

# Chapter 1. Introduction

---

## DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This document presents a locally based concept for the future of the Yolo Bypass (Bypass). A Framework for the Future: The Yolo Bypass Management Strategy (Management Strategy) is the culmination of a stakeholder-based project funded by the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED). Chapter 1 presents general information about the location of the project area, background about the project process, and descriptions of past and present projects that are related to the Bypass. Chapter 2 presents a description of existing conditions in the Bypass, with an emphasis on existing land and water uses and historic and recent floodflow and low-flow hydrologic data. Chapter 3 describes several “assurances” and related issues that landowners need addressed to feel more comfortable about considering habitat-related land use changes in the Bypass. Chapter 4 presents a set of realistic habitat recommendations prepared by the Yolo Bypass Working Group (Working Group), including an analysis of habitat benefits, ways in which such ideas could match with CALFED’s targets and actions, and constraints that could prevent implementation of such recommendations. Chapter 5 presents conclusions and recommendations of several technical studies that will likely be necessary to achieve future implementation of potential habitat enhancement ideas.

## LOCATION OF PROJECT

The Bypass is a leveed, 59,000-acre floodplain on the west side of the lower Sacramento River in California’s Yolo and Solano Counties (Figure 1-1). Located within the boundaries and levees of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project (FCP), the Bypass is a primary component of the FCP and carries floodwaters from several northern California waterways to the Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta (Delta). These waterways include the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers and their associated tributary watersheds. Tributaries specific to the Bypass include Cache and Putah Creeks, Willow Slough, and the Knights Landing Ridge Cut from the Colusa Basin. The Bypass provides:

- # flood conveyance for the entire Sacramento Valley (i.e., the FCP) (Figure 1-2), including numerous communities and cities throughout the valley;
- # agricultural land for a variety of farming uses;
- # riparian and managed wetland habitats; and
- # some upland and grassland habitats.

For the purpose of this project, two main geographical sections comprise the Bypass: an upper 14.2-mile section (measured north to south) between the Fremont Weir and the Interstate 80 (I-80) causeway (Northern Bypass) and a lower 26.8-mile section (measured north to south) between the I-80 causeway and the southern end of the Egbert Tract (Southern Bypass). The Northern Bypass is nontidal and is bounded on the east by the Tule Canal (the upper extension of the Toe Drain) and the East Bypass Levee and bounded on the west by the West Bypass Levee. The Interstate 5 (I-5) causeway bisects the Northern Bypass east to west.

Several opinions exist regarding the formal definition of the southern extent of the Bypass. For the purpose of this project, the Southern Bypass is bounded on the east by the Toe Drain and the East Bypass Levee (also considered the west levee of the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel [Ship Channel]), downstream to the northwest corner of Prospect Island. At this location, the Bypass extends east to include Prospect Island, although the East Bypass Levee remains intact along the west edge of the island. South of Prospect Island, the east side of the Bypass extends downstream of the confluence of Cache and Lindsey Sloughs to the downstream boundary of Egbert Tract. This eastern downstream limit of the Bypass is roughly collocated with the confluence of Steamboat and Cache Sloughs. The west side of the Bypass is bounded by the West Bypass Levee to just south of Putah Creek and the Putah Creek Sink downstream of Putah Creek. The Southern Bypass is unleveed on the west side for approximately 8 miles, allowing floodwaters to flow unimpeded as far west as Yolo County Road (CR) 104. Farther downstream (approximately 1 mile north of Yolo CR 155), the West Bypass Levee resumes and extends south and west of Liberty Island. The west side of the Bypass extends farther south, downstream of Liberty Island, and along the western boundary of Egbert Tract.

The Southern Bypass, which lies within the legally defined Delta, has some tidally influenced areas. Tidal conditions are routinely measured as far upstream in the Toe Drain as the I-80 causeway. The 3,660-acre California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area (Yolo Wildlife Area) is situated predominantly south of I-80 in the upper reach of the Southern Bypass. As previously described, the southern limit of the project area extends to the southern boundary of the Egbert Tract. However, because of limitations in available map data, most of the data figures in this document (excluding Figure 1-1) do not fully capture the southern portion of the project area south of Liberty Island or the east side, including Prospect Island.

## **CURRENT FUNCTION OF PROJECT AREA**

The purpose of the present-day Bypass is to provide flood control. More specifically, the Bypass conveys floodflows generated by runoff from the entire Sacramento River watershed. Further description of this function is provided in Chapter 2. Within this flood management context, most of the land within the Bypass is farmed, with a smaller amount (located largely in the Southern Bypass) dedicated to publically and privately managed wetlands. Land use within the Bypass is restricted by easements held through the Sacramento–San Joaquin Drainage District, as amended by the State of California Reclamation Board (Reclamation Board). However, these easements do not

restrict the use of the land within the Bypass for agricultural and managed wetland (duck club) activities. These easements are described in more detail in Chapter 2.

Those portions of the Bypass that are flooded in winter and early spring also function as a migration route and spawning and rearing habitat for many sensitive special-status fish species endemic to the region (as defined by the federal Endangered Species Act [ESA] and the California Endangered Species Act [CESA]). This migration connection occurs when floodwaters are spilling over the Fremont and Sacramento Weirs (Chapter 2), creating upstream hydrologic connection between the Bypass and the Sacramento River. As the floodwaters inundate and then recede, the Bypass also provides habitat for shorebirds, waterfowl, and terrestrial species. Large areas within the Bypass are currently managed for wildlife habitat, including the Yolo Wildlife Area, Conaway Ranch, and private duck club lands in the southern section of the Bypass.

## **PROJECT PROCESS**

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

The process of stakeholder involvement for the Management Strategy project began in summer 1999 with the Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation) and their consultant team (collectively referred to as the “project team”) contacting and meeting with the five Yolo County Supervisors (Lois Wolk, Tom Stallard, Dave Rosenberg, Lynell Pollack, and Mike McGowan) and with representatives of Congressman Doug Ose. The purpose of these meetings was to provide these local leaders with a description of the project purpose and goals, address initial questions and concerns of these leaders, and establish appropriate lines of communication for the remainder of the project.

After these initial contacts were made, the project team contacted potentially affected Bypass stakeholders, including landowners; duck club managers; representatives of local, state, and federal resource and planning agencies; conservation organizations; agricultural interests; and private citizens. As with the meetings held with local leaders, the purpose of meeting with these individuals was to introduce the project concept to them, answer questions, and gather input on how best to proceed with the project. Issues discussed with these stakeholders included agricultural and other management practices being used on Bypass properties, previous and similar stakeholder efforts initiated in or near the Bypass, flood conveyance, and habitat management. After the project team felt it had elicited enough interest and support, the first Working Group meeting was held in November 1999.

### **Yolo Bypass Working Group**

The first Working Group meeting was attended by 14 participants, four of whom were members of the project team. The remaining participants included landowners, land managers, and

representatives from government agencies (DFG and the City of Woodland). Since then, through follow-up efforts by the project team and word of mouth among stakeholders, the monthly/bimonthly meetings regularly attract between 30 and 40 participants, most of whom are private and public landowners or tenants in the Bypass. Appendix A presents a list of participating stakeholders (affected and associated) to date.

The Working Group meetings act as a forum to educate and inform all parties interested in the Bypass. Information on Bypass-related land use, flood management, resource policy, economics, and ecological issues is presented to and openly discussed by members of the Working Group. Guest speakers have included representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)(also a landowner stakeholder), Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), Northern California Water Association, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), DFG (also a landowner stakeholder), Reclamation Board, Port of Sacramento, U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Farm Services Agency (FSA) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), California Waterfowl Association (CWA), University of California Davis (UCD), and several technical consultants on ecological and hydrologic issues.

It should be noted that prior to the formation of the Working Group, many landowners and other stakeholders were oftentimes not informed about issues and decision-making processes that directly affected their interests and the Bypass. These meetings give local stakeholders the chance to provide direct input, helping to protect their interests and guide projects proposed by others. As of June 2001, there have been 14 Working Group meetings. Appendix B provides a set of meeting agendas from each meeting.

The information the group has discussed has resulted in numerous reoccurring issues regarding land use and floodflows in the Bypass. These issues are addressed in greater detail in Chapters 2, 3, and 4.

## **FUTURE OF THE PROJECT**

The future of the Working Group and its efforts to establish a shared concept for the Bypass are positive. In spring 2000, the Working Group submitted a proposal to CALFED for continued technical efforts to resolve issues identified in this document. Specifically, the Working Group was seeking information about the economic and hydrologic/hydraulic impacts of expanded habitats in the Bypass and about ways to legally protect landowners and agencies regarding potential impacts to special-status species, such as safe harbor agreements. In December 2000, CALFED funded the economic impact, land value/fair compensation, and safe harbor agreement portions of the Working Group's proposal. The hydrologic/hydraulic impacts analysis portion of the proposal was not supported at that time. Since then, the Reclamation Board has expressed an intent to lead an assessment of Bypass-specific, habitat-related hydrologic/hydraulic impacts. As presented later in this chapter, a technical advisory committee has been formed by the Foundation to further discuss/resolve these hydraulic issues. Additionally, the USFWS has provided funding for additional Working Group meetings as part of their agency's planning efforts on the proposed North Delta

National Wildlife Refuge (NDNWR). The USFWS has committed to working with a subcommittee of Bypass landowners to pursue resolution of issues related to the proposed NDNWR (as described later in this chapter).

The Working Group seeks to be recognized as a primary advisory body on all issues related to the Bypass. They also seek further refinement of rules and policies regarding restrictions of land use and operations related to the presence of special-status species. The group remains interested in the numerous easement programs that exist or have been proposed for Central Valley lands.

Lastly, the Working Group anticipates playing an important role in any future development of the proposed NDNWR, other habitat-related efforts pursued by public and nongovernmental organizations, and future flood management projects proposed by the USACE, DWR, and SAFCA.

## **RELATED PAST AND ONGOING STUDIES/PROJECTS**

As previously described, the Bypass is a critical component of the FCP. Additionally, it provides important agricultural land uses and private and public managed wetland land uses. Lastly, it provides important existing habitats and the possibility for future habitat enhancement. As such, the Bypass has been and continues to be the subject of numerous studies, programs, and reports. The following sections describe some key efforts regarding the Bypass.

### **State and Federal Water Projects—1860 to Present**

Between 1860 and 1914, the cumulative effects of hydraulic mining and the increased amount of reclaimed lands led to the implementation of large-scale flood control projects to protect newly acquired private lowlands. In 1861, the original State Reclamation Board (formerly titled the Board of Swampland Commissioners) was created to oversee reclamation of swamplands and encourage the formation of reclamation districts. The State Reclamation Board was dissolved in 1868, and jurisdiction of individual reclamation districts was transferred to the counties. In 1911, the California Legislature reinstated the State Reclamation Board to implement and coordinate the “Major Project”, a federal basinwide plan for flood control in the Sacramento Valley. The Major Project provided an approach to the Sacramento River’s drainage problems by constructing several leveed channels and bypasses throughout the Sacramento River drainage area. With regards to the historic Yolo Basin (as further discussed in Chapter 2), the Yolo Bypass was created, capable of delivering approximately 500,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of water through Cache Slough in the North Delta, and the Sacramento River channel was modified and leveed to convey a flow of approximately 100,000 cfs from Sacramento to Cache Slough. Massive levees were constructed along both sides of the Yolo Bypass from Cache Slough north to the Fremont Weir. The Sacramento Weir (located approximately 2 miles upstream of the American River) was also constructed as part of this project. The reclamation project was gradually carried to completion in 1948 by state and federal agencies and local reclamation districts (Thompson 1957).

The federal Flood Control Act of 1914 unified the individual reclamation district efforts in the Sacramento Valley under the Sacramento River FCP (Figure 1-2). The FCP allows the Sacramento River to overflow its banks at designated locations, so that winter and spring flows are conveyed through the Sutter and Yolo Bypasses to the Delta.

The Central Valley Project (CVP), begun in 1938, and the State Water Project (SWP), begun in 1951, were also constructed as part of the valleywide flood control system. The primary purpose of the projects was to alleviate the imbalance in water supply in the northern and southern parts of the state by storing and transferring water through more than 20 reservoirs and 1,100 miles of canals in the Sacramento, Trinity, Feather, American, and San Joaquin River basins. The main features of the CVP are reservoirs created by Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River, Whiskeytown Dam on Clear Creek, and Folsom Dam on the American River. The main feature of the SWP is the reservoir at Oroville Dam on the Feather River.

The effects of the state and federal water projects on the Sacramento River and the Yolo Bypass are far reaching and are interconnected with the urban and agricultural development of the Sacramento Valley and the Delta.

### **Hydrologic Analysis of the Mace Ranch Portion of the Proposed Yolo Basin Wildlife Area—December 1990**

Sponsored by the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture (CVHJV), the hydrologic analysis of the Mace Ranch portion of the proposed Yolo Basin Wildlife Area looked at potential water supply sources and quality for the Mace Ranch—a 16,700-acre area that was proposed as a wildlife refuge. The proposal resulted in the creation of a 3,660-acre wildlife area, which is managed by DFG. Most of the study area of the analysis is within the Yolo Bypass.

In addition to water quality and supply studies involving hydrology and hydraulics, pollutant sources, and water quality criteria and existing data, the hydrologic analysis included a brief discussion of flood control issues in the Bypass. The need for additional studies was noted, along with recommendations for specific studies needed to support the development of the Yolo Wildlife Area.

### **Suitability Analysis for Enhancing Wildlife Habitat in the Yolo Basin—January 1994**

Also sponsored by CVHJV, the suitability analysis for enhancing wildlife habitat in the Yolo Basin arose in response to the creation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP). Its purpose was to examine existing conditions in the Yolo Basin and identify ways to implement the NAWMP goals. The study area for this analysis encompassed approximately 110,000 acres in the eastern portion of Yolo County, east of the cities of Davis and Woodland and

west of the City of West Sacramento. The study area is bordered by the Yolo/Solano County line on the south and southwest, CR 102 on the west, the Sacramento River on the north and northeast, and the Ship Channel on the southeast.

A comprehensive study, the suitability analysis (1) identified opportunities for and constraints to the creation and management of wetland, riparian, grassland, and oak woodland habitats in the Yolo Basin and (2) identified and evaluated both current and potential secondary benefits to various wildlife species provided by existing agricultural land uses. Specific topics included historical and existing physical (landforms, hydrology, soil), biological (vegetation and wildlife), and agricultural (crop types) conditions; existing wetland enhancement projects; potential constraints to future projects; and regulatory agency jurisdictions in the Yolo Basin.

This study concluded that successful habitat restoration and enhancement will depend on encouraging landowner and agency participation and advised improving participation by providing opportunities for technical support and funding for future projects. It further recommended that CVHJV and numerous stakeholders continue their policy of using a broad, consensus approach to planning in the study area. Lastly, it summarized management goals and offered specific guidelines for implementation of restoration and enhancement objectives.

### **Results and Recommendations from 1997–1998 Yolo Bypass Studies—April 1999**

In response to CALFED habitat restoration plans, DWR prepared the draft report of the Results and Recommendations from 1997–1998 Yolo Bypass Studies (Fish Studies Report) to determine the extent to which Bypass habitats support fish species within the Delta and San Francisco Bay (DWR 1999). More specifically, field studies for this report investigated the effects of current inundation patterns in the Bypass on the physical habitats; presence, location, and life history functions of various fish species; and the Bypass's contribution to the Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta and San Francisco Bay (Bay-Delta) food chain. These studies provided data necessary to compare these key characteristics with those of the Sacramento River, thus illustrating the comparative value of the Bypass as aquatic species habitat.

The conclusions of this report suggest that floodplain restoration and creation in the Bypass would provide excellent opportunities for improving habitat for aquatic species.

### **Environmental Assessment, Land Protection Plan, and Conceptual Management Plan for the Proposed North Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Solano and Yolo Counties—December 1999**

USFWS prepared an environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed NDNWR as a tool for determining the significance of the environmental impacts of establishing a land acquisition boundary for the proposed NDNWR. The purpose of the project is to establish and acquire a national

wildlife refuge unit to conserve, restore, and perpetuate the habitats of diverse native fish, wildlife, and plants representative of the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta ecosystem. Five boundary alternatives were proposed, along with a no-action alternative. These alternatives differ primarily with regard to refuge size (9,000–49,200 acres) and extent of resources to be protected. Environmental, economic, and human issues were examined for each alternative to identify mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate environmental consequences. Because of other planning efforts and issues raised during the planning process, USFWS is now considering a boundary of 12,300 acres, focusing primarily on the three islands: Liberty Island, Prospect Island, and Little Holland Tract in the southern portion of the Bypass (Figure 1-3).

Key assurances described in the EA include:

- # acquire the least degree of interest in property needed to accomplish land protection objectives, through a willing seller program;
- # ensure the availability of safe harbor agreements to all landowners within and adjoining the refuge boundary;
- # develop a public use program that provides compatible wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities;
- # protect, manage, and restore the area’s natural habitats in a manner compatible with the role of the Bypass in conveying Sacramento River floodwaters;
- # have a negligible impact on the total acres of prime agricultural land in Solano and Yolo Counties;
- # ensure that long-term refuge habitat management plans do not have a significant impact in the two-county region’s overall economy;
- # ensure that county tax revenues will not significantly be affected; and
- # ensure that water rights will not be transferred outside of the refuge boundary.

As of the publication date of this document, the EA for the proposed NDNWR has not been completed, and some Bypass landowners remain uncertain as to the adequacy of the above key assurances.

## **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Water Resources Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Comprehensive Study**

In response to extensive flooding and damages experienced in 1997, the U.S. Congress authorized USACE to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River



FCP and to partner with the State of California to develop master plans that provide flood damage reduction while integrating ecosystem restoration benefits. The USACE and the Reclamation Board are leading the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Comprehensive Study (Comprehensive Study) to improve flood management and restore the ecosystem in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins. The USACE and the Reclamation Board, in cooperation with members of the Comprehensive Study's Executive Committee, developed the following mission statement during Phase I of the study to guide the implementation of the effort.

*“To develop a systemwide, comprehensive, flood management plan for the Central Valley to reduce flood damage and integrate ecosystem restoration.”*

Phase I of the Comprehensive Study was completed in March 1999. The completion of the Post Flood Assessment Report and the Interim Report marked the end of this phase. Phase II is now underway. The scope of Phase II includes:

- # determination of the without-project hydrologic and hydraulic conditions,
- # development of the basin flood damage analysis model, and
- # determination of the without-project future environmental and related conditions.

This phase will also define the strategy to formulate master plans and evaluate the benefits of these plans and continue to expand the public outreach program to ensure wide support for a recommended Framework Plan to be submitted to Congress for authorization in late 2002. The reach of the Yolo Bypass in the study area of the Comprehensive Study extends approximately from Fremont Weir downstream to the mouth of Cache Slough. However, the downstream boundary is still subject to change following the results of hydraulic modeling efforts still in progress as of the publication date of this document (Kirschner 2001).

## **The CALFED Bay-Delta Program**

In 1995, the State of California and the federal government initiated a collaborative effort among state and federal resource management agencies and representatives from urban, agricultural, and environmental interests to attempt to resolve numerous water-related issues associated with the Bay-Delta. The program was titled the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED).

The mission of CALFED is to create a long-range, implementable solution for the Bay-Delta that focuses on four major problem areas: drinking water supply, water quality, levee system integrity, and environmental restoration. As part of CALFED, each of these issues has an established program and staff.

In 1996, regional interested parties and CALFED staff developed overall objectives for CALFED that include achievement of ecosystem quality, water quality and supply reliability, and levee system integrity in the Bay-Delta and its watersheds. As part of this process, the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) was created to identify a long-range set of specific ecosystem-related

objectives and methods for implementation of those objectives. The result of that development process was the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP). The ERPP is a far-reaching document that outlines and describes a multitude of ecological improvement targets and actions to potentially be implemented over several decades. It also delineates the area (known as the CALFED Study Area) where most of the prescribed CALFED ecologically based actions would occur. The Bypass is included in the CALFED Study Area.

The ERP's goals and objectives are to:

- # achieve recovery of at-risk native species dependent on the Delta and Suisun Bay to establish large, self-sustaining populations of these species, support similar recovery of at-risk native species in the Bay-Delta estuary and the watershed above the estuary, and minimize the need for future endangered species listings by reversing downward population trends of native species that are not listed;
- # rehabilitate natural processes in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watershed to fully support, with minimal ongoing human intervention, natural aquatic and associated terrestrial biotic communities and habitats in ways that favor native members of those communities;
- # maintain or enhance populations of selected species for sustainable commercial and recreational harvest, consistent with the other ERP goals;
- # protect or restore functional habitat types in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watershed in support of ecological and public values (such as species, biotic community, and ecological processes), health, recreation, aesthetic quality, and scientific research;
- # prevent the establishment of additional non-native invasive species and reduce the negative ecological and economic impacts of established non-native species in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watershed; and
- # improve or maintain water and sediment quality conditions that fully support healthy and diverse aquatic ecosystems in the Bay-Delta estuary and watershed and eliminate (to the extent possible) toxic impacts on aquatic organisms, wildlife, and people.

Since 1996, the ERP has provided numerous diverse organizations an opportunity to propose ideas for early implementation of the CALFED program. Specifically, the ERP has solicited proposals that have undergone an extensive review process by numerous decision-making committees. Proposed projects supported through these committee reviews, which range from site-specific ecosystem restoration to regional research projects, watershed stewardship programs, and other similar types of efforts, are granted funds for implementation.

## The Yolo Bypass Hydraulic Issues Technical Advisory Committee

As the Management Strategy, the proposed NDNWR, the Comprehensive Study, and assorted CALFED-related projects have progressed (as previously described), it was identified by the Foundation that several issues related to hydraulic assessment and impacts have remained unaddressed. As a result, in summer 2000, the Foundation convened a group of flood agency and private hydraulic specialists, as well as potential project proponents, to form a hydraulic issues technical advisory committee (TAC). The purpose of the TAC is still evolving. However, a principal motive for convening and continuing TAC activities is to develop a unified approach for quantitatively evaluating hydraulic effects of future proposed public and private habitat enhancement and flood management projects within and up and downstream of the Bypass. Some of the key issues that have been identified as priorities for resolution are described below.

- # There is a lack of continuity among state and federal flood management agencies regarding how proposed projects in the Bypass should be and are assessed for hydraulic impacts.
- # There is uncertainty among state and federal flood management agencies regarding what hydraulic changes in the Bypass constitute a hydraulic impact.
- # There are numerous, but in some cases flawed (e.g., geographically incomplete, technically inaccurate), hydraulic modeling tools available regarding the Bypass; however, they are not coordinated or linked.
- # There is no comprehensive topographic map of the Bypass that can be used to identify existing and finely detailed topographic features in the Bypass.

The immediate goal of the TAC is to address these issues and to make recommendations to state and federal flood management agencies, as well as prospective funding entities, that could assist in the development of a unified and future-oriented set of assessment tools and rules for the Bypass.

As of the publication date of this document, there have been four meetings of the TAC. Participants included the following representatives from public and private entities: USACE; Reclamation Board; USFWS; DFG; DWR; SAFCA; Natural Heritage Institute; Yolo Basin Foundation; MBK Engineers; Northwest Hydraulics Consulting, Inc.; Reclamation District 2068; and Gus Yates Consulting Hydrologist. Staff from Jones & Stokes have facilitated the meetings.

## GLOSSARY

To aid reader clarity, the following glossary of terms is provided.

<b>Affected Stakeholders</b>	Any landowner, landowner tenant, and/or water user who has ownership of, reliance on, or responsibility for Bypass land and water. Also, any agency that has responsibility for Bypass flood conveyance and/or natural resources found or endemic to the Bypass. Such stakeholders would be directly affected by any proposed changes in the Bypass.
<b>Duck Club</b>	A privately managed wetland that is owned by single or multiple owners and provides habitat for the expressed purpose of supporting hunting recreation activities as well as for general habitat values in the Bypass.
<b>Habitat Enhancement</b>	The act of taking a piece of property and creating habitat conditions on it that will be conducive to multiple-species use but that are not necessarily intended to return the property to conditions that predate all disturbance and development in the Bypass.
<b>Habitat Restoration</b>	The act of taking a piece of property and returning it to its predisturbance and development habitat condition.
<b>Interested Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders who do not fit the description of an affected stakeholder but who have an interest in the condition of the Bypass.
<b>Landowner</b>	Any person, collection of persons, private or charitable trust, or public agency owning fee title of or holding easements on land within the Yolo Bypass project area as defined earlier in this chapter.
<b>Managed Wetland</b>	Any privately or publicly owned wetland habitat that has specific land and/or water management practices performed on it.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	A combination of affected and interested stakeholders.
<b>Water User</b>	Any landowner or landowner tenant located either inside or outside the Bypass who has a reliance on water derived from, but not necessarily originating in, the Bypass.
<b>Working Group</b>	The combination of associated and affected stakeholders that have been involved with the Yolo Bypass meetings described in this Management Strategy.