

**Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum  
Planning Forum Meeting #10**

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

MEETING DATE: April 28, 2010

LOCATION: California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area  
45211 County Road 32B  
Davis, CA

ATTENDEES:

Planning Forum Members and Co-Sponsors

Kathy Barnes-Jones, Solano County  
Gilbert Cosio, Reclamation District (RD) 536  
Dave Feliz, DFG  
Mike Hardesty, RD 2068/2098  
Tom Hester, Ryer Island/RD 501  
Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation (Foundation)  
Dean Messer, Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
Selby Mohr, Mound Farms  
Phil Pogledich, Yolo County  
Don Stevens, Glide In Ranch

Melinda Terry, North Delta Water Agency (NDWA)  
Jan Vick, City of Rio Vista  
Bob Webber, RD 999

Staff

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

Other Participants

Cliff Covey, Solano County  
Mitsuko Grube, DFG  
Gina Von Klompenburg, DFG

**All meeting materials are available on the Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum (Planning Forum) website at [www.yolobypass.net](http://www.yolobypass.net) under “Meeting #10” unless otherwise noted.**

**ACTION ITEMS**

1. CCP will revise the Planning Forum’s letter requesting participation in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) Yolo Bypass local issues work group based on meeting participant comments. Planning Forum members will respond with changes or additions to the letter within one week of letter distribution.
2. Based on Planning Forum discussions, CCP will develop a proposed approach to proceed with planning activities by the Planning Forum.
3. As part of the Planning Approach (see item 2) CCP will regularly query Planning Forum members for updates on external planning processes as a means to prioritize Planning Forum activities and focus during meetings. This is an ongoing action item.

4. CCP will modify the “Preliminary Draft Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum Goals” document, post it to the project website, and request comments from Planning Forum members within one week of document distribution.
5. CCP will include a list of upcoming Planning Forum meetings with the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting summary.

### **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Dave Ceppos opened the meeting and thanked participants for attending. After a brief review of the agenda, Mr. Ceppos reviewed the agenda. He explained the primary focus of the meeting was to review the results of the recent “mid process assessment” and develop options for a Lower Bypass planning approach.

### **Planning Forum Letter to the BDCP Steering Committee**

Sam Magill reviewed a proposed letter from the Planning Forum cosponsors to the BDCP Steering Committee (Steering Committee). The letter, requested by Planning Forum members during their February 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, reminds the Steering Committee that the Planning Forum and Yolo Bypass Working Group (Working Group) already include all of the stakeholders needed for a Yolo Bypass local issues work group. The following comments on the letter were received:

#### Discussion:

- Meeting participants expressed a need for a more concrete message that the Planning Forum must be included in any Yolo Bypass local issues work group.
- Participants are not unanimously advocating that the Steering Committee use the Planning Forum and Working Group as the source of stakeholders but that stakeholders in these existing groups must have full opportunity to participate in a BDCP process
- Kathy Barnes Jones and Phil Pogledich commented that the letter should require the Steering Committee to keep the Planning Forum apprised of all Yolo Bypass discussions and materials.
- CCP will revise the letter based on meeting participant comments. Planning Forum members will respond with changes or additions to the letter within one week of letter distribution (**see Action Item #1**).

### **Mid Process Assessment Results**

Mr. Magill reviewed the recent Planning Forum mid process assessment. The assessment was carried out over three weeks. CCP interviewed Planning Forum members via phone and asked the following questions:

- Given the other large scale planning efforts underway, does the Planning Forum still have value?
- If the Planning Forum has value, how should it interact with other planning efforts like BDCP?
- What should the “end product” of the Planning Forum be?

Mr. Magill explained that Planning Forum members interviewed unanimously agreed that the process has value. Furthermore, all interviewees agreed that the Planning Forum must be prepared to react to BDCP and other planning efforts as measures are proposed that may affect the Lower Bypass. In addition to being reactive to these outside efforts, nearly all members agreed that the Planning Forum must also be proactive and develop its own management solutions to issues in the Lower Bypass. A small minority suggested that the Planning Forum should be reactive only and propose mitigation principles similar to those in the document entitled, “*Local Impacts From Habitat Conversion And Delta Infrastructure Projects and Suggested Solutions*”.

After the review, Mr. Ceppos reminded participants that as the funder of the Planning Forum process, DFG expects some type of management strategy for the Lower Bypass. The following comments were recorded:

Discussion:

- Don Stevens noted that private landowners may have difficulty reacting to Planning Forum strategies that do not immediately affect their land.
- Participants noted that because of the timing of the BDCP Conservation Measures, the Planning Forum will have to be ready to react to its conclusions. Mike Hardesty suggested that a product for the Lower Bypass similar to the “Yolo Bypass Conservation Measure” developed by the Planning Forum could be useful for this purpose.
- Melinda Terry cautioned meeting participants to stay focused on BDCP when considering outside planning efforts. Other efforts such as the Delta Plan and Central Valley Flood Protection Plan will not immediately affect the Lower Bypass, and are not project-specific like BDCP.
- Robin Kulakow commented that Planning Forum members should be prepared to share information with each other to keep the group informed of outside planning efforts. Dave Feliz suggested that CCP could develop fact sheets with meeting summaries that include “distilled information” from outside planning efforts.
- Tom Hester commented that the Planning Forum should focus on developing goals and be “proactive in defining them, and reactive in defending them.”
- Ms. Terry and Mr. Hardesty commented that the Planning Forum should develop goals and priorities to address BDCP Conservation Measures. The list of preliminary goals developed for the meeting represents a number of issues BDCP isn’t considering that must be addressed and/or protected in the Lower Bypass.

### **Planning Forum – Planning Approach Proposal**

Based on the assessment results and the group discussion, Mr. Ceppos proposed an approach for developing Lower Bypass management options. He confirmed that no meeting participant stated that they want to be reactive only, and reminded the group that all Planning Forum members joined the process for likely two reasons: to hear about other stakeholders’ interests, and to protect their own interests. He also reminded the group that when the Planning Forum process was stopped for 9 months due to the State economic crisis, the group was just about to transition

from the education stage of the process (e.g. technical briefings and informational discussions) into the planning stage (e.g. development of goals, objectives, solutions, etc). Based on these ideas, the following approach was proposed.

## FORUM PLANNING APPROACH

Step 1: The Planning Forum will define and complete a set of Forum Goals.

Step 2: CCP and the Planning Forum will develop and prioritize a list of external planning processes. Priority items will represent processes that have an immediate potential impact on Yolo Bypass conditions and require focused attention by the Planning Forum

Step 3: Using the Forum's Goals, CCP will regularly screen background materials from each external process (with a focus on the priority efforts) and will report upcoming issues to the Planning Forum as a means to keep Forum members informed of high priority issues. These issues will be the basis for agenda items at subsequent Planning Forum meetings, such that the Forum is constantly addressing and responding to real-time conditions.

Step 4: CCP will regularly work with Planning Forum members who will provide updates at each meeting regarding discussions / presentations they have participated in with representatives from external planning efforts.

Step 5: The Planning Forum will continue to work on proactive planning options for the Lower Bypass, creating ideas to be presented in their final project deliverable, the Lower Yolo Bypass Management Strategy.

Step 5: Using the information provided in Steps 3 and 4, and the actions in Step 5, the Planning Forum will conduct three planning functions: 1) **Inform** all members of current events , 2) **React** to external conditions and defend Forum Goals, and 3) **Create** new planning options for the Yolo Bypass.

### Discussion:

- Selby Mohr confirmed the proposal was a good approach, and asked if there is anything in the Planning Forum Charter that precludes individual members from acting independently should the need arise. Mr. Ceppos confirmed that the Charter accommodates such independent actions with a caveat that all Members are expected to proactively communicate needs and to proactively solve problems through the collaborative approach, after which they are always allowed a "go solo" option.
- Ms. Terry agreed with the approach, and reiterated the need to focus on BDCP right now.
- Ms. Barnes Jones asked at what point the Planning Forum should engage stakeholders downstream of the Lower Bypass who may be affected by the actions it recommends. Mr. Ceppos noted that groups like the Delta Counties Coalition exist and could be good forums for this discussion.

- **Planning Forum members confirmed that the approach as proposed is appropriate.** CCP will develop a finalized proposal and regularly query Planning Forum members for updates on external planning processes (**see Action Item #2**).

### **Planning Forum Goals Discussion**

Mr. Ceppos reviewed the document titled “Preliminary Draft: Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum Goals,” and asked participants to review each goal and provide comments. The following discussion was recorded. Specific changes to the document are outlined in the version titled “Draft Lower Yolo Bypass Planning Forum Goals v.2” available on the website listed above. CCP will distribute the revised Goals statement to meeting participants. Planning Forum members will respond with comments within one week of distribution (**see Action Item #4**).

#### Discussion:

- The role of agriculture should include its value as a “flood and habitat friendly” land use.
- Mr. Stevens suggested an additional goal for managed wetlands conceptually similar to the existing agricultural goal. These wetlands provide a critical habitat beneficial to a variety of species.
- Ms. Kulakow suggested that one goal should encompass a global commitment to honor existing easements and management plans within the Lower Bypass.
- Additional clarification is needed on the definition of “water management” in the goals. As envisioned, water management refers to maintaining existing diversions and discharges whenever possible without being subject to stricter regulation. If habitat or other plans affect this management, mitigation and avoidance measures must be implemented.
- The term “safe harbor” should be avoided given its implications for Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) issues. Although conceptually similar to safe harbor, Planning Forum members suggested that one goal should be “impact avoidance” if ESA listed species are introduced to an area near landowner diversions or discharges.
- An additional goal should be mitigating the impacts on local government fees from private/public land transfers.
- Participants suggested that emergency response be removed from the recreation goal and elevated to become a goal in itself.
- The invasive species goal should acknowledge that not all non-native species are bad.

### **Wrap-up and Adjourn**

CCP will distribute the list of upcoming meeting dates to Planning Forum members (**see Action Item #4**).