

**Yolo Bypass Working Group  
IRWMP Subcommittee Meeting 1  
November 28, 2006  
5:00 PM – 7:00 PM  
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Headquarters**

**Meeting Summary**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation)  
Ann Brice, Foundation  
Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)  
Regina Cherovsky, Conaway Ranch, RD 2035  
Leonel De Leon, Guest  
Robert Eddings, California Waterfowl Association (CWA)  
Dave Feliz, Dept. of Fish and Game (DFG) Yolo Wildlife Area  
Dick Goodell, Glide In Ranch  
Mike Hardesty, RD 2068 and 2098  
Marianne Kirkland, Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
Betsy Marchand, Foundation  
Phil Martinelli, Channel Ranch  
Selby Mohr, Mound Farms  
Jack Palmer, H Pond  
Paul Phillips CWA  
Heidi Rooks, DWR  
Julie Simpson, Larry Walker Associates  
Ron Tadlock, Farmer

Dave Ceppos opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and stating the purpose of the meeting. There is an effort to create a Yolo County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP.) The Water Resources Association of Yolo County (WRA) which is a group of Yolo County jurisdictions, is leading the effort. The IRWMP is supported by the DWR Division of Planning and Local Assistance. The history behind IRWMP's statewide was to minimize competing (purposeful or not) proposals for water-resource project funding and to encourage regional integration on such topics. Key jurisdictional stakeholders in the county opted to participate and pursue an integrated approach to managing county-wide water resources. Through several years of planning, the WRA concluded that there are a lot of stakeholder groups organized in the watersheds of Yolo County. Local groups should be included in the planning. These are the groups that know the watershed best and they often represent a range of stakeholders in the area who are often affected by projects and/or project proponents.

The WRA approached the Foundation and CCP as the logical starting place for the Yolo Bypass Integrated Project because of their long term role in facilitating the Yolo Bypass Working Group. The Working Group has no formal structure beyond being a forum to discuss issues related to land management in the Yolo Bypass. The group has no decision making capacity and no formal membership. The WRA asked if we could convene a group of stakeholders to be involved in

implementation of the Yolo County IRWMP. CCP has a long term contract with DWR for facilitation services. Dave has provided a proposal for putting together a Yolo Bypass IRWMP Subcommittee. He will report back to DWR after this subcommittee meeting and if the proposal is affirmed by tonight's meeting participants, the task order for CCP to advise the Foundation and the Working Group will likely be executed.

Regina Cherovsky with Conaway Ranch and RD 2035 has been involved in development of the Yolo County IRWMP for a few years now and there has been no group looking at the Bypass as a whole. It is really important that the Subcommittee get together and focus on the IRWMP or there will be a missed opportunity. It's a freight train that's left the station with money behind it. Hopefully we can move forward and implement projects in partnerships and get something done.

Dave Ceppos noted that the Working Group has been meeting since 1998. The proposed actions identified in the IRWMP represent the universe of options that could be implemented in the Bypass in future.

Dick Goodell asked if there will there be a larger group over the Subcommittee? Will the Subcommittee be part of a larger group? How will projects be prioritized?

Dave - there are people working on this issue through the WRA. A lot of people are asking that now.

Betsy Marchand- Historically people in Yolo County could not get along on water issues. Most other counties have a county wide approach through water districts. This is a chance for individual groups to participate. There was a 3-2 vote of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors in the 1970s against creating a county water district. This is something that people have been trying to do for a long time. It's worth a try.

Selby Mohr —are these projects that will have an affect on us in the Yolo Bypass?

Dave - yes – there are many projects upstream on Cache Creek and Putah Creek For example, proposed mercury studies are likely needed. Dave further encouraged the group that the time has come to stop the us – versus – them mentality that has permeated the Working Group for some time. He's heard from some people the complaint that the Working Group is all about the agencies and from others that the Working Group is all about the landowners. Every interest is valid. Landowners have a stake and agencies have mandates. That's the way it is. No one is wrong. No one is being bad and everyone needs to come to grips with that and stop pointing fingers.

Dave distributed handouts from the draft IRWMP plan. These documents can be found on the WRA website: [www.yolowra.org](http://www.yolowra.org).

The Yolo Bypass Integrated Project is a group of Yolo Bypass related actions being considered under the IRWMP. Foundational actions are the building blocks to IRWMP. The IRWMP also identifies specific actions.

Robin noted that the group needs to know that the plan is a draft. The public comment period is still open. The list of projects is not a fixed list.

The working assumption is that the implementing watershed groups for each of the integrated projects will start establishing priorities. There are numerous funding sources out there and as new ideas get generated and funding sources are identified additional actions can be added to the IRWMP. There needs to be a group to prioritize and reprioritize as appropriate. This subcommittee should fill that role.

Betsy stated that we need to use terms that everyone understands. Language can really determine how well the discussion goes. We need a commitment that the language be understandable...cut to the chase.

Selby—so the point of tonight is to determine if this group wants to participate in the IRWMP.

Dave distributed the attached handout (see below). In it he proposes a structure and operating approach on how this group could function. Dave is referring to the proposed group as a subcommittee of the Yolo Bypass Working Group since the WRA came to the larger group first.

Handouts: Yolo County IRWMP Implementation Structure; IRWMP Section 5 Potential Actions and Prioritization; IRWMP Section 5.4.8 Yolo Bypass Integrated Project; IRWMP Section 6.3.2 (Integrated Action excerpt); IRWMP Yolo Bypass Integrated Project Prerequisite Tasks and Component Actions; IRWMP Schedule -2006; IRWMP Draft Potential Actions.

Dave described what consensus with accountability is and why he is recommending that approach for decision making for the Subcommittee.

Phil Martinelli - the group needs to sing the same song at the end of the discussion.

There are two categories of stakeholders that should be included – project proponents and those affected by the projects. Dave suggests that the subcommittee meet once per month in the first 3-4 months. Then the meetings will most likely be quarterly thereafter.

Robin described the Scope of Work that she has worked out with the WRA to support Working Group meetings and to cover the Foundation's costs to organize Working Group and Subcommittee meetings, attend technical and WRA meetings and represent the Subcommittee to the public when needed. That role could be changed in the future as the Subcommittee gets going.

Phil, Selby, and Betsy all voiced that there needs to be an understanding with the larger Working Group that the subcommittee will make decisions. The Subcommittee members will need to listen to the larger group's concerns.

Dave Feliz asked about the threshold that determines when a project needs to go to the Subcommittee for discussion and prioritization.

It was suggested that we add Solano County to list of affected/implementing Bypass stakeholder. The role of Ducks Unlimited and CWA was discussed. There was a discussion of establishing membership on the Subcommittee?

Dave asked for a show of hands of support for the proposed participant mix—All participants support the proposal.

Dave asked for a show of hands for interest in participating in the Subcommittee—The following participants volunteered:

Regina Cherovsky, Conaway Ranch, RD 2035 (left early but volunteered when she left)

Robert Eddings, California Waterfowl Association (CWA)

Dave Feliz, Dept. of Fish and Game (DFG) Yolo Wildlife Area

Dick Goodell, Glide In Ranch

Mike Hardesty, RD 2068 and 2098

Marianne Kirkland, Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Phil Martinelli, Channel Ranch

Selby Mohr, Mound Farms

Paul Phillips CWA

Heidi Rooks, DWR

Ron Tadlock, Farmer

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

**Yolo Bypass Working Group  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Subcommittee  
Proposed Structure and Operating Approach**

**Background**

The Water Resources Association (WRA) of Yolo County is leading the development of an integrated regional water management plan (IRWMP) for Yolo County. The purpose is to create a coordinated and integrated set of goals, objectives, and actions related to water resources in the County. Recognizing the complexity of physical and social conditions, and existing watershed related stakeholder efforts throughout the County, the WRA has identified eight “implementation partners” associated with the eight subwatershed-based “integrated projects” located throughout the County. The goal of this approach is to support project-related stakeholder-based discussion and prioritization at the subwatershed level, rather than have such decisions made separate from the affected stakeholders. One of these integrated projects is the Yolo Bypass (Bypass) and the proposed implementation partners for Bypass actions are the Yolo Bypass Working Group (Working Group) and the Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation).

The WRA has requested the Working Group and Foundation to create a feasible, effective process through which Bypass actions can be prioritized, revised (as appropriate and mutually acceptable to stakeholders) and implemented in the future. To assist in the development of this process, WRA and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) have approached the California State University Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) (longstanding facilitator of and advisor to the Working Group and Foundation) to recommend an appropriate approach. CCP has initially advised the WRA and DWR that the current structure of the Working Group is not supportive of the types of tasks being requested. Principal limitations of the current Working Group include a lack of structure and balance regarding stakeholder participation, and the lack of decision-making protocols / operating rules to support prioritization discussions. CCP has preliminarily advised the WRA and DWR that a subset of the Working Group, if convened with a heightened degree of structure and organizational rules, and as linked to the Working Group to support public input / outreach opportunities, is feasible and reasonable to pursue. The rest of this document presents CCP’s preliminary recommendations on this approach. These recommendations are subject to revision based on subsequent stakeholder discussions.

**General Structure**

The subcommittee should reflect a representative cross-section of stakeholders that will be affected by, and likely implementers of proposed projects in the Bypass. The group should be prepared to solicit technical advice from agency, consultant, and academia sources and to address public input from Bypass stakeholders.

## **Meeting Frequency / Duration**

Monthly for the first 3-4 months of 2007 (to establish specific operating rules, shared baseline understanding of Bypass conditions and proposals, etc) followed by quarterly thereafter for approximately 3 years. Meetings are expected to last 4-5 hours each and will be scheduled to accommodate the mutual needs of all participants.

## **Process Support**

CCP (Dave Ceppos) will facilitate and provide strategic guidance on collaborative processes (as described below). CCP will provide neutral administrative support at the meetings (i.e., meeting summaries, etc). The Foundation will provide logistics support and will be (has been) the initial spokesperson on behalf of the implementation partnership. Once and if convened, the subcommittee may select a different or additional spokespersons to represent the group at WRA meetings, local government meetings, and similar external events.

## **Public Outreach / Input**

The Working Group will be the principal venue through which the subcommittee solicits and receives public input. Quarterly subcommittee meetings will be coordinated with Working Group meetings such that key agenda items for the subcommittee will first be addressed by the Working Group, allowing a broad community of stakeholders an opportunity to address their interests in the presence of the subcommittee. The subcommittee will then use the information provided at Working Group meetings to inform/ influence their deliberations and decisions.

## **Operating Guidelines**

The subcommittee should function as a collaborative, consensus-seeking group, focused on making decisions that will take the form of Bypass-specific implementation and prioritization recommendations. The consensus decision-making rule should reflect principles of “consensus with accountability”. Consensus with accountability requires that all participants seek to reach consensus. In the event a participant must reject a proposal, that participant **MUST** provide a counter proposal that legitimately attempts to achieve their interest **AND** the interests of the other participants. In this proposed consensus-seeking process, the committee will **NOT** vote and will not seek to identify numeric “winners and losers” on key topics. Rather, the group will seek to reach mutually acceptable and beneficial conclusions.

None of the participants are expected to be final decision-makers for their respective organizations or constituents but should nonetheless commit to communicate key issues with decision-makers / constituents and to be willing to be informed by input from public venues (primarily through full Working Group meetings). The subcommittee should be further defined by the following principles:

- All participants will represent their key interests and/or interests groups.
- All participants will commit to communicate with their key interest constituents / stakeholders.
- All participants will pursue opportunities that support their interests and ideally other participants' interests and that at a minimum, are neutral or pose no negative impact to the other participants' interests.
- The subcommittee will commit to coordinate all project ideas and decisions with similar implementing partners from adjacent watersheds (Putah Creek, Cache Creek, and the Sacramento River West Bank)
- All participants will commit to consistently attend Working Group meetings and other public outreach / input events to ensure they are fully informed on broader stakeholder topics.
- All participants must be provided a “*go solo*” clause. By example, in some cases, a compelling mandate for an agency may be inconsistent with the near-term goals / sentiments of the other participants. In such cases, the agency may need to pursue a project, even if it is not the priority of the full subcommittee. Similar situations may happen for private landowners and local governments. In these cases, the participant must show a good faith effort to reach a mutually acceptable conclusion but should that be unachievable, the participant must be afforded the right and responsibility to continue with a project absent group consensus. This clause will not legally prohibit other participants from seeking to obstruct the proposal but merely reflects that a good faith effort has been made by all participants to collectively resolve an issue.

## **Participants**

The Bypass reflects a wide range of public and private stakeholders, working in a wide range of voluntary to statutory capacities to address Bypass topics. This includes:

- State and Federal regulatory / resource trustee agencies pursuing legally mandated and/or policy driven efforts,
- private recreational landowners and landowner partnerships,
- private agricultural landowners and tenants,
- conservation and environmental education advocates,
- local governments,
- Academicians and researchers,
- Consultants, and
- other stakeholders.

All of these participants have played a valuable role in the Working Group process. In the context of the proposed effort to support the IRWMP, the challenge is to create an equitable set of stakeholders that can effectively address their self / organization interests, work collaboratively with other stakeholders, and identify / prioritize appropriate projects to be pursued in the Bypass. These unique needs require the subcommittee to be composed of stakeholders that will be directly affected by land/water use decisions (e.g. landowners, tenants, user groups) and stakeholders that will be likely implementers of projects (e.g. agencies, local

governments, advocacy groups). The following list represents the reasonable set of affected and implementing Bypass stakeholders:

- California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
- U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
- Dixon Resource Conservation District (RCD)
- Yolo RCD
- Sacramento Yolo Mosquito & Vector Control District
- Private Agricultural Landowners and Tenants
- Private Recreational Wetland Manager(e.g. hunting club) Landowners and Landowner Partnerships
- Private Habitat Management Landowners
- Yolo County
- Solano County
- City of Davis
- City of Woodland
- Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
- Adjacent Reclamation Districts
- US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Regional Utilities providers (e.g. Union Pacific Railroad, Gas???)
- Yolo Basin Foundation
- California Waterfowl Association (CWA)
- Ducks Unlimited (DU)
- Tuleyome
- Putah Creek Council and the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee

No stakeholder group can ever be completely inclusive. Time, budget, and size considerations always mandate that a stakeholder group must be a representative cross-section of interests rather than a comprehensive collection of all parties. In the context of the above stakeholder groups, the general criteria described above regarding appropriate stakeholder participants, and the need to keep the proposed subcommittee a workable size, CCP proposes the following participant structure and rationale for the IRWMP subcommittee.