

Memorandum

To: Jacques DeBra, Chair, WRA Technical Committee

Cc: Fran Borcalli, Wood Rodgers
Dan Mount, City of West Sacramento
Dave Shpak, City of West Sacramento
Traci Sheehan, Yolo County

From: Gerrit Platenkamp and Steve Chainey, EDAW

Date: February 23, 2007

Subject: Yolo County IRWMP Implementation Strategy Chapter

While assisting Yolo County and the City of West Sacramento with preparing the text for the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project, we noticed that the current structure of Chapter 6 of the IRWMP does not work well. We made the text of the Sacramento River section conform to the current outline of the IRWMP, as requested by the Technical Committee, but we would like to offer some recommendations for an improved structure.

We would like to suggest that the section on integrated actions (currently Section 6.3.2) should be converted to a separate Chapter 7. This will make the integrated actions more prominent and more easily identified in the document's Table of Contents. The outline for Chapters 6 and 7 would then be as follows:

6 Implementation Strategy

- 6.1 Purpose
- 6.2 Institutional Structure
- 6.3 Funding Opportunities
- 6.4 Environmental and Regulatory Compliance
- 6.5 Public Outreach
- 6.6 Items for Early Action

7 Action Implementation

- 7.1 Foundational Actions
- 7.2 Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project
- 7.3 Reclamation District No. 2035 Sacramento River Diversion and Conveyance Project
- 7.4 Cache Creek Integrated Project
- 7.5 Dunnigan Integrated Project
- 7.6 Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project
- 7.7 Putah Creek Integrated Project
- 7.8 Yolo Bypass Integrated Project
- 7.9 Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program

We believe that the prerequisite tasks and schedules (now included in Figures 6-4 to 6-17) should be made part of the project descriptions, where appropriate. For most proposed actions these prerequisite tasks and schedules are either too general or too speculative. Although including these tasks and schedules was a good idea to begin with, it turns out that most proposed actions are not well enough developed to allow for the development of prerequisite tasks. Instead, a more general discussion of the overall implementation process could be included in the IRWMP, including the various required stages of project planning, design, environmental compliance, etc., for example in Section 6.6.

IA5. Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project

Overview

The Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project (SRWBIP) is designed to improve the management of public safety infrastructure and public benefits of water resources on the west side of the Sacramento River in Yolo County. The SRWBIP integrates actions that meet IRWMP objectives relating to flood management, aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement, recreation, water supply and water quality issues. The actions incorporated in the SRWBIP apply to the geographic sub-area that includes the portion of the west bank and levee of the Sacramento River in Yolo County, the City of West Sacramento, Knight's Landing and Clarksburg, and the basin surrounded by levees between the Deep Water Ship Channel and the Sacramento River.

The Sacramento River, the largest river in California, forms the eastern border of Yolo County. The meandering, single-channel river is 327 miles long and drains a watershed of 24,000 square miles (Mount 1995). Levees and channels have significantly altered the original pattern of the Sacramento River, but major portions in the lower reaches still retain their meandering characteristics. Much of the Sacramento River's water is pumped through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to supply irrigation water to San Joaquin Valley farmers and drinking water to residents of Southern California. Yolo County contains a portion of the Delta south of Highway 80.

Flood Management

Yolo County's Sacramento River levees protect the City of West Sacramento, the towns of Knights Landing and Clarksburg, and important agricultural lands. In addition, the Fremont Weir, the Sacramento Weir, and the Yolo Bypass in Yolo County help provide flood protection to the City of Sacramento and other communities that rely on the protection of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. As a result of a recently improved technical understanding of levee stability and concern resulting from the impact of two major floods in the past 20 years, the level of protection that these levees provide is increasingly in doubt. Decision makers realize that careful management of the floodway is essential to the protection of life and property, including continuous improvement and maintenance of levees, control of bank erosion where it threatens levees, management of vegetation near levees, maintenance of levee accessibility, and improved control of the general uses of the floodway (Jones and Stokes 2006).

Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystem Enhancement

The reach of the Sacramento River that passes through Yolo County has been studied far less from an ecosystem perspective than other portions of the river, in part because the quality of fish and wildlife habitat is not as high as in other areas. Decades of efforts to provide flood protection to the Sacramento region has resulted in a highly channelized, heavily rip-rapped reach in which vegetation was historically removed to facilitate the movement of flood waters. Fish species found in the Sacramento River in the vicinity of Yolo County and listed for protection under the California and/or Federal Endangered

Species Acts include winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and the Delta smelt. Biologists also are concerned about sturgeon populations. Spawning of adult Chinook salmon and steelhead historically was not common in this reach because of the absence of suitable habitat. The potential to improve riparian habitat consistent with flood management goals should be explored.

Recreation

The Sacramento River provides the public with a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities, including boating, water skiing, fishing, hunting, nature study, picnicking, and hiking. Yolo County provides public access to the Sacramento River at three major river access facilities, including Knights Landing, Elkhorn Regional Park, and Clarksburg. West Sacramento also provides public access and has plans for additional public access in the future as envisioned in the Sacramento Riverfront Master Plan the 2003 Parks Master Plan. The Delta Protection Commission's Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta recommends enhancement of public access opportunities in the Delta, including Yolo County.

Water Supply and Water Quality

The Sacramento River is a source of water for portions of Yolo County. Two other integrated projects: the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project and the Reclamation District 2035 Sacramento River Diversion and Conveyance Project address important aspects of this water supply function. These two water supply projects are discussed in other sections of the IRWMP document and implementation strategy, and are not part of the SRWBIP. However, local water supply and the quality of surface water are addressed in this integrated project.

Lead Agency, Partners, and Stakeholders

Planning and implementing tasks associated with the Sacramento River will involve several federal, state, and local agencies. From the standpoint of the IRWMP, the County will serve as the Lead Partner for actions within the unincorporated territory of Yolo County. The City of West Sacramento will be the Lead Partner for actions within the incorporated boundaries and related to the municipal services of the City, and for actions associated with the Sacramento Bypass levees, Yolo Bypass east levees, South Cross levee, and Deep Water Ship Canal and associated levees. Collaborating partners in various elements of the SRWBIP and stakeholders include the following:

➤ *Partners*

City of West Sacramento

Yolo County

Reclamation District Numbers 108, 87, 730, 1600, 827, 785, 537, 900, 999, 765, 307, and 150

➤ **Stakeholders**

Town of Clarksburg	State Reclamation Board
Town of Knights Landing	California Department of Fish and Game
Delta Protection Commission	California Department of Water Resources
Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento River Corridor Planning Forum	Federal Emergency Management Agency
	N.O.A.A Fisheries
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Integration and Prioritization Method

Actions within the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project were integrated and prioritized according to a stakeholder-mediated process that was led by Yolo County and the City of West Sacramento. This separate process for the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project was necessary because of the unique issues and geography of the project area, where the main water management concerns relate to potential flooding by the Sacramento River. This process also provided communities along the Sacramento River an additional opportunity for participation, where there had been limited involvement in the overall IRWMP process.

The integration and prioritization process consisted of the following five steps:

1. *data collection*: collect sufficient information from public agencies about potential actions to allow integration and prioritization;
2. *integration*: combine individual actions into integrated projects when a substantial improvement in meeting IRWMP objectives would be obtained;
3. *prioritization*: develop an initial prioritization of actions based on their potential to meet IRWMP objectives, Proposition 50 Program preferences, and Statewide Priorities;
4. *stakeholder and public participation*: obtain stakeholder- and public input on integration and prioritization and adjust integration and prioritization of actions as needed based on this input; and
5. *implementation*: develop a strategy for implementing the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project.

Step 1. Data Collection

Information was collected on actions that had been suggested by agency representatives, the WRA and the public. Although brief descriptions and information about the relevant water management categories and geographic area were collected previously, this information was generally not sufficient to allow meaningful integration and prioritization of actions. The additional information was collected using an Action Information Form. The following additional information was solicited from agencies that originated the actions, or from the most appropriate agencies when actions were suggested by the public:

- Project goals and objectives
- Related IRWMP objectives
- Project benefits
- Impacts of not implementing the project
- Estimated project cost
- Available matching funds
- Project timing
- Project readiness

Although most actions that were identified in the October 2006 draft IRWMP were included in the integration and prioritization process, insufficient information or sponsorship was obtained for a number of actions. The latter actions were tabulated for future consideration, and were not considered in the current integration and prioritization process.

Step 2. Integration

Actions were evaluated for their potential to be integrated with other actions. Actions were combined into clusters of multi-objective integrated projects that:

1. **Complement other actions** that would more likely meet one or more IRWMP objectives in combination than individually.
2. **Relate geographically** with other actions that would be implemented in the same area, in close proximity to each other, or in some other spatially related way, e.g., along the same water way.
3. **Increase public and agency support** in combination resulting in greater public and/or agency support than individually (e.g., individual actions may each be supported by different segments of the public or by different agencies).
4. **Improve efficiency** by using fewer resources when implemented in combination than individually.
5. **Reduce conflict** through combinations where independent implementation would lead to greater conflict, e.g., individual actions may each benefit opposing interests.
6. **Reduce adverse impacts** through combinations that would have fewer or smaller adverse impacts than individually (e.g., one action may compensate for the impacts of another action, or the combination of actions result in a net benefit).
7. **Improve the likelihood of funding** through combinations that would better match grant funding criteria than individual actions (e.g., the

integrated action may fit the selection criteria for Propositions 1E, 50, 84 or other grant programs better than the individual component actions).

For example, a levee improvement project, an aquatic habitat enhancement project and a river recreation project could be integrated if they were planned in the same area. Submerged (“instream”) woody material, which provides shelter for juvenile salmon, and river recreation improvements, including a boat ramp or river access trail, could be included in the levee design. This integration would result in a multi-objective levee improvement project with public safety benefits to residents and businesses living behind the levee, benefits to salmon populations and river ecosystem functions, and benefits for river recreation and public access.

Conversely, unconstrained integration of actions could bundle too many individual actions, combine inherently disparate purposes, or link impractical or non-productive implementation elements (e.g., timeframe, mobilization, site impacts, administration, funding, etc.). Individual actions were not integrated where the resulting project would be unwieldy, trigger a complex and time-consuming web of regulatory compliance, or if too many actions would define a single project or program. This consideration was used in some cases to limit the number of actions that were combined.

Not all actions were integrated into clusters. Some actions already had multiple objectives and integration was not necessary. Two actions did not meet the integration rationale for combination with other actions and remained separate.

Step 3. Prioritization

After actions were integrated, when appropriate, the resulting integrated projects and remaining individual actions were prioritized through a two step process. The first step scored the performance of integrated and non-integrated projects on the bases of criteria derived from the IRWMP, known funding programs, and statewide priorities:

- **Responsiveness to the Yolo County IRWMP Objectives** – The WRA felt that it was important that the proposed actions would meet one or more Yolo County IRWMP objectives. In addition to the overall IRWMP objectives listed in “Section 2.1 Goals and Objectives”, specific objectives for the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project were formulated and used as prioritization criteria (see Table 6-1).
- **Preferences of the Known Funding Programs** – The Proposition 50 program funded the development of the IRWMP, and the program’s project preferences were therefore considered appropriate as prioritization criteria. Implementation of projects in the IRWMP could also be eligible for funding under Propositions 84 and 1E, however project preferences under these proposition grant programs will not be available until September 2007.

- **Statewide Priorities** – The statewide priorities formulated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) listed in the IRWMP Program guidelines were considered appropriate prioritization criteria because of the regional character of the IRWMP and the funding provided to the program through Proposition 50. For more information on the statewide priorities see “Section 2.2 Statewide Priorities”.

Tables 6-1 to 6-3 show how the objectives, preferences and priorities, respectively, were translated into consolidated performance criteria.

The purposes of consolidated performance criteria were to acknowledge the substantial consistency between the different sets of objectives and focus the evaluation on the actual breadth of functions and outcomes. These consolidated criteria are similar to those used in other IRWMPs, notably the North Coast IRWMP and the Bay Area IRWMP.

Each component element of an action was tested for performance according to each of the 28 criteria. An action component was credited for contributing to or meeting performance criteria. Each action received overall performance credit for a criterion if a component element was credited under that criterion.

Similarly, integrated projects received performance credit for each action that received criterion credit. Given the different number of actions in each of the integrated projects, the score for performance credit was normalized for each criterion as follows:

- “no action credit”: score = 0,
- “1 or few action credit”: score = 1,
- “some actions credit”: score = 2,
- “all actions credit”: score = 3.

The normalized scores for the performance criteria were added to determine IRWMP criteria total scores.

The second scoring step was based upon a set of criteria that consider situational factors unique to the project or localized conditions:

- Project Urgency (including immediate needs to avoid loss of life and preserve human safety, imminent gain or loss of funding, compelling opportunistic conditions, etc.)
- Total Project Integration (consideration for integrating multiple actions)
- Lead Agency Capacity for Implementation
- Project Readiness
- Status of Funding (including fund acquisition and allocation, and relation of available funding to total project cost)

Of the several considerations that represent situational or local factors, the uniformly recognized and overwhelming importance of life and safety warrants single-function

integration and stand-alone priority. Several actions crucial to life and safety were integrated into an immediate-priority project. These actions also contribute to a set of multi-function projects, integrated by proximate location and timing, or opportunistic implementation. The multi-function integrated projects were then given a score for relative performance on the five considerations. The score for other considerations was summed for each of the multi-function projects and recorded along with the evaluation rationale. The total project score for the other considerations was doubled to establish a scale comparable to the IRWMP criteria score. The sum of IRWMP criteria score and weighted score for other considerations determined the final IRWMP priority for each integrated project. The largest score was assigned high IRWMP priority. The lowest score was assigned a lower IRWMP priority. Scores between the high and low scores were assigned medium IRWMP priority.

Step 4. Stakeholder and Public Participation

The overall SRWBIP and the integration and prioritization methods were presented to a group of invited stakeholders on February 5, 2007, in West Sacramento. The meeting summary from this meeting is provided in Appendix X, including a list of attendees and their affiliations. Input received during and after the meeting from stakeholders indicated that actions taking place in the Delta should be added to or incorporated into existing Sacramento River West Bank Actions, and that consistency with several recent Delta programs should be incorporated into the prioritization criteria. As a result of this input, consistency with Delta Protection Commission standards and programs was included in the prioritization criteria.

The SRWBIP and integration and prioritization process were also presented at a public workshop held on February 8, 2007, in West Sacramento. The meeting summary for this meeting is also in Appendix X, including a list of attendees. Feedback received during and after the public workshop indicated that actions relating to flood hazards and protection of life and private property from flood hazards should be the highest priority among the Sacramento River West Bank Actions. Many participants also advocated for expanded or improved river access, trails, and recreation facilities. This feedback was incorporated into the Sacramento River West Bank Action prioritization process.

Step 5. Implementation

During implementation project priorities will be revisited to consider issues which were not certain or changes that were not anticipated at the time the IRWMP was completed. This step is essential to ensure that implementation is properly aligned with changes in:

- Emergencies
- Additional Actions For Project Integration
- Physical Conditions
- Funding
- Regulatory Requirements, Limitations or Opportunities
- Socio-economic Values

Table 6-1. Relationship between IRWMP Objectives and Prioritization Criteria

	Objectives	Criteria
1	To ensure open and frequent communication with the public.	The action contributes to open and frequent communication with the public.
2	To integrate water resource planning and land use planning.	The action contributes to integration of water resource planning and land use planning.
3	To help disadvantaged communities with basic water infrastructure improvements.	The action contributes to basic infrastructure improvements that benefit disadvantaged communities.
4	To integrate actions to ensure multiple benefits, including recreation and aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement.	The action contributes to integration of actions to ensure multiple benefits, including recreation and aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement.
5	To provide a reliable and sustainable surface water supply from a variety of sources.	The action contributes to a reliable and sustainable surface water supply from a variety of sources.
6	To manage the county's ground water resources to provide water purveyors and individual users with a sustainable, reliable, high quality supply of ground water to serve urban, agricultural, environmental and other uses during normal, above normal and prolonged drought periods.	The action contributes to management of the county's ground water resources.
7	To conjunctively use ground water and surface water to maximize the efficiency, sustainability and value of the county's surface and ground water.	The action contributes to the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater supplies.
8	To develop state-of-the-art urban and agricultural water use efficiency programs that meet statewide guidelines and that substantially and measurably reduce water use throughout the county.	The action contributes to the development of state-of-the-art urban and agricultural water use efficiency programs.
9	To meet state, federal, or local standards for water quality protection, including Total Maximum Daily Loads, in all surface and ground water resources, working closely with water purveyors, landowners, businesses, citizens, state, federal and local agencies, and non-profit organizations.	The action contributes to meet state, federal, or local standards for water quality protection, including Total Maximum Daily Loads.
10	To develop continuous water quality monitoring, management and protection programs, including institutional capacity, to ensure that water quality continues to meet	The action contributes to development of continuous water quality monitoring, management and protection programs.

Table 6-1. Relationship between IRWMP Objectives and Prioritization Criteria

	Objectives	Criteria
	standards for surface and ground water sources.	
11	To reduce flood risk in all areas of the county within 20 years, taking into consideration resource constraints and environmental impacts.	The action contributes to reduce flood risk in all areas of the county within 20 years.
12	To become a model area for flood management approaches that reduce flood risk, protect and enhance the riparian environment, and improve recreational opportunities.	The action contributes to the area becoming a model area for flood management approaches that reduce flood risk, protect and enhance the riparian environment, and improve recreational opportunities.
13	To develop innovative storm water management requirements, guidelines and best practices that enable the county to meet state and federal permit requirements, reduce the risk of flooding, improve the quality of storm water runoff, and reduce impacts to surface water resources.	The action contributes to development of innovative storm water management requirements, guidelines and best practices.
14	To enhance the aquatic and riparian environment in priority areas, consistent with the emerging Yolo County NCCP/HCP, through ongoing, comprehensive programs with dedicated sources of funding.	The action contributes to enhance the aquatic and riparian environment in priority areas, consistent with the emerging Yolo County NCCP/HCP.
15	To become a model area for integrating agricultural production and habitat conservation through the use of sustainable agricultural water use practices and habitat enhancement incentives that are compatible with agricultural production.	The action contributes to the area becoming a model for integrating agricultural production and habitat conservation.
16	To utilize a variety of tools to achieve a sustainable and effective monitoring, management and reporting process for priority aquatic and riparian habitat areas.	The action contributes to utilization of a variety of tools to achieve a sustainable and effective monitoring, management and reporting process for priority aquatic and riparian habitat areas.
17	To improve and expand water-related recreational programs, facilities, and opportunities.	The action contributes to improvement and expansion of water-related recreational programs, facilities, and opportunities.
18	To become a model area for integrating water-related recreational actions with other actions that meet water management objectives, such as flood management, water supply, and habitat enhancement.	The action contributes to the area becoming a model for integrating water-related recreational actions with other actions that meet water management objectives.

Table 6-1. Relationship between IRWMP Objectives and Prioritization Criteria

	Objectives	Criteria
19	To eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance.	The action contributes to eliminating or significantly reducing pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas.
20	To reduce conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues.	The action contributes to reducing conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes.
21	To implement RWQCB Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies.	The action contributes to implementing Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies
22	To implement the SWRCB's Non-point Source (NPS) Pollution Plan.	The action contributes to implementation of SWRCB's Non-point Source (NPS) Pollution Plan.
23	To assist in meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives.	The action contributes to assisting in meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives.
24	To implement the recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, recycling task force, or state species recovery plan.	The action contributes to implementing the recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, recycling task force, or state species recovery plan.
25	To address environmental justice concerns.	The action contributes to addressing environmental justice concerns
26	To assist in achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.	The action contributes to achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
27	Implement Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta	The action is consistent with Delta standards and programs.

Table 6-2. Relationship between Proposition 50 Program Preferences and Prioritization Criteria

	Program Preferences	Criteria
1	Include integrated projects with multiple benefits.	The action has benefits within benefits multiple water management categories.
2	Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability.	The action contributes to water supply reliability.
3	Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.	The action contributes expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.
4	Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance.	The action contributes to the elimination or significant reduction of pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance.
5	Include safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities.	The action contributes to safe drinking water and water quality in disadvantaged communities.
6	Include groundwater management and recharge projects that are located 1) in San Bernardino or Riverside counties; 2) outside the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; and 3) within one mile of established residential and commercial development.	<i>Not used, does not apply.</i>

Table 6-3. Relationship between Statewide Priorities and Prioritization Criteria

	Statewide Priorities	Criteria
1	Reduce conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues.	The action contributes to reducing conflict between water users or resolving water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues.
2	Implementation of Total Maximum Daily Loads that are established or under development.	The action contributes to meeting TMDLs.
3	Implementation of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Watershed Management Initiative (WMI) chapters, plans, and policies.	The action contributes to implementation of WMI chapters, plans, and policies.
4	Implementation of the SWRCB's Non-point Source (NPS) Pollution Plan.	The action contributes to reducing non-point source pollution.
5	Assist in meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives.	The action contributes to meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives.
6	Implementation of recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, recycling task force, or state species recovery plan.	The action contributes to implementation of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, recycling task force, or state species recovery plans.
7	Address environmental justice concerns.	The action contributes to addressing environmental justice concerns.
8	Assist in achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.	The action contributes to achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Integration and Prioritization Results

Action Information Forms were collected for 31 individual actions (Table 6-4). These included both revisions of actions that were included in the draft IRWMP and new actions. The individual actions included 13 flood management actions, 11 recreation actions, three aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement actions, two water quality actions and two water supply actions. Eight actions that were identified in the draft IRWMP were not carried forward as individual actions, because insufficient information was available for these actions, because they had been incorporated in some form in other individual actions, or because implementation of the actions was already funded or substantially under way (Table 6-5).

The two performance scoring steps in the process for setting project priority are presented in Table 6-6 (IRWMP Criteria) and Table 6-7 (Other Local Considerations). The results of integration, performance evaluation, and priority determination are summarized in Table 6-8. One integrated action “Urgent Levee and Other Flood Management Improvements” (UP) was rated as an “immediate” priority, because the protection of life and safety is the most important consideration of Yolo County and City of West

Sacramento. The overarching importance of life and safety warrants single-function integration of urgent flood control actions and immediate priority for implementation. This action integrates eight urgent flood management actions.

The “Sacramento River Flood Management Habitat, and Recreation Improvements” (P1) received a “high” priority. This integrated action advances urgent life and safety improvements and achieves the highest level of multi-function integration. It integrates 10 flood management, aquatic and ecosystem enhancement, and recreation actions.

Five integrated actions received a “medium” priority rating. These include the “Knights Landing Area Project”, “West Sacramento Project”, “Clarksburg Area Project”, “Deep Water Ship Channel Project” and the “Sacramento River Water Quality and Water Supply Project”. These projects generally integrate complementary individual actions within a local geographic area, or in the case of the water quality and water supply project are of fundamental importance to several on-going and pending programs and projects.

Two actions were not integrated and were considered “low” priorities at the time of scoring. They include the “Elkhorn Regional Park Improvement Project” and the “Delta Management Plan”. While there is sufficient lead agency capacity to implement these actions, they either lacked funding, project integration, or urgency.

Implementation

Prerequisite tasks may be required prior to implementation of the integrated actions described here. They may include geotechnical investigations, hydraulic modeling, environmental compliance, engineering design, etc. Unfortunately, some of these activities take months to years to complete. Urgent flood management improvements have immediate priority to protect life and property of the community. There can be no doubt that such urgent priority projects should be implemented immediately. Responsibility of these urgently needed actions along the Sacramento River and Ship Channel lies primarily with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the State Reclamation Board, and the California Department of Water Resources. Local reclamation and levee districts have a shared, but lesser, responsibility as local sponsors and maintaining agencies for state-federal levee protection projects

Planning and implementing water management along the Sacramento River West Bank is an ongoing process. Although available implementation funding from sources such as Propositions 50, 84 and 1E should be pursued whenever appropriate, the water management issues and needs of the community are ongoing and independent of state or federal funding cycles. The stakeholder-based local water management planning and implementation process that was initiated through the IRWMP should be continued into the future. For the SRWBIP, the process was led by Yolo County and the City of West Sacramento, with stakeholder input. In the future, the process should involve focused

stakeholder participation in the form of a Sacramento River West Bank Stakeholder Work Group. This group should include participation of the following entities:

- City of West Sacramento
- Yolo County
- Reclamation Districts
- Private Landowners
- Town of Clarksburg
- Town of Knights Landing
- Delta Protection Commission
- State Reclamation Board
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Water Resources
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Other local planning processes centered on water management and public safety have benefited from similar work groups, including for example the Yolo Bypass Working Group, Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee, the Sacramento River Corridor Planning Forum, and the Lower American River Task Force. These groups have been effective in collaborative planning, obtaining funding and implementing multi-objective projects. Important, ongoing roles for a local Sacramento River West Bank Stakeholder Work Group are to monitor and lobby for yearly progress and funding of state-federal bank and levee protection projects along the west side of the Sacramento River in Yolo County and West Sacramento, and to promote state funding and technical assistance for local geotechnical investigations of potential levee under-seepage risks.

Meanwhile, numerous high, medium and even low priority projects would greatly benefit the community. Therefore, a longer term planning and implementation program of projects with multiple water management and flood risk reduction objectives should be pursued within the more formal structure of a local Work Group. The primary tasks of the WRA can then be to provide a forum for sharing information among local groups, to disseminate information about funding opportunities, and integrate efforts for joint funding applications.