

# **Water Resources Association of Yolo County Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

## **Public Attendees**

Approximately 45 interested persons attended the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) community workshop on October 25, 2006 at Heidrick Ag History Center in Woodland.

Several members of the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA) Technical Committee were present as were 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
- ◆ Doug Baxter, City of Woodland
- ◆ Mark Cocke, City of Woodland
- ◆ Donita Hendrix, Dunnigan Water District
- ◆ Max Stevenson, Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
- ◆ Bill Brewster, Department of Water Resources
- ◆ Tasmin Eusuff, Department of Water Resources

### WRA Board of Directors Attendees:

- ◆ Kurt Balasek, City of Winters

### Local Electeds Attendees:

- ◆ Duane Chamberlain, Yolo County Board of Supervisors and WRA Board
- ◆ Helen Thomson, 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
- ◆ Lucy Eidam, Lucy & Company

### Media Attendees:

- ◆ Crystal Lee, 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 draft IRWMP (October 2006) and implementation guidelines and receive public comments. All input will be considered during the final review of the IRWMP. Eidam then outlined simple ground rules for meeting conduct.

# Water Resources Association of Yolo County Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006

## Presentation Summary and Overview

One public workshop was held from 4:30 to 7 p.m. on October 25, 2006. The workshop consisted of a brief overview of the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA), its members and the WRA Board of Directors by Sid England, WRA vice-chair.

England turned the presentation over to Jacques DeBra, City of Davis Public Works. DeBra provided an overview of the IRWMP development process and project timeline. He summarized the work of the Technical Committee into three phases: tasks accomplished to date, current status and goals for finalizing the draft and its adoption by WRA member agencies by early 2007.

The IRWMP contains three categories of actions: foundational, integrated and stand alone actions. A description of the actions along with projects or programs was provided (reference presentation handouts attached with this summary). DeBra also discussed the implementation strategy for the integrated actions by area and explained how the WRA is collaborating with established local agencies and groups. Lead partner(s) have been identified to be responsible for each integrated action to facilitate effective implementation. DeBra concluded his portion of the presentation by asking the group if there were any questions.

Eidam detailed the various methods through which the public could provide feedback on the IRWMP and how to obtain a copy for review. The deadline for comments is November 21<sup>st</sup>.

For those interested in an update on the Cache Creek Flood Management subcommittee progress, please speak with Steve Chainey, MIG, at the information table in the back of the room. The WRA Cache Creek Flood Management Subcommittee has established a technical Flood Advisory Committee (CC-FAC) to serve as an independent panel to review flood management data. The CC-FAC will determine the adequacy of the data and advise the subcommittee on any gaps, deficiencies or data needs. CC-FAC membership includes local and regional professionals and community members with technical expertise in flood control, hydrology, engineering and related disciplines, who will work together for the next six months. The WRA also has incorporated Cache Creek flood management actions into the IRWMP. The WRA will continue to work with the Cache Creek Flood Management Subcommittee to make progress on finding a flood management solution as part of the IRWMP implementation process.

## Public Comment Period

Eidam asked the attendees for their questions and comments. The questions and comments have been grouped and summarized by the related topics and are transcribed below.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	RESPONSES
<p><b>Specific actions within the IRWMP:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water &amp; Aquatic Habitat Management: Perform Aquatic &amp; Riparian Habitat Assessment (pg 6-28) and Evaluate Potential for Establishing Anadromous Fish Population (pg 6-31) – both should extend to the Yolo County line and not be restricted to below Capay Dam</li> </ul>	<p>Not sure how or if this question was answered?</p>

**Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodland resident concerned about the quality of drinking water supplied from city wells. Has received conflicting information from different sources.</li> </ul>	<p>Referred to speak with City of Woodland public works staff present at the meeting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knights Landing Citizen Advisory Committee member concerned about the description in the plan of the Knights Landing Storm Drainage/Flood Management Project (FM8).</li> </ul>	<p>Designated Technical Committee member can attend next CAC meeting to address their questions &amp; concerns. (Note: Petrea Marchand is already scheduled to attend a Knights Landing Advisory Committee meeting on November 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss the IRWMP, including this concern.)</p>
<p><b>Accessibility of the information:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where can a copy of the plan be reviewed in Knights Landing or Esparto?</li> </ul>	<p>As of October 12<sup>th</sup>, copies of the IRWMP are available at the local libraries. A complete list of locations can be accessed on the WRA's website: "<i>locations</i>" link <a href="http://www.yolowra.org/irwmp_docs">http://www.yolowra.org/irwmp_docs</a></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What efforts are being made to outreach in unincorporated areas?</li> </ul>	<p>WRA technical committee members (primarily Yolo County) have been in contact with several local Citizen Advisory groups in the unincorporated areas and offered to attend local meetings and provide information. A series of stakeholder meetings were held relating to Cache Creek issues. Reference IRWMP Section 3.2</p>
<p><b>Integration and regional coordination:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the Yolo County IRWMP been integrated with other neighboring watersheds?</li> </ul>	<p>Regional meetings and contact has been made with Solano, Colusa, Lake and Sacramento County, including coordinating with other regional agencies. Reference IRWMP Section 3.9</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some projects need State involvement. How does the plan address and incorporate that?</li> </ul>	<p>Addressed through implementation partners. Will be addressed at the stage when an specific project is prepared to , identify those needs, i.e. during EIR development</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the IRWMP interface with the Yolo County General Plan? Can we comment on the General Plan?</li> </ul>	<p>Model water policies developed by the WRA will be included in the IRWMP Appendix and submitted to Yolo County for consideration in the Yolo County General Plan. The Yolo County Board of Supervisors make the final determination of what will be included in the General Plan</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a really integrated plan that makes</li> </ul>	

**Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

<p>choices. Ties together flood, water and all related elements for Yolo County. Yolo County has made big steps in this direction.</p>	
<p><b>Funding/Cost:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will multiple lead partners be seeking state funding concurrently?</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation strategy includes coordination through the WRA. A communication protocol will be establish with the implementation partners to address coordinating and consolidating efforts where feasible and appropriate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we foresee local groups, not currently implementation partners, applying for funding as part of the IRWMP?</li> <li>• Who is the lead to apply for funding ? Is it the WRA?</li> </ul>	<p>See response above. The current organizational structure of the WRA does not allow us to be the fiscal agent. A lead partner would need to fulfill that role, although the WRA can be the grant application entity. Sid England explained the organizational structure and funding base for WRA operations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IRWMP is an important process for the County. Coordination among agencies has always been a challenge. It is very useful to have a County-wide focus on the needs for Yolo County on paper. The question comes back to how much will it cost? Are the infrastructure needs of the county 20 years behind?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Public Safety:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is public safety a priority in the IRWMP? Safety grabs the State’s attention.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cache Creek levee protection should be at the top of the priority list.</li> </ul>	<p>A separate Cache Creek Flood Management subcommittee has been established and funded by the following participating agencies: City of Woodland, YCFC&amp;WCD, Yolo County and the WRA. The Subcommittee established a Flood Advisory Committee to serve as an independent technical panel to review flood management data. For more information and periodic updates visit: <a href="http://www.yolowra.org/irwmp_ccfm.html">www.yolowra.org/irwmp_ccfm.html</a></p>
<p><b>Prioritization:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does the WRA Technical Committee think are the top issues of concern for Yolo</li> </ul>	<p>The WRA is comprised of 9 very different agencies with varied needs and interests.</p>

**Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

<p>County?</p>	<p>Yolo County is a unique environment. During the prioritization review process, the Technical Committee determined that the Cache Creek Integrated Project met a broader number of goals and objectives. (Reference IRWMP pgs 6-24 to 6-36 and Figures 6-6 &amp; 6-7.) This project encompasses 39 component actions within 3 elements: flood management, water &amp; aquatic habitat management and recreation &amp; riparian habitat. Other priorities mentioned: Foundational Actions in IRWMP – some are already developed and ongoing; and the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WRA should annually list the top 5 priority issues for state funding. Focus on a strategy for making that decision.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the final plan prioritize projects?</li> </ul>	<p>The Technical Committee’s goal was to keep a broad range of actions viable and not eliminate projects from the list. Integrated Action anchor projects are more likely to garner wider support and other smaller projects can be advanced under their umbrella. Smaller projects that might otherwise fall lower on the priority list (e.g. recreation &amp; habitat elements.) The implementation partners will be prioritizing tasks for their area’s actions. A list of prerequisite tasks is included with each integrated action to facilitate implementation will also assist with the prioritization process. (Reference IRWMP Section 6.3.2 and each individual integrated action in Section 6.)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is going to decide what projects move forward? When will that decision be made? What criteria will be used to make that decision?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several Technical Committee members (including DWR) attempted to provide an explanation of the prioritization process that the committee undertook over a period of months.</li> <li>• Appendix B of the IRWMP details the screening and prioritization method developed and the challenges determined for its suitability. As a result of this process, the Integrated Actions matrix was developed.</li> <li>• Some actions may be state regulated.</li> </ul>

**Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some actions will advance as funding sources are identified.</li> <li>• Some actions are more developed and ready to advance. The lead agency is prepared to take responsibility for the implementation and funding.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be more prioritization County-wide, especially when competing for state funding. For example, if a bond measure passes, projects XYZ should be prepared to apply for funding.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify a way to make a decision based on criteria, inform policy makers, prioritize projects, do an analysis.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a better priority list. Figure out how projects can leverage other funding resources. Ability to pay for a project ought to be a criterion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Miscellaneous topics:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of comments the WRA is looking for on the IRWMP? Need more specific guidelines; just asking for our comments is too general a request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review descriptions for your area of interest – improved wording or explanations, missing or inaccurate information.</li> <li>• Are there projects missing for your area of interest?</li> <li>• Are the tasks for an integrated action organized appropriately?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the plan deal with potential legal actions against the projects? (e.g. person cited Paterno vs. the State – flood-related lawsuit regarding levee maintenance liability).</li> </ul>	The IRWM plan is a framework. As a lead agency takes responsibility for an action, the implementation process will address such issues as it relates to that specific project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are most of these projects doomed from the start to never see completion? (<i>due to lack of funding, quantity of projects and complexity of prioritizing</i>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group was reminded that this is the first time such a broad list of actions has been developed by so many local agencies. That is a major accomplishment on its own.</li> <li>• <i>Suggestion:</i> convene one stakeholder briefing for interested parties to address questions about prioritization process.</li> </ul>

**Closing**

All of the attendees were thanked for coming and providing their input. Meeting participants were reminded about how to obtain a copy of the IRWMP and the tools available for providing input via:

**Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
Public Workshop Meeting Summary – October 25, 2006**

public workshop comment card, WRA's website, WRA member agency public review process, and upcoming WRA Technical Committee and WRA Board meetings.