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)
Summary Notes

DATE: Monday March 10, 2008

TIME: 10:00am – 12:00 pm

LOCATION:
Yolo County Department of Employment and Social Services (DESS)
25 N. Cottonwood Street, Community Room (# 167),
Woodland, CA 95695

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 10:02am by TAC Chair, Eric Larsen

Attendees: Kim Bellows, Lillie Noble, Lynnel Pollock, Max Stevenson, Carol Rodgers, Ed Armstrong, Melanie Truan, Jeanette Wrysinski, Ben Adamo, Yasha Saber, Barry Cavanna, Jack White, Mark Hirzy, Dave Pratt,

Yolo County Parks and Resources Staff: Holly Malcolm, Kent Reeves, Kevin Schwartz.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

Review and consider the minutes for the meeting of December 10, 2007. Moved by Tim Horner, TAC Hydrologist, and 2nd by Eric Larsen, TAC Fluvial Geomorphologist.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

4. STAFF UPDATE:

4.1 Update on TAC Riparian Biologist: Kevin Schwartz stated that the County is very close to making a selection and will have the final interview for the candidates today. He hopes to have the Riparian Biologist on board by the May meeting.

4.2 Additional Parks and Resources staff updates: Kent Reeves discussed starting the process for developing a vision for the Cache Creek Area Plan (CCAP); a stakeholders group will be formed and will include the Yolo Resource Conservation District (Yolo RCD), Cache Creek Conservancy (CCC), Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (YCFCWCD), and County staff. The County will begin an education and outreach program with the first breakfast meeting taking place on April 9, 2009 (Aggregate Mining and Safe Harbor Agreements). Tami Leathers, a Master's student of Tim Horner's, has been hired by the County in order to work as an intern on

completing her Master's degree related to the needs of the CCAP. Schwartz announced the annual creek walk will take place in June over 3 days and would like to monitor the creek more frequently. Schwartz mentioned using kayaks in order to look at the system. Jeanette Wrysinski (Yolo RCD) mentioned that this would be an excellent way to monitor the creek, but that safety training should be a priority prior to kayaking down the creek.

4.3 Cache Creek Conservancy (CCC) staff will provide an update on CCC projects: Pollock described restoration work on lower east end of the Cache Creek Nature Preserve (CCNP) by SLEWS on 2/28. The barn roof damaged in the January storms was been repaired. The CCC is looking at doing hedgerow plantings with a demonstration area. Vandalism and trespassing continue to be a problem along the creek. The CCC is having "No trespassing" and "Conserve the Creek" signs made and they will be available to landowners along the creek. There is a weed control workshop on 4/16. An Earth Day fun run is planned on 4/19. Cache Creek Discovery Day is planned for 5/10. The CCC is currently recruiting for a Habitat Restoration Manager as Shannon Brawley who was in charge of the Tending and Gathering Garden had to resign and move back East. The native grasses planted at the CCNP and on Harrison's property are doing well.

5. <u>REGULAR AGENDA:</u>

Review of Correll-Rodgers Final Pond Enhancement Feasibility Study by Foothill Associates and Domenichelli & Associates: The review of the Final Correll-Rodgers Pond Enhancement Feasibility Study ("Feasibility Study") at the 03/10/2008 meeting was not open for public comment. The Correll-Rodgers Draft Pond Enhancement Feasibility Study was discussed at 4 TAC meetings. There were 2 months to provide public comments to the Draft Feasibility Study. During this time and previous to the public comment period, staff met with local landowners and stakeholders. All comments submitted to the County, were submitted to the consultant, Foothill Associates for consideration in the development of the Final Feasibility Study.

Eric Larsen expressed that most of his concerns were addressed in the Final version of the Feasibility Study. He provided a handout that listed his concerns as well as putting comments in the PDF version of the Feasibility Study. He was looking for better narrative of what happens to the increasing discharge in the creek for the "Preferred Alternative" in the Final Feasibility Study. He found the narrative reasonable considering the existing conditions. He also liked that it was done in phases.

Tim Horner submitted his comments in written form as well and began recounting the comments verbally when Ed Armstrong, Foothill Associates Correll-Rodgers' Pond Enhancement Feasibility Study Project Manager, arrived to the meeting. Larsen recounted his comments shown above to Armstrong prior to Larsen needing to leave the meeting.

Below are excerpts from Horner's comments and Armstrong's response to those comments:
1) p. 4, paragraph 4: (Horner said) I would still contend that results from infiltration experiments conducted from 2001 to 2003 were not "disappointing". A study area of less than 30 acres yielded recharge rates of 100-150 af/yr during average water years. This would translate to 3-5 ft of recharge to the water table per year in this limited area... It seems to me that there is some potential for groundwater recharge at this site, and that the chance to induce recharge should be considered during site sculpting and creation of any new ponds.

3) Page 4 (bottom) and p. 5 (top) have a discussion of how the model was built and tested, but I lost track of which data sets were used- this paragraph could be clarified. I think LiDAR was used to build the model, then proposed cross sections were used to check inundation and storage at different flows.

Armstrong stated that Tony Barela, PE from Domenichelli & Associates would know more, but that he

believes the data came from an existing HEC-RAS model on Cache Creek and from LiDAR contours from 2006.

4) New mercury sections (section 3.3 Water Quality, and section 5.4.2 Emergent Wetland) look great! My only comment refers to the last statement in section 3.3- that any methylmercury produced will likely be broken down by sunlight, and not removed from the site. I don't think we can rule out bioaccumulation or transfer off site. Maybe tone this last statement down a little? Recognition and discussion of potential mercury problems is a good addition to this final draft.

Armstrong stated that he is expecting a net deposition of mercury on site, but he needs to talk to the Foothill hydrologist more.

5) p. 19 alternatives B and C: Both mention fill in the pit bottoms. Does this imply that the pit bottoms aren't six ft above the thalweg? I don't think we had talked about fill in the pit floors in earlier plans. Will this affect cost or volumes of soil moved? It sounds like we may have a soil deficit now.

Armstrong stated that the fill material is mentioned in order to clarify whether use of berm material will be used for filling in pits and also in order to ensure that pits are 6' above thalweg.

The Cache Creek Resource Management Plan (CCRMP) states that:

"In place of the theoretical thalweg, a series of reach-specific slopes and sinuosity rations (comparing the channel width to its length) have been adopted, which provide standards for maintenance excavation that would improve the channel flow…Since one of the primary goals of the CCRMP is to allow aggradation of the streambed, channel reshaping activities will remain six feet above the existing thalweg, unless maintenance of the existing 100-year flood capacity requires otherwise. "

8) Section 5.2.1 (test 3 compliance) discusses fill and excavation in pit bottoms, but after looking at pit elevations, I'm not sure excavation would be possible (see comment 5 above). Pit elevations are very close to the thalweg level, and may be less than six feet above the thalweg. In those cases we might need to fill.

9) Fig 13 (p. 31) shows elevations where the berm is cut to allow inflow into the pits (cross sections A-A' and B-B'). These elevations look like they are just a few feet above the active channel. Shouldn't elevations be at least 6 feet above the channel?

Horner stated that a lot of his comments are related to seeing the elevations on the proposed conditions figures which were added to the Final Feasibility Study. Horner stated that these elevations are a welcome and necessary addition to the Final Feasibility Study. Horner had concern that the proposed sculpting and surface elevations might not be 6' above the thalweg, as required by the CCRMP. Based on the topography shown in the Final Feasibility study, it was unclear whether the proposed condition went below the required 6' elevation mark. This raised the question about where the fill material would come from in order to create the desired topography, especially since the existing conditions would seemingly prohibit excavations that would deepen the ponds. Also, would the volume in the berm be sufficient or be feasible to use as the fill material? What are we going to do with the berm material?

Armstrong stated that the proposed condition was designed to improve mosquito control and diversify vegetation on site. The proposed design was assuming that most of the diversity in topography would have to be created by fill. The contours in the LiDAR data that Foothill had didn't show the depth of the channel. The proposed condition would be very close to 6' above thalweg and the fill estimate was based on the volume estimated in the berm material. A lot will be determined by the economic feasibility of using the berm material. Ecologically and economically, it may make more sense to use the berm material on site. When we open up the berm to allow better connections of Cache Creek to the site, we will get some

sedimentation on site, but it is unclear until we do further studies what amount of sedimentation we can expect and over how long a period of time. The thalweg appears to be at 60' elevation, and the entries into the site were designed at 66' elevation which would meet the requirement of keeping excavations 6' above thalweg. When get into the design phase will need to do site surveys and have 6" vertical resolution that will address some of these questions.

Kevin Schwartz, Yolo County Resource Specialist, mentioned that DWR will be doing flyovers on the creek this year and will provide more info than LiDAR has had in the past.

10) p. 34 general question: how common is it to use herbicides for weed control? The plan makes it clear that hand or mechanical removal is preferred, then herbicide application is the backup. From a water quality standpoint, I would rather avoid herbicide application if at all possible. Similar questions apply to p. 35, mosquito abatement. Pesticides are used after other methods, but I would like to know how often or how much. There are some water quality issues here. Vector control probably regulates this, but it would be helpful to have information about application of pesticides and herbicides.

Horner asked Lynnel Pollock, Executive Director for the Cache Creek Conservancy (CCC), about the use of herbicides near Cache Creek and would like to avoid the use of herbicides over water.

Pollock explained that the CCC uses both mechanical control and herbicides to remove invasive plants in the creek. Herbicides are not sprayed over the water even though the CCC does have an NPDES permit. Monitoring spraying over water is very costly and this is part of the reason for not spraying over water.

11) p. 36 section 6.4 (monitoring), paragraph 2: I would think monitoring should begin immediately after construction was complete- and not wait until the end of the first growing season. Some of the surveying or LiDAR will be done by the construction crews, but other physical or biological assessment should be done sooner to show exactly how the site looked after construction was complete.

Horner wants to document site conditions after construction and have a very detailed topographic map and vegetation planting plan. He also wants to monitor erosion on site.

Armstrong stated that they usually would do a post construction report.

Horner mentioned that the letter he was submitting highlighted a few other concerns and minor typos and editorial comments that don't need to be discussed at the meeting. His main concern was the elevations of the proposed plan. All of the comments from the County and TAC would be sent to Foothill Associates in order to complete the final document.

Pollock asked what would happen next. When will the final be available?

Schwartz stated that after Foothill Associates made the final changes with the satisfaction of the County, the document would be published and posted on the County website.

6. <u>SET DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS:</u>

Monday, April 14, 2007 10am-12pm

7. <u>ADJOURNMENT:</u> Tim Horner adjourned the meeting at 11:00am.