

Handout 2 – Summary of Comments Received

Meeting 7

September 18, 2012 – 2-5 pm, Vacaville Public Library, Vacaville

September 20, 2012 – 2-5 pm, Clearlake City Council Chambers, Clearlake

This handout contains the stakeholder comments received concerning topics discussed and presented at Meeting 6. The major comments included:

- Comments on Section 1- (1) Patti Turner at Colusa County, (2) Chris Lee at Solano County, and (3) Betsy Cawn from the Essential Public Information Center. These comments were incorporated into the revised version of Section 1 (posted to the website). Comments included:
 - a. Clarification of Colusa County Resource Conservation District’s (CCRCD) responsibilities.
 - b. Clarification of wording implying the SWP provides agricultural water.
 - c. Clarification concerning Lake County’s previous IRWM Plan Development.
- Comments on Climate Change – (1) Chris Lee at Solano County and Chad Roberts at the Yolo Audubon Society. These comments will be incorporated into the revised version of the climate change vulnerability assessment. Comments included:
 - a. Additional source recommendations.
 - b. Identification of Vacaville as an area with 100 year flood risk.
- Comments on Section 2 – (1) Chris Lee at Solano County and Betsy Cawn from the Essential Public Information Center. These comments were incorporated into the revised version of Section 2 (posted to the website). Comments included:
 - a. Clarification that SCWA provides water to NCFWCWD, not directly to cities in Napa.
 - b. Information on Cache Creek as a source of mercury contamination to the delta. Note: Due to the detailed nature of this information, it will be included in Section 3 of the IRWM Plan.
- Goals and Objectives – (1) David Okita at Solano County, Stefan Lorenzato, and Chad Roberts at the Yolo Audubon Society. These comments were incorporated into the revised version of the Goals and Objectives Handout.

Section 1

1. Colusa County - Patti Turner
 - a. There are mistakes on Draft Section One at 1.1.4.3. First paragraph the CCRCD does not manage “water” if you change the word to “watershed” it would be more correct (this correction was noted once before). The second paragraph has a typo...I think the word should be “also” instead of the RCD “is” works.
2. Solano County - Chris Lee
 - a. 1.1.1 add city of Dixon
 - b. 1.1.2 reference to SWP water implies that SWP is used for ag – need to clarify
 - c. 1.1.2 reference to NZMS-might want to put in parenthesis (confined to Putah Creek)
 - d. 1.2.2.1 add Dixon and Solano County
3. Essential Public Information Center - Betsy Cawn
 - a. On page 1-9 (PDF page 12) of the draft of Section 1, there are three paragraphs describing "Lake County IRWM Plan Development." Can you please tell me from whence these statements were derived (document citation?)?
 - b. I would like to see if there is some way to improve that description, in the draft for which the next comment deadline is tomorrow. Can you please let me know what the source is, or who would be the writer (Sean?)?

http://westsideirwm.com//meetings/Handout_6_Draft Section 1.pdf

Climate Change

1. Solano County - Chris Lee
 - a. 3.1 the Solano Hazard Mitigation Plan has some information of wildfires that may be useful. <http://www.solanocountymhmp.org/annou/solanocountymhmpazardmaps>
 - b. References to Delta levees on peat soils. None of the Delta in the Westside region is on peat soils (source Delta Atlas) thus subsidence and stability issues are much less.
 - c. 5.1 and 5.4 Vacaville should be listed as an area of urban flood risk from overflows from Ulatis and Alamo creeks – less than 100 year protection
2. Yolo Audubon Society - Chad Roberts
 - a. The Climate Change Screening document (Handout 8) contains a significant error of omission with respect to conservation planning in the region; this error should be redressed in all future West Side planning documents. The response to item 6.9 states: *“It is not known whether there are movement corridors for natural species migration,”* and it fails to identify the Yolo JPA’s NCCP/HCP document as containing movement/migration corridors in the region, which constitute an important element in the conservation of covered species and local-concern species in the plan.

More significantly, the response fails to identify documents prepared for and adopted by state agencies that specifically do designate movement corridors in the region. This is the “California Essential Habitat Connectivity Report” (documents may be downloaded from http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/bio/project_materials.htm). Cache Creek and Putah Creek are highly significant ecological linkages identified in this planning report, from the Sacramento River all the way to the headwaters; the report also incorporates non-aquatic linkages through the inner Coast Ranges in the area covered by the West

Side planning work. In addition, the “essential connectivity” report incorporates the recommendations of the “missing linkages” conference (see <http://www.calwild.org/linkages/index.html>), which identified the significance of the north-south habitats along the Blue Ridge axis as a linkage of regional and statewide significance.

It’s really not acceptable that these major conservation planning approaches have not already been identified and incorporated into the West Side planning process.

More generally, responding to climate change in the region requires more than dismissive statements that suggest that this is not an important conservation concern in the West Side region. It is in point of fact the primary underlying motivation for the proposed Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area proposal (H.R 5545; see <http://berryessasnowmountain.org/>). The ever-expanding list of climate-change related publications distributed by the Department of Fish and Game should be consulted with respect to the significance of habitat linkages in promoting the retention of natural biological resources in the face of climate change, and this clearly needs to be considered one of the major issues raised by the West Side IRWMP.

Section 2

1. Solano County - Chris Lee
 - a. 2-7 Clarify that SCWA does not serve Napa cities with NBA water. NCFWCWCD does.
2. Essential Public Information Center - Betsy Cawn
 - a. There is a link on this web page linked below ("Final California 2010 Integrated Report (303(d) List/305(b) Report)"), under the section called "Data and Information" (scroll down or select hyperlink), to Reference Document Number 850, "Central Valley RWQCB. 1998. Mercury Concentrations and Loads From the Sacramento River and From Cache Creek to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary" contains the following statements on Page x (PDF page number 12 of 114):

Fourth paragraph: "Studies conducted between 1996-1998 confirmed that Cache Creek was a major source of mercury."

Fifth paragraph: "Cache Creek is diverted into the Settling Basin before discharge to the Yolo Bypass. Bulk mercury loads from the watershed to the Settling Basin were estimated at 980 kg/yr for water year 1995. Similarly, export to the Yolo Bypass from the Settling Basin was 495 kg/yr."

Continuing text on Pages x and xi indicate the greatest source of mercury to the basin is coming from the North Fork of the Cache Creek, not from Clear Lake itself.

Nonetheless, Cache Creek does deliver mercury contamination to the Yolo Bypass and thence to the Sacramento River Basin, Delta, and San Francisco Bay.

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/2010state_ir_reports/r5_ref_index.shtml

I hope you can employ this reference (if no other is located) to substantiate the reason for illustrating the continuation of Cache Creek (albeit only part time) to the Yolo Bypass in your mapping of the Westside Region.

Goals and Objectives

1. Solano County - David Okita
 - a. I think that both M&I and ag should have an objective of 100%-suggest using the same wording for ag as M&I
 - b. For M&I Quantitative measurement, rationing is not a good measurement to reflect M&I shortages as what we have found in Solano is that drought ordinances that provide for temporary higher rates work the best and rationing is not necessary. I suggest that the measurement is the number of days that M&I water supplies invoke drought ordinances and number of days of rationing.
 - c. For ag measurement, the number of acres fallowed probably is the only measurement that would work, but you still would not know if fallowing was because of lack of water, or normal rotation, or crop markets. Ag districts would probably have a good idea of rough acreage in this circumstance.
 - d. In Solano both situations of an ag or M&I shortage will be very rare.
2. Yolo Audubon Society - Chad Roberts
 - a. I largely agree with the Goals statements identified in Handout 5a. These are appropriately broad and inclusive of the range of values held by people in the region, and the document seems suitable to use as we move forward with West Side planning.

With respect to the Objectives (handout 5b), again most of the specific statements are suitable for broad-based planning (although we may need to augment the habitat objectives as appropriate to match the Yolo Habitat JPA NCCP/HCP contents), but I do have some significant concerns with respect to item 12, the "Risk Management Focus" on vegetation removal for "upland fuel loading." Clearly this item refers to removing chaparral from the Coast Range tributaries to Clear Lake, Indian Valley Reservoir, and Lake Berryessa. There is no current evidence that fires in the Coast Ranges exacerbate erosion into these water bodies, whereas actively removing the dominant vegetation in the Coast Ranges will definitely accelerate erosion as well as causing fragmentation impacts in the biological habitat networks in the region. The impact of the vegetation removal is not identified as a significant adverse effect, but that's what it would be. Conservation biologists working on regional conservation issues will not be able to support such a vegetation removal element in the IRWMP.
3. Stefan Lorenzato
 - a. In general I think this is shaping up as a very conventional planning document and that integration or designing projects to achieve multiple benefits is not really happening as part of this process. I understand the time pressure to be ready for grant applications. I also think the responsibility for integration lies with the folks in the seats not so much with facilitators who are by design not empowered to make those kinds of decisions. Still I urge you to press folks on this issue. You mentioned yesterday that your criteria

for integration are those stipulated by DWR in the grant guidelines. That seems a logical place to start, but I doubt the group has read those and I don't think there is general agreement with those, although I could have missed that in my spotty participation. As you get into ranking projects it would be nice to affirm the DWR text as the working definition of integration and multiple benefit. Right now it is an unstated assumption. One particular point that gives me pause is the idea that we can append one project to another even though they were not developed in concert. There may be opportunities for changing projects around to accommodate needs and priorities captured by another project, but simply lumping them together seems to me to be "the big staple" approach that DWR has previously questioned (although ultimately they accepted that strategy). My sense is they are looking for something more at this point.

The issue of scale that Max raised is important. Where we have broad statements like modernize the water supply system it presents a concept far beyond what anyone in the room is really anticipating. They may want key pieces modernized, but an objective of that scope undermines the plan because it creates a credibility issue. If the plan is to be meaningful at the local and state levels we need to be more careful about these scale issues. The infrastructure piece is a case in point that also confronts the integration issue. I think a better objective would be to establish a regionwide capital improvement schedule that includes identifying key capital assets and that by 2020 those key assets should all have at least a 35 year working life expectancy. This kind of objective is more realistic, we actually intend to rely on much of our old systems and not redo them all in the near future, and creates very focused priorities that allow us to search for financial support. If we fail to get that financial support it defines those needs as totally internal to the local area, not of state or federal interest. Those are positive outcomes that then influence the governance structure and how or perhaps whether joint projects will actually occur. This objective would create new approaches (integrate) across agencies boundaries, governance approaches, resource priorities, and touch on multiple objectives (e.g. ensuring the key infrastructure supports habitat and watershed objectives). That, I think, would provide real value at the local level.

In the watershed functions objective I think it should say the objective is to participate in state and federal resource management and regulatory processes that influence water resources including ecosystem conditions, water supply, flood management, and regional and local economic development and local government financial stability. The qualitative measures would be named current processes underway that the steering committee wants to commit to, e.g. BDCP, CVFPP, etc. The objective of understanding the complexity of managing water resources should be moved to the Education and Awareness Focus. Qualitative measures there should include publication of technical documents, reports and evaluations. This topic again raises the need for governance and it may be appropriate to develop a specific governance objective that give more direction to these various feature that will need cross agency participation.

- b. I have suggested that the IRWM plan include a regionwide capital improvement schedule with a list of key infrastructure as a component of that schedule. I also have

suggested that the plan include an objective to ensure that by 2020 (or some date that works) all the key infrastructure have a working life expectancy of 35 years (or more if that is more appropriate). I think this kind of objective would make things much more tangible than what the draft currently contains. It would require that you folks do some extra work to put the schedule together and identify the key infrastructure. It would also require sorting out how things get on the list and how things get funded, governance issues that haven't been clarified to date. I do not plan to push hard for this since I am not in position to do anything about it. But I do think it is an idea worthy of your consideration.

I think having a combined list would be helpful to let the public know what the state of the key systems are. It might also lead to working out ways that the various entities could support each other differently than at present. For example, these bigger cost projects will need matching funds to secure federal or state help. Even with the grant programs it may be hard for an agency working on its own to come up with the cash for the match. Working together there may be ways to develop loan agreements or other costs sharing that could allow the key projects to move forward more quickly than if each is pursued in isolation. Again some governance provision would likely need to be developed to allow for this. But it seems to me this kind of approach is where the IRWM could bring really benefit without necessarily including DWR money. As a starting point it might be possible to do some collaborative purchasing, something like a mini coop, for things that are common to the various agencies. For example you may be able to get better prices on vehicle purchases if the purchases are pooled rather than negotiating the them separately.

I am throwing this out for your consideration. If you think it has merit I hope that it could emerge as part of the Westside plan. If you think it is not workable, please let Ken Kirby and crew know so we don't waste time on it in the coming meetings.