GRANITE CONSTRUCTION INCORPORATED

April 1, 2010

Heidi Tschudin
Kevin Schwartz, Kent Reeves
Yolo County Parks and Resources Department
120 W. Main Street, Suite C
Woodland, Ca. 95695

RE: Response to TAC Comment Letters March 8, 2010 Meeting

Heidi,
Our project team has reviewed the letters submitted by the TAC members after the public hearing on March 8th and have prepared the following responses.

1. Eric Larsen, Geomorphology TAC member. We appreciate Eric's input and concerns. We have attached the HEC RAS table he requested in item#2 as well as a 100 yr. water surface profile in the vicinity of the Esparto Bridge. We believe, with this attachment and based on his letter dated March 14, 2010 that we have adequately addressed his questions.

2. Tim Horner, TAC Hydrologist member. We appreciate Tim's input and based on his letter dated March 12, 2010 believe he is comfortable that the Project meets the guidelines of the CCRMP and CCAP. We offer two clarifications to the discussion in the letter. First under Question #3 Granite representatives agreed that concrete would be used as the core of the berm and then faced with natural **on-site cobbles** for a better cosmetic look. (This is the same treatment that has been used for prior stabilization projects on the adjacent property) These notes will be added to the plan. Second, we are submitting, as an attachment, copies of the Slope Stability Reports by Wallace Kuhl and Assoc., Inc. dated 2007 and 2001. These reports are referenced in note #9 on the Streambank Stabilization Plan Title Sheet and provide the geotechnical data and construction methodology requested by the Department of Conservation. With the submittal of this data we believe that all of Tim's concerns have been addressed.

3. Erik Ringelberg, TAC Biologist member. We also appreciate Erik's input to the proposed project though it appears based on his letter dated March 11, 2010 he may still be unclear as to what the project is. At the bottom of Page 1 he states that "The intent of the CCRMP's test 3 line does appear to be met by the overall plan." We agree.
After the quote from section 2.4-12 Erik seems to infer that the re-vegetation component of the plans is an "afterthought" which is not accurate. Granite Construction Company has fully embraced the overall goals of the CCRMP including the restoration of riparian vegetation and increasing the site's habitat values. Erik raises four issues that we hope to address.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA OPERATING GROUP
8950 Cal Center Drive, Suite 201
Sacramento, CA 95826
916-855-8840, Fax 916-855-8885

Issue # 1. There is nothing in the submitted plans that identifies the required and stated consistency with previous re-vegetation plans.

The plans contain General Notes on the Title page 1of 3. Note #2 states "All work shall conform to …, the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan, ...". Additionally, this portion of bank stabilization is proposed to be the same as those previously approved. We are attaching the 2001 Habitat Restoration Plan which includes the 1995 section relative to the creekside area for your review. We are happy to include this as additional detail to be referenced in the conditions of approval.

Issue #2. The site specific Technical Studies specifically appear to exclude this area, in particular, the Habitat Restoration and Landscape visual screening Plan (2007) and the biological assessment (2007; attachment d. pg. 7.). I was not able to assess the consistency with the previous re-vegetation plans or site specific requirements that might be more suitable for this site and the proposed Streambank Stabilization activities.

The 2007 plans Erik references do in fact exclude this area and are pertinent to the adjacent Off-channel mining proposal. This Streambank Stabilization Plan can be implemented as part of the CCRMP implementation of the Test 3 line as proposed whether or not the adjacent mining project is approved.

Issue # 3. Staged native soils stockpiled at depths greater than a couple of feet (or typical rooting depth) can lose the important soil structure and organic material composition fairly quickly. Backfilling these cells and recreating the soil horizons as soon as practicable will be much more successful in restoring this site. In addition, there appears to be no re-vegetation plan provided, these provisions would be beneficial in achieving the stated project goals.

Perhaps there was some misunderstanding of how and when the project would be implemented. In order to provide clarification please consider the following process:

1. The berm shown on the South portion of the plan (i.e., the Test 3 line) would be constructed first. Included in this stage would be the construction of the keyway including the concrete rubble and facing with on-site cobble material. The remainder of the berm would be planted with the purple needle grass and creeping wild rye.
2. As B-horizon soil becomes available from overburden removal in the mining phases the area north of the berm (which would now be outside the floodplain) would be filled from West to East to the grade established by the 100 yr. flood elevation as shown in the hydraulics study cross sections. This material would not be "staged" in stockpiles prior to placement. This material would be placed as required by the geotechnical report for the site as specified for levee construction and sloped at between 1 and 2% toward the North into the toe of the existing high bank. Any and all areas that are disturbed during the construction season would be covered with grasses prior to November 1st each year. Once a cell is completed (between the existing spur dikes) the area would be planted

with the proposed planting palette as listed on the plans. The re-vegetation plan is the planting list provided on the plans planted as per Note #2 of the Title sheet.

Issue #4. The CCRMP has several specific requirements (Performance standards) that must be met for re-vegetation:

PS 4.5-6 Dense vegetation.....

Because this is a transition area and the main low flow channel is currently on the North side of the creek it would be inappropriate to try to establish dense vegetation at this location in the coarse grained streambed material. Perhaps in time after the meander works its way East and the area is a cut off this type of vegetation may establish at the toe of the bank. Granite will provide a secure source of irrigation for the plantings to ensure an adequate supply of water for the area.

PS 4.5-9 All plant materials should.....

All plant materials have been and will be purchased thru Cornflower Farms and we believe they have been the Native plant supplier for most of the restoration efforts and materials along Cache Creek.

PS 4.5-14 (b) Trees and shrubs.....

Planting will be in accordance with these criteria.

PS 4.5-15(a) Trees and shrubs shall be planted in clusters of six (6) to seven (7) individuals.....

Planting will be in conformance with these criteria.

Since the above cited Performance Standards are a part of the CCRMP we believe that Note #2 on the Title Sheet of the plans incorporates them by reference but we would not object if they were included as conditions with the exception of PS 4.5-6 for the stated reason.

With the inclusion of the above information in the record we ask that the TAC make the finding of consistency requested by County staff. We appreciate the time and consideration that the committee and staff have taken to help improve this project for the benefit of the Creek.

Sincerely,

Ben Adamo
Plant Operations and Permitting Coordinator
Granite Construction Company