



County of Yolo

PARKS AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Warren Westrup
DIRECTOR

120 W. Main St., Suite C
Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 406-4880 FAX (530) 668-1801
www.yolocounty.org

CACHE CREEK TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) March 9, 2009 Summary Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Eric Larsen.

Attendees: Mike O'Hagen (Stantec Consulting), Heidi Tschudin (Tschudin Consulting Group, Yolo County), Tim Horner (TAC Hydrologist), Erik Ringelberg (TAC Riparian Biologist), Eric Larsen (TAC Fluvial Geomorphologist), Brian King (Teichert Aggregates), Yasha Saber (Granite Construction Co.), Dave Pratt, Lillie Noble (Teichert Aggregates), Ross Roberts (Syar Industries, Inc.), John Perry (Syar Industries, Inc.), Jennifer Gomez (Syar Industries, Inc.), Jim Syar (Syar Industries, Inc.), Yolo County Supervisor Duane Chamberlain (Yolo County), Dale Whitmore (Department of Fish and Game), Tanya Meyer (Yolo RCD), Bob MacArthur (NHC), Mark Hirzy (CEMEX)

Staff: Kent Reeves, Kevin Schwartz, Tami Leathers

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

Meeting minutes were not reviewed

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

4. STAFF UPDATE:

4.1 Parks and Resources staff updates:

Kent Reeves mentioned that the County has retained 6 different consulting firms on an as-needed basis in order to help with regulatory and permitting components of the Off-Channel Mining Plan (OCMP) and the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP). Kevin Schwartz gave an overview of the work that is happening at the Correll-Rodgers' site. Collaborations with the Rodgers family, Teichert, the Cache Creek Conservancy, the Schwarzgrubers, and the Center for Land-Based Learning's SLEWS program, and the Water Resources Association of Yolo County are all helping make the work at Correll-Rodgers' possible. Kevin also mentioned the new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that the County has with the Yolo Resource Conservation District (YCRCD) that will help facilitate more work with them on our projects.

4.2 Cache Creek Conservancy (CCC) staff updates:

The CCC was not in attendance.

4.3 Yolo County Resource Conservation District (YCRCD):

Tanya Meyer, Vegetation Management Specialist for the YCRCD gave the YCRCD's update. The YCRCD's work schedule has been reduced by 50% to full days Monday and Tuesday and ½ of Wednesday for the next 6 months, because of the state budget crisis and freeze of bond funded projects. After 6 months, the YCRCD will not have any more funding. The Wildlife Conservation Board is helping fund Tamarisk and Arundo control and the YCRCD did some spraying in the fall. In the area that was sprayed, they had a group of SLEWS students out doing restoration work and did acorn planting. The Rumsey Band of the Wintun Indians also funded another SLEWS day for planting on March 5. The Cache Creek Watershed Stakeholders group has been doing restoration work at the Yolo County Nichols Park on a volunteer basis with work parties every 2-3 weeks. The Cache Creek Watershed Forum met on January 15 and will be meeting on March 19 at Esparto Library at 10 am and talking about the watershed weed work and the Cache Creek Discovery Day. This year the Discovery Day will be held April 25-26 at the Heron Festival.

The Yolo RCD has just submitted a grant to Department of Pesticide Regulation in order to research the long term run-off from the golf course on tribal lands.

Kent mentioned the MOU with the YCRCD will allow us to collaborate more with Yolo RCD and expand our abilities within the CCRMP.

4.4 Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District staff updates:

No one from the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (YCFWCWCD) was in attendance.

4.5 TAC updates

Tim Horner

Bob MacArthur, Tim, Tami and Yolo County personnel are working on Tami's thesis project looking at gravel mobility and bank stability over long periods of time within the CCRMP and thinking about goals and objectives. Tim turned in his Water Quality Annual report to the County. Tim has only seen several reports back to 1996 even though there were supposed to be reports annually. Tami and Tim have compiled data and made graphs back to 1999 and are working looking at looking at the bigger picture and creating a longer range data set.

Erik Ringelberg:

Erik has been working on reviewing and updating our methods for collecting aerial data and improving our LiDAR data collection.

Eric Larsen

TAC AD Hoc technical studies working group. Eric has been looking at geomorphic monitoring that has been done in the CCRMP and is looking for any data that any other groups may have. He is looking at geomorphic monitoring transects and found presumed transects to be monitored and 150 cross-sections for a HEC-RAS model. In addition, we assume that we can take cross-sections from LiDAR and DTM data. Mark Hirzy stated that in the 1970's and 1980's all the gravel companies were required to do manual cross-sections at specific locations as part of the old permits. It would be good to find these cross-sections.

Eric gave an overview of the HEC-RAS training that we had in February.

Eric also looked at the existing HEC-RAS model that goes from from Road 94b to Highway I-5. Bob MacArthur said there were 2 FEMA studies that would have good information and

that Flood Control with the City of Woodland would be good to consult with. The Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) in 1973 and 1976 did a detailed study (HEC-6 with cross-sections every ~3 miles) from Clear Lake all the way to the Settling Basin and the cross-sections were spaced several miles apart. It would be good to select some key indicator cross-sections done previously and follow them through time.

Lillie Noble asked if there was any update on the Capay Dam and the TAC responded that it has not been formally asked to review the Capay Dam.

5. REGULAR AGENDA:

Heidi Tschudin (Tschudin Consulting Group) overview of the Cache Creek Area Plan (CCAP) update

Kent introduced Heidi Tschudin who is the consultant hired by the County to steer the CCAP update. The Off Channel Management Plan (OCMP) and the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP) comprise the CCAP. Heidi has institutional memory of the Cache Creek management plans as she helped create them. The OCMP and the CCRMP will be updated together.

Heidi was pulled into the “gravel wars” in 1995 and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) needed to figure out a balance; in exchange for their rights for mining in the Creek, the companies were given permits to mine off-channel. The OCMP describes the plan developed to regulate these permits. The CCRMP created a plan for the restoration of the Creek. There was lots of conflicting scientific information about the impacts of mining on the Creek. The 1995 Tech Studies were completed to gather and clarify scientific information on Cache Creek. The center piece of the management plans was an adaptive management approach. Not only was there a certain amount of data and monitoring supposed to be collected on an annual basis, but there was also built into the plans 10-year check points for the mining permits and the management plans.

In 2002 there wasn't really an update, but was more of a stop-gap measure to ensure the continuance of our general permits. While we need an OCMP 10 year review, the CCRMP should also undergo a full update as the two work hand in hand and because the 2002 update was not a complete update. The CCAP update will then allow for 10 year reviews of both the OCMP and CCRMP, will make needed editorial changes, update agency names (e.g. the “Yolo County Community Development Agency” is now the “Department of Parks and Resources”), update names within the text, and will determine what we need to change institutionally. The updates of the mining permits were completed by Heidi ~1 year ago. Heidi handed out a “Workplan for CCAP update” which is embedded in the text below along with additional comments made during the meeting regarding the work plan:

1. Technical Analyses

- a. Update to original 1995 Technical Studies
 - Streamway Study Update
 - Groundwater Study Update
 - Biological Resources Study Update
 - Peer Review

The purpose of the 1995 Technical Studies was for it to be a comprehensive summary of research on the CCRMP and it looked at 100 years of data. The Technical Studies update is happening currently with Eric Larsen focusing on channel morphology, channel dynamics and historical trends in channel migration; Tim Horner focusing on water quality; Erik

Ringelberg focusing on the Creek biology; and Tami focusing on aspects of the Creek's geomorphology for her Masters' Thesis. The difficulty is that the studies are being done by consultants operating under the Brown Act which restricts the sharing of information by the TAC members. The Tech Studies update will need to be peer reviewed probably by an outside consultant.

b. Preparation of "data matrix" identifying all monitoring, modeling and data collection (aerocartography, digital terrain, etc) under CCAP since 1996 -verification of what we are supposed to have, whether we have it, and if so where it is located, what form, etc.

Need to look at Data matrix-Heidi will put this together and doesn't want to duplicate what has already been done. The TAC has already looked through CCRMP and CCIP and at what we should be doing and what has been done. TAC members will send their Annual reports to Heidi so she can assemble the data matrix. TAC members were asked to do review of CCRMP and CCIP as part of their annual status reports.

Update 2006 list from 1996-2006 update presented to BOS. Just as operators need to submit annual review and compliance, the county should yearly submit yearly update of monitoring and activities in the CCRMP.

c. Compile and review existing general permits including all required conditions and mitigations

2. OCMP Project Assessment

a. Review results from 2006-2007 Mining Permit Compliance Review

This part has already been done last year.

3. CCRMP Project Assessment

a. Identify, map, and describe (using a common template) all creek projects undertaken pursuant to the CCRMP

Stabilization/Test 3 Implementation

Channel Maintenance

Restoration

b. Review and analyze all Flood Hazard Development Permits

Just like what has been done for the OCMP where we have a record of everything that has been done for each mining permit, etc., we need to take the 2006 Status Report and add to it and update it with all the information we have to date on the projects that have been done within the CCRMP and their status. How well have these projects worked and what projects should we do. These projects include all the bank stabilization projects, the Test 3 implementation projects, all the Flood Hazard Development Permit projects, all the restoration work, all the TAC projects, all the channel maintenance projects, and the weed control projects, etc. All of the information on this work should be input into a database and there should be an analysis of what all this information means.

4. Economic Assessment

a. Update prior economic analyses; define existing and emerging markets; assess aggregate demand.

Back in 1996, there were 2-3 different economic analyses done. We need to "dust off" the old information and update the information.

5. Public Workshops

Once all of the above information has been collected, all of this information should be shared with the public (agencies, landowners, and other stakeholders) and there should be a series of workshops.

6. Update Recommendations

- a. Based on information generated above, prepare strikeout/redline version of documents for which changes are proposed
 - OCMP
 - CCRMP
 - CCIP
 - Ordinances (Mining and Reclamation)
- b. Include changes to reflect new department/organization
- c. Corrections and clarifications
- d. New mining areas/tonnage expansion

7. Environmental Analysis

After all of the review, we will need to see if the changes to be made will affect the environmental review.

8. Hearings and Final Action

- a. Planning Commission
- b. Board of Supervisors

The timeframe for this process is 1 year or less and funding is coming from Division. The CCAP is a 30-year plan, although it was created to serve as a 50-year plan and the original intent was to have the renewal of gravel permits after 30 years. There were 7 Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) done for the CCAP: 2 program level EIRs and 5 project level EIRs. We may not need to do a new EIR and may just need to do lower level California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis. If we are doing purely regulatory and policy changes that don't change the environmental effects, then this wouldn't trigger CEQA. If bigger changes will be done, then we may trigger higher level CEQA. Tim Horner stressed the importance of the economic analysis and ensuring the sustainability of the Yolo County Natural Resources Division. Erik Ringelberg stressed that with the new greenhouse gas evaluation requirements in CEQA, we may have to consider these in the environmental analysis.

Kent-asked everyone simply whether they think there should be an update or not and went around the room getting individual responses from everyone present. The consensus from the meeting attendees was yes, but given the effort to undertake the update, the update should not compromise or overshadow the annual data collection and the current gathering of information.

6. SET DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:

Monday, April 13, 2008

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.