

**DRAFT Meeting Summary
Yolo Bypass Working Group IRWMP Subcommittee
Meeting 4**

**December 11, 2007
4:00 to 6:00 pm**

**Yolo Wildlife Area Headquarters
45211 County Road 32B, Davis**

IN ATTENDANCE: Subcommittee Members

Dick Goodell, Glide In Ranch
Tom Schene, Glide In Ranch
Selby Mohr, Mound Farms
Dave Feliz, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Robert Eddings, California Waterfowl Association (CWA)
Marianne Kirkland, Department of Water Resources (DWR) Environmental Services
Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation)
Yemi Okupe, DWR Flood Management

General Public

Donna Gentile, Yolo County Water Resources Association (WRA)
Peter Perrine, Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB)
Bob Schneider, Tuleyome
Linda Fiack, Delta Protection Commission (DPC)

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

Facilitator Dave Ceppos (Center for Collaborative Policy [CCP]) opened the meeting and gave a brief history of the Yolo Bypass Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) Subcommittee (Subcommittee). He reminded that the group has not established rules for declaring a quorum and making decision. He described that the subcommittee was initially intended to furnish recommendations to the WRA towards the creation of a county-wide IRWMP. Recognizing the complexity of physical and social conditions, and existing watershed related stakeholder efforts throughout the County, the WRA identified eight “implementation partners” associated with the eight subwatershed-based “integrated projects” located throughout the County. This, in turn led to a number of meetings during the spring of 2007 resulting in the formation of this Subcommittee.

Before going over the agenda, Mr. Ceppos invited the meeting participants to introduce themselves and identify their affiliation. He then opened the floor to discussion on the agenda and asked participants to suggest changes as needed. Linda Fiack asked that the Delta Vision component of the meeting be moved to agenda item #3. There was no objection by the other participants.

2. Discussion on Proposed Operating Rules

Mr. Ceppos delivered a walkthrough of the Subcommittee Operating Rules and noted that the Rules were revised based on suggestions at the May meeting. Changes in Sections 1 and 2 were based mainly on switching from current to past tense. Other notable changes to the Operating Rules include a clarification of the meeting schedule, a “sunsetting” clause, and a clarification of the rules concerning interactions with the media. A full copy of the Operating Rules will be posted online at www.csus.edu/ccp/publications.htm after January 2, 2008.

Subcommittee Discussion

Several of the members raised a number of questions and concerns regarding the decision making capacity, attendance requirements, and voting mechanisms of the Subcommittee. Selby Mohr asked how the Subcommittee will reach a consensus if members are not always present at the meetings. Mr. Ceppos drew the Subcommittee’s attention to Section 5 of the Operating Rules, which states:

“If a Member cannot attend a Subcommittee meeting, they are encouraged to communicate their views (in writing) on any issues or pending decisions to be discussed to the facilitator and their Alternate (if any) prior to that meeting. These persons have the responsibility to present such views to the Subcommittee. “

Mr. Mohr also raised the concern that if decisions are made without at least a majority present, individual viewpoints could be overlooked. As a counter proposal, he suggested requiring a minimum of 10 participants present in order to make a group decision. Mr. Ceppos reminded the group that the Subcommittee is intended to be an interest-based (rather than individual-based) group; this approach could lead to as many as four (out of eight) interest groups being left out of a decision.

The Subcommittee compromised by agreeing to hold decisions unless at least one representative from each of the 8 predetermined interest groups/organizations is present. If not all interests are represented, Subcommittee members agreed that all meeting materials and a summary of the decision in question will be forwarded to the missing parties by the facilitators within one day. The absent parties will then be given three business days to respond. Meeting participants agreed that no response will imply a silent affirmation of the decision.

Marianne Kirkland asked what the procedure will be if a single person dissents from an otherwise unanimous decision. Mr. Ceppos and Mr. Mohr responded that if, after negotiation, one Subcommittee member is still unable to agree with the rest of the group, the recommendation will be sent out with the caveat that there is a single vote against the decision. Additionally, individual members always have the option of invoking the “go-solo” clause of the Operating Rules and simply offer their own position publicly. If this option is chosen, members should take care to characterize their views as their own, rather than that of the Subcommittee.

Subcommittee members will review the document and submit any changes to CCP as soon as possible. CCP will revise the Operating Rules and post them to the website above on January 2nd.

3. Role of the Subcommittee Regarding Delta Vision Effects on the Bypass

Ms. Fiack introduced a discussion of the potential role of the Subcommittee in the Delta Vision process. Subcommittee members generally agreed that they should start addressing items beyond IRWMP activities, and that the Delta Vision process will definitely impact activities in the Bypass.

Subcommittee Discussion

Ms. Fiack stated that Yolo and Solano Counties are starting to get more involved in the Delta Vision process. Given the short time frame of Delta Vision, she suggested that the Subcommittee should take a position sooner than later if it wishes to be involved. Subcommittee members agreed that they should *at least* be informed of the process as much as possible. Sam Magill (CCP) will attend the Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group (SCG) meeting on December 17th and report his findings to the Subcommittee.

Mr. Ceppos then asked meeting participants if they felt vested with the authority to take an official position on Bypass issues as they relate to Delta Vision. Several Subcommittee members thought it would be beneficial to bring the issue directly to the larger Yolo Bypass Working Group. Ms. Kulakow reminded the participants that if Working Group members really want to be involved, they are welcome to attend Subcommittee meetings. Given the limited amount of time, Subcommittee members agreed that they should weigh in on issues as a group instead of elevating it to the Working Group. CCP will track Delta Vision issues and inform the Working Group of any decisions on behalf of the Subcommittee as needed. Ms. Kirkland suggested that more Subcommittee meetings may be necessary in order to stay on top of issues as they arise.

4. Discussion on the Status of the Yolo County IRWMP

Ms. Gentile delivered an update on the current status of the Yolo County (County) IRWMP. The final version of the IRWMP was adopted in July of 2007 to get “Round 2” Proposition 50 funding. Unfortunately, the \$12 million proposal for projects throughout the County was rejected. Part of the application process included an evaluation of the grant proposal, including a scoring system used to rank all of the statewide applications. The Yolo IRWMP proposal scored 49 out of 100 points; most of the projects selected for funding throughout the state scored between 59 and 69 points. Ms. Kulakow agreed to provide links to the rankings.

The WRA is discussing what Yolo County can do to be more competitive in the future as funding from Proposition 84 becomes available. Unlike Proposition 50, 84 is expected to be highly regional and support partnerships instead of singular actions. The County is actively talking to a range of interested parties and has realized that many grant bids for various projects can be combined to be more effective, such as the emerging partnership between Dunningan Water District, the County, and the cities of Davis and Woodland.

5. Meeting Schedules, Logistics, and Next Steps

Ms. Gentile stated that at the January 28th WRA Board meeting, lead implementation partners will be asked to give an annual update in regards to implementation of the Yolo County IRWMP. Mr. Ceppos suggested the possibility of holding a Subcommittee workshop to put developing issues in a geographical context and to spend focused time developing long-range, multi-interest ideas for future Bypass activities. The group agreed on holding the proposed workshop and decided that it should be held prior to the January WRA meeting. CCP will coordinate the meeting as soon as possible and put together a quarterly meeting schedule for all of 2008.

(Note: the workshop has since been scheduled for January 23rd from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm at the Yolo Wildlife Area)