

**YOLO BYPASS WORKING GROUP  
MEETING 23**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING DATE:** January 23, 2003

**LOCATION:** California Department of Fish and Game  
Yolo Wildlife Area Headquarters  
45211 County Road 32B (Chiles Road)  
Davis, CA 95616

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation (YBF)  
Dave Feliz, California Department of Fish & Game (DFG)  
Ed Towne, Bull Sprig Outing  
Dave Ceppos, California Center for Public Dispute Resolution (CCPDR)  
Casey Walsh Cady, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)  
Dennis Kilkenny, Dawsons Duck Club  
Armand Gonzales, DFG - Region 2  
Dean Kwasny, DFG  
John Currey, Dixon Resource Conservation District (Dixon RCD)  
Lori Clamurro, DPC  
Marianne Kirkland, Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
Randy Mager, DWR  
Ted Sommer, DWR  
Boone Lek, DWR/Reclamation Board  
Don Stevens, Glide In Ranch  
Will Wylie, H Pond  
Mark Kearney, Landowner  
Scott Stone, Landowner  
Ron Tadlock, Landowner/Farmer  
Selby Mohr, Mound Farms  
Sally Negrai, National Resource Conservation District  
Cindy Mathews, National Weather Service (NWS)  
Pete Fickenscher, National Wildlife Service (NWS)/CNFRC  
Mike Hardesty, Reclamation District 2068 (RD 2068)  
Betsy Marchand, Reclamation Board  
Butch Hodgkins, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)  
Mick Klasson, SAFCA  
Tony Lucchesi, Wildlands Inc., Pope Ranch  
Gaye Lopez, YBF Board  
Rachelle De Clerck, YBF  
Brett Williams, Yolo County Parks and Resource Management Division  
Cheechoy  
Dick Goodell

**NEXT MEETING: February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2003. 10:30 am to 1:30 pm**

Dave Ceppos called the meeting to order and began introductions of attendees. Mr. Ceppos briefly covered the agenda and the purpose of the Working Group. The Working Group is open to the public and has been in existence for 3 years. It provides a focused opportunity for farmers, land owners and agencies within the Bypass to discuss Bypass related issues and provides guidance and opinions on such issues. The Working Group is continually funded by Cal-Fed.

Mr. Ceppos introduced himself and informed the participants that he is an employee of the California Center for Public Dispute Resolution. Participants introduced themselves.

Mr. Ceppos asked if there were any changes or edits to the draft November 21, 2002 meeting minutes. No changes or edits were requested and the November 21, 2002 meeting minutes were adopted as final.

**E-mail Rollover Update  
Robin Kulakow, YBF**

Over the past couple of months Yolo Basin Foundation (YBF) has attempted to convert outreach communications to e-mail. At present there are approximately 65 people on the Working Group list who have not listed their e-mail addresses. If you haven't received the last e-mails YBF has sent please let Robin Kulakow know so that YBF can make the appropriate corrections.

On December 18<sup>th</sup> Yolo Basin Foundation sent out the minutes for the first two focus group meetings via e-mail. Robin asked for a show of hands from anyone who received the e-mail. Based on the show of hands, only the first twenty people on the list received the e-mail. YBF's internet provider apparently filters out e-mails with more than 150 people as spam mail. The internet provider claims they do not filter e-mails. YBF made a second attempt, but the e-mails were once again filtered out. Therefore, YBF has converted the e-mail list into 15 groups of 10. Everyone who YBF has e-mail addressed for should have received an e-mail at the end of last week, except for the 65 people who have requested hard copy mailings.

Robin asked for a show of hands from people who received last weeks e-mail. The analogue board on Robin's computer went out and the computer was lost. Therefore the first focus group meeting minutes will be e-mailed again.

**Update on the Yolo Wildlife Area Management Planning Process  
Dave Feliz, DFG**

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is currently pursuing CALFED funding for preparation of the management plan and participating in the Yolo Regional Restoration

Planning effort for SAFCA. DFG has indicated areas where riparian restoration would be desirable and located potential sites to create wetlands that would be affected by tidal action.

NAWCA funding requires that the modeling for the Bypass be completed by 2005. Realizing that the modeling efforts may not be completed in the timeframe necessary to take advantage of the two NAWCA proposals, Dave is proceeding with the assumption that the current limitations on emergent vegetation and riparian areas will be applicable to the new lands. The Reclamation Board approved Dave's scenario of 5% vegetation and 5% permanent wetlands after the 1D modeling was completed by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Dave needs further clarification from the Reclamation Board whether the same modeling effort is sufficient to proceed with the NAWCA proposals. For this reason, Dave feels it is important to the effort that the Yolo Hydraulic Technical Advisory Committee is reconvened. The Yolo Regional Restoration Planning effort and the newly approved Reclamation Board Hydraulic Model test case will become an important part of the process to restore riparian and emergent vegetation in excess of the current standards.

**Update on the Yolo Wildlife Area Hunting and Other Related Programs**  
**Dave Feliz, DFG**

The duck hunting season ended in the Bypass on December 15<sup>th</sup>, due to flooding. The early helped contribute to a bad hunting year with only 1371 hunters killing 882 waterfowl for an average of less than 1 bird per hunter. Pheasant hunting was much more successful with 271 birds shot. This was an increase of over 130 birds from last year. The increase in pheasants was likely a combination of several years without major flooding along with agricultural plantings of millet, milo, and wheat, harvested rice fields and the application of late spring water. DFG hopes to be open for the Junior Hunt the first weekend in February.

The public tour route has been open intermittently since mid-December. DFG re-opened the tour route up to Parking Lot B today for wildlife viewing. School group programs have been working around the flooding however, the hunting areas are still flooded especially on the east side where the water is much deeper.

**Department of Water Resources Lisbon Monitoring Stage**  
**Cindy Mathews, NWS**

Cindy Mathews of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) presented information and answered questions regarding the Lisbon Weir monitoring stage.

*Participant Question:* As I recall, you received a lot of input from many of us in the Working Group to lower Lisbon Weirs monitoring stage from 14 feet to 11 feet. However, the monitoring stage remains at 14 feet, can you explain this to the group.

*Ms. Mathews:* I may not have made myself clear during our last meeting. Originally the forecasts were to be set at 20 feet, I was trying to keep the forecast at 14 feet.

*Participant Question:* Guidance plots are forecasting at less than 14 feet, so why are the forecasts set at 14 feet.

*Ms. Mathews:* Guidance plots will forecast lower than 14 feet, but text issues will not be sent out until 14 feet. It is difficult for DWR to forecast at the Lisbon Weir based on the tidal effects; therefore the forecasting is set as a basin. DWR will be able to forecast trends using the guidance plots for Lisbon Weir, but they will not be accurate at levels lower than 14 feet.

*Participant:* After the peak flows in the basin, the guidance plots seem to forecast faster receding water than what really happens in the Bypass. The rate of decrease appeared to be the same as increase, but in actuality it falls off much slower.

*Participant Question:* Does the gauge fit in that cylinder?

*Ms. Mathews:* Yes.

*Participant:* You mentioned the science is only good to 14 feet. Can you be more specific?

*Ms. Mathews:* How to measure flow is the hardest part. The lowest the rating goes down to is 12feet. If we could improve the rating it would help DWR with the forecasts. The other problem is the fact that the Bypass is so flat that there is a looped rating due to fact that the influx of water is faster than the outflow.

*Participant:* When Lisbon is at 14 feet my property is under 3 feet of water. I need to rely on the forecasts in order to remove my equipment before water is on my property.

*Participant:* An acoustic Doppler has been installed at Lisbon Weir which measures the net amount of flow that goes through the Weir. Can DWR post this information on CDEC?

*Ms. Mathews:*

*Mr. Ceppos:* Can you walk everyone through the information on the graph and explain what it means?

Ms. Mathews briefly walked the Working Group through the graphical river forecasts. The river forecast graphs are updated only after forecast models are run and the official forecast is issued. The observed stage information in not updated between forecast issuances.

The top graphs on the river forecast page depicts both the observed and forecast rain and snowmelt. The blue bar graph illustrates the actual observed rain and snow melt over the past 6-hour period, whereas the green bar graph is the forecast rain and snow melt for the next 6-hour period.

The bottom line graph illustrates the observed and forecast river stages. The red dotted line is flood stage and the orange dotted line is monitoring stage. The vertical scale on the right is the stage in feet. The vertical scale on the left is discharge in cubic feet per second (cfs). The bottom horizontal scale is the date and hour. There are three colors on the plot line, blue, green and pink and are as follows:

- Blue – Observed river stage for the previous 5-days.
- Green – Official river forecast for a 24 to 48 hour period depending on location.
- Pink – Guidance over a 2 to 5-day period.

The official river forecast line plot agrees with the text forecast in the river bulletin. This portion of the graph has a high confidence in the forecasted stages. The guidance plot line is not an official forecast. This portion of the graph has a larger degree of uncertainty and lower confidence. The guidance plot should be used only as a planning tool.

Some of the assumptions that are included in the forecast and guidance plots are as follows:

#### Precipitation Assumptions

- The amount forecasted will be the amount that falls.
- The amount of forecasted rain versus snow will be correct.
- The amounts will fall within the forecasted 6-hour period (i.e. the storm will arrive as planned and not stall off the coast or arrive early).

#### Reservoir Assumptions

- Reservoir releases will remain constant through the 5-day period. (WARNING – Reservoir releases are not likely to remain constant during most storm events. A new reservoir release change can radically change the forecast and guidance graphs.)

The 6-hour precipitation plots include the water sheds north up to Shasta Dam.

Ms. Mathews discussed an “after-the-flood” analysis of how well the Graphical River Forecast did in comparison to the actual observed river stage. In the short term (the actual forecast section of the graph) the forecasts are usually good. But if the storm stalls, the short term forecast can be very wrong (as shown on the third slide). In that instance, the storm stalled off the coast and dumped its rain directly into the ocean;

therefore the actual river stages were significantly different from the forecast. Ms. Mathews reiterated that major decisions should not be based on the guidance portions of the graphs, they should be utilized as planning tools only.

Ms. Mathews listed websites for river forecast graph locations:

- CDEC Web Page – River/Tide Forecast Links  
<http://cdec.water.ca.gov/rivforecasts.html>.
- NWS Web Page –Hydrology Link  
[http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/sacramento/html/hydro\\_data.html](http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/sacramento/html/hydro_data.html)
- Weather Forecast daily e-mail updates, send an email to [weather\\_list@water.ca.gov](mailto:weather_list@water.ca.gov) and ask to be included on the e-mail list.

*Participant:* I like the idea of being able to plan out 5-days in advance, even if it is imprecise because it gives us a basis. Lisbon is the middle of the Bypass; however my property is located at the south end of the Bypass which is heavily affected by tidal influence. Can we get another station farther south?

*Ms. Mathews:* United States Geological Society (USGS) has posted another station at the southern end of Bypass where it empties into Cache Slough. There is also a stage gauge at Liberty Island which is available on CDEC.

*Participant:* On the current river prediction stage for the Bypass there are two stations south of Lisbon. There are currently no predictions for these stations, but they at least list the current river stages.

The LIY graph is inside the bypass, CDEC is doing real time within the hour for this location.

*Participant:* Will the gauge on the southern end of the Bypass be on CDEC?

*Ms. Mathews:* That isn't clear at this point; however DWR is working on that.

*Participant:* On the graph it says not rated for flow at Yolo Basin at Lisbon Weir. Why?

*Ms. Mathews:* Lisbon Weir is within the influence of tidal flow. At this point DWR can not measure tidal flow because the flow direction changes.

*Participant:* Is the influence of tidal flow built into the DWR forecast model?

*Ms. Mathews:* DWR does not have that capability at this time.

### **Weather and Flood Forecasting Websites**

## **Butch Hodgkins, SAFCA**

Mr. Hodgkins briefly went through the steps on using the CDEC website to find real time data that is available on water and weather in California. Mr. Hodgkins' handout illustrated the steps used to maneuver through the CDEC website. Please see handout for information.

*Participant:* Do these flows illustrated on the website take into account a flood event?

*Mr. Hodgkins:* There is fundamentally a 5 – 10 day weather forecast which includes a 6-hour quantitative precipitation forecast for up to 5 days. The precipitation forecast plus the snow melt is run through the models, and estimates a 6-hour runoff period.

At Folsom Dam in the middle of winter, when the reservoir storage goes above 60% full, the rules mandate that additional water is released from the reservoir up to the point where released water would exceed downstream capacity.

*Participant:* Can you explain what the increments are for the boxes on the blue line graph.

*Mr. Hodgkins:* The 23 on the blue line graph indicated January 23<sup>rd</sup>, the black lines indicate each day after.

The data for these graphs are run through two computer models prior to posting on the graphs. It is not likely that SAFCA will not hear of a large flood before it comes, in fact the NWS may say the coming flood is bigger than what actually occurs; however, SAFCA would rather be over prepared than under prepared.

*Mr. Ceppos:* The Bypass picks up local flows as well as Sacramento flows. Does the data include Putah Creek and Cache Creek flows? Are these flows being averaged?

*NWS:* Yes the data includes Putah Creek and Cache Creek flow, but the two flows are lumped together. This is an area that can be improved.

*Mr. Hodgkins:* I don't see Putah Creek on the CDEC graphs?

*NWS:* Putah Creek is not an official forecast.

*Participant:* Lisbon weir is only one, point location in the Bypass. If your property is north of Lisbon, then the flood crest will reach your property sooner and leave later than a property south of Lisbon Weir. There are many micro-geographical situations in the Bypass. The CDEC information is two-days should be used as a forecast, 3 to 5 days as guidance.

*Mr. Ceppos:* What doesn't exist on the graphs is flow to topography, the Bypass is micro-topography.

*NWS:* The NWS can estimate the inundation after the flood, but that is the current extent of NWS' capabilities.

*Mr. Hodgkins:* SAFCA hopes to take some aerial photographs during flood events to help us better understand what is happening at various stages at Lisbon. SAFCA is currently in the process of using data from the CDEC website for SAFCA's website.

*Participant:* Is there a chance that the model will show Freemont Weir will not spill but Sacramento Weir will?

*Mr. Hodgkins:* I can't conceive of an event where that would be happen?

*Participant:* There is a graph that illustrates that Sacramento Weir has never opened unless the Freemont Weir was spilling.

*Participant:* What determines the statement "monitor stage"?

*NWS:* On the levied river system, the monitor stage is when the river rises up onto the levee. For Lisbon that stage was lowered because the deep water channel is between an official levee and a weir. At Freemont Weir the monitor stage is when water tops the weir. Monitoring stages are different at different places.

*Participant:* What is Ridge Cut?

*Mr. Hodgkins:* Ridge Cut is south of Knights Landing and consists of two parallel canals upstream of Cache Creek. It is a connection of Colusa Basin drain.

In 1997 the Ridge Cut overtopped its bank and flooded Highway 113. The Ridge Cut flows into the Bypass; however, in 1997 Bypass water was so high that it acted as a dam to Ridge Cut flows and backed up the Ridge Cut.

*Participant:* Is the data on the CDEC website in feet at sea level or something else?

*Ms. Mathews:* Datum on the CDEC graphs is either in USED or NGVD both of which do not agree on sea level measurements and vary between 3 to 5 feet. According to Michael Mossbacher, Lisbon Weir is -3 feet NGVD. Therefore, use the datum from the CDEC chart and using a USGS topographic map subtract 3 feet from the Lisbon Weir elevation. This means 3 feet below seal level. In order to know the elevation you need to understand and know what your local datum is compared to such as NGVD or USED data.

*Participant:* Why can't all the data be zeroed out so that all the data is consistent?

*Mr. Ceppos:* To whom would the YBWG write a letter to in order to standardize all the data? Who does the standardization?



*Ms. Marchand:* I would suggest you write the reclamation board.

*Mr. Hardesty:* DWR would be a good place to start; however, that means you have to change all the data and gauges which is costly. The stages and datum information is included on the back of the flood operations manual. In addition, the CDEC website includes a datum information page which is a good reference.

*Participant:* Why doesn't CDEC make the conversions before plotting the data on the graphs?

*NWS:* There is a history of data that would have to be converted.

*Participant:* This is an academic issue is not that important to us in the Bypass. As long as we understand the measurement parameters at Lisbon, we can do our own conversions. What's important is the height at any given point in time and then we know what will happen to our property.

*Mr. Hodgkins:* I work with these sister agencies all the time, change is difficult. I suggest you do your own development of what you need. In that way you can insure you will get what you need.

*Mr. Ceppos:* Cindy Mathews handed out a thumbnail on her power point presentation. Contact information for Cindy Mathews is 916-979-3049. Butch Hodgkins handed out river guidance materials and on the back of that he included an e-mail list serve information for forecasting.

*Mr. Martinez:* Is there a phone number we can call to obtain updated forecast information if we are unable to use a computer?

*Ms. Mathews:* Forecast recordings are still available at 800-952-5530 and are updated with each forecast.

*Participant:* The lower and upper Sacramento bulletins also have a lot of useful information for the Bypass. The CDEC website also gives you access for weather forecasts and weather forecast discussions.

### **Update SAFCA Regional Flood Control Plan Butch Hodgkins, SAFCA**

There has been little change in SAFCA's regional flood control plan. Since the last Working Group meeting, SAFCA has met with a couple of Bypass land owners. SAFCA is coordinating efforts with DFG through Dave Feliz regarding land uses in the Bypass. SAFCA is interested in including environmental restoration; however it needs to be understood that the vision of DFG and the community is not likely to happen if there is

any loss in flood capacity of the Bypass. There is a lot of water in the Bypass, even when Freemont Weir is not flooding. SAFCA would like to have a better understanding of flooding in the Bypass; therefore if you would like to help SAFCA in this endeavor please contact Butch Hodgkins.

*Ms. Marchand:* What concerns has SAFCA run into in their discussions with land owners?

*Mr. Hodgkins:* Those involved in agriculture want to preserve agriculture in the Bypass and not lose productive farm land. However, agricultural land owners have a different view than that of the farm bureaus. Elected officials are interested in hearing from farmers and land owners in the upper Elkhorn area in order to avoid conflict with them. From SAFCA's standpoint, issues in the Bypass can not be approached without Yolo County input or support. If there is a great deal of opposition, SAFCA will fall back on just raising their levees.

*Participant:* What concerns has SAFCA heard from constituents down stream such as Rio Vista?

*Answer:* SAFCA is just beginning to talk to people downstream; however there could be some big changes in the Rio Vista area.

**Initiation of Individual Landowner Interviews  
Existing and Potential Land Use Conditions in the Bypass  
Dave Ceppos, CCP**

In the beginning, when Working Group was convened and the first CALFED grant was made, there was a naïve belief that at the culmination of the Working Group meetings a map on could be placed on the table illustrating property ownership and identifying who was interested in any land use changes. Over time the underlying mission applied to this project and group became to help every single land owner and tenet make the best land use decisions without negatively impacting neighbors. Conversely, if a land owner wants to make a change to their property without the limitations imposed by easements, etc, the mission would allow the land change to occur within reasonable boundaries.

The first phase of the CALFED project, the management plan, intimately involved the Working Group. The document that ensued included the issues that the Working Group felt should be addressed. The second phase of this project, one-to-one discussions with land owners in the Bypass regarding what will happen in the Bypass, is slated to begin. These discussions will be bound by the management strategy.

Some of the issues that will be of discussed will include land use changes such as habitat friendly farming, long term easements, habitat change or addition and property improvements. These meetings are not a requirement of land owners. If a land owner chooses not to participate they will not be bothered any further. If a land owner would like to participate, then the discussion will focus on the most current farm bill issues. The

discussion will be documented and a concept plan drafted which will include what land owners want to do and the constraints. The next stage will be to see how land owners wants can be addressed, and still stay whole and compensated without affecting flood control capacity of the Bypass. The bottom line is land owner wants for their property, such as habitat management for endangered species, will be known as well as the potential negative impacts to neighboring properties.

*Participant:* Will the discussions focus on land as a whole or only on the fringes?

*Mr. Ceppos:* Based on the management strategy the habitat change is along the fringes of the properties in addition to the NAWCA grant.

*Property:* What is the latest on Tom Hardy's proposed refuge?

*Mr. Ceppos:* Currently the refuge is on hold. The North Delta refuge is 12,300 acres. Liberty Island, Prospect Island and Little Holland Tract are hoping to pursue the North Delta Refuge through the Environmental Policy Act or through legislation. Representative Doug Ose is in a position of resistance to the refuge and is an influence in Congress regarding this issue. At this point it is uncertain whether it will come into fruition.

*Participant:* How is the information that is being collected going to move where it is most effective?

*Mr. Ceppos:* At this point there is no intention of publishing the survey results; however there is an advantage to having land owners combine for larger scale improvements within the framework of the current farm bill. Cooperative efforts between land owners could result in a higher ranking; therefore, the information collected could be utilized for funding purposes for land owners in the Bypass.

*Ms. Marchand:* How is public safety, etc, going to be addressed?

*Mr. Ceppos:* If the information collected illustrates trends, these will be communicated to the Reclamation Board. These discussions are happening independently of the regional flood plan. At the same time, the regional flood plan indicates certain flood regulations are changing which could influence land use in the Bypass. The political and physical landscape is always changing.

*Ms. Marchand:* It might be good to have a discussion Pete Laboon before the land owner meetings so that there isn't any miscommunication.

*Participant:* What we want to see come out of this is an overall plan for the Bypass, the goals and objectives of duck clubs and agriculture, and a plan for recommendations and best management practices that are in compliance with flood control. Hopefully the modeling will be done quickly so that land improvements can begin. If a land owner is involved in an overall management plan, then they get more points for their

improvements at the farm bureau. When the Working Group has this plan we can then go to USFWS and obtain a biological opinion and an incidental take protection document.

*Mr. Ceppos:* I'm acting as a conduit for NRCS to do their leg work

*Participant:* What is the time frame for completing the concept paper? Six to nine months?

*Mr. Ceppos:* The interviews should be completed within the next 3 months and the paper written within 6 months.

Some of the issues that may be discussed include agricultural economic change, family lineage changes, etc. For example, a land owner would like to get out of the agriculture business. Their options for their property include continued farming, fallow fields, hunting or habitat change. The purpose of these discussions is to avoid having land owners not make changes to their land due to regulations.

*Participant:* I understand you want to get everyone together to make a big master plan; however what about those land owners who aren't at these meetings.

*Mr. Ceppos:* YBF knows who they are and will try to engage them in these discussions.

*Participant:* How do you handle absentee land owners?

*Ms. Kulakow:* In the case of absentee land owners, many of the tenants of those properties are attending these meetings.

*Participant:* In my case I represent multiple absentee owners and we work around their absence.

*Mr. Ceppos:* YBF will do everything it can to contact absentee land owners. Education of what is happening in the Bypass will be critical. Properties will be enhanced not ruined.

### **CALFED Modeling Project Boon Lek, DWR**

Mr. Ceppos how to find proposal 32da of the CALFED modeling project. The initial 32da proposal was submitted in 2001. That proposal was not funded; however, CALFED recommended some changes in the proposal and to resubmit in 2002. In December 2002, the proposal was approved for a roughly \$500,000 grant. Approximately \$350,000 was allotted to YBF for outreach and modeling. CALFED is hoping to have the modeling selection finalized soon. The current timeline is a two year plan beginning in

2003 and ending in 2005. SAFCA has proposed to support the project with \$50,000 per year for two years. Whether that will be included in a grant hasn't been decided yet. The YBF technical advisory committee, an ad hoc collection of the reclamation board, army corps of engineers, Gus Yates, Dave Feliz, Robin Kulakow, Mike Hardesty, NHC engineers, NBC engineers and others, will be included in modeling. CALFED is thinking of reconvening another technical committee. If you are interested in being on the committee please contact Boone Lek.

*Ms. Marchand:* The reclamation board put into CALFED for this and there was a lot of agency and resource support. The resources agency was very supportive and feels the 2D model is what will be needed for this project.

*Participant:* What's the start date for the project?

*Mr. Lek:* CALFED is shooting for the end of February to finalize funding contracts. The project may begin in early of March, although it may be awhile before we have any results.

*Participant:* As new things are added to the Bypass will there be updates to the model?

*Mr Lek:* That was discussed but CALFED does not have a continuum. It is possible additional CALFED funds could be requested for a second phase for maintenance.

One of the goals of the project was to make this a more user friendly tool where a manual is produced in a CD-ROM format so that changes could be made during planning. However, other issues need to be looked into first.

*Participant:* Can the farm bureau presentation be tied in with a NAWCA presentation by Chadd Santerre?

*Dave Ceppos:* Yes.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) had a 20 year waiver for agricultural land and water runoff from property during a flood event. The waiver ended December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2002. In June 2004 farmers will need to select being involved in a regional program water quality monitoring or do it on their own. This process needs land owner participation but most people don't know anything about it. Water quality monitoring program for a farmer's property will be part of regional program.

*Mr. Ceppos:* Can we get a more formal discussion?

*Mr. Lek:* A watershed faire is scheduled for Feb 5<sup>th</sup> at noon at the Ulatis Community Center in Vacaville. The state board will give a discussion first.

Meeting was adjourned. Next meeting scheduled for February 27, 2003.