During the preparation of the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) written comments were transmitted to the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA). Although some of the comments preceded preparation of the draft report they are addressed herein as well. Presented herein is a summary of the comment(s) that were received followed with a response to the comment(s). When the comment(s) address multiple subjects or items each was identified on the transmittal with a number and the responses are keyed to each item number.

Presented in Table 1 is list of the comments received. The comments are arranged in chronological order and numbered accordingly. A Summary of the comments with responses follows Table 1. The responses are assigned corresponding numbers.
# TABLE 1

**YOLO COUNTY INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN**

## COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark S. Williamson</td>
<td>City of Davis Resident</td>
<td>11/22/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frank Sieferman, Sr.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>2/10/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bob Schneider, President</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>4/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Patricia Gouveia</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>5/15/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diane Tauzer</td>
<td>Concerned landowner</td>
<td>5/18/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>David E. Bird, General Manager</td>
<td>Tehama Colusa Canal Authority</td>
<td>9/22/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>David Pratt</td>
<td>County Resident</td>
<td>10/25/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dave Ceppos</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/25/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bob Schneider</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>10/25/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Olin Woods</td>
<td>County Resident</td>
<td>10/25/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stephen McCord</td>
<td>Larry Walker Associates</td>
<td>10/28/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bob Schneider, President</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>11/6/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joel Buettner, Water Management Specialist</td>
<td>Mosquito &amp; Vector Control District</td>
<td>11/7/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vance Russell, Program Director</td>
<td>Audubon California Landowner Stewardship Program</td>
<td>11/13/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mary Kimball</td>
<td>Center for Land-Based Learning</td>
<td>11/13/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Frank Sieferman, Sr.</td>
<td>County of Yolo</td>
<td>11/14/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Caroline Quinn</td>
<td>City of West Sacramento Public Works &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>11/14/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jerrold A. Burns, Environmental Program Manager</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Individual Members</td>
<td>Yolo County Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Advisory Committee</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vicki Murphy</td>
<td>County Resident</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maria Wong</td>
<td>Yolo Habitat JPA</td>
<td>11/30/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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YOLO COUNTY INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>David Okita</td>
<td>Solano County Water Agency</td>
<td>12/11/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bob Schneider</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>1/4/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Petrea Marchand and</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/4/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Shpak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bob Schneider</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>1/24/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bob Schneider</td>
<td>Tuleyome</td>
<td>2/27/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY OF COMMENTS WITH RESPONSES

No. 1 – Mark S. Williamson, City of Davis Resident

Mr. Williamson indicated the IRWMP should address six items. The respective items are enumerated below as a comment with a response following:

1. **Comment:** Improved drinking water quality.

   **Response:** A new municipal water supply for the cities of Davis, Woodland, and UCD is addressed in the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project; for the town of Dunnigan in the Dunnigan Integrated Project; and for the towns of Esparto and Madison in the Cache Creek Integrated Project.

2. **Comment:** Sustainability of water supplies.

   **Response:** Foundational actions that provide essential information for managing water supplies, both groundwater and surface water, are deemed important with or without the IRWMP. These relate to monitoring programs that currently exist and will be enhanced over time. Implementation of actions within the following three integrated projects will assist in providing Yolo County with a sustainable water supply: the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project; the Cache Creek Integrated Project; and the Dunnigan Integrated Project.

3. **Comment:** Maintenance of agricultural character.

   **Response:** This is a land use matter that is the subject of Yolo County’s General Plan Update. The activities of the WRA related to the IRWMP are coordinated with the General Plan with respect to water-related policies.

4. **Comment:** Preventing development in flood prone areas.

   **Response:** This is a land use matter for both Yolo County and the cities; however, good land use decisions need good information on flood hazards and risks. Action FM35, the creation of a Flood Management Division within the Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, or a separate entity, is an important initial step toward the development of information and plans to reduce the risk of flooding.

5. **Comment:** Identification and protection of groundwater recharge zones.

   **Response:** The greater part of Yolo County is a recharge area to some extent. Cache Creek and to some extent Putah Creek represent site-specific recharge areas. Accordingly, land use and practices on the land can affect recharge and are appropriately addressed in the General Plan, ordinances, and permitting process.

6. **Comment:** Regional communication and cooperation.
Response: The process of preparing the IRWMP has illustrated the ability of the WRA and its Technical Committee to be an effective vehicle for addressing water-related matters in Yolo County. The WRA highlights the fact that the WRA should become more prominent in fulfilling coordination and facilitating functions. To this end, it is recommended that non-governmental entities such as the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee and the Yolo Bypass Working Group participate with the WRA and Technical Committee on a regular basis to achieve the regional coordination and communication that is important to the long-term success of the IRWMP effort.

No. 2 – Frank Sieferman, Sr., Landowner

Comment: Mr. Sieferman was advising the WRA of known existing studies related to the drainages north of Cache Creek.

Response: The studies prepared by the Soil Conservation Service relate to the Hungry Hollow area and Zamora, Buckeye Creek, and Dunnigan Creeks. The information contained in the reports will be more applicable in the implementation of the Dunnigan Integrated Project and the Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program.

No. 3 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome

Mr. Schneider addresses several topics including potential actions, prioritization, specific studies, and process. An attempt is made to capture the salient points presented in the letter and to respond accordingly. Paragraphs addressing common topics have been grouped and numbered for easy reference. Presented below is a summary of the respective topics with a response following.

1. Comment: Mr. Schneider expressed concerns that the IRWMP does not adequately address the biological and ecological resources related to waterways in Yolo County. He also draws attention to linking the IRWMP to the Yolo County HCP/NCCP and questions the extent to which the IRWMP process has been open to the public.

Response: The IRWMP includes eight Foundational Actions, two of which relate directly to the comments presented. These are identified in the IRWMP as follows: FA6 HCP/NCCP Development and FA7 Aquatic Habitat and Fish Monitoring Program. With respect to the HCP/NCCP, the WRA acknowledges the benefit and importance of the HCP/NCCP in facilitating the implementation of potential actions. Since the Yolo Habitat JPA is not a WRA member agency special attention will be required on the part of the WRA and the JPA to coordinate activities on a regular basis.

The WRA agrees that the knowledge base for aquatic and fisheries resources is deficient and warrants attention as a Foundational Action. FA7 is planned to focus on Cache Creek and the Yolo Bypass because of the hydraulic connectivity. Biological and ecological resources related to the other waterways in Yolo County will be addressed in the Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program.

The work plans related to biological and ecological resources for the foundational action and the management program remain to be developed; however, this is anticipated to be
an important aspect of both activities. The steps noted in Mr. Schneider’s letter for investigating these resources will be appropriate to address in the process of developing the work plans for the above-mentioned foundational action and management program.

With respect to the public process, all meetings of the WRA, the Technical Committee, and the partners or subcommittees involved in the various foundational actions or the integrated actions are open to the public. The agenda for the various meetings vary and, as a consequence, the extent and opportunity for public input varies.

2. **Comment:** Mr. Schneider draws attention to the fact that an understanding of biological and ecological resources is foundational to sound water management and should be dealt with accordingly. He notes that studies of this nature are multi-year programs and for this reason it is important to initiate them as early as possible so as not to delay implementation of important water management projects.

   **Response:** The points raised in the comments relate to implementing the Cache Creek and the Yolo Bypass Integrated Projects and the Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program. The WRA acknowledges the importance of the work outlined in the comments and the time required to obtain suitable baseline data and information. The information needs and the studies listed will be considered in preparing the work plans and budgets for the respective integrated projects as well as for the related foundational actions. It is the intent of the IRWMP that the lead partners or leadership within the respective integrated projects or subcommittees proceed in an open process.

3. **Comment:** Mr. Schneider expresses concern about the Technical Committee conducting business behind “closed” doors and requests that the meetings of the Technical Committee be public.

   **Response:** All meetings of the Technical Committee are open and conducted in accordance with the Brown Act. From time-to-time subcommittees will be set up to address particular items or issues and these may not be publicly noticed. However, recommendations from the subcommittee are brought back to the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee meetings are open to the public.

No. 4 – Patricia Gouveia, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality

   **Comment:** Ms. Gouveia indicates that the IRWMP overlooks urban water quality and draws particular attention to the handling of storm water runoff through the application of “smart growth” and “low impact development” (LID).

   **Response:** The emphasis on urban water quality in the IRWMP is associated with recycling of wastewater and stresses viewing municipal wastewater as a viable “water resource.” The matter of urban water quality related to storm runoff is addressed in actions for Water Quality and Flood Management and Storm Drainage. Action WQ4, which deals with the interface between runoff from agricultural land and urban land, is a component action in the integrated project, Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program. Action FM15 relates to preparing design criteria for Yolo County that provides consistency among
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the various jurisdictions. The design criteria should have provisions related to LID and the description of this action now includes mention of LID. Specific reference has been added to Action FM 21, which relates to storm runoff associated with potential new development in the vicinity of Dunnigan. This action is a component of the Dunnigan Integrated Project.

No. 5 – Diane Tauzer, Concerned Landowner

1. **Comment:** Ms. Tauzer expresses concern about the indiscriminate filling in of drainage channels that alter natural drainage patterns thereby creating drainage problems and potentially mosquito problems as well. She also suggests that if she was able to purchase water for irrigation from the District that farming would be more economical.

   **Response:** It is recognized that there is a need for an entity to be responsible for addressing flood control and storm drainage issues. Accordingly, Action FM35 was identified and included as a component of the Yolo County Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program. Action FM35 is aimed at creating a flood management division within the Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, or a separate entity to address a multitude of flood/storm drainage issues. Developing a sustainable funding mechanism is an important part of this action.

   With respect to the purchase of water from the District, this can be pursued with the District directly and outside of the IRWMP.

2. **Comment:** Ms. Tauzer expresses concern regarding the quality of groundwater in the vicinity of the Yolo County Landfill and the availability of groundwater data.

   **Response:** The WRA has in the past and continues to support groundwater monitoring and views it as a foundational action that must be continued and enhanced with or without an IRWMP. With respect to groundwater level monitoring and groundwater quality monitoring there are several entities involved. In Yolo County the groundwater level and quality monitoring is coordinated through the Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District. With respect to the County Landfill, the monitoring of groundwater is an essential element of the operation. The data on groundwater from the monitoring program is available to the public and it should be incorporated into the groundwater database that includes data from various sources that is maintained by the District. The data would be available from personnel at the Landfill. With respect to air quality, this matter should be discussed with Yolo County and personnel at the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District in Davis.

No. 6 – David Bird, Tehama Colusa Canal Authority

Mr. Bird identified three issues that the IRWMP should address. They are noted below with a response following.
1. **Comment:** WS3.2 Oat Creek Water Storage Project. Mr. Bird notes that plans have existed for quite some time for storage on Oat Creek and he indicates that additional investigation would reveal its viability.

**Response:** A storage facility on Oat Creek has been considered by interests in Yolo County; however, for various reasons it has not appeared to be feasible. This facility is, however, carried forward in the IRWMP for further consideration in the future.

2. **Comment:** WS3.3 Bird Creek Water Storage Project. Mr. Bird indicates that with the Tehama Colusa Canal terminating at Bird Creek a storage facility on Bird Creek could be worthwhile.

**Response:** The response to a storage facility on Bird Creek will be carried forward in the IRWMP for further consideration. It may be attractive in relation to water supply and managing storm runoff in association with prospective development in the town of Dunnigan.

3. **Comment:** WS 23 Tehama Colusa Canal Extension Project. Mr. Bird indicates that an extension of the Canal hold promise in terms of better water quality, environmental enhancement, and increase reliability.

**Response:** Similar to Oat Reservoir, the extension of the Tehama-Colusa Canal has been considered by interests in Yolo and Solano Counties for supplemental water supplies and improved water quality. In the regional coordination with the Solano County Water Agency interest was expressed in relation to the Canal with respect to obtaining water with improved quality. The concept will be carried forward in the IRWMP for consideration in the future.

**No. 7 – David Pratt, County Resident**

1. **Comment:** Mr. Pratt raises concern about not accepting the work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in March 2003, which indicated setback levees to be the preferred project for preventing flooding of Woodland by Cache Creek, and the June 1994 report that indicated “dry” dams on tributaries and temporary off-stream storage to be impractical.

**Response:** The work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) was not completely ignored. The feasibility study of the USACE indicated that the National Economic Development (NED) project was the barrier project that was not acceptable locally. The intent is to examine the full range of options in order to identify an alternative or combination of alternatives that might be feasible and gain the support of the community. This even involves an evaluation of the USACE’s hydrology.

Principal reliance for minimizing the risk of flooding to Woodland is not intended to be on “dry” dams or off-stream storage, but to include them for consideration when an objective examination of alternative solutions is made.
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2. Comment: Mr. Pratt makes reference to a statement in the draft report on page 5-11 and questions the fact that the IRWMP does not accept the work of the USACE at face value.

Response: The statement merely reflects the sentiment gleaned from discussions at the public meetings that there may not be a “silver bullet” to deal with the issues of flooding for the City of Woodland, and that the chances of success in developing a solution will require an objective examination of all options. This may require going back and reexamining alternatives considered previously. The USACE is silent on the Cache Creek Settling Basin, which they know has a limited life. Nevertheless, the alternatives considered by the USACE completely ignore how the future modifications to the Settling Basin may affect the alternatives.

3. Comment: Mr. Pratt indicates that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) may look unfavorably at the IRWMP for not accepting the work of the USACE at face value.

Response: There are sufficient questions regarding the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps and the USACE’s work as it relates to or is influenced by future decisions for managing sediment from the Cache Creek system that DWR will understand the necessity for reexamining alternatives.

The documents referenced by the author will be included in the References section.

4. Comment: The question raised by Mr. Pratt relates to the rights for the public to access the tops of levees in the county. The interest relates to the ability to provide for foot and bicycle traffic along the levee corridors.

Response: The legal entitlement of all levees and the right for the public to access the tops of levees would have to be researched. It is anticipated that Action R32, which is included in the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project, would address this question. This action will be included in the Cache Creek Integrated Project also.

5. Comment: Mr. Pratt suggested that Action AR8, Cache Creek – Yolo Bypass Anadromous Fish Passage Project should not be delayed until the Foundational Action FA6 is implemented.

Response: The scope of a project that would be configured under Action AR8 is not well known and focused at this time. What ultimately is resolved to deal with the flood issues related to Lower Cache Creek and the disposition of the Settling Basin can impact any effort to implement Action AR8.

6. Comment: Mr. Pratt questions the wisdom of Action AR48, Putah Creek Geomorphic Restoration in that it may reduce the channel capacity of Putah Creek.

Response: The participants in the Lower Cache Creek Coordinating Committee indicate that the channel size should be reduced to enhance the geomorphological function of the
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creek; however, for reasons you stated, there should be interest in preserving the flood carrying capacity of Putah Creek especially in view of the expressed concerns of climate change. It is presumed that those responsible are attentive to this matter.

7. **Comment:** Mr. Pratt identified some “typos” that need to be corrected.

   **Response:** Thank you. The corrections were made.

No. 8 – Dave Ceppos, Citizen

   **Comment:** Mr. Ceppos draws attention to statements made by the IRWMP facilitation team during the October 25, 2006, Public Workshop, and notes that was an interesting approach to enthuse/interest the public.

   **Response:** No response required.

No. 9 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome

   **Comment:** Mr. Schneider indicates that the work described under Task 2 and Task 11 under Water and Aquatic Habitat Management (page 6-28) should not be limited to the reach of Cache Creek downstream of Capay Dam, but should extend up to the County line.

   **Response:** The information is needed throughout the system and this will be reflected in the description of the work. The availability of funding may dictate that the work be accomplished according to different segments of the system.

No. 10 – Olin Woods, County Resident

   **Comment:** Mr. Woods in essence supports the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project but suggest that consideration also be given to seeking supplemental water from the Solano Project.

   **Response:** UCD does have a contract for up to 4,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Solano Project. A decision regarding the allocation or reallocation of water supply from the Solano Project was made recently for environmental purposes on Putah Creek. The prospects for an additional allocation of water from the Project for municipal use in Yolo County are such that pursuing this is not deemed appropriate. The analyses for the DEIR for the Davis-Woodland Water Supply address other supplemental water supplies for the community and this document is now available for public review.

No. 11 – Stephen McCord, Larry Walker Associates

   1. **Comment:** Mr. McCord recommends including the water quality management plan prepared for the City of Woodland in the references. Also the reference to the IRWMP Technical Appendix needs to be made clear.
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Response: The document is being modified to incorporate the two suggestions.

2. Comment: **Mr. McCord suggests making reference to volunteers as an important source of “funds” to support projects in the county.**

   Response: Yolo County does have an incredible volunteer ethic. It will be mentioned as suggested.

3. Comment: **Mr. McCord suggest including reference to “pollutant trading buyers” where entities in the lower Sacramento Valley may be interested in participating in a project on Cache Creek to reduce the mercury load if demonstrated to be more cost effective.**

   Response: Reference will be made to this concept as suggested.

4. Comment: **Mr. McCord suggests making reference in Section 6.5 to two regulations, the TMDL’s and the Basin Plan.**

   Response: The comment is appreciated; however, it is deemed best to leave the section more generic otherwise there would be numerous other regulations to reference that are not necessarily appropriate at this stage.

5. Comment: **Mr. McCord expressed his willingness to participate in establishing prioritization criteria.**

   Response: Your expressed interest is appreciated; however, the WRA allocated three months for the lead partners for integrated projects to establish priorities for their respective geographic subarea.

**No. 12 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome**

Mr. Schneider presents some general comments as well as specific comments to text sections of the report. The general comments will be grouped and numbered with a summary of the context provided herein. The specific comments will be repeated as presented in Mr. Schneider’s letter. Responses are provided to each numbered comment.

1. Comment: **Mr. Schneider, although acknowledging the difficulty in prioritization of projects describes the importance of going through the process and suggests a general example of what might be considered a high priority integrated project. He also indicates that activities implemented under the IRWMP should be aligned with the HCP/NCCP and interface with the County General Plan update.**

   Response: The WRA, in response to the input received at the Public Workshop on October 25, 2006, regarding the concern about prioritization allocated three months of time for the lead partners in the respective geographic subareas to prioritize activities important to implementing the integrated project for which they are responsible. The results of this effort are reported for the respective subareas in Section 7 of the IRWMP.
Prioritization as it relates to allocating staff time and funding will be dealt with on an ongoing basis as actions are implemented. Each subarea has and likely will continue to have different methods or approaches to setting priorities.

The relationship between the IRWMP and the HCP/NCCP is recognized by the WRA as being important. It was for this reason that the HCP/NCCP was included in the IRWMP as a Foundational Action. The IRWMP should and does interface with the General Plan. The IRWMP process initially produced potential water-related policy options to be considered in the General Plan process. These are included in Appendix C of the IRWMP. As the General Plan progressed, water-related objectives were produced according to the five water management categories selected for the IRWMP. Most of these objectives have been incorporated into Section 2 of the IRWMP.

2. Comment: Mr. Schneider draws attention to the fact that where appropriate for management of the resource, activities within the various geographic subareas need to be coordinated. This is illustrated by citing fishery resources between Cache Creek and the Yolo Bypass as an example.

Response: This point is absolutely true and this coordination between the respective subareas is an important part of the on-going coordination that can be accomplished through the WRA with the cooperation of the lead partners in the respective subareas.

3. Comment: Page 3-1: 3.2.2.1 Disadvantaged Communities and Environmental Justice

   “The Plan fails to adequately address environmental justice. Hispanic and other minority communities have special ties to water quality as it relates to subsistence fisheries and recreation. As an example, the Hispanic community is a significant user of Yolo County parks in the Cache Creek canyon. Yet, adequate outreach to this community has not been undertaken and when we checked we found that significant groups such as the Woodland Hispanic Chamber of Commerce were unaware of the IRWMP process. We are willing to assist where we can to ensure that environmental justice issues are addressed.”

Response: The Plan does include several potential actions that would improve facilities in what are considered disadvantaged communities according to the Proposition 50 Guidelines. Your assistance in reaching out to the Hispanic community as potential actions are addressed subsequent to completion of the IRWMP would be helpful.

4. Comment: Page 4-5:

   “Under 4.5.1.1 Salt Creek, Bird Creek, Oat Creek and other tributaries north of Cache Creek should be mentioned.”

Response: The referenced waterways have been included.

5. Comment: Page 5-8:
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“Description, bottom paragraph: We don’t want the channel put into a pipe.”

**Response:** This concern should be expressed at the time the specific project environmental review takes place. It is not a project feature at this time; however, it could be in the event the feature is combined with the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project.

6. **Comment: 5-9 to 5-12:**

“Several comments are made in these pages related to efforts to address the Woodland flood issues. We have specific concerns, but first make the following general comments related to this issue.”

- “Why does this section completely ignore the Army Corps of Engineers conclusion that the preferred project for preventing flooding by Cache Creek of Woodland and the land north of the creek is “setback levees”? [US Army Corps of Engineers, March 2003. Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, CA, City of Woodland and Vicinity. Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report for Potential Flood Damage Reduction Project.]”

**Response:** It does not completely ignore what was stated in the work of the USACE. It was deemed appropriate based upon the reactions of the residents of the City of Woodland and Yolo County to the USACE’s feasibility study to consider all potential alternatives and combinations of alternatives to some extent. The purpose is to provide an objective assessment of the full range of options from which to deal with the problem. This even includes a reevaluation of the USACE hydrology for the Cache Creek watershed as identified as a prerequisite task under the Flood Management Element of the Cache Creek Integrated Project.

- “Why does this section make its principal reliance (top of page 5-12) on two kinds of projects that the Corps has specifically rejected”?

1. “dry” dams, the best of which (Bear Valley) the Corps found to be maximally expensive and minimally effective. [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, June 1994. Reconnaissance Report, Westside Tributaries to Yolo Bypass, California]. If dry dams are to be discussed the earlier Corps reports on the Guinda and Brooks dams should also be mentioned and included in the bibliography.

2. “temporary off-stream storage, which the Corps concluded would need to flood so much land so deep that it was impractical. [same 1994 reference]”

**Response:** The principal reliance for resolving the flood issues in the Lower Cache Creek area is not proposed to be dry dams. It is suggested that all options be considered in the process of moving forward to identify an acceptable solution. Please refer to the response presented above.
• “We are unaware that “there seems to be growing consensus that the Woodland/Cache Creek flood control solution will, by necessity, consist of multiple, integrated actions.” We totally disagree with this statement and in fact it is our preliminary conclusion that efforts to utilize multiple integrated actions will in effect divert attention and funding to projects that do not resolve Woodland’s flood issues and that the capital and operating and maintenance funds that might be expended will make it increasingly difficult to resolve this issue. There is no growing consensus. We do recognize, however, that some projects that may provide some incremental improvement such as re-operation of Indian Valley Reservoir or changing the decrees with respect to management of the water level on Clear Lake can make sense and be cost effective.”

Response: The language was modified. The intent is that there may not be a single project that adequately addressed the problem and that a combination of projects may be required.

7. Comment: Pages 5-10:

• “Under Theme - Our goal should be 200-year flood protection and this should be explicitly stated.”

• “Under Relevance to Goals and Objectives- Fifth bullet should be changed to read Providing recreational opportunities while minimizing impacts to other property owners.”

Response: The City has indicated a 200-year level of protection so this change has been made. The objective was left unchanged as that was the intent when the language was drafted.

8. Comment: Page 5-11:

• “The Thurston Lake Pump Storage Project is referred to as (WS1) but this should be (WS 19)”

• “Under Description: We are unaware that “there seems to be growing consensus that the Woodland/Cache Creek flood control solution will, by necessity, consist of multiple, integrated actions.” We totally disagree with this statement and in fact it is our preliminary conclusion that efforts to utilize multiple integrated actions will in effect divert attention and funding to projects that do not resolve Woodland’s flood issues and that the capital and operating and maintenance funds that might be expended will make it increasingly difficult to resolve this issue. There is no growing consensus. This statement should be removed.”

Response: WS1 was corrected to WS19, thank you. Please see the response above for the second bulleted comment.

9. Comment: Page 5-12:
• “We do not agree that consideration should be given to temporarily storing flood waters in the upper watersheds in new detention basins. However, the re-operation of existing reservoirs may have merit.”

• “5.4.5 Cache Creek Water Management Integrated Project
Location: We disagree with limiting this project between Capay Dam and County Road 94 B. This arbitrarily limits the reaches of the creek for projects that should be considered over the entire watershed. Specifically, this inappropriately limits the extant of AR 8, AR 24, AR 46, and R3.”

Response: At this point all alternatives are left open for consideration. The two Cache Creek integrated projects are combined later in the document and the limitations noted in the comment are removed.

10. Comment: Page 5-16:

• “We are extremely concerned about mention of in-stream storage projects on either Oat Creek (WS3.2) or Bird Creek (WS3.3). We feel that these two smaller creeks in the Dunnigan Hills should be identified for restoration of riparian and aquatic habitat elements. This is also true of Buckeye Creek (FM4). The IRWMP is clearly not “integrated” with the planning process included in the NCCP/HCP, which is a major point that we have made previously.”

Response: The merits of how the resources should be managed in the future will be the product of an open process with the appropriate environmental review. The HCP/NCCP has been brought in as a Foundational Action in order that it is incorporated into both the planning and implementation process.

11. Comment: Page 5-20:

• “See comment under page 5-10 with respect to rewording the fifth bullet.”

Response: Same response as for comment under page 5-10.

12. Comment: Page 5-21:

• “At top of the page the sentence should be reworded to state: “Planning and implementing this action will be closely coordinated with all local stakeholders and…””

Response: The wording was modified.

13. Comment: Page 5-34 Table 5-1:

• “FA 6: We continue to request that this title be properly described to include “opportunity assessment” as it is a critical foundational activity.”
Response: Agreed. We want to understand the opportunities.

14. Comment: Page 5-36 Table 5-2:

- “WS 7: We have serious concerns about any efforts to convert the open channel that parallels highway 16 across the Yolo-Bypass into a piped transmission facility. We asked to be informed with respect to any continued action or development of this project.”

Response: Any proposal to significantly modify the conveyance across the Yolo Bypass will require compliance with CEQA and the process will provide the opportunity for input at that time.

15. Comment: Page 5-37 Table 5-2:

- “WS13: We appreciate that this project mentions that fish passage investigations should be conducted.”

Response: None required.

- “WS 17: We would like additional information on the status of these projects. It is also important to insure that the Agricultural Mitigation Conservation Program will not preclude the establishment of these small reservoirs that are in essence a widening of a slough, in appropriate locations.”

Response: This action will be included in the Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Integrated Project. Your participation in the stakeholder group will enable you to be kept informed.

- “WS 20: This description should include the list of potential projects.”

Response: The list will be developed in collaboration with Lake County as the Cache Creek Integrated Project matures.

- “WS25: The first statement should be modified to read, “The building of Sites Reservoir may enhance the viability…””

Response: Agree. Suggested change was made.

16. Comment: Page 5-46 Table 5-4:

- “FM1 and FM18: We have serious concerns about both of these projects that involve on-stream and off-stream dry dams and short duration detention projects. Both of these projects have large potential environmental impacts and regulatory and engineering constraints. Studies of these projects that do not include these environmental elements merely serve to divert needed resources from solutions to
important flood management projects. There is no consensus on this approach to resolving Woodland flood management issues.”

Response: Any effort to consider projects of this nature will certainly involve an environmental assessment at the appropriate time.

• “”FM19: The flood management goal for our region should be a minimum 200-year event. The wording should be for a “minimum 200-year event” in place of “at least 100-year flood protection.””

Response: The City has unofficially noted this so the suggested change will be made.

17. Comment: Page 5-53 Aquatic and Riparian

• “AR 30: Action AR7 and AR30 are substantially similar. Perhaps these should be combined to refine a plan and county coordination with the entities conducting this work throughout the region.”

Response: It is agreed that they are similar; however, at this time they are being dealt with as deemed appropriate by the parties involved.

• “AR36: The YCFCWCD is the best responsible agency to implement control of invasive species along their canal and natural waterway system in conjunction with AR7 and AR30. This effort can be coordinated with projects such as AR 36 to restore habitat and minimize the reinvasion of exotics.”

Response: Agreed.

• “AR46: Cache Creek once had significant salmon runs. As Joe Farnham reported, he remembers his dad fishing in Gordon Slough with a pitchfork in order to catch salmon to feed to their hogs. A Fish and Game warden reported steelhead in Clear Lake as late as the 1939.”

Response: The appropriate actions are identified and when implemented this will be dealt with.

18. Comment: Page 6-21: Conveyance Project

• “As noted earlier we have concerns with respect to the Conveyance Project and request to be listed as stakeholders and notified as to any planning on the project and EIR processing. Is the Draft EIR complete, who is the lead agency, and where is the EIR available”?

Response: The project has not advanced to the point of preparing the environmental documentation.
19. Comment: Page 6-24: Cache Creek Integrated Project

- “Please erase “U.S. Bureau of Land Management designation of a Cache Creek as a natural area” and replace with “Cache Creek federal Wilderness designation.” “

Response: The suggested change was made as it applies to land under the jurisdiction of BLM.

20. Comment: Page 6-25

- “Yolo County must be listed as partner in this project.”

Response: The County is listed in the previous paragraph in the report as part of the partnership with the YCFCWCD and the City of Woodland.

21. Comment: Page 6-26

- “We have serious concerns with respect to the composition and representativeness of the Flood Management Technical Committee. It currently consists of 6 engineers and 1 farmer. In our judgment this composition seriously undermines the public process and trust in the IRWMP process. It is, perhaps, also a fatal flaw in efforts to develop a community consensus on flood management options for Woodland. Tuleyome has formally requested to be a member of this committee in the past, and there are numerous other interests in the county that should be part of these discussions.”

Response: This concern was dealt with in the composition of the recently formed and expired Flood Advisory Committee. This is not to say that there may not be another Technical Advisory Committee formed in the future.

22. Comment: Page 6-28: Item 2

- “The title of Item 2 should read “Perform Aquatic and Riparian Opportunity Assessment.” ”

Response: The intent to assess opportunities is clearly stated in the text that follows the heading.

- “In addition, this study should not be limited to the area downstream from Capay Dam. It must include the creek from Clear Lake Dam and Indian Valley Reservoir to below the settling basin.”

Response: Language was added to reflect the Cache Creek System.

• “Language limiting this action to the area below Capay Dam must also be eliminated. Items 2 and 11 are directly related to water flows and ecosystem processes throughout the length of the creek, and the entire system must be studied in order to address the principles of watershed science that underlie integrated regional water management planning. As we have said on numerous occasions, these studies need to be started as soon as possible, as they must be completed prior to moving forward with water supply, water quality, and flood control projects that may have adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem elements and fisheries in the basin. We do appreciate that some funding has been set aside to begin this work.”

Response: The language has been modified to refer to Cache Creek without reach restrictions.

24. Comment: Figure 6-6

• “We will submit additional comments on this chart. But, it is clear that the cross references for Tasks 11 and 12 are inadequately marked. The potential to establish anadromous fisheries and evaluate potential for aquatic habitat enhancement must also precede the Huff Corner levee work in the creek, reconciliation of the Cache Creek settling basin, the purported Cache Creek tributary detention basin project, the Cache Creek off-stream detention basin project, the Woodland area flood management project, Water management program, and the Clear Lake operations evaluation project. The interrelationships of all of these project elements is the primary point that Tuleyome has been stating about this planning effort for several years: it is simply impossible to look only at water supply, or flood control, or any other technical phase of water resources planning, without looking equally at the ecological, environmental, recreational, and other aspects of water resource planning and management in the county.”

Response: Work related specifically to the Huff Corner levee is not specifically addressed. There is agreement on the intent of the comment and it is for that reason that the work described in Task 2 under the Water and Aquatic Habitat Management Element was indicated to be initiated early.

25. Comment: Page 6-57

• “Please add Tuleyome as stakeholders in the Yolo County sloughs, canals and creeks integrated projects.”

Response: This was done.

No. 13 – Joel Buettner, Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District

Comment: Mr. Buettner draws attention to their concern regarding the creation of mosquito breeding sources and notes that his District has the authority to abate public nuisances and impose civil penalties and suggested corrections and the addition of some language related to the concern of mosquito breeding sources.
Response: Your points are well taken. The corrections and suggested language noted in your letter are being included in the IRWMP.

No. 14 – Vance Russell, Audubon California

Mr. Russell identified three recommendations that he feels should be addressed in the IRWMP. These are identified below with responses.

1. Comment: Mr. Russell recommends that the WRA develop guidelines for setting regional priorities and integrating programs, policies, and project actions for planning and future funding purposes.

Response: The resources, the degree to which projects have been identified and analyzed, and the stakeholders involved in the respective subareas identified for implementing the IRWMP vary substantially. For this reason, setting priorities between the respective subareas is problematic. Establishing guidelines or a process/procedure for establishing priorities tailored to the respective geographic areas would be beneficial in the future.

2. Comment: Mr. Russell recommends that a prioritization process should give an appropriate balance to water, agriculture, and the environment without compromising any of the three.

Response: As a practical matter, one interest will emerge to be the “lead”. This will be driven to some extent by resource needs, readiness, source of funding, and relative feasibility. To the extent all resource interests are moving forward albeit some in greater steps than others none should feel compromised.

3. Comment: Mr. Russell indicates that the state requires monitoring and measuring the effects or outcomes of the recommended plan actions and that not having them in the IRWMP will jeopardize the opportunity of funding.

Response: Monitoring and measuring the effects or outcomes of actions is important; however, the protocols for this would be tailored to a specific action the details of which are not defined at this time. The monitoring protocols will be important in an application for funding a particular action.

No. 15 – Mary Kimball, Center for Land-Based Learning (CLBL)

1. Comment: Ms. Kimball indicates that the CLBL feels the IRWMP should have a process by which organizations such as hers would be able to implement projects within the Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Management Program for which they have the ability and resources. A concern expressed is that without a structured process certain organizations will have the advantage over others with respect to implementing their own priorities.
Response: The intent of the IRWMP is to coordinate the activities of entities participating in resource related activities within the respective geographic subareas and not to exclude or compete with each other. There is no shortage of work and it behooves all parties to work together for the benefit of the community of Yolo County. The response you received with respect to how various groups work together was an honest one at that time and that structure needs to be worked out with the parties and stakeholders within the respective geographic subareas. The structure will be different in each geographic subarea. The CLBL is encouraged to be an active participant in the program and work with or assist the YCFCWCD to organize and implement actions in the above-referenced program.

2. Comment: Ms. Kimball expresses concern regarding a prioritization process and that although it is a difficult and complex process there needs to be a way to determine priorities.

Response: The prioritization of actions is complex and even more so for this particular integrated program. Do you prioritize by waterway or by activity? In reality, it will probably be some of both and with other parameters as well. The collaboration of all interest groups and landowners as well will be important. The program is in its formative stages and CLBL needs to be actively involved. The approach is not to be a competitive one but a collaborative one instead. As noted above the CLBL is encouraged to be in direct communication with the YCFCWCD at this time.

No. 16 – Frank Sieferman, Jr., Yolo County Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors addresses three subject areas where changes should be incorporated into the IRWMP. Each is addressed below.

1. Comment: Prioritize actions. The Board encourages the WRA to take the time necessary to develop priorities in a thoughtful and careful manner and include all interested stakeholders in the process.

Response: The WRA allocated three months for the lead partners to work on prioritization and integration of actions for each of their respective geographic subareas. The product of that effort is embodied in the IRWMP for each subarea or integrated project. The resources, the potential actions, the manner in which they are integrated, and the stakeholders involved are quite different within each of the integrated projects. There is no “cookie cutter” that fits all circumstances. There is no substitute for communication, coordination, and collaboration among the parties involved and this will be the key to success. Priorities will change depending upon several factors, one of which is funding and its related criteria. The action of highest priority may in fact be a long-term project by virtue of its complexity and size. This does not mean that a lower priority action is put on hold until the priority action is implemented. From a practical standpoint, so little is known of the majority of the potential actions that several tasks have been identified for implementation in order to determine if the action is in fact feasible or what the physical parameters of the action are.
2. **Comment:** Integrate actions. The Board suggests that the WRA develop a strategy for integrating actions so that they achieve multiple benefits. It is suggested further that the WRA make an initial attempt at integrating actions now and to develop a strategy that lead agencies may use to revise integrated actions in the future.

**Response:** The IRWMP is comprised of Integrated Actions. By definition, each integrated action is comprised of component actions. The component actions are to be integrated as implementation occurs and as it is determined how this can be best accomplished. As noted above, implementation in the early years will be the product of what are identified as perquisite tasks. For example, the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project has public safety as a high priority. Nevertheless, one cannot commence implementing levee construction or reconstruction without first completing several critical prerequisite tasks such as geotechnical investigations, establishing zones of benefit and assessment districts, etc. The strategy for integrating actions in the future will be different for each of the respective subareas and will be the product of the collaborative process that emerges in each. This process is well established for Putah Creek as a result of a lengthy process and the dedication of many people. What is important is that it works and progress is measurable. That process it not necessarily a template for the other subareas.

3. **Comment:** Clarify implementation strategy. The Board suggests that the WRA should create clear guidelines for implementing the IRWMP in Yolo County.

**Response:** The discussion on implementation has been expanded in the IRWMP to reflect some of the Board’s suggestions. The implementation strategy has been expanded to include factors that are deemed important for the WRA and lead partners as they proceed into the implementation process.

No. 17 – Caroline Quinn, City of West Sacramento

1. **Comment:** Ms. Quinn indicates a defensible process of prioritization and integration of IRWMP actions is needed including a method for stakeholder input on the priorities.

**Response:** The WRA allocated three months for the lead partners in the respective geographic subareas to revisit prioritization and integration of potential actions. The WRA also allocated funds to the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project to facilitate prioritization and integration. The product developed for each subarea in relation to further prioritization and integration is presented in Section 7 of the IRWMP.

2. **Comment:** Ms. Quinn indicates placing more emphasis on greater integration of recommended actions in different areas of resource benefit and that perhaps a new consultant could fine-tune the Plan with fresh eyes.

**Response:** The majority of the actions identified in the IRWMP are not well defined in terms of scope and even location. This was recognized by most of the members participating in the development of the IRWMP. Although integration was deemed
important it was also understood that devoting additional time to integrating actions that are not well defined would be academic. It was understood that more investigative work on the actions was necessary to understand where integration was most beneficial. The consultants providing additional assistance to the City of West Sacramento and Yolo County for the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project were involved in the preparing the draft IRWMP.

3. **Comment:** Ms. Quinn suggests that spending additional time to polish and fine-tune the IRWMP would assist in developing more competitive projects.

**Response:** As noted above, the WRA provided three months in the schedule for the lead partners for the respective geographic subareas, particularly the Sacramento River West Bank and Yolo Bypass Integrated Projects, to revisit the prioritization and integration. The polished documents are now included in the report. The competitiveness of a given project for implementation grant funding will be determined on the merits of the project based on information that needs to be developed beyond the IRWMP.

No. 18 – Jerold A. Bruns, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region

1. **Comment:** Mr. Bruns draws attention to the concerns related to mercury discharges in the watershed and notes that, where applicable, the monitoring and assessment requirements included in the recently adopted Regional Water Board Cache Creek Mercury Control Program should be rolled into the plan.

**Response:** The mercury issues relate largely to the Cache Creek Integrated Project and the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project and the lead partners are fully aware of the concerns related to mercury. Reference will be made to Regional Boards Mercury Control Plan in both integrated projects.

2. **Comment:** Mr. Bruns notes that the State Water Board administers funding programs that provide grants and/or loans for wastewater treatment plant construction and provides the website address for downloading related information.

**Response:** The WRA appreciates the helpful reference you provided. Reference to this information will be included in the funding section of the IRWMP.

3. **Comment:** Mr. Bruns identifies programs of the Regional Water Board that apply to discharges that may be associated with implementation of IRWMP actions in the future.

**Response:** The WRA appreciates this information and it will be referenced in the discussion on environmental compliance in the IRWMP.
The committee provides comments under two categories: General Individual member comments, and Advice on setting priorities.

**General individual member comments:**

1. **Comment:** Use demographic data more recent than 2000 data.  
   **Response:** The information compiled was based on using one source to represent the respective cities. This was the most readily available at the time.

2. **Comment:** Specifically identify lead agencies in the IRWMP to carry projects forward.  
   **Response:** The lead partners for the respective subareas are identified. It is premature to identify the lead agency for implementing actions. The actions need to be better defined and the agency that takes the lead is not necessarily known at this time. Granted, some are obvious because of jurisdictional responsibilities; however, others could be implemented by various agencies.

3. **Comment:** It is suggested that the two Cache Creek Integrated Projects be combined.  
   **Response:** This was already done in the draft Action Program.

4. **Comment:** Include some evaluation of general feasibility of flood management alternatives in the IRWMP.  
   **Response:** This type of evaluation would logically be required for other alternatives if it were done for flood management. This was beyond the scope of the IRWMP.

5. **Comment:** Identify opportunities for recreational enhancements as part of the Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Integrated Project and further develop the description and integration of the actions.  
   **Response:** The opportunities for enhancement will be site-specific and involve landowner participation and the involvement of many stakeholders. This is anticipated as an important part of the planning and implementation of the integrated project subsequent to completion of the IRWMP.

6. **Comment:** Combine all types of use of the gravel pits and related Lower Cache Creek Area Features into a single master plan.  
   **Response:** A master plan for Lower Cache Creek has been prepared by Yolo County as part of the Cache Creek Resources Management Plan. Activities along the creek will need to be coordinated with the existing master plan.
7. **Comment:** Better establish the detailed and/or quantifiable benefits obtained by integrating individual actions into “integrated projects.”

**Response:** To develop detailed and/or quantifiable benefits requires that the actions themselves are well defined. Considerably more work is required to know the dimensions or details of a particular action. This will, of necessity, have to be done in the implementation phase.

**Advice on setting priorities:**

1. **Comment:** Prioritize based on merit, not only on “the extent that prerequisite tasks are required before an action can be implemented.”

   **Response:** The merit of actions, similar to the benefits noted above, cannot be evaluated when the actions are not well defined as most the actions are. What the IRWMP illustrates is that there is a lot of opportunity; however, there is a great deal of work to be accomplished to begin to understand the full extent of the opportunity. The prerequisite tasks, if completed, are intended to provide information from which a better definition of several actions will begin to be evident.

2. **Comment:** Prioritization would be easier if we were able to base it on some fiscal information, specifically projected costs, fiscal history, and projected revenue for each component.

   **Response:** What is stated is true; however, as noted above, information on the actions is severely lacking to do what is suggested. It is time to get the program on track and keep it moving.

3. The Committee suggest the following as top priority actions:

   3.1 **Comment:** Foundational Actions that address wildlife and recreation.

   **Response:** The WRA sees this as a priority and is considering allocating monies from the WRA budget to initiate work on this action.

   3.2 **Comment:** Removal of invasive species from Cache and Putah Creeks.

   **Response:** There is widespread agreement on this action and work is continuing on this action.

   3.3 **Comment:** Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystem Enhancement areas that benefit other action categories, including Recreation.

   **Response:** Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystem Enhancement is an important consideration in the integrated projects for each geographic subarea. A determination of what it means in each area is not known at this time; however, with the appropriate studies and investigative work a definitive program can be
defined. It would helpful if Committee members participated in the stakeholder groups that will be a part of the implementation program for most of the integrated projects. The lead partners are identified for each subarea and can be contacted to obtain specific information on the planned meetings and activities.

3.4 **Comment:** All those Recreation actions that are part of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan and/or have been recommended by the PRWAC.

**Response:** The lead partners for the respective integrated projects recognize the importance of recreation. As more detailed planning for implementation of actions within the respective integrated projects takes place the opportunity for recreational elements will be considered as a component of an integrated project or a stand-alone project. Again, it would be helpful if Committee members participated in the stakeholder groups that will be a part of the implementation program for most of the integrated projects.

3.5 **Comment:** Actions benefiting West Sacramento which may not have been included in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.

**Response:** The lead partners for the Sacramento River West Bank Integrated Project recently completed an effort to identify and prioritize actions. Both recreation and aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement actions were addressed.

No. 20 – Vicki Murphy, County Resident

1. **Comment:** Ms. Murphy indicates that much more attention needs to be devoted to removing sandbars and vegetation from the Cache Creek channel to maintain the flood-carrying capacity. She also asks if Cache Creek will get its share of funding to do more projects.

**Response:** Without any doubt Cache Creek is a resource where flood management and the integration of resource categories are of high priority. Actions taken recently by the governing bodies of Yolo County, the City of Woodland, and the Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to implement Action FM35, Creation of Flood Management Division or Entity, is illustrative of the importance being given to flooding associated with Cache Creek and Yolo County generally.

2. **Comment:** Ms. Murphy expressed her concern about the time involved to get permits to implement projects and that there should be a stream-lined permit process to allow certain projects and types of work to move forward within waterways.

**Response:** The WRA and member agencies agree with the expressed concern and, it is in part for this reason that the work of the Yolo Habitat JPA is included in the IRWMP and a Foundational Action.
3. **Comment:** Ms. Murphy expresses concern that the “do-nothing-but-neglect-policy” of "flood management" in California as well as with Cache Creek is a problem and that an effective policy to deal with flooding before it happens is needed.

**Response:** From both a statewide and local perspective flood management, hazard identification, and emergency preparedness have never received the attention that is being given at this time. Funding is available to those parties that actively “get their act together.” As noted under comment 1 above, flood management ranks higher and is being treated more seriously now than it has ever been. The opportunity to accomplish or overcome the concerns expressed is good at this time.

4. **Comment:** If there is widespread flooding, what happens to landowners if there are attempts by environmental groups to lay claim to newly flooded areas as “natural flows,” “wetlands,” and new riparian corridors?

**Response:** If new areas are proposed to be flooded or existing flooding is proposed to be increased, affected landowners will have to be compensated fairly before a project can be implemented. There is no dispute on this. However, what is considered to be fair compensation may be disputed.

No. 21 – Maria Wong, Yolo Habitat JPA

Ms. Wong reviewed the administrative draft of the IRWMP and offered both general and specific constructive comments that are both structural and editorial in nature.

1. **Comment:** Ms. Wong suggests editing the document and moving the description of the actions.

**Response:** The document has been edited and the action program has been moved to a new Section 7.0.

2. **Comment:** Ms. Wong suggests replacing jargon with more common terms for ease of reading.

**Response:** The WRA plans to prepare an Executive Summary that would be written for a more general audience and the document would be written accordingly.

3. **Comment:** Ms. Wong suggests presenting a “take home message” early and concisely.

**Response:** This suggestion is good. A “take home message” was drafted for inclusion as a Foreword, however time did not allow all agencies that may be concerned about the language to review it beforehand. Therefore it was not included. Although the WRA does intend to prepare a summary document that should be helpful.

4. **Comment:** Ms. Wong suggests editing to pick structural inconsistencies and cites an example.

Appendix F–27
Response: The example noted has been corrected.

5. Comment: Section 1

1.2 Suggests adding a sentence regarding the statutory purpose of the IRWMP.

Response: A sentence was added referencing Proposition 50, Chapter 8.

1.3 Indicates that the stated goal in Section 1.3 was oversimplified.

Response: The goal in Section 1 was removed and the goals and objectives in Section 2 were expanded.

1.4 Suggests discussing how the collaborative process will be developed or referencing Section 6.0 and how “outsiders” are admitted to the process.

Response: Reference is made to Section 6.0 regarding implementation strategy that addresses some of the items addressed in the comment.

1.5.6 Notes that it is not clear as to what is meant by “native” classification as a land use designation.

Response: The “native” classification is the terminology reported in DWR’s land use surveys and relates essentially to a non-cultivated vegetation.

6. Comment: Section 2

2.1.2 Refers to comment 1.2 above regarding goals and objectives.

Response: As noted above, the goals and objectives were expanded in this section.

2.1.3 Notes that stated objectives appear to rely on a future process to actionable and suggests adding language recognizing this and outlining a roadmap for developing that process.

Response: The stated objectives are to guide the planning and implementation of individual actions and integrated actions. Those involved in the respective integrated actions should be attentive to the objectives as they design and implement prerequisite tasks aimed at implementing actions.

7. Comment: Section 3

3.6 Suggests reversing the order of the first two sentences and asks how new information will be integrated as the IRWMP process unfolds.

Response: The two sentences were reversed. As new information becomes available, it will be the responsibility of the lead partners to ensure that integration is accomplished where it is appropriate.
8. **Comment: Section 5**

- *Suggests moving the detailed discussion to an appendix.*

**Response:** It is not clear as to what the detailed discussion refers. If it was intended to be the tables, it was decided to leave the tables in Section 5.

9. **Comment: Section 6**

6.2.3 *Suggests explaining the statement “Integration is not the product of this IRWMP”* (pg. 6-4)

**Response:** Integration is not accomplished in a written document. Integration is accomplished in the implementation, if at all. The text notes that “this IRWMP does provide the overall guidance and framework by which integration can be initiated and sustained as a common aspect of implementation.”

6.2.6 *Makes the following suggestions and poses questions as follows:*

- *It appears that most foundational projects are “countywide”. Were they elevated to this status based on some subjective criteria?*

**Response:** The Foundational Actions were identified as such because they are essentially countywide and should be considered for implementation regardless of the IRWMP. As noted in the text, several of them are being implemented and will be enhanced over time.

- *Suggests moving details of Foundational Projects to the appendix.*

**Response:** The “details” of concern are not so detailed and were deemed appropriate to leave in the main body of the report.

- *It is unclear how centralized the structure is intended to be. An organizational chart would be helpful.*

**Response:** The figure entitled, “Yolo County IRWMP Implementation Structure” is an organization chart showing the relationship between the WRA, Technical Committee, and the Foundational and Integrated Actions. Coordination is the central function of the WRA and Technical Committee. The intent is that non-member organizations would coordinate their projects and programs through the respective integrated projects and look to the WRA to identify opportunities to coordinate work.

- *It is unclear how entities not enrolled in the WRA who undertake “activities” under this plan would be subject to the decision making process of the governing organization (WRA).*
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Response: The WRA is not a governing body, but rather one with a primary function facilitating the coordination of the activities of its member agencies. It is suggested in the IRWMP that the WRA serve as a vehicle for coordinating activities of non-member entities as well. This relates to the Putah Creek and Yolo Bypass Integrated Projects in particular. It is also suggested that the WRA be structured to function as a fiscal agent serving all integrated projects.

No. 22 – David Okita, Solano County Water Agency

Comment: Mr. Okita provide editorial comments to text related to Putah Creek

Response: The edits were incorporated into the IRWMP.

No. 23 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome

Comment: Mr. Schneider suggested including reference to climate change and increasing energy costs in the goals of the IRWMP.

Response: Reference to climate change has been incorporated in the objectives related to water supply and flood management. Increasing energy costs will, of necessity, be dealt with as will the increase in costs for other items when actions are formulated, evaluated, and implemented.

No. 24 – Petrea Marchand, Yolo County and Dave Shpak, City of West Sacramento

Comment: The authors suggested edits and additions to the goals and objective of the IRWMP that provide greater linkage between the IRWMP and the County General Plan.

Response: The majority of the suggested edits and additions were incorporated into Section 2 of the IRWMP.

No. 25 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome

Comment: Mr. Schneider expresses his concern regarding the composition of the Yolo Bypass Working Group Subcommittee that currently exists to prioritize and coordinate projects under the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project. In particular, Mr. Schneider does not feel there is appropriate representation on the subcommittee to speak for maintaining, restoring, and enhancing the Bypass for fish.

Response: The subcommittee has been in existence a short time and was established in response to the request from the WRA to establish a more formalized structure for addressing issues and projects in the Yolo Bypass as an element of the IRWMP implementation process. The subcommittee and the overall coordination through the WRA and among the respective integrated projects is in the formative stages. The WRA, in the interest of facilitating management of the resources for the overall benefit of the County can
provide a forum for addressing the concerns expressed. It is suggested that the concerns expressed and the basis for them be discussed with the WRA.

No. 26 – Bob Schneider, Tuleyome

Comment: Mr. Schneider describes the importance of the Yolo Bypass as a flood management feature for the Sacramento Region and the deficiencies that are now known to exist and suggests including the evaluation of options for increasing the Yolo Bypass flood conveyance capacity as a Foundational Action in the IRWMP.

Response: Mr. Schneider’s summary of the known deficiencies associated with the Yolo Bypass is good. The importance of the Yolo Bypass as a flood management feature for flood protection for the Sacramento Region is well stated. Since this item is not a countywide issue it will not be included as a Foundational Action, but rather highlighted in the discussion under the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project and the Cache Creek Integrated Project.

It is recognized that the Yolo Bypass and its relationship with Cache Creek are very important. Since the draft IRWMP was completed, items of notable significance have been accomplished. First, the early attention by the jurisdictional bodies of the County, City of Woodland, and Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District to implement Action FM 35, and the Creation of a Flood Division or Entity to address flood-related issues in the County is a major step toward addressing the comment. Although this effort is only now in the process of becoming memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding, it does set the stage for linking flood and other related items between the two geographic subareas.

Second, is that steps have been made to establish an institutional framework for the Yolo Bypass that could not only ultimately provide a structure for coordinating actions throughout the Bypass area, but also facilitate coordination, where appropriate, between the respective geographic subareas of which Cache Creek is one.
From: <warrenfwy@yahoo.com>
To: <info@yolowra.org>; <cal@catanio.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2005 9:45 AM
Subject: From IRWMP Comment Page

> Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
> (warrenfwy@yahoo.com) on Tuesday, November 22, 2005 at 09:45:51
> -----------------------------------------------
> -----
> 
> name: Mark S. Williamson
> organization: 431 Heron, Davis
> 
> comments: I am interested in the Yolo County IRWMP process but unable
> to attend -- the November 30th meeting conflicts with the Association
> of California Water Agencies conference.
> The IRWM Plan should include examination of:
> 
> 1. Improved drinking water quality.
> 2. Sustainability of water supplies.
> 3. Maintenance of agricultural character of Yolo County.
> 4. Preventing development in flood prone areas -- NOT simply building
> or enlarging levees.
> 5. Identification and protection of groundwater recharge zones.
> 6. Regional communication and cooperation.
> 
> Please include me on the mailing list for future meetings.
> -----------------------------------------------
> -----
> HTTP_USER_AGENT: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US;
> rv:1.7.12) Gecko/20050915 Firefox/1.0.7
Fran Borcalli

From: WRA [info@yolowra.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 8:27 AM
To: Fran Borcalli
Subject: Sieferman, Sr. - IRWMP Data inquiry

----- Original Message -----  
From: WRA
To: Fran Borcalli
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 1:32 PM
Subject: Re: IRWMP Data inquiry

Thanks for following up on this Fran.
Donna

----- Original Message -----  
From: Fran Borcalli
To: WRA
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2006 1:10 PM
Subject: RE: IRWMP Data inquiry

Donna,

I am pretty sure that we have them however, I will confirm this with Phil Hogan.
Thanks,

Fran

Francis E. Borcalli, P.E.
Wood Rodgers, Inc.
3301 C Street, Suite 100B
Sacramento, CA 95816
Telephone: 916-341-7760
Direct Line: 916-326-5224
Facsimile: 916-341-7767
E-mail: fborecalli@woodrodgers.com

----- Original Message -----  
From: WRA [mailto:wra@ncdc.org]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 4:01 PM
To: Fran Borcalli
Subject: IRWMP Data inquiry

Hi Fran,

I received a call from Frank Sieferman, Sr. the other day. He wanted to know if we are aware of engineering studies done in the late 70's on the Cache Creek north areas by the Soil Conservation Service. These were studies on flood control & water storage. He called them the "566 Projects" and indicated that they would be in the SCS archive files. Are you aware of these reports he is referencing? He wanted to be sure they were part of our IRWMP planning efforts.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
April 21, 2006

Dave Schuering, Chair, Board and Technical Committee
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624
Woodland, CA 95776-8624
Email: info@yolowra.org

Dear Dave, Board and Technical Committee:

Tuleyome supports an integrated approach to water resources planning in Yolo County. In the past Tuleyome representatives have written letters of support, participated in public meetings, and followed the work of the Technical Committee. In addition, we have on numerous occasions provided both written and oral communications with respect to the potential aquatic and habitat restoration actions and potential recreation actions that should be included in an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP).

Thus, it was with some concern that I reviewed the Draft Integrated Actions handout, dated April 13, 2006, which was presented at the Cache Creek focus group discussion on April 18, 2006. Key projects with respect to the reintroduction of anadromous fisheries (AR8, AR 12, and AR 29) were omitted from the Integrated Projects for both Cache Creek Water Management and Cache Creek Flood Management.

It is my understanding that this omission was based upon the perception that these projects were not adequately “developed.” In further discussions following the session, it was mentioned that this was actually no longer the case, as the Technical Committee had decided at a recent meeting that, at this time, all “Potential Actions” should be included in the various “Integrated Projects,” as they had not yet been “prioritized.”

I appreciate that this decision was made, although it is my understanding that this was not a unanimous decision by all members of the Technical Committee. Nevertheless, the concerns, perceptions, and trust that should exist with respect to the IRWMP being an open public process are damaged by the apparent exclusion of environmental concerns from the IRWMP formulation.

Tuleyome remains supportive of the IRWMP concept. It is vital that decision-makers in the County proceed to meet future Yolo County needs of water supply and quality, and to address issues of flood management, aquatic and riparian habitat enhancement, and recreation. In order to accomplish a truly integrated water resources management plan, important issues, concerns, and potential projects cannot be left out of consideration in the plan-development stages.

Tuleyome’s participants in the IRWMP process have been impressed by the efforts of Water Resources Association, and in particular the members of the Technical Committee, in their commitment to an inclusive and open public process. However, the commitment to openness has
apparently not resulted in a commitment to ensuring that important conservation concerns are included in and addressed by the IRWMP. **We suggest that the IRWMP incorporate the following steps to ensure an integrated process that addresses all of the concerns that exist for water in the County (see discussion below):**

1. Include additional “foundational” tasks into the IRWMP:
   
   A. Identify important biological and ecological resources associated with the streams, sloughs, creeks, and rivers in the county that will be affected by the water-supply and flood-control projects described in the IRWMP. In particular, Tuleyome believes that there needs to be substantial involvement in studying the potential for salmonid reintroduction to the Cache Creek basin (suggested task WM8). Tuleyome also believes that substantial additional focus is needed for fishery and other ecological resources in the Yolo Bypass, including salmonid concerns. Tuleyome believes that identifying existing biological and ecological values associated with sloughs is an essential foundational task (suggested task WM9).
   
   B. Tuleyome believes that associating the focus of the IRWMP with the essential focus of the Yolo County HCP/NCCP is also a foundational task, which needs to begin before there are commitments made to adopt the content of the IRWMP.

2. Begin necessary or appropriate environmental studies now:
   
   A. Identify fishery resources within the Cache Creek basin, including those associated with anadromous fisheries reintroduction and those associated with maintaining the important native fishery resources in the basin.
   
   B. Identify the fishery, riparian, and wetland resources within the Yolo Bypass, together with solutions to their protection and enhancement.
   
   C. Identify biological resources associated with sloughs, including preliminary considerations of water needs for maintaining and enhancing these resources.

3. Provide full public access to all WRA planning actions and documents.

**Discussion**

1. **Foundational Actions:** It is our understanding that “foundational” actions are basic in nature to sound water management in Yolo County. In other words, these actions underlie the other tasks in the IRWMP, and many other “potential actions” cannot proceed until these foundational actions are in place. Since Tuleyome members first became involved with the WRA process for the IRWMP, we have been urging that identifying biological and ecological elements associated with Yolo County’s streams, sloughs, and other water resources constituted an essential action for such a Plan. Our comments have consistently indicated that identifying the ecological water needs of the County’s waterways would be an essential underlying issue for the IRWMP.

It is with a significant degree of concern that we now note that the draft integrated projects do not include tasks that will allow the WRA, County government, and the County’s citizens to understand what biological “resources” exist in the County’s waterways and how the IRWMP would affect them. In Tuleyome’s opinion, the “resource assessment” studies underlie informed decision-making for any proposed action that might result from the Plan, and it is difficult for us
to see how the County could adopt possible implementational projects, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the California Water Code, without this information.

Therefore Tuleyome requests that the identification of biological and ecological concerns for the waterways in the County be identified as a critical "foundational" element for the Plan. The appropriate studies must be initiated as soon as possible in order to provide key information needed for the rest of the Plan’s implementation. As our representatives have commented previously, identifying the biological circumstances concerning the reintroduction of anadromous salmonids to Cache Creek is certainly one area of critical environmental concern. A similar concern is the current lack of understanding about the relationships among biological resources and the use of a number of natural water features called "sloughs" for water supply and drainage purposes. These are only examples; we have raised a number of other biological questions previously.

There is much to learn and it is imperative that these complex studies begin as soon as possible to ensure that future "actions" do not create significant adverse effects on aquatic resources. It is important to remember that the benefits to fisheries that are included in an integrated plan can help the County in securing additional capital dollars as well as funding priority.

Tuleyome continues to support improved water-management efficiency in Yolo County, including irrigation, flood-control, and conjunctive use. However, existing biological habitat functions in the County’s streams, sloughs, and irrigation distribution system must be maintained; proposed management projects may provide opportunities for these habitats to be improved. For example, as irrigation efficiency is improved carriage water and tailwater return flows that currently nurture habitat within these features may be reduced. We need to know, for example, what water flows will protect these habitat functions as changes in irrigation water or storm drainage conveyance is implemented. While there is real potential for improved efficiency in the irrigation and drainage functions in the system, as well as for enhanced water quality in these reaches, the biological studies that will tell us about the biological impacts of the changes are necessary. Once again, we will not be able to proceed with beneficial projects until we understand and can address these biological questions.

2. Begin Studies Now: The resource-based studies mentioned above are generally multi-year in nature. If the need for information is not to hold up beneficial projects, then we suggest that it is essential that the County begin them now. There is currently available funding in the IRWPM grant intended for exactly this purpose. Additional funds for environmental projects, including the fishery studies on Cache Creek, may be available through the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan funding assessments related to the flood conveyance in the Yolo Bypass, and other ongoing water-related issues. While it will take a number of years to complete these studies, an early result of the study can be an outline of the issues, and the County can develop a task list and time schedule and begin working in a timely manner to assist in integrating these actions with other water supply and water quality concerns.

Anadromous Fisheries Studies: Tuleyome has provided numerous comments in the past about the studies that are necessary to address potential fishery management needs in Cache Creek,
particularly the restoration of anadromous species. We believe that the County will need information about: (1) water flows; (2) water quality, including temperature; (3) elimination of likely fish barriers (at the settling basin, Moore siphon, and Capay Dam) with respect to potential design and cost; (4) protection of native fisheries above the Capay Dam; (5) potential spawning locations; (6) potential for out-migration; and (7) institutional solutions, such as the “safe harbor” letter that NOAA Fisheries issued regarding the restoration of salmonids to Putah Creek. There is likely to be other appropriate information that is needed in order to determine the feasibility of reintroduction. While these are, for the most part, scientific studies, it would be advantageous to include a public outreach component with these studies. The draft reconnaissance-level report addressing potential fishery enhancement options in the Cache Creek basin that are associated with the YCFCWCD water delivery system, prepared by the Natural Heritage Institute in 2003, and Attachment E to the Report of Independent Science Advisors for Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan /Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), dated March 2006, provide additional background information about this subject.

**Yolo Bypass Fishery Needs:** Information on the fishery values in the Yolo Bypass are available in a report prepared in December, 2002, by the Natural Heritage Institute (“Habitat Improvement for Native Fish in the Yolo Bypass”), and also in Attachment E to the Report of Independent Science Advisors for the Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan /Natural Communities Conservation Plan. We have participated in a number of discussions about the Bypass’s fishery resources in the past year, addressing potential enhancement options, possible improvements to the Fremont Weir, and other issues; it is clear to us that these issues are central to discussions and future implementation of the IRWMP.

**Biological Concerns in Sloughs:** We are unclear how much of the biological inventory work needed for the sloughs located between the Coast Range and the Yolo Bypass has been completed. Studies to determine the necessary water quantity and quality needed to maintain these aquatic resources have not been completed. It is time to start.

3. **Open all technical committee meetings to the public:** Tuleyome has in the past expressed concerns about closed sessions conducted by the Technical Committee, including the development and implementation of the prioritization process for the IRWMP. While we noted our concerns, we did not press this issue as we also recognized the occasional need to for an “administrative process.” This has been characterized as the need to ensure a coherent document that is grammatically correct.

Efforts to implement prioritization or integrate projects in private, however, goes far beyond this concept of administrative draft; a closed process can significantly skew and short-circuit the public-involvement process for the IRWMP, and the perception of that process. I personally believe that this was dramatically illustrated by the actions that have prompted this letter.

It is time to open all technical committee meetings to the public.

**Closing**

In conclusion, Tuleyome acknowledges that the IRWMP process will determine the course of
water management in Yolo County for many years. It is also a critical tool that will help the County compete for limited water-resource dollars. The process is designed to integrate a series of individual actions supported by the community as a whole. As Tuleyome spokespersons have said on numerous occasions, the IRWMP needs to express a “vision” about the County’s joint management of water resources, flooding, natural environmental values, and related concerns, and the studies and implementation projects need to flow out of that “vision.” If the vision is good, it will speak for the County’s citizens with one voice, allowing the County to compete with more populous areas.

We believe that the actions that we suggest can help us in this process. In particular, we need to dedicate available funds for the needed aquatic studies and begin this process in an expedited manner.

While we have a number of specific and significant concerns with the IRWMP, we still greatly appreciate the visionary work that the WRA and the Technical Committee have undertaken.

Sincerely,

Bob Schneider,
President

Copies: open letter
May 15, 2006

David Scheuring, Chair
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
PO Box 8624
Woodland, CA 95776

Dear Mr. Scheuring:

RE: WATER QUALITY COMPONENT – DRAFT WATER MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

As a representative of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Program of the State Water Board, I have attended both public meetings of the Water Resources Association (WRA) on the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). While we applaud your efforts in the Water Quality portion of your document for addressing solutions to important water quality issues, we feel the document overlooks an important aspect - addressing urban water quality issues.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), at its’ January 20, 2005 Board Meeting, adopted the concept of sustainability as a core value for SWRCB programs and directed its incorporation into future SWRCB actions (SWRCB, 2005). Further, the resolution identified “smart growth” and “low-impact development” (LID) as two sustainable practices related to water supply and water quality protection.

Low Impact Development (LID) is an approach to site design and storm water management that seeks to maintain the site’s pre-development runoff rates and volumes. LID’s goal is to mimic a site's predevelopment hydrology by using design techniques that infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, and detain runoff close to its source. Techniques are based on the premise that storm water management should not be seen as storm water disposal.\(^1\) Instead of providing for the movement of storm water off site; LID techniques provide for the treatment of storm water on-site.

LID provides economical as well as environmental benefits. LID practices result in less disturbance of the development area, conservation of natural features, and are less costly than traditional storm water controls. The cost savings apply not only to construction costs, but also to

\(^1\) Low Impact Development Center, Inc. http://www.lid-stormwater.net.
long-term maintenance and life cycle cost considerations. LID provides many opportunities to retrofit existing highly urbanized areas and can be applied to a range of lot sizes.

LID includes specific techniques, tools and materials to control the amount of impervious surface, increase infiltration, improve water quality by reducing runoff from developed sites, and reduce costly infrastructure. LID practices include bioretention facilities or rain gardens, grass swales and channels, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels, cisterns, vegetated filter strips and permeable pavements.

The Water Board believes the IRWMP is the appropriate vehicle to address long range strategies to manage urban runoff and requests that these sustainable technologies be considered for incorporation.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. If you have any questions, please contact me at 916-341-5306 or via e-mail at pgouveia@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,
/s/
Patricia Gouveia
MAA Coordinator
NPS Coordinator
Dave Scheuring, Chair  
Water Resources Assn. of Yolo County  
P.O. Box 8624  
Woodland, CA 95776-8624

Dear Mr. Scheuring;

I am writing to you regarding the County’s effort toward developing an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) and would like to make you aware of some flooding and drainage issues in the area of my property, which is located on County Rd. 103 about a mile south of Rd. 27.

There used to be a ditch running along the north side of my property (parcel 42-10-06) that drained most of the properties to the northwest between us and Willow Slough. About 7 or 8 years ago that ditch was filled in and shifted, against natural flow, to a new ditch that runs a mile north along Rd. 103, east on 27 and south on Rd. 104. This ditch is typically overgrown with cattails and tules to the point where flood water during a good storm has no place to go and backs up on the upstream properties for weeks at a time. This is bad for the animals kept there and for the homes that the water backs up to. The change in land management at the old Hunts property has also resulted in water backing up at a low corner and accumulating on my property both winter and summer. This can be a mosquito problem. I would support having something written into the IRWMP to address this local flooding problem either through regular ditch cleaning or re-pulling a drain ditch where it was to split the storm flows. We are just outside the irrigation district and it would help make farming more economical if District water could be made available.

One of my biggest concerns, and something that MUST be included in the IRWMP, is how the quality of the groundwater near the County Landfill is going to be monitored and maintained and how the health of those of us who live near the Landfill is going to be protected! A verbal reassurance is not enough.

I need answers to the question: “Who is responsible for monitoring the quality of our water and for reporting it to us on a regular basis?” The landfill was put in 30 years ago and I have never received any reports of when my or my neighbors wells have been tested, what was found and at what levels. I am particularly concerned about heavy metals, chloroform and other contaminants seeping through into the water table. I also have a concern about air quality, which can be very poor when the wind is blowing the wrong direction.

Diane Tauzer, concerned landowner
Dear Mrs. Gentile,

We have reviewed your IRWMP and congratulate you on it's content and thoroughness. We feel there are however, several issues that require additional consultation and fleshing out.

Item 1: WS3.2 Oat Creek Water Storage Project
This reservoir is approximately 4 miles south of the existing termination of the Tehama Colusa Canal. As a matter of fact, the basic engineering plans have existed for this project of quite some time. We believe additional investigation will reveal the viability of such a project.

Item 2: WS3.3 Bird Creek Water Storage Project
The Tehama Colusa Canal currently terminates at Bird Creek and as such no canal extension would be needed to service such a reservoir. It is worth while noting, that a canal extension departing the Bird Creek Reservoir would quit easily serve the Oat Valley requirements.

Item 3: WS23 Tehama Colusa Canal Extension Project
As previously discussed, the extension of the Tehama Colusa Canal holds a promise of better water quality, environmental enhancement, increased reliability, and is a substantial ingredient of an Integrated Regional Water Plan. We believe additional investigation along with inter-regional planning and partnerships to facilitate the canal extension would provide for greater water reliability, quality, and economics.

Please let me know if we can be of any assistance of your development of the plan.

Best Regards,

David E. Bird
General Manager
Tehama Colusa Canal Authority
Fran Borcalli

From: WRA [info@yolowra.org]
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 10:29 AM
To: Fran Borcalli
Cc: DeBra, Jacques
Subject: Fw: Draft IRWMP comments
Attachments: General Comments.doc; Potential Trails along Cache Creek.doc; Foundational Action FA6.doc

Forwarding comments from Dave Pratt on the IRWMP.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
Website: www.yolowra.org
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Barbera.pratt
To: info@yolowra.org
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2006 9:52 AM
Subject: Draft IRWMP comments

Hi Donna,

In case it would let you avoid having to transcribe my long comments, I've attached their files to this note.

Dave Pratt

4/13/2007
General Comments/Questions on Section 5.4.4, Cache Creek Flood Management Integrated Project, pages 5-9 to 5-12

Why does this section completely ignore the Army Corps of Engineers conclusion that the preferred project for preventing flooding by Cache Creek of Woodland and the land north of the creek is “setback levees”? [US Army Corps of Engineers, March 2003. Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, CA, City of Woodland and Vicinity. Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report For Potential Flood Damage Reduction Project.]

And why does this section make its principal reliance (top of page 5-12) on two kinds of projects that the Corps has specifically rejected?
(1) “dry” dams, the best of which (Bear Valley), the Corps found to be maximally expensive and minimally effective. [US Army Corps of Engineers, June 1994. Reconnaissance Report, Westside Tributaries to Yolo Bypass, California]
(2) temporary off-stream storage, which the Corps concluded would need to flood so much land so deep that it was impractical. [same 1994 reference]

A sentence on page 5-11 says, “While no firm decisions have been made, there seems to be a growing consensus that the Woodland/Cache Creek flood control solution will, by necessity, consist of multiple integrated actions.” What is the “necessity” that prevents adopting the Corps’ preferred project, that the Corps felt would suffice by itself? (Granted, some other actions, such as altered management of Indian Valley and Clear Lake water levels and releases, could be a helpful addition to any project, including setback levees.)

It seems likely that the California Department of Water Resources personnel who review this IRWMP will be familiar with the recent history of flood control studies and discussions for Cache Creek and will wonder about the points raised here and also why the Army Corps of Engineers publications on Cache Creek aren’t included in the reference list of this IRWMP, even though the Corps is the leading flood control agency in the U.S. and has done a lot of work on Cache Creek.
Potential Trails along Cache Creek?

There is a good quality gravel road on top of the levee on each side of Cache Creek for the 11 miles from the Settling Basin upstream to where I5 crosses the Creek. The stream is in sight and the scenery is good. There is access to the levee top from public roads at the Settling Basin, Road 102, Highway 113, and next to I5. The levee-tops could be used as excellent trails at minimal cost.

These levees were built with public funds and are maintained at public expense but the land that the Cache Creek levees were built across was mostly (totally?) privately owned. Do members of the public have the legal right to go onto the levee-top roads, assuming that they get there from a publicly-owned access point, don't stray from the levee-top road until they leave via a publicly-owned access point, and don't in any way harm the levee or adjacent private lands while they are on the levee top?

The fact that IRWMP project R32, “Levee Public Access Improvements Project”, is intended to facilitate foot and bicycle travel along the levee tops from UCD all the way to Woodland, and that some of those levees go across privately-owned land, presumably means that the public does have the right to use the tops of levees built with public funds across private lands.

If the public does have this right, the adjacent landowners would certainly object to the public being there, saying that their lands would get trashed. This is an important objection but there are ways to deal with it. In the first place, the level of trashing would certainly be way less than if the public had access to the levees by vehicles. (There is a lot of public hiking along the levee-top road on the west side of the Yolo Basin south of I80 and that area isn't noticeably trashed. And the hiking trails on the publicly-owned lands along upper Cache Creek aren't trashed.) But even if trashing proved to be less than the landowners expected, whatever amount there was would have to be dealt with. There could be at least two different solutions: have a county crew to take care of any problems, or have the county subsidize the land owners so they could take care of any problems themselves. Any law enforcement problems on the levees would certainly have to be a county responsibility.

If it turns out that the public actually does not have legal access to the Cache Creek levees, there would presumably still be the possibility to buy easements to create access. And if even that was not possible for the present levees, then maybe if any more levees will be built along Cache Creek, public access rights could be written into the agreements for building those levees.
Foundational Action FA6, Aquatic Habitat and Fish Monitoring Program (page 5-34) and Project AR8, Cache Creek – Yolo Bypass Anadromous Fish Passage Project (Table 5-5, page 5-50):

The studies needed for AR8 are well-known and sharply-focused. They are mainly some engineering work plus talking advantage of the biological knowledge that Peter Moyle and his coworkers already have. AR8 shouldn’t be required to wait for someone to first figure out what the undefined FA6 should be about and then spending a year doing whatever they decide that it is.

Project AR48, Putah Creek Geomorphic Restoration (Table 5-5, page 5-55): When Lake Berryessa fills, there is still a very major flow through Putah Creek. Is it really a good idea to do these things that will reduce the channel capacity?

A few typos:

-page 4-4, top: FEMA will decertify if Yolo does (not?) submit the required geotechnical studies?

-page 5-1, bottom, next-to-last line: ...(w)hen actions...

-page 5-6, 3/4 of way down the page: ...groundwater subsidence?

-page 5-43, item WQ13: Giardia

-Figure 6-7, item 9 in the middle of the table: Road 19 Storage Reservoir
IRWMP Comment Form - October 2006 Draft

Name: Dave Ceppos
Phone Number: ______________________
Address: _____________________________
E-mail: _____________________________

Comments:
- If you're looking to enthuse/interest the public, your tone tonight was an intense approach.
- "He could spend tonight, tomorrow, tomorrow night, and the next day talking about this very large doc." - Lex
- "We've been meeting for 3 years, but it seems longer." - Sid
- "I for one am glad this planning period is almost over." - Lex
- "We've been together what... 8-10? 13 years has it been; that's long." - Sid
- A key question on how you've done what you've done and prioritized is asked. And... no one wants to answer it.
- "Are we going to be here all night?" - Lucy.
- "It's quite a soft document." - Lucy.
- "You're still trying to wade through the plan." - Lucy.

IRWMP Comment Form - October 2006 Draft

Name: Bob Schneider
Phone Number: 309-6215
Address: 607 North State Woodland 95695
E-mail: bschneider@telxone.org

1. Comments: Under Water & Aquatic Habitat Management p 6-26
- Task 2 Aquatic Assessment & Task 11 Establish Potential
- Establishing Annual/Anadromous Fish Populations

Both of these should extend to the pole Carey Line and NOT be restricted to below Carey Dam.

2. Comments: [Blank]
IRWMP comment received via website from Olin Woods, Willowbank County Service Area Committee. See you later!

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator Water Resources Association of Yolo County P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
Website: www.yolowra.org

----- Original Message -----
From: <olinwoods@sbcglobal.net>
To: <info@yolowra.org>; <cal@catanio.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2006 1:29 PM
Subject: From IRWMP Comment Page

> Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
> (olinwoods@sbcglobal.net) on Wednesday, October 25, 2006 at 13:29:35
> ---------------------------------------------------------------
>
> name: Olin Woods
> organization: County Resident
> comments: I am a member of the Willowbank County Service Area (CSA)
> committee writing to you as an individual resident of the Willowbank
> neighborhood, located South of Davis in the unincorporated area of Yolo
> County. As some the IRWMP Study Team may be aware, the Willowbank CSA is
> a customer of the City of Davis for its water supply. As such many of us
> in the Willowbank community commend the IRWMP Study Team and support the
> effort to obtain a surface water supply. The purpose of this comment is
> to encourage the study team to push hard for the Sacramento River as a
> source for Davis, UCD, and Woodland AND to look beyond the Sacramento, as
> appropriate. Many years ago, Davis and UCD were provided an opportunity
> to access Lake Berryessa as a water source. A decision was made not to
> pursue Berryessa water at that time primarily because, as I understand it,
> Davis believed that it had sufficient ground sources. I would encourage
> the study team to look at Berryessa again as a water source for Davis, UCD,
> and Woodland. There may be good reasons for dismissing Berryessa as an
> alternative, but to the casual observer, it would seem to be an excellent
> supplement to the Sacramento River for surface water supply. I believe
> that the report could be criticized as incomplete, if it did not at least
> evaluate Berryessa as an option. Again, thanks to the study team for all
> its efforts to date and for considering my comments. opportunity to
> comment.
>
> HTTP_USER_AGENT: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:1.7.8)
> Gecko/20050511 Firefox/1.0.4
From: WRA [mailto:info@yolowra.org]  
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 9:18 AM  
To: Stephen McCord  
Subject: Re: IRWMP comments  

Thank you for your comments Stephen! I appreciate that you took the time to provide comments via email. I know the on-line comment box is small. I'll see about correcting that.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator  
Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776  
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257  
Website: www.yolowra.org

----- Original Message -----  
From: Stephen McCord  
To: info@yolowra.org  
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 8:25 AM  
Subject: IRWMP comments

The comment box in the on-line comment form was too small to use, so here are my comments on the September 2006 draft, following up on the workshop I attended on 10/25/06.

4/13/2007
The City of Woodland recently had my firm, Larry Walker Associates, develop a water quality management plan for the Yolo Bypass. A copy of the plan is available at ftp://209.76.48.227/Yolo_Bypass/. Although many projects and ideas in that plan are included in the IRWMP, referencing it will provide additional information and guidance. This plan is particularly relevant to the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project.

In the Description section under FA2, p.8-9, there is reference to the “IRWMP Technical Appendix chapter on water quality”. I can’t find that. The reference should be made clearer.

Section 6.4 is, in my worldview, missing an important source of “funds”: volunteers! Citizens in the county have lots of energy and enthusiasm that can support projects as well as provide technical expertise and “sweat equity”. I think it deserves mention at a minimum. You could even list the many non-profits who could be project partners as well as additional sources of funds (they can get grants separate from the larger entities given responsibilities in the plan).

Section 6.4.8 could consider another outside funding source: pollutant trading “buyers”. Many entities in the lower Sacramento Valley recognize the disproportionately high mercury load coming from Cache Creek and would consider funding a project there if it were relatively inexpensive compared to other means of reducing mercury loads.

Section 6.5 is a bit generic, which perhaps is appropriate at this stage. But two regulations to consider mentioning are TMDLs and the Basin Plan. Both fall under the Clean Water Act and/or Porter-Cologne, but they are being applied to the County directly. The Cache Creek and Sulphur Creek mercury TMDLs are essentially done now and written into the Basin Plan. They require compliance of many projects in the County that could impact water quality.

I appreciate the effort that went into Appendix B to develop prioritization criteria. I am willing to help to finalize that or to produce something separate (one project to propose for funding next year, top 5 overall projects today, etc.) then feel free to contact me.

Finally, I’d like to express my appreciation for all the work that the WRA and technical committee did to get this plan on paper. It’s very comprehensive and well organized.

Regards,
Stephen

Stephen A. McCord, Ph.D., P.E.
Larry Walker Associates, Inc.
707 Fourth Street, Suite 200
Davis, CA 95616
www.lwa.com
530-753-6400
November 6, 2006

David Scheuring, Chair
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624
Woodland, CA 95776
Email: info@yolowra.com

Re: Comments on Draft IRWMP

Dear Mr Scheuring:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Yolo County Intergrated Regional Water Resources Management Plan.

These are preliminary comments and should not be construed to include all of Tuleyome’s concerns with respect to the plan as a whole or with respect to individual actions in the plan.

Prioritization:
One of Tuleyome’s most significant concerns about the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) is with the lack of “prioritization,” which we mean to refer to the process of assigning a relative importance or “rank” to projects that will be undertaken under the IRWMP. While we have reached this conclusion in part on the basis of how the IRWMP addresses environmental resources and the plan’s effects on them, we have also concluded that the plan’s lack of prioritization for publicly supported project elements will adversely affect the plan’s implementation. It has become apparent that the IRMWP does not address prioritization in a manner that defines the most important projects in terms of generating community support when grant applications are made to state and federal entities.

We know that priority-ranking projects are a complicated and difficult task. In addition to maintaining water-supply and flood-control accomplishments, the Plan must also include an overall strategy that maintains ecological processes in the County. This objective is an underlying goal that is being defined through the HCP/NCCP process that is currently underway. In a similar manner the IRWMP discussion must directly interface with the County General Plan update that is shaping land use and growth management strategies for the county’s future. In short, the IRWMP simply must be framed so that it’s compatible with other planning efforts in the county, and priority projects need to carry out the goals in these other planning efforts.

With these objectives in mind a prioritization process might resemble the approach used in the SACOG Blue Print process, which identified transportation infrastructure priorities as they related to growth management strategies. The SACOG planning approach is now (belatedly) recognizing that transportation planning must also address the need to protect important ecosystem elements and flood zones.
Prioritization need not rank all of the project elements in the plan (that is, to rank all 150 projects in consecutive order, but we believe that it might work to rank projects in tiers. In addition, we believe that it would be appropriate to rank projects within each category, such as, for example, a tiered ranking of all of the recreational projects. Such a prospective ranking of projects would be helpful in framing the discussions about various projects or elements that need to be held in the county in order to be successful in the future competition for pots of money needed to implement the plan.

Tuleyome has a dual mission to protect both our wild heritage and our agricultural heritage. As a result we look for projects that will restore and protect the natural environment in the county, while offering the public appropriate recreation consistent with this goal. But, we are also interested in projects that can improve water supply and quality for farmers. In addition, public safety may be an overriding consideration for projects, such as providing a 200-year flood management project for Woodland and other communities.

**Prioritization Example:**
An example of an integrated high priority project might be setback levees that provide 200-year flood protection for Woodland, while also leading to the restoration and enhancement of aquatic and riparian habitat areas, and the reintroduction of anadromous fish to Cache Creek, while adding needed public recreation. Such a project might also be tied to the YCFCWCD’s proposed winter-flow storage reservoir north of Rd 19.

This kind of “integrated” project would not only meet the needs of the City of Woodland for flood control, but would also meet needs of environmental and recreation advocates throughout the county, as well as farmers within the YCFCWCD service area. While some might not agree with every component of such a project, an overall community consensus might emerge. This could be tested through the promotion of a resource bond or sales tax increment enacted within the county, which would provide seed money for matching funds required for grant applications.

Why is this worth the effort? An integrated project such as this, with strong community support and matching money, is likely to rank high in grant applications. We believe that it will take this strong unified community consensus and support to compete for funding needed to implement the IRWMP with other communities that have done the ranking and consensus-building.

**Regional Groupings:**
In order to get a handle on the many projects included in the plan, the technical committee decided to “regionalize” the county, such as by recognizing that Cache Creek projects should be considered separately from Putah Creek projects. This makes lots of sense, but it is also vitally important that projects that effectively include more than one region, or that cross over regions, also be addressed in an integrated manner. As an example, it will be very important that Yolo Bypass fishery projects be closely coordinated with Cache Creek fishery projects to ensure that they are complementary and that one project area does not create barriers to projects in the other.

**Specific Comments:**
While we recognize that this plan does not differentiate projects or rank them for community acceptability we have made preliminary comments based upon the general description and our general knowledge of these projects.
3.2.2.1 Disadvantaged Communities and Environmental Justice

- The Plan fails to adequately address environmental justice. Hispanic and other minority communities have special ties to water quality as it relates to subsistence fisheries and recreation. As an example, the Hispanic community is a significant user of Yolo County parks in the Cache Creek canyon. Yet, adequate outreach to this community has not been undertaken and when we checked we found that significant groups such as the Woodland Hispanic Chamber of Commerce were unaware of the IRWMP process. We are willing to assist where we can to ensure that environmental justice issues are addressed.

Page 4-5:

- Under 4.5.1.1 Salt Creek, Bird Creek, Oat Creek and other tributaries north of Cache Creek should be mentioned.

Page 5-8: Description, bottom paragraph: We don't want the channel put into a pipe.

Pages 5-9 to 5-12:

Several comments are made in these pages relate to efforts to address the Woodland flood issues. We have specific concerns, but first make the following general comments related to this issue.

- Why does this section completely ignore the Army Corps of Engineers conclusion that the preferred project for preventing flooding by Cache Creek of Woodland and the land north of the creek is “setback levees”? [US Army Corps of Engineers, March 2003. Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, CA, City of Woodland and Vicinity. Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report for Potential Flood Damage Reduction Project.]

- Why does this section make its principal reliance (top of page 5-12) on two kinds of projects that the Corps has specifically rejected?
  1. “dry” dams, the best of which (Bear Valley), the Corps found to be maximally expensive and minimally effective. [US Army Corps of Engineers, June 1994. Reconnaissance Report, Westside Tributaries to Yolo Bypass, California] If dry dams are to be discussed the earlier Corps reports on the Guinda and Brooks dams should also be mentioned and included in the bibliography.
  2. temporary off-stream storage, which the Corps concluded would need to flood so much land so deep that it was impractical. [same 1994 reference]

- We are unaware that “there seems to be growing consensus that the Woodland/Cache Creek flood control solution will, by necessity, consist of multiple, integrated actions.” We totally disagree with this statement and in fact it is our preliminary conclusion that efforts to utilize multiple integrated actions will in effect divert attention and funding to projects that do not resolve Woodland’s flood issues and that the capital and operating and maintenance funds that might be expended will make it increasingly difficult to resolve this issue. There is no growing consensus. We do recognize, however, that some projects that may provide some incremental improvement such as re-operation of Indian Valley Reservoir or changing the decrees with respect to management of the water level on Clear Lake can make sense and be cost effective.

Page 5-10:

- Under Theme- Our goal should be 200 year flood protection and this should be explicitly stated.
• Under Relevance to Goals and Objectives- Fifth bullet point should be changed to read
Providing recreational opportunities while minimizing impacts to other property owners.

Page 5-11:
• The Thurston Lake Pump Storage Project is referred to as (WS1) but this should be (WS 19)

• Under Description: We are unaware that “there seems to be growing consensus that the
Woodland/Cache Creek flood control solution will, by necessity, consist of multiple,
integrated actions.” We totally disagree with this statement and in fact it is our preliminary
conclusion that efforts to utilize multiple integrated actions will in effect divert attention and
funding to projects that do not resolve Woodland’s flood issues and that the capital and
operating and maintenance fund that might be expended will make it increasingly difficult to
resolve this issue. There is no growing consensus. This statement should be removed.

Page 5-12:
• We do not agree that consideration should be given to temporarily storing flood waters in
the upper watersheds in new detention basins. However, the re-operation of existing
reservoirs may have merit.

• 5.4.5 Cache Creek Water Management Integrated Project
Location: We disagree with limiting this project between Capay Dam and County Road 94 B. This
arbitrarily limits the reaches of the creek for projects that should be considered over
the entire watershed. Specifically, this inappropriately limits the extant of AR 8, AR 24, AR 46, and R3.

Page 5-16
• We are extremely concerned about mention of in-stream storage projects on either Oat
Creek (WS3.2) or Bird Creek (WS3.3). We feel that these two smaller creeks in the
Dunnigan Hills should be identified for restoration of riparian and aquatic habitat elements.
This is also true of Buckeye Creek (FM4). The IRWMP is clearly not “integrated” with the
planning process included in the NCCP/HCP, which is a major point that we have made
previously.

Page 5-20:
• See comment under page 5-10 with respect to rewording the fifth bullet.

Page 5-21:
• At top of the page the sentence should be reworded to state: “Planning and implementing
this action will be closely coordinated with all local stakeholders and ...”

Page 5-34 Table 5-1
• FA 6: We continue to request that this title be properly described to include “opportunity
assessment” as it is a critical foundational activity.

Page 5-36 Table 5-2
• WS 7: We have serious concerns about any efforts to convert the open channel that parallels
highway 16 across the Yolo-Bypass into a piped transmission facility. We asked to be
informed with respect to any continued action or development of this project.
Page 5-37 Table 5-2
- WS 13: We appreciate that this project mentions that fish passage investigation should be conducted.
- WS 17: We would like additional information on the status of these projects. It is also important to insure that the Agricultural Mitigation Conservation Program will not preclude the establishment of these small surge reservoirs that are in essence a widening of a slough, in appropriate locations.
- WS 20: This description should include the list of potential projects.
- WS 25: The first statement should be modified to read, “The building of Sites Reservoir may would enhance the viability …”

Page 5-46 Table 5-4
- FM 16 and FM 18: We have serious concerns about both of these projects that involve on-stream and off-stream dry dams and short duration detention projects. Both of these projects have large potential environmental impacts and regulatory and engineering constraints. Studies of these projects that do not include these environmental elements merely serve to divert needed resources from solutions to important flood management projects. There is no consensus on this approach to resolving Woodland flood management issues.
- FM 19: The flood management goal for our region should be a minimum 200-year event. The wording should be for a “minimum 200-year event” in place of “at least 100-year flood protection.”

Page 5-53 Table 5-5 Aquatic and Riparian
- AR 30: Action AR 7 and AR 30 are substantially similar. Perhaps these should be combined to refine a plan and county coordination with the entities conducting this work throughout the region.
- AR 36: The YCFCWCD is the best responsible agency to implement control of invasive species along their canal and natural waterway system in conjunction with AR 7 and AR 30. This effort can be coordinate with projects such as AR 36 to restore habitat and minimize the reinvasion of exotics.
- AR 46: Cache Creek once had significant salmon runs. As Joe Farnham reported, he remembers his dad fishing in Gordon Slough with a pitchfork in order to catch salmon to feed to their hogs. A Fish and Game warden reported steelhead in Clear Lake as late as the 1939.

Page 6-21: Conveyance Project
- As noted earlier we have concerns with respect to the Conveyance Project and request to be listed as stakeholders and notified as to any planning on the project and EIR processing. Is the Draft EIR complete, who is the lead agency, and where is the EIR available?

Page 6-24: Cache Creek Integrated Project
- Please erase “U.S. Bureau of Land Management designation of a Cache Creek as a natural area” and replace with “Cache Creek federal Wilderness designation.”
Page 6-25
- Yolo County must be listed as partner in this project.

Page 6-26
- We have serious concerns with respect to the composition and representativeness of the Flood Management Technical Committee. It currently consists of 6 engineers and 1 farmer. In our judgment this composition seriously undermines the public process and trust in the IRWMP process. It is, perhaps, also a fatal flaw in efforts to develop a community consensus on flood management options for Woodland. Tuleyome has formally requested to be a member of this committee in the past, and there are numerous other interests in the county that should be part of these discussions.

Page 6-28: Item 2
- The title of Item 2 should read “Perform Aquatic and Riparian Opportunity Assessment.”
- In addition, this study should not be limited to the area downstream from Capay Dam. It must include the creek from Clear Lake Dam and Indian Valley Reservoir to below the settling basin.

Page 6-31: Item 11.
- Language limiting this action to the area below Capay Dam must also be eliminated. Items 2 and 11 are directly related to water flows and ecosystem processes throughout the length of the creek, and the entire system must be studied in order to address the principles of watershed science that underlie integrated regional water management planning. As we have said on numerous occasions, these studies need to be started as soon as possible, as they must be completed prior to moving forward with water supply, water quality, and flood control projects that may have adverse effects on the aquatic ecosystem elements and fisheries in the basin. We do appreciate that some funding has been set aside to begin this work.

Figure 6-6
- We will submit additional comments on this chart. But, it is clear that the cross references for Tasks 11 and 12 are inadequately marked. The potential to establish anadromous fisheries and evaluate potential for aquatic habitat enhancement must also precede the Huff Corner levee work in the creek, reconciliation of the Cache Creek settling basin, the purported Cache Creek tributary detention basin project, the Cache Creek off-stream detention basin project, the Woodland area flood management project, Water management program, and the Clear Lake operations evaluation project. The interrelationships of all of these project elements is the primary point that Tuleyome has been stating about this planning effort for several years: it is simply impossible to look only at water supply, or flood control, or any other technical phase of water resources planning, without looking equally at the ecological, environmental, recreational, and other aspects of water resource planning and management in the county.

Page 6-57
- Please add Tuleyome as stakeholder in the Yolo County sloughs, canals and creeks integrated projects.
Conclusion:
Thank you for the opportunity to submit these initial comments on the Draft IRWMP project. Putting this plan together is a difficult process and while we have issue and concerns we also appreciate the hard work and time that the WRA and the WRA technical committee has put in to this effort.

Sincerely,

Bob Schneider
President
530 304 6215
November 7, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

The Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District’s (SYMVCD) mission is to provide safe, effective and economical mosquito and vector control for Sacramento and Yolo Counties. We perform mosquito and vector control surveillance and control operations according to the principles of Integrated Pest Management. As it applies to the Integrated Regional Water Management Program (IRWMP), we are concerned with water related projects that create or have the potential to create mosquito breeding sources. This includes, but is not limited to, sources of standing water for at least 72 hours between March and November, permanent standing water with significant emergent vegetation, or water sources that may be difficult to access and treat.

Pursuant to Sections 2060-2067 of the California Health and Safety Code, the SYMVCD has the authority to abate public nuisances on (1) any property excluding water, that has been artificially altered from its natural condition so that it now supports the development, attraction, or harborage of mosquitoes; (b) any water that is a breeding place for mosquitoes; and (c) any activity that supports the development, attraction, or harborage of mosquitoes or that facilitates the introduction or spread of mosquitoes. While it is our goal to work cooperatively with the appropriate parties to resolve any mosquito source issues, the SYMVCD is authorized to impose civil penalties of up to $1000.00 per day in cases where the public nuisance continues after a specified time.

By submitting the attached recommendations, it is our hope that mosquito source reduction practices will be incorporated in water projects at the planning phase, thereby preventing the need for increased treatment operations with the possibility of abatement proceedings.

Sincerely,

Joel Buettner, Water Management Specialist
Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District
Recommendations for the Draft IRWMP submitted by the SYMVCD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Add to list: SYMVCD Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-56</td>
<td>Correction: Change “YSMVCD” to “Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District (SYMVCD)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-58, 59</td>
<td>Add language to the effect that: &quot;Stormwater and wastewater systems are significant breeding sources of mosquitoes that are important vectors of human disease. Addressing this issue during the planning of new storm and wastewater systems will help to prevent future mosquito control problems and, potentially, the need to enforce mosquito abatement statutes. To assist the SYMVCD’s efforts in identifying, monitoring, and treating these sources, measures should be taken in the design of new systems to minimize standing water and facilitate mosquito surveillance and treatment operations. The SYMCVD will provide any technical assistance during the planning and implementation stages of this project.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-64</td>
<td>Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District Law in particular Sections 2060-2067 of the California Health and Safety Code pertaining to the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District’s responsibilities to manage and treat mosquito breeding areas. This is potentially relevant to a wide range of proposed projects including but not limited to: creation of wetlands, stormwater and wastewater projects, agricultural water use, construction of flood control structures, and habitat restoration projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 13, 2006

Mr. David Seheuring  
Chair, Water Resources Association  
P.O. Box 8624  
Woodland, CA 95776-8624

Dear Dave,

Audubon’s Landowner Stewardship Program lends the Water Resources Association’s efforts to date to develop a draft plan encompassing a diverse set of interests, stakeholders and issues in a spirit of collaboration and teamwork. The Yolo County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan has the potential to incorporate aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement, water quality, and water-related recreation projects into water supply and flood control projects, unlike any previous water plan in Yolo County’s history. Furthermore, it provides access to state funds and allows for a process to identify and address water issues by providing a list of projects to help address those issues.

Despite this success, we have three recommendations regarding the plan that should be addressed:

1. **Prioritize projects equitably**—the Water Resources Association needs to develop a system for setting regional priorities and integrating programs, policies, and projects into actions both for planning and future funding purposes. A review process could be developed that revisits priorities on a one, three or five year basis to adjust to changing conditions, funding and new projects;

2. **Integrate habitat enhancement with water management**—the prioritization process should give an appropriate balance to water, agriculture and the environment without compromising any of the three. It may be necessary to weight each of these factors to further assist prioritization efforts. Furthermore, Department of Water Resources requires integration as part of the plan; and

3. **Measure success**—we understand that the state requires monitoring and measuring the effects or outcomes of the recommended plan actions. The lack of a monitoring protocol will put any of the WRA’s project proposals at a competitive disadvantage. Furthermore, applied research needs to act as a compass that points towards future actions yet also questions assumptions about the best practices or solutions for integrated water projects.

Audubon California Landowner Stewardship Program hopes that these suggestions are incorporated into the next draft of the plan. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Vance Russell  
Program Director
Dear Dave,

The Center for Land-Based Learning (CLBL) has been actively participating in every public meeting of the WRA, including providing numerous potential projects that would provide benefits in ecosystem enhancement, water quality, and even flood control (in some cases). We realize that this effort, on behalf of the WRA, to draft a plan encompassing such a diverse range of issues, stakeholders and interests is very difficult and complex. It is a very exciting and groundbreaking opportunity to incorporate and integrate so many critical efforts in Yolo County to date. Even more exciting, it gives access to state funds in a new way – there are many organizations and agencies already doing great work in Yolo County, but we all are competing for limited funding, and very little of our work is a part of a greater strategy. This plan has the opportunity to provide ALL of us access to new and different funding sources that will really allow the County to GET THINGS DONE on the ground.

Nevertheless, we have some concerns about the draft plan, as it stands today:

1. **Strategies for implementing the projects and programs within the plan** — CLBL feels that the plan needs to develop a system by which organizations such as ours will have the opportunity to implement projects that we have the ability and resources to implement. At the last public meeting, when I asked the question; “how will we work together with the lead organization for Creeks, Streams, and Sloughs — which is the YCFC&WCD — to implement integrated projects” — the answer that I received was not very clear. The answer was “we really do not know yet”. The concern of CLBL, as well as other agencies and organizations, is that without a structured process by which decisions are made and priorities are set, certain organizations would seem to have the advantage over others with respect to implementation of their own priorities.

2. **A process for defining prioritization of integrated projects** — this concern builds upon the last paragraph. Without defined priorities, or at least a regular, annual (or otherwise) process to define priorities, it feels as if the plan is without an anchor. As stated earlier, we certainly recognize that this is a difficult and complex process, and that there are many interests at stake. It is precisely for that reason that we believe that this plan MUST include some kind of prioritization process, if the decision is that final priorities can not be set at this time.

The Center for Land-Based Learning hopes that these suggestions are incorporated into the next draft of the plan. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Kimball

Mary Kimball
November 14, 2006

David Scheuring
Chair, Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624
Woodland, CA 95776

RE: Comments on Draft Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Dear Chair Scheuring:

The Yolo County Board of Supervisors (Board) appreciates the efforts of the Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA) to develop the draft Yolo County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) and include such a diverse set of issues and stakeholders in the planning process. Yolo County has concerns with the current draft of the IRWMP, however, and requests that the WRA address these concerns prior to our consideration of the IRWMP for adoption.

The Board recognizes that the IRWMP’s primary goal is to improve water management in Yolo County. The WRA could strengthen the IRWMP and ensure WRA eligibility for Proposition 50 funding, however, by meeting the state’s IRWMP requirements for project prioritization, project integration, and the development of an implementation structure. The Board believes that including these elements in the IRWMP is important because they will significantly improve the plan, increase the likelihood of successful implementation, and increase the potential for obtaining funding. We suggest the following changes to the plan to achieve this goal:

**Prioritize actions.** The Board applauds the WRA Technical Committee’s recent decision to establish short-term and long-term priorities in the IRWMP. We encourage you to take the time necessary to develop these priorities in a thoughtful and careful manner and include all interested stakeholders in the process. As you know, the state’s IRWMP standards include a requirement to prioritize projects, both in the short-term (3-5 years) and the long-term (beyond 5 years). The WRA can revise the priorities in the future as appropriate. The IRWMP currently organizes actions by watershed or geographic area and places the actions in a 3-5 year implementation timeframe, but does not establish short-term or long-term priorities.

**Integrate actions.** The WRA should develop a strategy for integrating actions so that they achieve multiple benefits. If, for example, the WRA establishes a specific flood control project as a priority, the WRA should also integrate habitat enhancement and water-related recreation actions into the project. The existing plan requires lead agencies of “integrated projects” in each geographic area to decide in the future whether to integrate actions, but offers no consistent guidance on how to achieve this goal. The WRA should make an initial attempt at integrating actions now, as well as develop a strategy that the lead agencies may use to revise integrated actions in the future.
Clarify implementation strategy. The WRA should create clear guidelines for implementing the IRWMP in Yolo County, specifically focused on the integrated projects developed for each geographic area. The WRA should specify the goals for the implementation process (i.e. revise priorities and integrate projects), the responsibilities of the lead agencies for the efforts in each of the geographic areas, the extent of public involvement, guidelines for a decision making process, and the type of coordination needed between the lead agencies and the WRA. In addition, the WRA should provide a structure for updating the plan as needed, including revising the list of actions associated with each geographic area. The existing plan does not adequately describe the implementation strategy.

Address staff comments. The Board’s representatives to the WRA and county staff sent detailed comments to the WRA related to the clarity, organization, and content of the IRWMP. We believe these changes will strengthen the document and make it easier for the public to understand. Please address these comments, as well as comments you receive from county staff during the public review period.

The Yolo County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan has the potential to improve water management in Yolo County by encouraging stakeholders to work together to identify solutions to complex water issues. It also has the potential to incorporate aquatic and riparian ecosystem enhancement, water quality, and water-related recreation projects into water supply and flood control projects, unlike any previous water plan in Yolo County's history. Furthermore, it provides access to state funds. The Board believes strongly that addressing the concerns expressed in this letter will help the WRA fully realize these benefits.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Frank Sieferman, Jr.
Chair, Yolo County Board of Supervisors
TO: THE HONORABLE FRANK SIEFERMAN, JR., Chair, 
and Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: JOHN BENCOMO, Director, 
Petrea Marchand, Water Resources Coordinator 
Planning, Resources and Public Works Department

DATE: November 14, 2006

SUBJECT: Comments on the public review draft of the Yolo County Integrated Regional 
Water Management Plan (no general fund impact)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

AUTHORIZE the Chair to send a letter to David Scheuring, Chair of the Water Resources 
Association of Yolo County (WRA) with the Yolo County Board of Supervisor’s (Board) 
comments on the Yolo County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (Attachment A). 
The WRA will request that Yolo County adopt the Yolo County Integrated Regional Water 

FISCAL IMPACT

Staff and consultant time involved in preparing the letter have been paid from the adopted 
Water Resources budget, a general fund account.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

The recommended action ensures that the Board’s comments will be considered as the WRA 
revises the IRWMP in December 2006, prior to the Board’s consideration of the IRWMP for 
adoption. The recommended comments focus on strengthening the IRWMP and ensuring WRA 
eligibility for Proposition 50 funding by meeting the state’s IRWMP requirements for project 
prioritization, project integration, and the development of an implementation structure. A strong 
IRWMP is important to Yolo County because: 1) it has the potential to improve water 
management in Yolo County by encouraging stakeholders to work together to identify solutions to 
complex water issues; 2) it has the potential to incorporate aquatic and riparian ecosystem 
enhancement, water quality, and water-related recreation projects into water supply and flood 
control projects, unlike any previous water plan in Yolo County’s history; and 3) it provides access 
to state funds.

BACKGROUND

California voters created the state’s Integrated Regional Water Management program in 2002 
with the passage of Proposition 50. The state designed the program to improve water
management in California by requiring local agencies to take a more active role in setting water management priorities and ensuring that water projects achieve multiple benefits.

The recommended comments aim to ensure that the Yolo County IRWMP meets the Integrated Regional Water Management program's requirements for prioritizing actions, integrating actions so they achieve multiple benefits, and including a clear implementation strategy. While the WRA recently decided to establish short-term and long-term priorities in the IRWMP, the IRWMP currently does not contain priorities. In addition, the IRWMP currently does not provide guidance on integrating actions to achieve multiple benefits or a clear implementation strategy. While staff recognizes that the IRWMP's primary goal is to improve water management in Yolo County, the WRA could strengthen the IRWMP and ensure WRA eligibility for Proposition 50 funding by meet the state's IRWMP requirements.

The Integrated Regional Water Management program provides grants of up to $500,000 to regional agencies to help pay for planning and coordination associated with developing IRWMPs, as well as design and engineering associated with high-priority projects. The Integrated Regional Water Management Program also offers grants for implementation of projects up to $25 million and may also offer future funding for planning grants to assist with the design and engineering of projects.

The WRA received a $500,000 grant to develop the IRWMP in early 2006. The WRA released the public review draft of the IRWMP on October 6, 2006 and requests comments from interested parties by November 20, 2006. In early 2007, the WRA will ask the member agencies of the WRA to adopt the IRWMP. All appropriate agencies and organizations must adopt the IRWMP for Yolo County to be eligible to receive state funding for implementation of the IRWMP. The WRA's member agencies are: Dunnigan Water District, Yolo County, the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the cities of Davis, Winters, West Sacramento, and Woodland.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

None.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A. Letter to David Scheuring, Chair of the WRA.
Fran Borcalli

From: WRA [info@yolowra.org]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 10:26 AM
To: Stem, Annabeth; Anderson, Dave; Baxter, Doug; Beggs, Rob; Fran Borcalli; Brewster, Bill; Chainey, Steve (2); Cherovsky, Regina; Cocke, Mark; Davids, Grant; DeBra, Jacques; England, Sid; Eusuff, Tasmin; Hendrix, Donita; Eidam, Lucy; Chandler, Jeff; Hanson, Rebekah; Marchand, Petrea; McIver, Julia; Mount, Dan; O'Halloran, Tim; Phillips, David; Platenkamp, Gerrit; Scheuring, David; Sciano, Carol; Scruggs, Mary; Stevenson, Max; Walter, Hanspeter; Wegener, Gary; WRA
Cc: Quinn, Caroline
Subject: Fw: West Sacramento IRWMP Comments

FYI - Please read comments from West Sacramento below, requested to be forwarded to the Technical Committee.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
Website: www.yolowra.org

From: Quinn, Caroline
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 6:42 PM
To: DeBra, Jacques; dscheuring@gvni.com
Cc: Stem, Annabeth; 'Petrea Marchand'; Mount, Dan
Subject: RE: Emails for WRA

Hello David and Jacques,

I am sorry that the City of West Sacramento has not been able to participate as fully as we would have liked in the IRWMP process to this point. We have done our best to provide input requested for the Plan throughout the process, but we simply have not had the resources to dedicate to the project as we would have liked. However, we are very interested in becoming more involved in the regional water resources planning process, including final development of the IRWMP.

We sincerely appreciate all the work that has gone into development of the draft IRWMP. We also want to make sure that the final document is as strong and complete as it can be. We believe a key element of the final document is a thorough, defensible process for the systematic prioritization and integration of the IRWMP actions, including a method for stakeholder input on the priorities. Completing the Plan without prioritization of the projects, or with prioritization accomplished by ambiguous means, weakens the Plan and may make it less competitive for State funding.

We would also like to see the organization of the IRWMP document evaluated and more emphasis placed on greater integration of recommended actions in different areas of resource benefit. It would also be helpful to compare it with IRWMPs that have been well-received by DWR and have produced competitive projects for grant funding. Perhaps a new consultant could review and fine-tune the Plan with fresh eyes, particularly as necessary to make the Plan more competitive as a vehicle for obtaining Prop 50—or future Prop 1E or 84—funding.

Efforts to date have produced good work; we feel that going this extra step will make those efforts that much more productive in maximizing the return on the investment to date of time and resources. We understand the WRA’s desire to complete the IRWMP soon, but it appears that taking a bit more time now will not
compromise project implementation; it may in fact assist in developing more competitive projects. This last push to polish and fine-tune the Plan could be done without too much delay, and the time investment now could result in a stronger implementation in the future. We all stand to benefit a great deal from spending a little extra time now, before the final Plan is submitted to the WRA member agencies for adoption, to prioritize and integrate the actions and fine-tune the Plan document to make it as good as it can be.

Thanks again for your time and effort on this process and thank you also for your consideration of these suggestions.

Best Regards,
Caroline Quinn, Assistant Director
Public Works & Community Development
CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO
1110 West Capitol Avenue
West Sacramento, CA 95691
916.617.4645
carolineq@cityofwestsacramento.org

Note: New e-mail address

4/13/2007
21 November 2006

Ms. Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8642
Woodland, CA 95776

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR YOLO COUNTY

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) staff would like to thank the Water Resources Association of Yolo County for this opportunity to provide input into the Draft Integrated Regional Water Management Plan for Yolo County (IRWMP) as it is under development. This kind of planning provides a framework for designing and prioritizing sound projects that meet the needs of all interested parties.

We appreciate your recognition of the need to address total mercury discharges in the watershed. It will be equally important to make sure that projects that are implemented don’t generate excessive methylmercury, since it is methylmercury concentrations in the water that are the most important factor in determining fish tissue concentrations. While the Regional Water Board recognizes that total mercury is being discharged from legacy mining operations, the mercury already present in the environment generates methylmercury on a localized scale. The amount of methylmercury that is generated depends on the types or projects and activities that are being implemented in the watershed. We hope that this consideration is factored into the IRWMP. Where applicable, the monitoring and assessment requirements included in the recently adopted Regional Water Board Cache Creek Mercury Control Program should be rolled into your plan.

We are also pleased that you have evaluated the need for new community sewage systems or upgrades to existing ones. Discharges from domestic wastewater treatment facilities are regulated under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit or Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) depending on whether the discharge is to surface waters or to land, respectively. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) administers funding programs that provide grants and/or loans for wastewater treatment plant construction. More information is available on the State Water Board’s website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/index.html

When initiating a project, it is important to determine whether a specific project falls under the jurisdiction of any regulatory programs. The following Regional Water Board programs may apply to discharges from the planned future actions:
• The discharge of dredge or fill material to waters of the United States, or waters of the State, is subject to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and the California Water Code (CWC). Section 401 requires that you obtain a Water Quality Certification from the State before the Corps of Engineers may issue a Section 404 permit. Any person discharging dredge or fill materials to waters of the State must file a report of waste discharge pursuant to Sections 13376 and 13260 of the CWC. You may meet both the requirement to submit a report of waste discharge and apply for a water quality certification by using the same application form. If waters on the project site are not under federal jurisdiction, the Discharger will still need to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (Form 200) to the Regional Water Board. However, the Regional Water Board recommends that the Discharger submit a 401 Water Quality Certification application rather than a Report of Waste Discharge because a 401 application can be processed more quickly than proceeding with Regional Water Board adopted waste discharge requirements.

• Dischargers of storm water to surface waters associated with construction activity, including clearing, grading, and excavation activities of one-acre or more, must obtain coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board, Order No. 99-08-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, General Permit No. CAS000002, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit). Dischargers must also implement Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BAT) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) to reduce or eliminate storm water pollution.

• To obtain authorization for proposed storm water discharges to surface waters, the Discharger must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) with a vicinity map and the appropriate fee to the State Water Resources Control Board prior to commencement of construction activities. Coverage under the General Permit shall not occur until the applicant develops a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must identify Best Management Practices that utilize the BAT/BCT performance standard to control pollutant discharges. These controls must reduce pollutants and implement any more stringent controls necessary to meet water quality standards contained in the Regional Water Board’s Basin Plan.

• Wetland operations within the Central Valley Region may contribute, or have the potential to contribute, “waste” (as defined in the California Water Code) to surface waters. In June 2006, the Water Board adopted two Conditional Waivers for discharges of waste from irrigated agricultural lands including managed wetlands. The adoption of the Conditional Waivers allows landowners and/or operators of irrigated lands, including managed wetlands, the option of obtaining the regulatory coverage required by the California Water Code (Water Code) by:
  o Joining a Water Board-approved Coalition Group that forms on behalf of individual growers; or
  o Filing under an Individual Discharger Conditional Waiver through the Water Board office.
Coalition Groups can generally not accept new participants after 31 December 2006. If a landowner or operator does not obtain regulatory coverage under a Conditional Waiver, they must file a Report of Waste Discharge and filing fee with the Water Board office to obtain an individual permit (also referred to as Waste Discharge Requirements).

- Many of the future action projects will require compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CEQA document needs to include a description of all solid and/or liquid waste that might be generated by the proposed project and how it will be handled, treated, and disposed of. The CEQA environmental document also needs to consider how storm water drainage may be affected by the proposed project. Pursuant to California Water Code, Section 13260, all persons proposing to discharge waste that may affect the quality of waters of the state must submit to the Regional Board a Report of Waste Discharge, following which the Regional Board will either prescribe waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or issue a waiver. If WDRs are prescribed, they will incorporate measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts to water quality and potential public nuisances that are due to the treatment or discharge of waste.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft IRWMP for Yolo County. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Holly Grover at (916) 464-4747 or hgrover@waterboards.ca.gov.

Jerrold A. Bruns
Environmental Program Manager
Sacramento River Watershed Section

cc: Mr. David Carlson
    Mr. Bill Croyle
    Mr. William Marshall
    Ms. Wendy Wyels
Yolo County
Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Advisory Committee
Individual member comments regarding the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

General individual member comments:
1. Use demographic data more recent than the 2000 data used – especially for areas that have experienced significant changes in population, including West Sacramento.
   1.1.1. This would be useful in determining the impact of a particular project, such as the levy work proposed for the West Sacramento/Clarksburg area.
2. Specifically identify lead agencies in the IRWMP to carry projects forward.
3. Avoid the confusion of showing the Cache Creek Flood Management Integrated Project and the Cache Creek Water Management Integrated Project as separate projects in Section 5 and a combined project in Section 6.
   3.1.1. Combine them in Section 5.
   3.1.2. Avoid a footnoted explanation by detailing the rationale for the combination in Section 5.
4. Include some evaluation of general feasibility of flood management alternatives in the IRWMP.
5. Identify opportunities for recreational enhancements as part of the Sloughs, Canals, and Creeks Integrated Project. Further develop the description and integration of the actions.
6. Combine all types of use of the gravel pits and related Lower Cache Creek Area features into a single master plan.
   6.1.1. Outline this single master plan in the IRWMP.
7. Better establish the detailed and/or quantifiable benefits obtained by integrating individual actions into “integrated projects.”
   7.1.1. Discussion on this is vague, especially in Section 3.7.
   7.1.2. Better establish the rationale for integrating projects on the basis of sub region.

Advice on setting priorities:
1. Prioritize based on merit, not only on “the extent that prerequisite tasks are required before an action can be implemented.”
2. Prioritization would be easier if we were able to base it on some fiscal information, specifically projected costs, fiscal history, and projected revenue for each component.
3. Top priorities should include:
   3.1. Foundational Actions that address wildlife and recreation. Ref—FA6 Aquatic Habitat and Fish Monitoring Program and FA14 Development of HCP/NCCP.
   3.2. Removal of invasive species from Cache and Putah Creeks (AR7) – this has and will continue to be the subject of efforts and revenue spent.
3.3. Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystem Enhancement areas that benefit other action categories, including Recreation. I.E. AR4; AR5; AR7; AR11; AR16; AR17; AR23(R?); AR30; AR36; AR37; AR38; AR46(R?).

3.4. All those Recreation actions that are part of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan and/or have been recommended by the PRWAC. R6; R7; R8; R10; R11; R15; R18; R20; R22; R30, perhaps others.

3.5. Actions benefiting West Sacramento which may not have been included in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan. R12; R13; R17; R21.
IRWMP Comments from Vicki Murphy.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
Website: www.yolowra.org

----- Original Message -----
From: Vicki Murphy
To: info@yolowra.org
Cc: Petrea Marchand
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 3:00 PM
Subject: Comments on Water Plan

First of all, thank you for receiving my comments on the very last day of the comment period.

My comments are few, but I am hopeful that you will consider them important....

1. PROBLEM: The Cache Creek Watershed Stakeholders Group has really not accomplished much in the nine or ten years of meetings. The coordinators, for the most part, have been very helpful in educating landowners about erosion control. However, almost all of the projects that have been applied inside the banks of Cache Creek itself have all been washed away because sandbars and tamarisk have been left in the waterways, and the CC flood flow capacity continues to diminish.
SOLUTION: Concentrate heavily on removing the vegetation and sandbars during the dry summer months throughout the Cache Creek reaches from Rumsey to the Bypass in an effort to stop streamside erosion and to increase the flood flow capacity. Some progress has occurred the past few years, but it is still ineffective. Will Cache Creek get its share of funding to do more projects, or will it continue to concentrate on more employment opportunities?

2. PROBLEM: In the past, by the time that a project got approved, it was the rainy season again and the dry months were wasted on wading through red tape. Since the beginning of the CC watershed group, the promise of a streamlined process has been dangled in front of folks, but has never materialized.
SOLUTION: The dire circumstances of Yolo County riparian and flood-risk areas have recently provided new funding, but there are also new reasons enough to require a special streamlined permit process to allow for necessary erosion control work inside the waterways. Also, capable and qualified riparian landowners might get paid to do some of the work for some of the other landowners who are not capable and/or qualified.

3. PROBLEM: The 'do-nothing-but-neglect-policy' of "flood management" has been the main watershed-wide consideration whenever areas were faced with dangerously eroding areas along every major waterway in California, as well as Cache Creek.
SOLUTION: Only apply the proven and effective policy of "flood control" as it promises to actually save lives and property. "Flood management" is dealing with the aftermath, and what kind, exactly, of a reasonable policy is that in the face of a flood threat?
4. PROBLEM: If there is widespread flooding, what happens to landowners if there are attempts by environmental groups to lay claim to newly flooded areas as 'natural flows', 'wetlands' and new riparian corridors?

SOLUTION: ????? Has this question been asked before? If so, what is the answer?

Most appreciatively,

Vicki Murphy
bvmurphy@afes.com
Memo

To: Fran Borcalli, Steve Chainey, Gerrit Plattenkamp, and Petrea Marchand
From: Maria Wong, Executive Director
Date: 11/30/2006
Re: Draft IRWMP dated 9/2006

All,

Petrea was kind enough to provide me with a copy of the administrative draft Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. I appreciate the opportunity to comment early in the process. Congratulations on the work so far; I look forward to receiving the public draft.

The comments below are offered in the spirit of improving the final product and reflect my years of preparing/editing and reading public agency reports.

General comments

Document organization: The document is informative, but suffers from overlap and redundancy. Suggest careful editing by "new eyes" (a technical writer?) to remove extraneous information. Suggest moving detailed descriptions regarding "actions" to an appendix, replacing expanded text sections with a condensed version to retain continuity.

Tone: The document is heavily peppered with "the language of the IRWMP", which may or may not be practical depending who the target audience is. Suggest replacing jargon with more common terms where possible to improve ease of reading.

Prioritizing information: Suggest presenting the "take home message " early and concisely at the beginning of the document.

Grammar: The draft should be edited for grammatical and structural inconsistencies. In several instances paragraphs appear to be attached to the wrong section and consequently are confusing (ex: the last paragraph in the section on the HCP/NCCP appears to be the lead-in paragraph for the next activity).
Specific comments

Section 1

1.2 Suggest moving language that explains the statutory purpose of the IRWMP (DWR and SWRCB) into this section. One sentence would be sufficient.

1.3 This section should be expanded, seems over simplified when compared to Section 2.1. The stated goal in 1.3 is singular, yet the title implies additional goals that presumably are in concert with the five management categories. Is “ensuring an adequate water supply” the overarching goal?

1.4 Good discussion regarding the structure of the WRA.. However, it’s not clear from this section how “the planning process...is structured for implementation” (pg. 1-3). Suggest adding a paragraph outlining the future organizational vision and process, or referencing Sec. 6. For example, how will governance issues be accomplished? What are the principles that will guide the process? This section implies a collaborative process: how will ground rules be developed and when? How are outsiders admitted to the process? Need to outline the who, what, when, where and how. If these are unknown as this time, then suggest outlining the process for developing them.

1.5.6 Table 1-5. Not clear what is meant by the “native” classification. Suggest adding a footnote defining this category more specifically.

Section 2

2.1.2 See Sec 1.2 comment above. Suggest carefully outlining the goals and objectives, as they will be the basis for actions going forward and will likely be the touchstone for resolving future conflicts.

2.1.3 Stated objectives appear to rely on a future process to be actionable. Suggest adding language recognizing this and outlining a roadmap for developing that process.

Section 3

3.7 Suggest reversing the order of the first 2 sentences. As the IRWMP process unfolds, how will new information be integrated?

Section 5

Suggest moving the detailed discussion to the appendix.

Section 6

6.2.3 Explain or reword the statement “Integration is not the product of this IRWMP” (pg. 6-4).

6.2.6 Suggest re-visiting the definition of “Foundational Projects” and then limit the sections where the definition is reiterated (it’s used in several places but with a slight twist each time). It appears that most foundational projects are “countywide”. Were they elevated to this status based on some subjective criteria? If so, then explain.

- Suggest moving details of the foundational projects to the appendix.
- Section 6 attempts to outline an organizational structure going forward. It is unclear how centralized the structure is intended to be. An organizational chart would be helpful.
- It is unclear how entities not enrolled in the WRA who undertake “activities” under this plan would be subject to the decision making process of the governing organization (WRA).
DATE: 12/11/06

TO: WRA
  P.O. Box 8624
  Woodland, CA 95776

FROM: David Vega
Solano County Water Agency

☐ For Your Information
☐ Sign and Return
☐ For Your Comment

Comments: LATE MINOR COMMENTS

trans.frm
eroding sites should be designed. These bank protection projects should include biotechnical stabilization methods whenever feasible. These projects should include riparian and aquatic habitat improvements to the largest extent possible, without compromising stability.

4. **Plan, Design and Build an Appropriately-Sized Bridge at Mace Boulevard**

Hydraulic and engineering studies should be conducted to design a new bridge over Putah Creek at Mace Boulevard. This bridge is currently undersized and catches debris during flood events, further reducing its capacity.

5. **Design and Implement the Restoration of North Fork Putah Creek at the UC Davis Confined Animal Facility**

A study to determine the appropriate location of the confined animal facility and to determine the appropriate habitat restoration concepts for the creek has been completed by UC Davis. Funding and appropriate approvals are needed to proceed with the project.

6. **Implement the Putah Creek Diversion Dam Vegetation Removal Project**

The reduction of channel capacity by vegetation in the channel below Putah Creek Diversion Dam has been well documented. The vegetation removal can be implemented without conducting prerequisite studies.

7. **Design and Implement Floodplain and Riparian Habitat Restoration Projects**

Floodplain and riparian habitat restoration projects should be designed. Existing LiDAR survey data and the results of hydraulic and geomorphic analyses should be used. Projects should be designed to include multiple benefits, whenever appropriate, including bank stability, and aquatic habitat, and on public land recreation components.

8. **Design and Implement Winters Putah Creek Park**

Removing the derelict percolation dam in Winters (funded by a River Parkways grant), Himalayan blackberry, and other invasive plants will create an opportunity to build a trail and floodplain downstream form the dam site. These components of a Winters Putah Creek Park should be designed to enhance aquatic and riparian habitat and recreational opportunities. The park has the potential to become an amenity for the City of Winters, which enhances the connection of the people of Winters to Putah Creek.

---

This project was found to be not feasible. The Diversion Dam is not impacted by the downstream conditions and the amount of veg removal to make a significant improvement in channel capacity was found to be infeasible.
Putah Creek Council  
City of Winters  
City of Davis  
UC Davis

Stakeholders  
YCFCWCD  
Yolo Basin Foundation  
Riparian landowners  
Tuleyome

Prerequisite Tasks

A matrix is presented in Figure 6-12, which illustrates the relationship between the respective component actions and the prerequisite studies or investigations that are deemed important to support the orderly development of the integrated action. The majority of the actions require detailed planning and investigative work in order to be advanced.

Brief descriptions of the prerequisite studies or investigations are presented below. A general schedule and time frame and budget for completing the respective studies are presented on Figure 6-13.

1. **Conduct Hydraulic Studies**

The Solano County Water Agency is currently developing a HEC-RAS hydraulic model that will be completed in 2006. Hydraulic modeling using this model would be necessary as part of project feasibility assessment and design for a number of actions. A LiDAR survey of the main channel and major tributaries has been completed (2005) and one-foot contours are available for the entire channel. This data will need to be used for detailed project design.

2. **Investigate City of Winters Storm Water Drainage Issues**

Investigations need to be carried out to determine the storm water drainage system that is required to allow the build out of the City of Winters, envisioned in its General Plan. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted a study several years ago that should be reevaluated. The Corps study included a diversion of up to 1,000 cfs to Putah Creek during a 100-year storm event.

3. **Design Putah and Implement Creek and Dry Creek Bank Stabilization Projects**

After planning and feasibility studies have been carried out, including hydraulic and geomorphic analyses, bank stabilization projects for severely
Settling Basin. For hydrologic purposes, however, the downstream limit of the Lower Cache Creek portion of the system will be considered at Interstate 5 or Yolo. The total Cache Creek drainage system, upstream of Interstate 5, encompasses 1,139 square miles, with the drainage area above Capay Diversion Dam comprising 1,044 square miles.

**Willow Slough**

The Willow Slough watershed drains most of the central part of Yolo County between Cache Creek and Putah Creek. Natural levees that formed through deposition of sediment along the valley floor reaches of Cache and Putah creeks cause local runoff to flow away from the main creek channels and to enter a complex network of sloughs and small drainage channels. These channels flow eastward and eventually consolidate into Willow Slough before discharging into the Yolo Bypass.

**Putah Creek**

The Putah Creek watershed encompasses approximately 710 square miles and extends from an elevation of 4,700 feet at Cobb Mountain in Lake County southeast for a distance of about 50 miles to the Yolo Bypass, at an elevation a few feet above sea level (Thomasson et al. 1960). Approximately 600 square miles of the watershed are upstream of Monticello Dam, located seven miles west of Winters. Monticello Dam was completed in 1957 by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and impounds Lake Berryessa, which has a capacity of 1.6 million acre-feet. Operations and maintenance of the project is performed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Water released from Lake Berryessa flows down Putah Creek to the Putah Diversion Dam, three miles west of Winters, where water is diverted into Putah South Canal for delivery to agricultural and municipal users in Solano and southern Yolo County. The Putah Diversion Dam impounds Lake Solano. The tributary drainage area for the “inter-dam” reach is 38 square miles, and only one tributary of any significance – Dry Creek – enters Putah Creek between the Putah Diversion Dam and the Yolo Bypass (Northwest Hydraulic Consultants 1998). Natural levees, deposited by the creek as it flowed across its alluvial fan toward the center of the Sacramento Valley, cause lands along both sides of lower Putah Creek to drain away from the creek.
Fran Borcalli

From: WRA [info@yolowra.org]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 10:48 AM
To: Fran Borcalli
Subject: Fw: IRWMP goals

Fran,

This was an email that I received from Bob Schneider in January. I did not forward it to the Tech Committee pending Jacques approval to do so. However, I thought we should catalog it as public comments received for the record.

Donna Gentile, Administrative Coordinator
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624, Woodland, CA 95776
Ph: (530) 666-2733; Fax: (530) 666-4257
Website: www.yolowra.org
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Bob Schneider 
To: Gentile Donna 
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2007 2:05 PM 
Subject: IRWMP goals

Hello Donna, (please forward to the tech comm.)

I made a suggestion today for an additional goal for the Yolo county IRWMP. It can certainly use some word smithing but was something along the lines of:

Maximize consideration with respect to climate change and increasing energy costs.

Attached below is a chapter 5.0 from the Working Draft of Tuleyome’s Vision for the Yolo County general plan which gives some perspective on this suggestion.

Cheers,

bob

5.0 Responding to Earth-Scale Planning Issues in Yolo County

Managing the Impacts of Global Warming and Increasing Energy Costs

Global warming and increased fuel costs will have significant impacts in Yolo County effecting agriculture, transportation, development patterns, habitat and other issues. Yolo County can and should be a leader in proactively anticipating the effects of these and other influences and putting in place a process to mange these effects locally. This General Plan process must include a strategy to respond to these new impacts and constraints; it can no longer be “business as usual.” Decisions made in this general plan must incorporate responses to these overriding issues.

As an example, the possible reduction of the Sierra snowpack may increase reliance on agricultural
areas like Yolo County that have adequate surface storage. The irrigation system is also gravity fed reducing energy costs particularly in wet years.

Increased fuel costs may limit the distance to which crops can be economically shipped restricting the import or export of foods on a national and foreign market basis. Development of new fuel technologies, such as biomass and ethanol, may also influence both agriculture and transportation decisions.

Decisions that we make in this general plan with respect to how and where we grow will greatly impact on our future. Are we building communities for the future in a world with increasing energy costs and a global warming reality, or is it just more lower density suburbs covering large expanses of some of the best farming land in the world with deep soils, gravity fed irrigation and a Mediterranean climate.

Specific recommendations include:

1. Establishing General Plan goals and objectives to anticipate future trends that will affect Yolo County and to manage the effects of these trends. Decisions made in the Elements of this general plan should be evaluated with respect to global warming and increased energy costs.

2. Include an Energy Element as a component of the General Plan.

3. Create a standing committee, under direction provided by the Board of Supervisors and staffed by the county executive, to gather information on future trends affecting the county and to issue annual reports and recommendations to the Board.

4. Establish policies that support and encourage local food “branding,” farm-to-market and farm-to-school programs.

5. Establish policies that promote reduction of carbon dioxide and methane producing activities and increase carbon sequestration.

6. Require the county to examine its own energy use and carbon production and setting specific targets for reduced levels of each.

7. Promote cooperation between cities, including cities in other counties, in the development and operation of transit systems that increase opportunities for citizens to reduce their carbon production.

8. Continue communication and regional planning processes with area counties to coordinate policies and approaches that are regional in nature. For example, discuss and implement a system of regional wildlife corridors.

Bob Schneider
Tuleyome
607 North Street
Woodland, CA 95695
530-304-6215
bschneider@tuleyome.org
www.tuleyome.org
or
Verve
2402 Westernes Rd.
Davis, CA 95616
Phone: 530-304-6215
Fax: 530-852-0381
Suggested Changes to Yolo County IRWMP Goals and Objectives
Petrea Marchand and Dave Shpak
January 4, 2007

EXISTING GOALS

The goals for the Yolo County IRWMP are to:
• Ensure an adequate water supply – both in quantity and quality – for the people of Yolo County, present and future, in a manner that is efficient, economical, and environmentally sound and
• Protect the people of Yolo County and property from hazards associated with storm runoff and flooding.

SUGGESTED ADDITIONS TO GOALS

• Enhance, improve and maintain aquatic and riparian ecosystems and aquatic bio-diversity throughout the county.
• Provide superior water-related recreational opportunities for Yolo County's growing population.
• Ensure high quality surface water and ground water resources throughout the County on a sustainable basis to serve the needs of all beneficial uses, including urban, agricultural, environmental and recreational uses.

SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO GOALS

Ensure an adequate water supply – both in quantity and quality – for the people of Yolo County, present and future, in a manner that is efficient, economical, and beneficial to the environment.
• Reduce the risk to the people of Yolo County and property from hazards associated with storm runoff and flooding.

EXISTING OBJECTIVES

The 14 IRWMP objectives are:

1. Coordinate and conjunctively manage surface water and groundwater supplies to avoid the potential adverse impacts from surface water supply development and use and from groundwater extraction (e.g., water quality degradation, environmental deterioration, and land subsidence).

2. Formulate a comprehensive water management, conservation, and reuse program for municipal, industrial, and agricultural waters users.

3. Provide a mechanism or process that facilitates the rational treatment of proposals for importing water, for the intra-county transfer of water, and for the export of water.

4. Ensure open and frequent communication with the public.

5. Integrate water resource planning and land use planning.
6. Maximize the extent to which priority projects help meet statewide priorities.

7. Help disadvantaged communities with basic infrastructure improvements.

8. Help meet TMDL’s being developed for mercury in the Cache Creek watershed.

9. Enhance the aquatic and riparian environment.

10. Use recycled water to the maximum extent possible.

11. Identify measures that can be implemented to reduce point-source and non-point source pollution.

12. Comply with applicable water discharge requirements.

13. Provide recreational opportunities, without adversely affecting private property owners.

14. Provide adequate storm drainage and flood control, consistent with recommendations of the State’s Floodplain Management Task Force.

SUGGESTED REVISION TO OBJECTIVES

- Provide recreational opportunities that balance public investment interests and consideration of effects upon private property owners.

OBJECTIVES FROM WATER-RELATED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES (AND SUGGESTED REVISIONS)

Water Supply and Drought Preparedness

Goals

- To provide a reliable, sustainable and high quality water supply for the county to support existing and planned beneficial uses including urban, industrial, agricultural, environmental, recreational and other appropriate uses.
- Could replace this goal with the water supply goal already in the IRWMP.

Objectives

- To provide reliable and sustainable surface water from a variety of sources sufficient to serve urban, agricultural, environmental and recreational uses (as planned by the county’s water purveyors and consistent with the IRWMP) in normal, above normal and prolonged drought periods, that is protective of natural resources and surface water flows.
- To manage the county’s ground water resources on a sustainable yield basis that provides water purveyors and individual users with reliable, high quality ground water to serve urban,
agricultural, environmental and other uses during normal, above normal and prolonged drought periods.

- To develop conjunctive use and ground water protection programs within the next ten years, consistent with the IRWMP and the needs of water purveyors, that maximizes the efficiency, sustainability and value of the county’s surface and ground waters.

- To work with the area’s water purveyors within the next five years to develop state-of-the-art urban and agricultural water use efficiency programs that meet statewide guidelines and provide substantial and measurable water use reductions throughout the county.

**Water Quality**

**Goal**

- To ensure high quality surface water and ground water resources throughout the County on a sustainable basis to serve the needs of all beneficial uses, including urban, agricultural, environmental and recreational.

**Objectives**

- To meet state and federal standards for water quality protection in all surface and ground water resources working closely with water purveyors, landowners and businesses, citizens, and state, federal and local agencies and non-profits.

- To develop continuous monitoring, management and protection programs and institutional capacity to ensure that water quality continues to meet standards for surface and ground water sources.

- To work in a collaborative manner with state and federal agencies and both public and private water dischargers to ensure a fair and open process of achieving long-term countywide and regional water quality protection standards for point source and non-point source pollutants.

**Flood Hazard Reduction and Storm Drainage**

**Goals**

To reduce the risk to people and property from storm runoff and flooding, taking into consideration resource constraints and environmental impacts.

- To provide for efficient, cost-effective, and sustainable solutions to storm water drainage for all new development, redevelopment, and where applicable, established developed areas.

**Objectives**

- To meet agreed upon standards to reduce flood risk in all areas of the County within 20 years, taking into consideration resource constraints and environmental impacts.
• To become a model area for flood risk reduction and management approaches that incorporate environmental protection and restoration efforts, and enhance recreational opportunities, while serving flood management needs.

• To develop innovative storm water management requirements, guidelines and best practices within 5 years that enable the county to meet state and federal permit requirements, as well as improving storm water runoff quality and reducing impacts to surface water resources.

Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystem Enhancement

Goals

• To enhance, improve and maintain aquatic and riparian ecosystems and bio-diversity throughout the county.

Objectives

• Consistent with the emerging Yolo County NCCP/HCP, to establish priority aquatic and riparian habitat areas for enhancement within 5 years; and establish the necessary management and funding responses to meet NCCP/HCP restoration and protection goals.

• 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.

• To utilize a variety of tools (such as the land development and permitting process, state and federal grants, and university resources) to achieve a sustainable and effective monitoring, management and reporting process for priority aquatic and riparian habitats in the county within 10 years.

RECOMMENDED RECREATION GOALS AND POLICIES

The water-related policies for the Yolo County General Plan did not include recreation goals or objectives, so these are proposed additions to the IRWMP goals and objectives.

Recreational Access, Opportunities, and Facilities

Goals

• To maintain, improve, and expand public access for recreational use of publicly-owned waters, waterfronts and banks, and open space.

• To create new recreational opportunities as part of public investments in water supply and conveyance, water quality, natural resource conservation, flood control and stormwater management.

• To create new recreational facilities as part of public investments in water supply and conveyance, water quality, natural resource conservation, flood control and stormwater management infrastructure and operations.
Objectives

- Identify recreational programs and facility needs and opportunities that complement IRWMP actions.

- Integrate complementary recreational access and facility improvements within IRWMP implementation and projects.

- Harness joint funding and development methods to leverage investments across recreational, flood control, water supply, natural resource conservation, water quality and other IRWMP project objectives.

- Establish public recreation benefits as a performance standard for public investment in projects that protect private property or provide for private property development.
January 24, 2007

Dave Scheuring, Chair  
Water Resources Association of Yolo County  
P.O. Box 8624  
Woodland, CA 95776

Dear Mr. Scheuring:

Tuleyome has expressed concerns over the make up of the Yolo Bypass Working Group Subcommittee that is being established to prioritize and implement projects in conjunction with the Integrated Regional Water Management Project in Yolo Bypass region.

We recognize the dedication, hard work, and integrity of all who have worked with the Yolo Bypass Working Group over the past seven years. We thank them for that. Our issue is not with the people involved or the work that has been accomplished by the YBWG.

We are concerned about the process of prioritizing projects and implementing them in the Yolo Bypass through the IRWMP. This is a new program with new issues and new implications and it merits a fresh review and fresh start. The formation of this new ad hoc organization charged with making key decisions on projects paid for with public money was not publicly noticed beyond the YBWG and there was no solicited public input into identifying the interests that should be represented on the committee. In its conception it was felt that this decision-making body would be merely a “subcommittee” of the existing participants in the YBWG.

We previously identified and communicated our concerns that this decision-making body should include NGO representatives concerned with fishery management issues in the Bypass, environmental justice issues, subsistence fishing issues, and similar “non-traditional” concerns. We suggested a member of the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance. We also suggested that a resident of West Sacramento should be included, particularly with respect to recreational uses in the Bypass. We suggested that outreach with respect to environmental justice interests should be made.

Notwithstanding the need for each of these other representatives, our primary interest is in having someone representing fish in Bypass management. We do understand that the people on the subcommittee care about fish, but unlike the other interests represented on the subcommittee no one outside of a governmental agency is there simply to speak for maintaining, restoring, and enhancing the Bypass as a place for fish. This is an omission that has been recognized by both the facilitator and DWR who recommended the inclusion of a fishery representative. Even so, at its last meeting the subcommittee decided not to add anyone to the subcommittee for this purpose.

Our goal in pressing this issue is to ensure that when projects are prioritized all interests are in agreement about priorities, and that when the IRWMP projects are implemented that the necessary expertise to accomplish the implementation are included in the subcommittee. Funding is limited
and we believe that when a full range of interests are represented and everyone is in agreement that Yolo County will compete more effectively with proposals from other regions.

It would be our hope prioritization of integrated projects will go smoothly and that all interests will find common ground and move forward together. It just makes sense to start out in agreement. The resistance to this simple and reasoned request to ensure an inclusive and open process is disheartening when it could be so easily avoided.

Sincerely,

Bob Schneider
530-304-6215
February 27, 2007

Dave Scheuring, Chair, Board and Technical Committee
Water Resources Association of Yolo County
P.O. Box 8624
Woodland, CA 95776-8624

Email: info@yolowra.org

Subject: Yolo Bypass Inclusion in IRWMP

Dear Dave, Board, and Technical Committee:

In recent months I (along with other Tuleyome Board members) have been involved in discussions that have focused on the lack of a project or action in the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) that addresses flood management within the Yolo Bypass region. Most recently this subject was discussed extensively at the YBWG Subcommittee meeting.

The Yolo Bypass is, foremost, a facility that’s focused on flooding and flood management in the greater Sacramento region. Within that broad context a variety of activities take place that are related to many of the subjects covered by the IRWMP.

As you know, the original Bypass design addressed a conveyance capacity that was thought to be capable of routing most of the flow in a 100-year flood event past the City of Sacramento, based on the hydrological information available in the early 1900s, and thereby preventing flooding within the City of Sacramento. Since the original Bypass construction was completed, some conveyance capacity in the bypass was lost south of the City of West Sacramento with the construction of the Sacramento shipping channel within the original Bypass footprint. Based on additional hydrological data and modeling work now available, it appears that the Bypass actually has a flood conveyance capability of only about a 70-year event.

Three primary issues now face the County and the region:

- The Bypass does not have a conveyance capacity that meets the original design parameters. In addition, the Bypass conveyance capacity does not meet current Federal Emergency Management Agency requirements for protection from 100-year floods.
- The regional context for the Bypass now includes substantial development in areas that were not contemplated for development when the Bypass was initially considered, including the Natomas basin, The Pocket region in south Sacramento, and West Sacramento, all of which could be affected by flows within the Bypass that exceed the capacity of the Bypass.
- The desired flood protection standard for facilities such as the Bypass has changed, and responsible governments in the region are working to provide 200-year flood-event protection capability.
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Many planners currently believe that globally forced climate changes will result in higher-intensity storms in California, with less snowfall in the Sierra and more intense rainstorms. How such changes might affect storm duration, flood magnitude, and event frequency is currently uncertain. It is certainly possible that an event that is now considered a 200-year flood event will become a 100-year flood event as a consequence of the changing climate pattern in California.

Increasing the flood conveyance capacity of the Yolo Bypass may be the only viable option that can create significantly increasing flood protection in the Sacramento region. This issue should be recognized in the Yolo County IRWMP. Because of its regional importance, it appears that this should be a Foundational Action.

Possible wording might be:
“Evaluate options for increasing the Yolo Bypass flood conveyance capacity, given the increased development at risk in the region and the uncertainties resulting from global climate change.”

Thanks you for consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

Bob Schneider
530-304-6215