

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

OVERVIEW

The FloodSAFE program of Department of Water Resources (DWR) is introducing the Central Valley Flood Management Planning (CVFMP) programs with five (5) regional Forums throughout the Central Valley – in Chico, Modesto, Walnut Grove, Las Banos, and West Sacramento. The Forums will present the same information and provide the same discussion opportunities at each location.

Each Forum consists of an initial presentation describing the key elements of FloodSAFE and the CVFMP program. The remainder of the time was dedicated to breakout sessions relating to four CVMFP topic areas. The first Regional Forum was held on June 3, 2009 in Chico, CA for the Upper Sacramento Region. Copies of the Forum presentations, handouts, and materials are available on the CVFMP website at www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp.

A brief recap of the presentations is provided in the following paragraphs and the remainder of this document provides a summary of the small group discussions. Flip charts and worksheets were used to record ideas generated during the discussions and transcripts of the recorded results are incorporated into the summary.

Gary Hester, CVFMP Program Manager, welcomed Regional Forum participants and reviewed the agenda before introducing Ken Kirby (title). Ken provided an overview of FloodSAFE, which is an initiative to (1) improve flood management systems and (2) operations and maintenance, as well as (3) inform and assist the public in flood awareness and (4) improve emergency response. The CVFMP program is a significant FloodSAFE component and Mr. Kirby described the goals, study area, and major products for the CVFMP.

Important CVFMP activities will be to identify and assess the current status of the flood protection system and then develop the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) to improve integrated flood management - for those areas protected by facilities of the State-Federal flood protection system in the Central Valley. The CVFPP will be developed through a broad outreach and engagement process. Options for participating in the CVFPP process include:

- Regional and Valley-wide **Forums** for information sharing and high-level discussions
- Regional and Topic-based **Work Groups** to help develop content for the Plan
- **Outreach, Briefings, and Coordination** with partners, interest groups, and related project, programs, and plans.

After a short question-and-answer period, participants were invited to join a breakout session. The first concurrent sessions addressed either the Regional Conditions Summary Report or the Planning and Engagement Process. The second concurrent sessions focused on Environmental Stewardship or Non-Urban Levee Evaluations.

A summary of the breakout session presentations follows:

- Regional Conditions Summary Report: Gary Hester outlined this report which will describe regional resource conditions. These conditions include: current regional conditions and challenges; flood management needs; and ecosystem conditions. This report will also define goals and objectives for the CVFPP. Content for the report will be developed through a work group, relying on existing information.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

- **Planning and Engagement Approach:** Chris McCready, FloodSAFE Communication Lead, described the proposed CVFMP outreach approach. This involves the Forums, Work Groups, and Outreach, Briefings, and Coordination mentioned in the initial presentation. Another component will be development of the CVFMP website and distribution of information and updates through email and other communication options.
- **Environmental Stewardship:** Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Office Chief for Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources, provided a working definition for the concept of Environmental Stewardship along with goals for a stewardship approach. A work group will be convened to help identify how Environmental Stewardship will be incorporated into the Regional Conditions Summary Report, the CVFPP itself, and the multi-species and floodplain conservation strategy (a CVFPP component).
- **Non-Urban Levee Evaluation:** Mike Inamine, Office Chief for Levee Repairs and Floodplain Management, described the proposal and timeline for conducting physical levee inspections for non-urban levees. The next activities, for 2009, would consist of crest explorations for project (and associated non-project) levees that protect communities of 5,000 people or more. In 2010, crest and toe borings (where needed) would be undertaken on the remaining levees that protect communities of 1,000 or more people. Additional exploration locations would be identified on the basis of criteria – for example, levees that protect critical infrastructure or small legacy communities, or levees with damage sites.

After the breakout sessions concluded, participants reconvened to hear next steps and closing remarks. Those who are interested in serving on either a regional or topic-based workgroup were encouraged to contact (provide contact information here).

Following the dinner break, the initial presentation was repeated during an evening session – to maximize participation opportunities for those who could not attend the afternoon session.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION (AFTERNOON SESSION) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q. When talking about the description of the system and its performance and risk, are you looking at the system as designed to keep water off of people's property or are you about it in a larger sense?
- A. The work to date on the floodplain systems status report is focusing on the state and federal levee systems. Addressing the improvements of the system is part of the plan that we are starting right now.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: REGIONAL CONDITIONS SUMMARY REPORT

- Q.: The maps show the entire watershed, but you mention "the system." Does this only apply to the state plan of flood control?
- A: We are evaluating the entire "study area" including areas outside of the state plan of flood control.
- Q: Do we have an idea of the hourly commitment for workgroups, or what time the meetings will be held?
- A: We'd probably be looking at as much as 40 hours per month. We'll make every effort to minimize travel time and use web-based meetings as much as possible. Typically, the work groups will meet during the day. The idea is that these workgroups will not be in perpetuity, but it will be a fairly concentrated effort.
- Q: Are you looking for specific expertise or geographic expertise?
- A. We will try to limit the groups to 25. We want to establish the groups with a range of expertise (local gov, RDs, etc). We have a fairly simple application that includes who they represent, what experience they have, and a few references.
- A: Workgroups are just one of the options available to provide comments. People are busy and if they can't meet in a workgroup, there will be plenty of other opportunities to keep you informed and allow you to provide input.
- Q: You mention the regional work group and subject-specific work groups. Any sense of what the time allocation will be?
- A: We recognize that there is already quite a bit of information available from groups like the Sacramento River Workgroup. We want to make sure that this information is brought to the CVFPP workgroups and summarized for everyone. We don't want to "recreate the wheel." We'll continue to meet with the interest groups as they develop. If we can, we want to take advantage of existing processes as much as possible.
- Q: Are you coordinating with BDCP?
- A. They have a more aggressive timeline than us, but within DWR we are making sure that there is coordination going on. Steve Bradley, with DWR, is in charge of coordination efforts.
- Q: I'm think specifically in terms of Environmental Assessments.
- A: Right. Don't want to recreate the wheel.
- Q: What is the intertie between water supply and flood control?
- A: The legislation asks us as part of the plan to evaluate "multi-objective" projects that have a water supply component, even though our focus is flood control. That interconnection is key.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

- Q: If a city or RD commits staff to the work groups, will they be reimbursed for that?
- A: DWR can provide reimbursement for travel expenses, but not time. We're seeking volunteers, like in the Water Plan.
- A: The input DWR would like today is based on the draft scope of work for the regional condition report. We will pass out the scope, have you look at it, and respond to several questions. We will have note takers for each group and then ask you to report back. This is not intended to be a consensus seeking process.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: PLANNING AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

- Q. Do you see interest-based groups participating in the work groups or the Forum? Will they have input or just review?
- A. We see them as hybrid of both. They would be part of the information dialog and understanding the perspective of that group. It might be possible to focus participation through an existing group. This is an adaptive system that we will work whatever process seems best.
- Q. 2012 is an aggressive schedule – interested based groups have a fine line to walk. Involving groups can slow processes down; on the other hand, if they are not involved, it could be tricky in terms of support for outcomes.
- A. It is important to emphasize that we have laid out a systematic process and we are not starting from scratch. We are going to create a list of document input and we will be asking the public to review that list and let us know if there are other things to consider – we will be leveraging those.
- Q. I am confused about the abbreviations: CVFMP v. CVFPP.
- A. We have wrestled with that ourselves. CVFMP is the overarching effort within FloodSAFE, and that is what we are talking about broadly. CVFPP is the specific document and this is a key deliverable of the process. The plan is a document that the mandate requires us to put together. And the CVFPB is the Board.

Suggestion: Provide a readily accessible list of abbreviations – post on the website and have at public meetings.

- Q. We have FloodSAFE as an initiative, not an entity. There are activities and programs related to that initiative. The planning program is new to me. Are levee assessments a part of this?
- A: FloodSAFE does have organized programs under that umbrella. The levee assessment program is broken into two groups: urban and non-urban. These are part of FloodSAFE.
- Q. At what point will you be engaging local governments and Boards of supervisors in the plan?
- A. We do want to work with them. The individuals at the county- or city-level that work on flood have been invited to the Forums. We will probably go out in 6-8 months to present local governments with information at their board meetings. We will be explaining how this is relevant to local entities. We will be actively engaging them.
- A. We are trying to let them know now what is happening and invite them to participate. As we get closer to having draft documents, we will have a road show to make presentations and give them additional details.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

Q: With regard to the work groups, why isn't a hydrology update a workgroup?

A: We identified the initial work groups – there will be more. Environmental Stewardship will focus on the goals at first and then they will break into more specific items. Some work groups will be more technical, others will be less technical. Please go onto our registry – on our website there is a partner registry link and we can help you focus your attention to what you are interested in.

A: We are getting to the topics that we have to cover first – hydrology is something that we can wait a little longer to begin because of the deliverables

Q: Will an environmental document be required?

A: We think that an environmental compliance document may be required for Board to adopt the plan. It may be a programmatic document – but we don't have specifics yet.

Q: How are your studies going to affect the FEMA flood insurance rate maps?

A: We are not competing with FEMA. We do have an evaluation program where we are working with FEMA and the Corps to update the models. We have better topography than we have ever had and that could lead to more floodplains. We are required to develop 200 year floodplain maps. Five consultant teams are working on the mapping. With the budget, we are not proceeding as quickly as we had hoped - but we are moving along.

Q: You talked about having private meetings with interest-based groups. How will the rest of the stakeholder know what their input is to the process?

A: We will be meeting with groups that have broad representation. Every deliverable that we produce will be made available for review and comment: we are doing meeting summaries; and you will see what is in the plan. We are not going to report and record every item from every meeting. We are committed to having this be an open process and part of that may be some narrowly focused conversations. If you know of a group that we should talk to, let us know and we will be happy to engage them and talk to them.

Q. We are concerned with interface between this planning effort and the Bay Delta. It doesn't appear that there is a lot of communication back and forth with these processes. There are strategies out there that appear to have potential impacts on flood aspects. While you are on a time frame for 2012, they are on a fast time frame. These Forums are a positive step for outreach. What about more communication within the Department and with the methyl-mercury planning effort?

A: (Chris McCready) You raise a great point. We have heard this and we understand and agree. The challenge is that there are a lot of large efforts going on right now, each with their own timeline. Part of my job is to try and get the word out and, within DWR.

(Steve Bradley) We know we still have a long way to go regarding communication between the different programs. We are working to find multiple venues for putting programs in touch with one another. I think that you will see evidence that we are trying to fix that.

Q: State law requires General Plan amendments to comply with this document.

A: The requirement is to incorporate the contents of the Plan, not to comply. There is no regulatory content in this plan.

Q. Will this plan affect local land use?

A: The plan will not, but the legislation does – in that 200-year (or greater) protection must be in place no later to 2015 to allow additional development in urban or urbanizing areas. This plan is to help local planners do that. The regulatory element is in the law.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

Q: Because of the implications of this plan, a detailed new process to engage new jurisdiction will be required. You are planning on going to a local jurisdiction on Tuesday night and that is when the baseball championship is. You need a set plan for how both large and small jurisdictions will be engaged, spelling out what you are going to do and what the options are to provide chances for input and involvement. Create a detailed and uniform plan for working with local jurisdictions.

A: We have developed the planning and engagement plan that is detailed here. This will be on the web and it provides flexible options – everyone that is interested will have multiple opportunities to be engaged.

Q: For hydrology, what we are doing for the 2012 is based on what has already been done. There is another effort to update hydrology for 2015 – and I know that consulting firms have been hired.

A: Yes. We have a number of people working on the levee evaluations, including 5 teams of contractors. We have a contract with the Corps to update hydrology as well. We chose to decouple the CVFPP from the hydrology because of the timing. The hydrology work is being done by contractors and DWR – they are focusing on the topography. We will have working groups on that as well, and we will have public input.

Q: Please expand on the FEMA process and their workshops. Are they related to CVFMP?

A: FEMA is independent of this effort, with its own mission and schedule. They are updating the flood insurance rate maps. They have their own policies that they follow. They are contributing funding to the levee evaluation. We are in the process of updating data on the levees and they are going ahead of this information. It is different data from what we are using. For example, FEMA does not have access to the LIDAR data which will be completed in 2012. This is an imaging technology that allows us to create digital models with 1-foot contours.

Q: You are using five major consultants, where we would like to be engaged in this program especially in the Delta and the Central Valley. There is a cost for us to be engaged – will there be opportunities down the road for small business?

A: We have 5 teams of contractors. Probably every consulting firm that has anything to do with flood is involved in some way. So actually there are 100s of contractors and there will be additional opportunities in the future – although it's unlikely for many opportunities in the near future. The statewide flood managing planning forum that we have been awaiting has still not rolled out.

Suggestion: The State Water Plan has a weekly e-news that I find helpful; it reminds you of recent and upcoming events. Provide a weekly summary along those lines.

Q: What will be the make up of the work groups?

A: DWR staff and consultants will work on the groups. No group will have more than 25 people, so that we can get work done. We will proceed to do that work either with or without outside participation, but we want outside participation.

Q: Will work groups be facilitated?

A: They will be, as needed. The regional work groups will definitely be facilitated.

Comment: My experience is that you need to have it facilitated. It will go faster you will get there quicker than having technical people sitting around trying to figure it out

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

Written comments received at the end of the breakout session (and not included in flipcharts):

- for the most part, key elements of planning and engagement are covered; not sure how outreach will be done to some interest groups – e.g. native tribes
- I see an opportunity to be involved in a topical work group, or attending forums; also, website very help to keep on top of current affairs, review draft documents, etc.
- the key elements are covered broadly, the key is broadly; without a more detailed process, it is impossible to tell how well planning and engagement is covered, for example:
 - State law requires local jurisdictions to amend their General Plan and zoning ordinances to comply with the CVFPP, IIRC. A detailed, uniform process for engaging local jurisdictions should be developed and vetted by counsel. More than just a “road show” will be necessary at some point in the future. Local jurisdictions will be very interested on how this affects them.
 - If the plan is going to have any significant effect on land use, it will be considered discretionary. Therefore, it will require an environmental impact analysis and document (CEQA, maybe even NEPA depending on what federal approvals will be required.)
- it is not clear how the CVFPP development process will interface with the BDCP process that is also being run by DWR, but is on a faster time line; some conceptual strategies currently being proposed by BDCP appear to have potential implications and/or impacts on flood protection
- Yolo County will definitely be engaged and involved in this process
- provide information about the Central Valley Flood Planning Hydrology Update. Who is doing what? When will it be shared with all stakeholders?
- who are the participants in the work groups?
- from a small business (consulting) perspective, I am trying to stay engaged in the CVFMP process; want to be involved in a work group as an expert and would like to know what the costs might be and potential opportunities in the future
- can the website and information sharing be expanded to allow questions to be submitted and responses posted? perhaps a FAQs section or best questions section?

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

(from flipcharts)

Thoughts and comments on the definition of Environmental Stewardship

- what is “sustainable”
- sustainability should include funding, as well as resource use
- what does “available” mean? – is available regardless of whether or not it is in a healthy condition?
- “available” is not working – “functional” or “healthy” instead; or “healthy/viable condition”
- “available” implies a use value; the environment is more than a use value
- suggestion: uncouple the definition from “future generations”
- take out “responsibility” – “commitment” means that you are responsible for it, why add extra words? fewer words clarifies the statement
- can anything be ensured?
- definition should include education → a commitment to education

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

- focus on natural and manmade systems and functional connections; manage the functions and values
- add: protection and restoration
- add “improve” or “enhance”
- need to define “manage”
 - who will be managing, or improving, or enhancing?
- somehow capture the notion of the tremendous “ecosystem services” provided by the natural resources

Thoughts and comments on the proposed Scope of Work

- use statements rather than questions
- this is clear, but daunting
- could end up with a laundry list of “key” areas; may want “top 5” or “top 10” or “top 500”
- how and when will the goals be integrated into the individual levee activities? (follow-up task)
- be aware of other local effort (key topic areas)
- principle add in: always consider other local processes
- environmental stewardship work group members should attend Regional Forums
- what is the scale of this plan?
 - engagement depends on scale; restoration depends on scale
- prioritization of environmental stewardship projects for funding
- this is a challenging and worthwhile scope - is the timeline of 3-6 months too tight?
- need to determine weighting of flood control v. environmental stewardship
 - no good answer
 - how do you get enough of both?
 - synergy possibilities
- need to include “multiple-use” language
 - under principles or topic areas or goals/objectives
- how and when should the goals and objectives be integrated (mandated?) into local jurisdictions’ land use policies and project decisions (approvals/denials)?

Thoughts and comments on the Measures of Success

- the measure of success is direct dialogue
- compliance with local, state, and federal ordinances, goals, acts, and laws
- buy-in from stakeholders
 - environmental
- change the question – don’t begin with risk

Written comments received at the end of the breakout session (and not included in flipcharts):

- by the way, this session was overly directed by staff to their burning questions answered; this was not the case in the first session – therefore, the results shown on flipcharts are somewhat biased
- I don’t see the guiding principles expanding more than the definition, because there may be conflicts between the natural resources being “stewarded.”
- native v. non-native?
- who pays?; finding a funding source

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

- what management structure; what level of government management?
- is there a flood control tradeoff with environmental stewardship? no tradeoff between flood control and environmental stewardship
- question is to decouple flood control needs by providing a mechanism that establishes environment as a sustaining, stand-alone function of the state
- if an HCP/NCCP is the mechanism, the goals and objectives should be considered in the drafting
- who, what , when – and justification
- what level of detail?
- regarding inclusion of goals and objectives into the Regional Conditions report: these should be regionally specific, there should also be a piece to look at neighboring regions together; for example, salmon need certain conditions for spawning in the Upper Sacramento watershed – however, they also need Lower Sacramento conditions to be within a range of flows, temps...These conditions for salmon span multiple regions and should be included in the larger report or consistently integrated into the regional reports.
- you should get academic people involved in this process
- give examples of principles; give examples for Measures of Success

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: NON-URBAN LEVEE EVALUATION

Q: Why will there only be crest borings during the initial phase?

A: There will be some toe borings based on geomorphology, and additional boring in Phase 2.

Q: The WSEL is based on original design. Are you doing any sediment analysis or bathymetry surveys?

A: We will be looking at the original WSEL. Some channels are scoured, others have sediment deposits. Where channel capacity may be reduced, we're looking at the design cue.

Q: How do we get information to DWR on where to do borings?

A: We've done one round of interviews with Local Maintaining Agencies. I would suggest getting it to Amid Bonnatel (sp??). All of our areas are split into regions.

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION (EVENING SESSION) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: Are there any other avenues for comment besides web-based? We could post this in the public library.

A: One way would be to come to these types of meetings. We are making every effort to work with people other ways. There is no problem with copying and mailing them.

A: Each document will be very iterative. By the time we get to the draft CVFPP, everyone will have all already seen them to some extent.

Q: Because of the budget, everyone is being impacted. Are you having any difficulties finding local cost share partners?

A: We aren't required to cost share with locals for this plan. However, when we start implementing things we do need a cost share partner. This could delay projects.

Q: I like the idea of work groups and would like to join. I'm not sure if the levee issue is an O&M issue or an overall levee performance issue?

A: Levee performance would be more of the focus for a workgroup.

CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009

Q: My HOA said that there would be new floodplain maps available, but we haven't seen any. Is there any sense of when FEMA will be finished? Our insurance premiums will increase as a result.

A: It hasn't been very frequent in the past. We work with FEMA closely, and know that they have a published schedule. This is a separate effort from ours. When the maps are changed, it's typically because they have new information. **We can get that information to you.**

Q: Regarding the slide on 2017 and beyond. This point on habitat and other resources, I don't see agriculture in there anywhere!

A: On the first sentence, it says "provide the appropriate level of protection throughout the system." You're included in there.

Comment: I would really appreciate it if agriculture was mentioned specifically. It's also important for people to realize that the Sacramento River system is the most volatile in the entire US. The ratio of floodflows to area is greater in the Sacramento River Valley than anywhere else in the entire U.S. It's 20 times greater than in the Mississippi River Valley.

Comment: We've developed urban areas and a lot of agriculture that needs to be protected. It's not only important for the area, but for the whole country. Agriculture should be mentioned specifically. I would also like an agricultural work group.

Comment: Finally, I would like to commend you for getting the word out. It's an Important effort!

Response: We can do that. Regarding work groups, we have levee performance which should cover agricultural activities. If we determine we need an agricultural group, we can certainly add one.

Response: Also, we mention it in the Regional Conditions work group information. We would like someone from agriculture to join that work group.

Q: In terms of workgroup commitment, how much time are we talking about?

A: Up to 40 hours a month, meeting 3 or 4 times a month for the Regional Condition work group. It could be less for the topic workgroups. All work groups are likely to last about 6 months. If you don't think you can handle the time commitment for a work group, let us know what your interests are and we will make sure you have an avenue for involvement.

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

ATTENDANCE

Kazeem Alabi, CalTrans
Leslie Albright, DHCCP
Chris Altendorf, Army Corps of Engineers
Rob Aragon, Conaway Ranch/RD 2035
Marieke Armstrong, Mead and Hung
Lewis Bair, RD 108
James Beresford, owner
Michael Bessette, West Sacramento
Fran Borcalli, local resident
Debbie Boethling, DWR
George Booth, Sacramento County
Nathan Burley, UC Davis
Nick Burton, Stanislaus County
Angeless Caliso, CVFPB
Regina Cherovsky, RD 2035
Dennis Clark, local resident
Joe Countryman, MBK
Cliff Covey, Solano County
Larry Dacus, MBK Engineering
Sara Denzler, DWR
Paul Devereux, RD 1000
Gregg Ellis, Jones and Stokes
Rose Ann Ellis, local resident
Tom Ellis, local resident
Mike Engelmann, DWR
Tom Engler, MBK
Jesus Esparza, DWR
Gary Estes, local resident
Diane Fales, RD 1001
Erik Fauselau, PB
Steve Fordice, RD 784
Bill Forrest, City of Galt
Dan Fua, CVFPB
Vince Geronimo, PWA
Mark Gilbert, ENGEO
Mike Hardesty, RD 2068
Vinion Hawkins, Sierra Holdings
Marc Hoshovsky, DWR
Brian Keating, Placer County Flood
Tim Kerr, ARFCD
Susan Korec, HJW
Robin Kulakow, Yolo Basin Foundation
Paula Landis, DWR
Mary Lasell, local resident
Stefan Lorenzato, YCFCWCD
Peter Masson, SWCA
Darren Mack, SAGE Engineers
Julia McIver, Yolo County
Doug Moore, West Yost Associates
Derek Morley, URS

**CVFMP Lower Sacramento Regional Forum – Comment Summary
West Sacramento, CA – June 10, 2009**

Dave Mraz, DWR
Ken Myers, Brown and Caldwell
Ingrid Norgaard, Jones and Stokes
Dennis Nunn, RD 830
Connie Perkins, City of Sacramento
Michael Peterson, Sacramento County DWR
John Pritchard, Wood Rodgers
Jay Punia, CVFPB
Erica Rodriguez, Assemblyman Yamada's Office
Ken Ruzich, RD 900
Jim Schaaf, Schaaf and Wheeler
Chris Scobba, DWR
David Shabazian, RD 2035
Cott Seamons, HC
Jackie Shutters, URS
Charles Tang, local resident
Curt Taras, CVFPB
Susan Tatayon, The Nature Conservancy
Don Trieu, MBK
Tim Washburn, SAFCA
Matt Weber, Winzler and Kelly
Terri Wegener, DWR/DPLA
Warren Westrup, Yolo County
Dan Whisman, DWR
David Williams, CVFPB
Joo Chai Wong, CVFPB
Sterling York, DWR
Kip Young, DWR
Kerit Zenobia, DWT