

**Yolo Bypass Working Group**  
**May 24, 2016 (Meeting 51); 10 am to noon,**  
**Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Conference Room**

**Meeting Summary**

**Meeting Participants**

Jeremy Arrich – CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
Lewis Bair – Reclamation District 108  
Pete Bontadelli – Yolo Basin Foundation/Analytical Environmental Services  
Doug Brown – Douglas Environmental  
Kent Calfee--landowner  
Chris Campbell - cbec ecoengineering  
Tom Chapman – HDR Engineering  
Mark Cowan – US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE)  
John Currey – Dixon Resource Conservation District  
Mike Eakin – CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Water Branch  
Henry Estrada – Sac Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District (SYMVCD)  
Judy Fisher – Kueneman Consultancy  
Chris Fulster Jr. – Glide In Ranch  
Dick Goodell – Glide In Ranch  
Larry Jahn – Los Rios Farm  
Alley Keller – McCord Environmental  
Dave Kohlhorst – Glide In Ranch  
Robin Kulakow –Yolo Basin Foundation  
Mike Lear – Swanston Ranch  
Betsy Marchand – Yolo Basin Foundation  
Petrea Marchand – Consero Solutions representing Yolo County  
Stephen McCord – McCord Environmental  
John McNerney – City of Davis  
Selby Mohr – Mound Farms  
Tara Morin – Consero Solutions  
Eric Nagy – MBK Engineers  
Heather Nichols – Yolo County Resource Conservation District (YCRCD)  
Martha Ozonoff – Yolo Basin Foundation  
Thomas Pate – Solano County Water Agency  
Paul Phillips – CA Waterfowl Association  
Mike Roberts – DWR  
Elisa Sabatini – Yolo County  
Marty Scholl – SYMVCD  
Sara Schultz – USACOE  
Bjarni Serup - CDFW  
Tom Schene – Tule Ranch  
Greg Schmid – Tule Ranch  
Jeff Stoddard – CDFW, Manager, Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area  
Kris Tjernel – CA Natural Resources Agency  
Lily Tomkovic – UC Davis

Eric Tsai – DWR  
Leanne Villa – Yolo Basin Foundation

## **I. Introductions:**

The group was welcomed by Jeff Stoddard and Robin Kulakow. Meeting participants introduced themselves. Robin Kulakow facilitated the meeting.

## **II. US ACOE/CA DWR – Sara Schultz and Mark Cowan**

The USACOE is preparing the Sacramento River General Reevaluation Report (GRR). The question was asked: What are the needs of the Sacramento River flood control system and what is required to meet those needs. The ACOE is trying to get input from all parties but they are still not hearing from some stakeholders. The ACOE primary goals are reducing flood risk while seeking habitat restoration opportunities. Other system benefits include water supply and recreation.

The study area was from Knight's Landing to Collinsville. The feasibility study identified the future without project condition, which is everything that would reasonably happen if the project was not implemented. This was the baseline. This baseline will change over time as things change or projects are identified. Alternatives were then outlined.

For the evaluation phase, USACOE will use modeling to analyze economic and environmental benefits of the alternatives and see which rise to the top. Which alternatives provide the most benefit for the cost?

The Plan will be made available to the public. Today's discussion was to present broad concepts and they are currently only at a conceptual level. They want to make things more efficient regardless of the benefit and/or constraints. The study will require CEQA and NEPA compliance. The process was originally supposed to take 3 years but due to the large study area and number of stakeholders and project groups, it will likely take much longer.

Please see Attachment A for the presentation by USACOE.

## **III. Regional Flood Management Plan for Lower Sacramento River/North Delta (Yolo Bypass) – Eric Nagy**

DWR started the regional flood management planning program to stimulate the conversation between local flood control agencies as well as with other water resource stakeholders. There are an extremely diverse set of interests and many stakeholders, including rural, agricultural, urban, and at least 40 levee maintaining agencies within this region. A Regional Flood Management Plan was submitted to DWR in July 2014. Since then the following six agencies came together to focus the region's attention on the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough areas: Yolo County, Solano County, SAFCA, West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (WSAFCA), RD 2068 and Solano County Water Agency. This team has tried to progress the Corridor Management Framework (CMF), adopted in February 2015, to provide a common set of regional goals and objectives when interacting with state and federal agencies concerning planned water resource projects in the region. The goals are to reduce flood risk, preserve and improve habitat

function, promote a vibrant agricultural economy, establish a sustainable approach to operations and maintenance for both flood and habitat projects, and improve water supply and drainage infrastructure. The CMF attempts to treat federal, state, and local interests equally and create long term, constructive relationships with agencies on all levels.

#### **IV. Salmon Biological Opinion: Yolo Bypass, Timeline for developing alternatives for US Bureau of Reclamation/ DWR CEQA/NEPA Analysis – Kris Tjernel**

In 2009, National Marine Fisheries Service issued the Biological Opinion for salmon. In 2012, DWR and Bureau of Reclamation adopted a formal implementation plan for the Yolo Bypass which includes fish passage and floodplain restoration. In 2013, studies, planning, and design work began. There has been significant progress in 2016. The near-term fish passage projects are: 1. Wallace Weir which will construct a permanent facility that crosses just downstream of the existing weir and allow for the same flows. Salmon will be collected and moved to the Sacramento River instead of getting lost; 2. Fremont Weir fish ladder will likely be done in 2018. The plan is to widen and deepen the current fish ladder. This design will allow for only 1000 cubic feet per second (cfs) so there will be little impact on surrounding area; 3. agricultural road crossings which should be implemented in 2017. Existing culverts don't work for fish so they are working with landowners to identify what to do here to help fish passage but retain agricultural operations; 4. Lisbon weir - the timeline not yet determined but probably 2018. The question remains of how to improve the facility for fish but retain current operations for agriculture and CDFW Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area use. Fish passage must work both directions with adult salmon moving up through system into the Sacramento River and juvenile fish leaving the Bypass to the Delta then ocean. The Biological Opinion also requires floodplain restoration. The ultimate goal would be to increase the frequency and duration of shallow inundations mostly for juvenile fish, create additional fish passage improvements, yet find ways that work for beneficial uses including agriculture, hunting, wildlife habitat, education, water supply, and more.

There has been significant stakeholder engagement with participation by over 100 land owners, land managers, non-governmental organizations, and local governments. All future outreach will be efficient, honest and purposeful. They hope to coordinate with ongoing flood management efforts so there is only one footprint.

The question was asked about modeling for different cfs levels. The current models are for 6000 cfs but they plan to model different levels including 3000 cfs. This modeling is in the works.

#### **V. Yolo Bypass Cache Slough MOU – Doug Brown**

In September 2015, 15 entities came together and created the Yolo Bypass Cache Slough Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU spells out how the agencies will work together. The 10-year agreement is non-binding and aims to develop trust. There are many projects going on in the Bypass (Ecorestore, Yolo County projects through Prop 1 funding, Central Valley Flood Protection Plan, Yolo/Solano HCP, Regional Trails Initiative) and the

MOU hopes to integrate all of these efforts by creating a structure to oversee all these projects. See Attachment B for MOU.

The principles of the MOU are as follows:

1. – concerns of all parties will be considered and are important.
- 2.– Primary function of Yolo Bypass is flood control, all projects must improve or maintain status quo
3. – identify ways to enhance other Bypass benefits
4. – can't modify regulatory requirements
- 5.– connect all agency levels with locals and consider all interests

## **VI. Proposed Projects in the Yolo Bypass for Proposition 1 funding: Update – Petrea Marchand**

Petrea discussed the proposed projects in the Yolo Bypass under Prop 1 funding. See Attachment C for further information.

Yolo Bypass drainage and water infrastructure improvement study was funded by Conaway Ranch and Yolo County and asked “what do stakeholders need in relation to proposed projects?” The 2014 passage of Prop 1 allowed the projects identified in this study to be funded, however, more funding is needed, to complete the projects.

The projects include:

1. Drainage/conveyance for water supply
2. Maintenance program for drainage (sedimentation and invasive species)
3. Weir improvements.
4. Monitoring west side tributaries.

## **VII. Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area – Wildlife Area Corridors Plan – Heather Nichols**

Heather Nichols with the Yolo County Resource Conservation District manages the agriculture permits and leases in the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area. In an effort to protect wildlife during flood events, they looked at what habitat enhancements could be done to provide cover for wildlife during these events but wouldn't impede agriculture or other projects. Two sites were selected and will be improved by removing noxious plants and planting native species. Please see Attachment D for project description, goals, and tasks.

### **Attachments:**

- A. USACOE presentation on GRR
- B. Yolo Bypass Cache Slough MOU
- C. Proposed Projects in the Yolo Bypass for Proposition 1 funding
- D. Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area – Wildlife Area Corridors Plan