

**Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum
BDCP Subcommittee Meeting #3**

**April 14, 2009
Center for Collaborative Policy
Sacramento, CA**

Attendance

Meeting Participants

Brad Burkholder, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Regina Cherovsky, Reclamation District (RD) 2035
Dave Feliz, DFG
Linda Fiack, DPC
Mike Hardesty, RD 2068/2098
Butch Hodgkins, Central Valley Flood Protection Board, (CVFPB)
Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation (YBF)
Julia McIver, Yolo County
Selby Mohr, Mound Farms

David Okita, Solano County Water Agency (SCWA)
Erik Ringelberg, RD 999
Don Stevens, Glide-In-Ranch
Jan Vick, City of Rio Vista
Bob Webber, RD 999
Jay Ziegler, Metropolitan Water District (MWD)

Staff

Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
Sam Magill, CCP

ACTION ITEMS:

1. CCP will work with Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum (Planning Forum) Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Conservation Measures Subcommittee (Subcommittee) members to develop individual lists of priorities for actions in the Yolo Bypass. CCP will compile the lists into a single report for discussion with Yolo/Solano County and BDCP staff at the next Subcommittee meeting.
2. Jan Vick will convey the Subcommittee's support of the Solano County Delta-Related Preferred Outcomes List to Supervisor Mike Reagan for his discussions with BDCP leadership. Ms. Kulakow will convey the Subcommittee's support of the Yolo County Delta Policies, Desired Outcomes, and Habitat Project Parameters to Yolo County Supervisors Mike McGowan and Jim Provenza for their meetings with BDCP leadership.

Opening, Introductions, and Announcements

Dave Ceppos, CCP, opened the meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves. He then discussed recent developments with Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) staff and the BDCP Steering Committee relative to the proposed April 17th between BDCP and the Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum (Planning Forum) BDCP Conservation Measures Subcommittee (Subcommittee).

Mr. Ceppos reported that several key BDCP Steering Committee members, including Undersecretary for Resources Karen Scarborough and CALFED Director Joe Grindstaff, would be unable to attend on the 17th. He noted that at previous Subcommittee meetings, Subcommittee members stressed that meetings with BDCP must happen with the leadership as opposed to staff. Undersecretary Scarborough also said in other meetings that BDCP staff and leadership already meet with most of the same people on the Subcommittee, albeit in separate venues.

BDCP is proposing to draft “coordinating agreements” with the Delta counties that ostensibly outline how county concerns will be addressed in the BDCP process. Many of the counties are unsure what level of coordination these agreements will allow/require and in general, the counties remain skeptical about this proposal. One strategy for engaging BDCP leadership suggested for the Subcommittee was to combine its meeting with county meetings, but the coordinating agreements may preclude that from happening. Nonetheless, Kathy Barnes Jones, Solano County, has expressed support for this strategy.

Mr. Ceppos explained that BDCP leadership is beginning these negotiation meetings of the proposed coordinating agreements with county elected officials beginning on April 20th. He suggested that the Subcommittee could “piggyback” on the Yolo and Solano County meetings, and opened the discussion to Subcommittee members for additional suggestions:

Discussion:

- David Okita, SCWA, suggested that the Subcommittee should be prepared to meet with County technical staff and BDCP staff to begin crafting actual management measures for the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Complex. He also suggested that the proposed meeting on April 17th does not need to happen, since the letter/invitation was sufficient to elevate the visibility of the Subcommittee.
- Brad Burkholder asked what level of specificity the conversations between county elected officials and BDCP leadership would have. Mr. Ceppos responded that there will likely be three levels of discussion:
 - Protocol oriented: What is the process for addressing county concerns in the Conservation Measures?
 - Assurances oriented: How can BDCP leadership build a lasting relationship with local elected officials and provide meaningful assurances / commitments regarding impacts and the lack thereof?
 - Technical considerations: What are the local technical considerations that must be addressed in the Conservation Measures?

Mr. Ceppos went on to explain that the Planning Forum and Subcommittee are likely to provide the highest level of stakeholder-developed detail BDCP leadership and staff will be able to include in the Conservation Measures.

- Jan Vick agreed with the strategy to meet directly with county technical staff and BDCP staff to develop specific measures and solutions to local concerns, and added that the Subcommittee must consolidate all of its ideas into a single document before these meetings occur.
- Julia McIver stressed that meetings with BDCP staff must be “two-way” conversations, as opposed to one-way presentations from BDCP about their Conservation Measures. Mr. Ceppos agreed, and noted that if this strategy is pursued, it won’t alter the strategy developed for the March 23rd Subcommittee meeting titled, “Draft BDCP Engagement Strategy;” it will change the venue in which the meetings take place.
- Mr. Ceppos asked Mr. Okita and Ms. McIver if the Subcommittee can develop talking points to reflect Subcommittee concerns for county elected officials when they meet with BDCP leadership. They responded that this is probably acceptable, but that it would not be appropriate for Subcommittee members to attend the meeting and deliver any comments.
- Robin Kulakow noted that BDCP has started to reference existing plans for the Yolo Bypass, including the Yolo Bypass Interagency Working Group 5-Point Fish Plan. This is a positive first step for BDCP to acknowledge the local planning that has already occurred in the Yolo Bypass. She also raised the concern that some members of the BDCP Steering Committee appear to be very unfamiliar with the geography of the Yolo Bypass. Educating individual members of the Steering Committee could be useful to ensure the Planning Forum’s concerns are acknowledged in the Conservation Measures.
- Ms. McIver suggested that because the Conservation Measures affect the entire Yolo Bypass, it could be good to expand the Planning Forum to expand Bypass-wide stakeholders as opposed to land owners/managers in and adjacent to the Lower Yolo Bypass. Mr. Ceppos noted that the Subcommittee includes stakeholders from the entire Bypass (as it was expanded at its inception to include members of the Yolo Bypass Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Subcommittee [i.e. Conaway Ranch, etc])
- Mr. Ceppos noted that the “education phase” of the Planning Forum process is over. The next phase of the process will focus on developing implementable management practices for the Lower Bypass. Offline conversations with the owners of Prospect Island, Liberty Island, Yolo Ranch, and Ryer Island are ongoing to determine what proposed projects and impacts need to be considered and how these items, as integrated with the proposed the Conservation Measures, could mean for land / water management in the area. Once these conversations are concluded, the full Planning Forum will be reconvened to begin development of the proposed LYB management plan.
- Mr. Okita suggested that rather than focusing on proposals for individual tracts of land (i.e., Yolo Ranch, Liberty Island, etc.) the Subcommittee should focus on developing standards for future Conservation Measures. Mr. Ceppos responded that some of this work has already been done.

Existing Desired Outcomes for the Yolo Bypass

Subcommittee members received three lists of desired outcomes for the Yolo Bypass:

- The Solano County Delta-Related Preferred Outcomes List
- Yolo County Delta Policies, Desired Outcomes, and Habitat Project Parameters
- The Yolo Bypass Interagency Working Group 5-Point Fish Plan

Mr. Ceppos instructed Subcommittee members to examine each of the documents and identify any areas of disagreement, agreement, or issues for addition. The outcomes of this exercise would be used to develop the final list of subcommittee priorities. Given time restraints, Subcommittee members were instructed to review the lists before the next meeting and develop their own list of priorities for the Yolo Bypass. Mr. Ceppos urged the group to make these priorities and ideas as geographically specific and detailed about the Bypass as possible. CCP agreed to work in coordination with individual Subcommittee members to assist in the development of these priorities and compile them all into a single report for meetings with county technical/BDCP staff (**see Action Item #1**).

Subcommittee members agreed that the Solano/Yolo County desired outcomes lists addressed many of the Planning Forum's concerns. Sam Magill, CCP, asked Ms. Vick to contact Solano County Supervisor Mike Reagan and Ms. Kulakow to contact Yolo County Supervisors Mike McGowan and Jim Provenza to convey the Subcommittee's support of the desired outcomes. He explained that this support should be explained to BDCP leadership during local elected official meetings discussed above (**see Action Item #2**).

Adjourn