

- The railroad trestle across the Tule Canal traps debris that clogs the low flow channel. Dudley showed photographs documenting this.

#### Use of Existing Information

- WRA should review *Yolo Bypass Management Strategy* (2001) (See [www.yolobasin.org](http://www.yolobasin.org)) which describes many actions and policies.

#### Distinguish Yolo wildlife Area and rest of Yolo Bypass

- In action descriptions the Yolo Wildlife Area and the rest of the Yolo Bypass should be distinguished. Actions that can be taken on the YWA cannot necessarily be taken on private land (e.g., rotation from rice – swamp timothy).

#### Bypass Flood Management Issues Not Yolo County Issues

- Yolo Bypass is the limiting link in the Sacramento River Flood Control Project and will have to be widened in the future (Hodgkins)
- Widening the Yolo Bypass is a Federal and State issue

#### Fremont Weir has Sediment Accumulation and Willows Retarding Flow

- Water management can keep willows and tall emergents from growing in the Bypass
- DWR does periodic maintenance, but funding is an issue

- Weir works adequately from the point of view of flood management
- Hydraulic modeling by MBK shows that sediment removal would not significantly improve conveyance

#### Farming Important for Maintaining Low Hydraulic Roughness

- Farming practices prevent invasion by willows and other species that have high roughness

#### Yolo County Levee Assessment

- Is Yolo County going to do an assessment of their levees?
- Looking for funding?
- Should this be in IRWMP?

#### Involvement of DFG/Yolo Basin Foundation in the Action Formulation

- Dave Feliz expressed surprise that DFG/Yolo Basin Foundation were not involved earlier in the formulation of actions
- Feliz provided 10 recreation and 3 ecosystem enhancement descriptions for projects to be added to the IRWMP that he and Robin Kolakow had prepared

## **Appendix E-2**

### **Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project Action Meeting Summaries**

## Stakeholder Workshop Meeting Summary

**DATE:** February 5, 2007  
**TIME:** 9:00 am – 12:00 pm  
**PLACE:** West Sacramento City Hall  
 1110 West Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento

**ATTENDEES:**

Butch Hodgkins, Reclamation Board	Katy Jacobson, West Sacramento Redevelopment	Cameron Beebe, City of West Sacramento
Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation	Dan Fua, State Reclamation Board	Tony Schwall, Reclamation District 900
Linda Fiack, Delta Protection Commission	Kent Lang, Reclamation District 537 & 1600	Gary Hobgood, Department of Fish & Game
Donna Gentle, Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Dan Mount, City of West Sacramento	Traci Sheehan, Yolo County
Dave Shpak, City of West Sacramento	Gerrit Platenkamp, EDAW	Steve Chainey, EDAW
Stephanie Bradley, EDAW		

**MEETING SUMMARY:**

**Proposed Actions:**

- The Delta Trail project (SB 1556) that would construct a multi-use trail network in the Delta should be added to the list of actions. It would connect to related actions in the IRWMP.
- The IRWMP should include completing the recreation study started by the Delta Protection Commission as an action.
- Should be looking at potential projects that relieve pressure on the levee system, including setback levees and floodplain easements.
- The Corps will be coming out with a report ranking projects for Congress. The projects that are high priorities should be added to the IRWMP.

**Potential Funding Sources for Actions:**

- The latest bonds that passed have a set of criteria for how they will allocate funds. One criterion is for regional flood control actions. DWR will be making 100% funding available for regional plans.
- Wording about proposition funding should be broadened to include all existing and future state and federal funding sources.
- The American River Front Revitalization Coalition may be a new source of funding.
- Emergency response and preparedness, which is a component of the Delta Vision, could be a source of funding. Yolo Co OES is already taking the lead on this plan.

- An inventory of funding programs is needed; Proposition 50 funding is no longer a focus because there are few remaining, uncommitted funds.

### **Other Considerations:**

- The actions in the IRWMP should be consistent with Delta Protection Commission policies, the Delta Vision, the Delta Mercury TMDL, the Delta Aquatic HCP, the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan, and the State Parks Central Vision.
- Yolo County provides mitigation opportunities for projects in other areas (e.g., Natomas in Sacramento). Projects providing upstream pressure relief on the Sacramento River would provide regional benefit.
- There is opportunity to integrate future emergency levee repairs with the IRWMP. New levee repair standards and guidelines are being or have been prepared by DWR, FEMA, and the Corps. IRWMP actions should incorporate new flood protection standards. DWR should be consulted on levee work on the water side of levees.
- Corps released new guidance on minimum standards for levee certification, including mandatory removal of all vegetation over 3" diameter on levee slopes. Interpretation and implementation of this guidance is still unclear, although DWR has already instructed local RD's to comply. Local, agricultural reclamation districts cannot afford levee repair and full compliance with new standards.
- SAFCA is looking at Sutter County to improve flood control by diverting peak flood stage along the Sacramento River upstream of the Sacramento urban areas. SAFCA is no longer focusing on the Yolo Bypass or Elkhorn area of Yolo County as loci of flood relief measures.
- There is a need for actions that have regional support, regional benefit (system-wide), and regional targets.

## Public Workshop Meeting Summary

**DATE:** February 8, 2007  
**TIME:** 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** West Sacramento City Hall  
 1110 West Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento  
 Civic Center Galleria

**ATTENDEES:**

Linda Henegein	Gary Merwin	Bob Kirtlan
Don Stauffer	Tasmein Eusuff, DWR	LaVerne Ireland
Kathryn Bellrami	Helen Smith	David Scheuring, WRA
John Tallman	Caroline Quinn, City of West Sacramento	Stephen Patek, City of West Sacramento
Joe Baramkin	Tricia Blocher	Mary Lasell
Julia Mciver, Yolo County	Tiffany Knapp	Marc Wheeler
Bob Bullis	Carissa Adams	Fran Borcalli, Wood Rodgers
Cameron Beebe	Bill Naddy	Jeff Twitchell, WoodRodgers
Roger Berry	Catherine Barankin	Mike Westlake
Donna Gentile, Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Dan Mount, City of West Sacramento	Traci Sheehan, Yolo County
Dave Shpak, City of West Sacramento	Gerrit Platenkamp, EDAW	Steve Chainey, EDAW
Stephanie Bradley, EDAW		

**MEETING SUMMARY:**

**Proposed Actions and Input on Actions:**

- Safety of people from flooding should be the 1<sup>st</sup> priority and safety of private property should be the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest priority.
- Flood protection should be a higher priority than other categories.
- Snow pack should be considered part of the equation to determine how much water is held behind dams.
- The Sacramento Weir gates should be removed.
- There is interest in recreation along levees. Recreation should be integrated with other components.
- Water quality in the Port of Sacramento is a concern – is there water quality monitoring currently occurring in the Port?
- Invasive weeds introduced by ships to the Port of Sacramento should be studied.
- As much natural vegetation as possible should be incorporated into the levee system.
- There is a need to protect regional infrastructure. The South River Pump Station needs to be protected.
- Actions need to respect private property.
- Is dredging in the Deep Water Ship Channel included in the IRWMP?

## Concerns:

- RD 150 was not notified about the public meeting. [*WRA sent notices to all the RD's. Yolo County mailed and emailed notification of the meeting, along with a form to propose actions/projects in mid-January*] ]
- RD 307 landowner was not notified about the public meeting.
- Why haven't the supervisors notified the RD's about the IRWMP process?
- Private landowners in Clarksburg have worked hard to close the levees to fishing because of vandalism and safety issues.
- If bank fishing is tied to levee projects in the Clarksburg area, they will be strongly opposed by landowners.
- Sacramento River West Bank group needs to gather information from the right sources, including individuals that know the history of the area and private landowners.
- Ferryboats are causing wave erosion on levee banks.
- Infrastructure and recreation on levees compromises the integrity of the levees (Sierra Club public comment).

## Questions and Other Considerations:

- Where are potential projects located?
- How can we find out more about what projects affect the "Rivers" development area?
- When homes in the "Rivers" development were built on the levees, problems with the levees were discovered and money was used from other areas to fix the levee problems.
- Will the public be voting on each action?
- Who decides what actions get integrated?
- Would a levee repair project in a rural area receive a lower priority?
- When considering projects and the available funding, it seems like flood protection projects are the 1<sup>st</sup> priority.
- Representatives from the Sacramento River West Bank group should attend a Clarksburg Advisory Committee meeting to get more input on the actions. [*Gerrit Platenkamp gave a presentation to CAC last year on behalf of WRA about the IRWMP*]
- Private landowners have fought the Corps to allow existing trees to remain on the levees.
- What is the status of the Central Park Plan?
- Is the WRA website interactive?
- When is riverfront development around Raley Field going to occur?
- What is the timeline for the IRWMP process?
- Why aren't elected officials at the meeting?