

## **Meeting #4 Summary**

### **Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**

#### **April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

This meeting summary for the Westside Sacramento Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan Meeting #4 provides a high level overview of the intent, content covered, and the discussions that occurred during the two meetings.

#### **Meeting #4 Highlights**

- Reviewed the current IRWM Plan development schedule
- Described upcoming IRWM-related funding opportunities
- Reviewed the IRWM Plan development process
- Discussed revisions to IRWM Planning Process Goals
- Continued discussion of water-related challenges and opportunities
- Presented information gathered to date regarding the current and future conditions of the region
- Introduced the water balance concept and invited participation in a subcommittee
- Introduced and began developing IRWM Plan Goals and Objectives

#### **Meeting Logistics & Intent**

The RWMG hosted public meetings from 1-5 p.m. in Woodland on April 23, and in Clearlake on April 24. The meeting objectives included: review the plan development process, share updates to planning process goals, continue the discussion about challenges and opportunities, introduce draft current and future regional conditions, introduce plan goals and objectives and discuss next steps.

The number of people in attendance at each meeting varied by location and collectively totaled approximately 25 stakeholders (not including the consultant team). The attendees and their respective affiliations are summarized in Appendix A.

#### **Meeting Content**

Meeting facilitator Ken Kirby opened by asking attendees to introduce themselves. He then confirmed with attendees that the Kickoff Meeting Summary provided an appropriate level of detail. Attendees from the Woodland and Clearlake meetings confirmed their agreement. The Kickoff Meeting Summary can be viewed at [www.WestsideIRWM.com/meetings](http://www.WestsideIRWM.com/meetings).

Mr. Kirby added that the planning horizon had been changed from 2031, as presented at the kickoff meetings, to 2035 to meet the 20-year IRWM planning horizon as well as to align with other water planning documents such as Urban Water Management Plans.

Mr. Kirby then provided a review of how content would be presented and discussed during the public engagement meetings. The information gathered during the document review and public engagement process will be synthesized into a compelling plan that meets Proposition 84 guidelines. Draft content will be revised, as needed, based on comments offered and then made

## Meeting #4 Summary Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake

available again for review and comment until the content is broadly accepted. At the end of the planning process, the agreed upon content will be combined into the IRWM Plan for final public review and potential RWMG member agency adoption.

The group discussed the timeline for completion of the Plan, which is scheduled for April 2013. One participant questioned about the amount of flexibility in the schedule, and Mr. Kirby responded that completion of the Plan in April 2013 remained the goal in order to complete in time for the next round of possible funding opportunities. Meetings 5, 6 and 7 will be held in June, July and September, respectively. Once meeting dates, locations and times are confirmed, they will be posted to the website and announced via our eNews.

### Stakeholder Involvement

The following summarizes the Woodland and Clearlake participant feedback and is organized by handout. Visit [www.WestsideIRWM.com/Meetings](http://www.WestsideIRWM.com/Meetings) for copies of the handouts and meeting presentation.

### Updates to Planning Process Goals – Handout #2

Participant Comments & Questions:

- *Inserting these extra, more specific statements made the goals somewhat unclear. In goal 2, the original statement covers the objective enough. It's a pretty long sentence now, and it makes it more complicated. Maybe it can be reworded. Goal 3 is good, but it is not necessary to repeat some of the content of other goals in goal 9.*
- *I like goal 3. Everyone has individual water projects and goals. I believe there are approximately 150 water-related entities in our region and goal 3 helps me understand what we are trying to accomplish. Our goal is to work collaboratively.*
- *How does goal 6 fit into the process goals?*
- *Goal 9 should read: Existing data from county-based IRWM Plans and other information relevant to the region will be used where appropriate to develop the Plan.*
- *Suggest including consideration of consistency with statewide planning efforts. For example, there are three statewide documents on invasive species that should be considered.*

Consultant Team Responses:

Mr. Kirby confirmed that the group did not have concerns with the content of the goals, and that they wanted the draft goals to be edited for clarity.

Consultant Team Action Items:

- Review Planning Process Goal 2 to make it more clear.
- Review Planning Process Goal 6 and determine if it is better suited in the Plan goals.
- Update Planning Process Goal 9 as per recommendation.

## Meeting #4 Summary Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake

### **Challenges & Opportunities – Handout #3**

The challenges and opportunity statements were developed using the more than 100 ideas and comments provided by the kickoff meeting participants. Challenges and opportunities provided in existing county-based IRWM Plans were also included. The consultant team's goal was to narrow the focus without leaving out major themes; many of the comments provided as input were project focused.

One participant asked for clarification about how some of the items appear to be goals for projects, while others appear to be goals in terms of what should be included in the IRWM Plan content. To clarify, this is essentially a list of problems that the Plan will potentially address, or challenges and opportunities. One person's opportunity might be another's challenge.

Another participant asked how the list of challenges and opportunities would be used. The challenges and opportunities, once updated with additional information from participants, will be used within the actual IRWM text to create a compelling regional narrative and to support the development of IRWM Plan objectives.

### Participant Comments & Questions:

- *TMDL challenges should include Clear Lake, not just Cache Creek.*
- *Mercury contamination should be included for the entire region, including Lake Berryessa and Putah Creek.*
- *The Valley Floor Planning Area should include mercury TMDL for the Bay Delta.*
- *There are other TMDLs that should be included in addition to mercury, such as nutrients.*
- *Should also look at contamination issues for entire region, not specific to TMDLs*
- *Potential water quality and thermal impacts for Upper Putah and Cache Creek should be included.*
- *Don't see anything referencing the conflict of usage between Lake and Yolo Counties. YCFCWCD has management responsibility; use of water is driven by Yolo County needs not Lake County or Clear Lake ecology needs.*
- *The third bullet under Upper Cache Creek regarding ultramafic soils should also be listed under Upper Putah Creek.*
- *Should include regulatory framework for context and background – and how this has historically inhibited action.*
- *Stormwater quality management and contaminants are not specifically identified and could be included under surface water.*
- *It was difficult to find the handouts on the website.*
- *The list is difficult to talk about without bullet numbers or letters.*
- *On the Lower Valley Floor list, salinity is specially listed, instead it should state*

## Meeting #4 Summary Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake

*“constituent of concern” to include all water quality concerns.*

- *Groundwater storage/conjunctive use should be listed.*
- *DWR guidelines specifically cite that “conflicts in the region” should be addressed in IRWM plans, so the plan text that describes the challenges and opportunities should also address specific conflicts that occur within the region.*

### Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:

- Review documents to identify if it lists TMDLs specific to Upper Putah Creek, or that is not already listed under the entire region.
- Update website to better highlight hyperlinks to information and handouts.
- Review all participant comments to determine inclusion.
- Organize the lists for future meetings with letters or numbers that allow for easier reference, but do not imply prioritization.
- Statements related to TMDLs will be modified and address the entire region.

### **Plan Outline – Handout #4**

The Plan outline describes content that will be included and must comply with Proposition 84 and 1E guidelines.

### Participant Comments & Questions:

- *Recreation needs to be added*
- *Agricultural interests should be listed under stakeholders*
- *Add the regulatory context*
- *Check order in which groundwater basins*

### Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:

- The team will review and include all recommendations.

### **Current & Future Conditions of the Region – Handout #5**

Handout #5 is the first draft of the current and future conditions information sheets, as they will appear in the Plan. The information is based on a series of maps and corresponding text that discusses a series of topics. During the meetings, participants were led through a discussion of the maps and asked to identify missing or erroneous components. Written comments were also encouraged following the meeting after detailed review.

### **Population Density – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

**Disadvantaged Communities – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Land Use – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *What is the definition for rural? The map shows Upper Lake as urban, but that does not appear to be correct. The accuracy of the definition is very important.*
- *Add Lakeport and City of Clearlake general plans on the list of Land Use Plans*
- *Change Clearlake Highland label to Clearlake.*
- *The color of Clear Lake is difficult to see, it would be helpful to change the color*

**Land Use – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Review California Department of Water Resources definition of rural land use and compare to documents to ensure accuracy; make changes as necessary and provide definition with region description.
- Review and add missing general plans to Land Use Plans list
- Make all other changes, as proposed.

**Land Management Agencies – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *The City of Woodland, City of Clearlake, and City of Lakeport are incorporated and have general plans; those plans should be added to the list.*
- *The maps and graphics are very well done.*

**Land Management Agencies – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- The General Plans for the aforementioned cities will be reviewed and added.

**Estimated Applied Water (Average Year) – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *It appears that this is based on earlier population projections, which have been recently reduced due to economic conditions.*
- *As long as the sources are documented, this approach is okay.*
- *The environmental use is not listed, it should be.*
- *The graphic does a good job of showing the low percentage of use in municipal areas as compared to agricultural uses.*

**Estimated Applied Water (Average Year) – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- The population projections are based on the most recent SACOG/ABAG and Lake County

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

estimates, but will be reevaluated to ensure accuracy.

- Most of the environmental water use in the region would not be considered “applied water,” (where applied water typically applies to water that is diverted and applied for consumptive uses) so it is not included in this figure. However, it is acknowledged that environmental water use is an important use of water in the region and will be described appropriately.
- The consultant team recognizes that there are a lot of uncertainties in the estimated applied water data, so participation in the water balance subcommittee will be important to help describe the current and expected future conditions. Understanding these elements of the region will be important to evaluate and select projects and provide factual information about why local entities and the State should invest in priority projects for the region.

**Estimated Applied Water (Dry Year) – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Estimated Applied Water (Dry Year) – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Total acre-feet will be added to the region description table and graphs.

**Westside Region Watersheds – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *Remove “Upper” from Cache Creek and Putah Creek labels.*

**Westside Region Watersheds – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Will adjust the maps per the recommendation.

**Water Agency Boundaries – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *It appears that Cache Creek may not be shown to connect with the Sacramento River, which happens during wet periods. During dry years, it terminates in Cache Creek Settling Basin. It is hard to tell because there may be another line covering it.*
- *Add Golden State Water Company to the Lake County water agencies; it was previously California Cities, so that can be deleted.*
- *Add three water treatment plants in Lake County – Highlands Water Company, Konacti County Water District, Golden State Water Company (in the City of Clearlake)*
- *Rename map from Water Agency Boundaries to Water Purveyors as a more generic term to include mutual water companies, etc.*
- *Add the diversion structure at Knights Landing.*

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

- *Solano County Water Agency's boundary includes the entire county, but it currently only delivers water to certain areas within the boundaries.*
- *Yolo County has three water treatment plants along Cache Creek that need to be added.*
- *Reclamation District 108 should be added.*
- *One page 6 of 14, Upper Cache Creek flood infrastructure should be listed.*

**Water Agency Boundaries – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Review map layers to determine how Cache Creek is portrayed in relation to the Yolo Bypass, and how the Bypass is portrayed in relation to the Sacramento River.
- Contact Reclamation District 108 for information regarding the diversion structure at Knights Landing; add to map.
- The Solano County Water Agency boundary will be added to the map.
- Review and implement other suggestions, as appropriate.

**Water Supply – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *It would be helpful if a mix of groundwater and surface water use around borders of Clear Lake were shown.*
- *Near Indian Valley Reservoir, the town of Spring Valley uses surface water.*
- *Approximately 80 percent of Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (YCFCWCD) has a mix of surface and ground water.*
- *The Tehama-Colusa Canal needs to be added.*
- *There are a few discrepancies in Solano County where surface water, not groundwater, is used. This should be corrected.*

**Water Supply – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Contact YCFCWCD regarding locations of surface and groundwater use.
- Review and implement other suggestions, as appropriate.

**Water Source – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *Upper Lake watershed should include Rodman Slough.*
- *Where did you find this information?*
- *Who is getting CVP in our region?*

**Water Source – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- The information is compiled from the DWR Land Use Surveys (which include available water sources) and other plans prepared in the Westside Region.
- The City of West Sacramento receives CVP.

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

- Review and implement other suggestions, as appropriate.

**Groundwater Basins – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Surface Water Quality – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *Don't see source reference materials.*
- *Nutrients as a drinking water impairment is listed for Upper Cache Creek, but isn't it also environmental? This is important because recreational water is not treated.*
- *Control of algae toxins from blue-green algae is not included, but should be.*
- *Selenium is not noted as a 303d listed constituent, but the City of Woodland has a wastewater discharge limit for that constituent. Selenium levels in the groundwater do not exceed the drinking water standards. Drinking water standards and wastewater discharge limits are set based on different criteria.*

**Surface Water Quality – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- The consultant team will review the alignment of the checked boxes and constituents with Basin Plan Beneficial uses. The consultant team will communicate with Lake County Water Resources for information about the blue-green algae.

**Groundwater Quality – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Westside Region Flooding – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *What are the magenta lines near Vacaville?*
- *It is difficult to see the 100-year flood zones (green) against the agriculture.*
- *Why don't all areas have a 500-year flood event?*

**Westside Region Flooding – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- The magenta lines indicate the Ulatis Flood Control Project.
- Research whether 500-year floodplains have been computed throughout the region and whether they are shown properly on the map.
- Review and implement other suggestions, as appropriate.



**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

**Ecosystems – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *Fisheries and waterfowl seem to be missing; can they be added?*
- *How do you identify the waterfowl habitat? How does that fit in, the Pacific flyway? Yolo Basin Foundation and Ducks Unlimited will be really interested in that.*
- *Ducks Unlimited is an excellent GIS resource.*
- *Many creeks and sloughs have riparian habitat benefits. Is that part of the data and not displayed?*

**Ecosystems – Consultant Responses & Action Items:**

- The riparian habitat is included, but difficult to see on top of the habitats. That will be adjusted.
- Review and implement other suggestions, as appropriate.

**Special Status Species – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- No comments specifically offered for this item.

**Aquatic/Riparian Invasive Species – Participant Comments & Questions:**

- *Fisheries and migratory waterfowl need to be added*
- *Blue green algae that release cyanotoxins are not specifically an invasive species but should be listed as an environmental health risk*

**Aquatic/Riparian Invasive Species – Consultant Team Responses & Action Items:**

- Review and implement suggestions, as appropriate.
- Add discussion re cyanotoxins, despite blue green algae not being an invasive species.

**Water Balance – Handout #6**

A water balance helps to tell a story of how water is used in the region. It shows how and where water moves throughout the region (and how precisely we can describe that) and can help us quantify challenges and opportunities. It also assists in project formulation and quantification of benefits and impacts. The consultant team invited interested meeting participants to join the water balance subcommittee. The subcommittee will meet via conference call and online meetings four to six times for approximately two hours per meeting.

One participant asked if climate change impacts had been considered. Mr. Kirby responded that the consultant team is working with California Department of Water Resources to determine what is known and understood for the region. The consultant team will include relevant information about climate change in the plan that is as specific as the information available.

## Meeting #4 Summary Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake

Six participants volunteered to serve on the water balance subcommittee.

### **Draft IRWM Plan Goals & Objectives – Handout #7**

Mr. Kirby explained that Handout #7 included draft Plan goals and objectives. One participant asked for clarification on the desired level of detail for the draft Plan goals. Mr. Kirby responded and asked for specific detail as the more specific it is, the more likely it can be implemented.

### **Goals**

The group reviewed the draft goals and provided the following comments:

#### **Goals 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10**

- There were no comments on these goals, and the groups agreed that they were acceptable as currently written.

#### **Goal 3 – Support more efficient use of water supplies.**

- *“Efficient use” is a difficult term as one’s efficient use may be viewed as wasteful by someone else. How will we qualify that term?*
- *The Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Water Use Dictionary would be a good starting point to determine the definition for “efficient use.”*
- *Wouldn’t it be helpful to harmonize with the CWP and the goals within?*

The consultant team responded by stating that a definition for “efficient use” will be included in the Plan glossary, and added that the language is consistent with the CWP. Ultimately, the group suggested that the goal could be something like: “Support more efficient use of consumptive water supply.” The group agreed that it will need to be revisited.

#### **Goal 4 – Preserve and manage water quality to meet intended uses.**

##### **a. Support consistent and cost effective compliance with all relevant water quality regulations and permits.**

- *Prefer that the goal is stated as: Preserve, improve and manage water quality...*

The group determined that the goal could be: “Preserve, improve and manage water quality to meet intended uses.”

#### **Goal 5 – Reduce flood risk (where risk = chance x consequences) in the region.**

- *A lot of environmental damage has been done to reduce flooding over the years, should that be considered?*

Mr. Kirby responded that the comment highlights the dilemma of water management, since

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

individual goals can cause negative impacts on one another. That is why the IRWM Plan looks at the goals collectively.

**Goal 6 – Protect and enhance biological diversity of native aquatic and riparian species.**  
**a. Reduce invasive species.**

- *Waterfowl and terrestrial species should be included in this statement.*

The consultant team responded by asking if the group wanted to limit species to terrestrial, and the group responded that it did not. Instead the goal will read:

Protect and enhance biological diversity by preserving, enhancing and protecting both native aquatic and upland species and migratory waterfowl.

- a. Prevent, reduce and manage invasive species.

After reviewing and providing feedback on the draft goals, the group suggested additional goals. During this session, the group discussed the difference between goals and objectives. Goals are good things that the IRWM Plan will address, but goals are never completely finished. Objectives can be identified and completed. The group identified the following themes for potential goals:

- Recreation
- Fishing access points
- Increase the number of miles of levees used for hiking and biking

**Objectives**

The objectives are organized into groups including: Entire Region, Upper Cache Creek Planning Area, Upper Putah Creek Planning Area, and Valley Floor Planning Area. If an objective is listed in the Entire Region list, it is not also included in each of the Planning Areas, and if an objective is listed in a Planning Area then it is specific only to that area.

The group reviewed the draft objectives and provided the following comments:

**Objective 1 (Entire Region) – Balance the expected urban supply and demand throughout planning period.**

- *Who will determine the “expected”*
- *Can we use a per capita use?*

Mr. Kirby stated that the water balance subcommittee will assist in determining the “expected” amount. The balance is over the long term and in the context of this planning horizon. It is important to be able to point to how we can supply demand, and if we cannot, then how identified projects can meet that demand. Mr. Kirby added that per capita use measurement could be used, but it may not be a reliable indicator for whether balance is achieved. For

## Meeting #4 Summary Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake

example, even if urban per capita water use is reduced throughout the region, that does not ensure that overall urban consumption in the region will be reduced. That is because an increase in total water use due to urban population growth could outpace the water savings realized from per capita reductions over the same time period.

### **Objective 2 (Entire Region) - Reduce urban per capita water use to [fill in details] by 2020 to meet the 20 by 2020 requirements as reported in Urban Water Management Plans.**

- *It would be helpful to remove the jargon and use percentages instead of the 20 by 2020 reference.*
- *Many customers are already well below per capita goals set by the State, and reducing water will actually drive up rates to account for fixed costs.*
- *Reducing water in Laverne also needs to address utility of water (i.e. for firefighting and public safety)*

Mr. Kirby stated that the objective would be reworked to remove any jargon and that the 20 percent reduction in water use statewide by the year 2020 are not requirements and the objective will be revised to reflect that they are targets if the stakeholders decide they would like to include an objective of this type.

At the Clearlake meeting, participants developed another objective: Manage Clear Lake to always meet recreational health and safety standards. Examples of this include meeting cyanobacteria and aquatic weed reductions.

At the close of the meeting, Mr. Kirby asked meeting participants to provide any additional comments on the plan goals and to develop additional proposed objectives and email it to the project team at [info@WestsideIRWM.com](mailto:info@WestsideIRWM.com) by May 2, 2012 to be included for consideration at the next meeting. Comments received after that date will also be considered for future versions of the IRWM Plan.

### **What Comes Next?**

The IRWM planning process will continue through the summer with three public meetings. The following is a sample of the information that will be presented at the upcoming meetings:

- Water Balance Subcommittee meetings
- Meeting #5 – Vacaville, June 2012
  - Review Draft Region Description
  - Review Revised IRWM Plan Goals and Objectives
  - Present Status Update on development of the Water Balance
  - Issue Call for Projects

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 – Woodland \* April 24, 2012 – Clearlake**

- Meeting #6 – Woodland, July 2012
- Meeting #7 – Vacaville & Clearlake, September 2012

Meeting materials will be posted to [www.WestsideIRWM.com](http://www.WestsideIRWM.com) approximately one week prior to each meeting. Stakeholders are encouraged to review and consider the materials prior to the stakeholder meeting to help facilitate a productive dialogue. Questions can be submitted to [info@westsideirwm.com](mailto:info@westsideirwm.com) or by calling the project hotline at 530-661-8115.

To view all Westside Sacramento Integrated Regional Water Management planning information, including information from the Kickoff Meeting and Meeting #4, please visit: [www.WestsideIRWM.com](http://www.WestsideIRWM.com).

**Appendices**

- A. Meeting #4 Attendees**
- B. Meeting #4 Presentation & Handouts – due to the size and number of the documents, please visit [www.WestsideIRWM.com/meetings](http://www.WestsideIRWM.com/meetings)**

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 - Woodland \* April 24, 2012 - Clearlake**

**Appendix A**

<b>No.</b>	<b>LAST NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
<b>Woodland: April 23, 2012</b>			
1	Marchand	Betsy	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
2	Hendrix	Doneta	Dunnigan WD
3	Okita	David	Solano County Water Agency
4	Lee	Chris	Solano County Water Agency
5	Rollins	Larry	Community Member
6	Bryant	Leif	Napa Flood Control
7	Turner	Patti	Colusa County Resource Conservation District
8	Reiche	Ben	Colusa County Resource Conservation District
9	Stevenson	Max	Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
10	Cocke	Mark	City of Woodland
11	Gentile	Donna	Water Resources Association of Yolo County
12	Pratt	Dave	Community Member
13	DeBra	Jacques	City of Davis
14	Floyd	Kim	Kim Floyd Communications
15	Modeste	Sarah	Kim Floyd Communications
16	Kirby	Ken	Kirby Consulting Group, Inc.
17	Itagaki	Sachi	Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
18	Maguire	Sean	Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
19	Cortez	Sara	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)
<b>Clearlake: April 24, 2012</b>			
20	Ahart	Keith	Golden State Water Company
21	Haas	Julie	California Department of Water Resources
22	O'Halloran	Tim	Yolo County Flood Control
23	Hansen	Gary	Lake County Water Resources
24	Cawn	Betsy	
25	Grover	Holly	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
26	Dills	Greg	Eastlake & Westlake Resource Conservation District
27	Brandon	Victoria	Sierra Club/City Council/Tuleyome
28	Ray	Larry	Upper Putah Creek Stewardship/Scotts Valley Band of Pomo
29	Smythe	Tom	Lake County Water Resources
30	Taylor	Jane	KPFZ Radio

**Meeting #4 Summary**  
**Westside Sacramento IRWM Plan**  
**April 23, 2012 - Woodland \* April 24, 2012 - Clearlake**

<b>No.</b>	<b>LAST NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
31	Taylor	Maurice	Community Member
32	Floyd	Kim	Kim Floyd Communications
33	Modeste	Sarah	Kim Floyd Communications
34	Kirby	Ken	Kirby Consulting Group, Inc.
35	Itagaki	Sachi	Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
36	Maguire	Sean	Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
37	Cortez	Sara	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)