

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1600**

February 12, 2021

Directors Present: Michele Clark, Nick Zanotti, Becky Yeung (attended by zoom)

Directors Absent: None

Others Present: James Nolan (Recording Secretary), and attending by zoom,
Kyle Lang, District Manager,
Tina Anderson & Ric Reinhardt, both of MBK Engineers

Pursuant to the foregoing consent and the notice thereof, duly and regularly posted and given to all members of the Board of Trustees, and by-laws of said District, a special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Reclamation District No. 1600 was called to order by Michele Clark, on February 12, 2021, via zoom/conference call in the office of Gardner, Janes, Nakken, Hugo & Nolan, 429 First Street, Woodland, California.

Information Item on Bypass Widening.

Ric Reinhardt presented his outline of DWR widening the Yolo Bypass in RD 1600. Why would the District want to pursue this? Infrastructure – the levees are old and are starting to fail; there is no replacement plan; the State does not want to continue to fund repairs. Bypass was clamshell buckets over the river dredging sands for the levee. Slips and erosion sites indicate system is starting to fail.

Corps of Engineers is backing out of maintaining. State won't want to take responsibility for the levees.

Where do we want District to be going forward? Active discussion on water capacity throughout the Bypass. Lower Elkhorn had a pitched battle to get the final configuration. Proposal was originally twice as large. Final result is a pretty good project.

RD 1600: Aged infrastructure- threat or an opportunity?

This paper lays out what Ric Reinhardt has heard from Trustees on the issues facing the District. All setting stage for what are property owner/farmer issues. Ric believes the District could position itself to be a leader going forward with the project and have more of a say in the outcome.

CVFP Plan would provide improved governance, strengthen regional coordination. Lower Sac Delta North regional planning groups (LSDN) has 6 regional groups in Delta. Fragmented flood control governance. Elkhorn Basin had 4 agencies -RD 1600, RD 785, RD 82, RD 537. Three are now consolidated. In a basin whoever has lowest level of maintenance is weakest link and controls the integrity of the basin. LAFCO- outlined consolidation of basins. If bypass widened in RD 1600- makes sense consolidating with RD 537. If project goes forward what does RD 1600 look like as a stand-alone agency, or is it a joint powers authority, or some other form of consolidation.

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1600**

Michele Clark recalls that this project was discussed starting in 2011, and then sort of evaporated. The configurations : figure 5-7, see attached. General Reevaluation Report by Army Corps of Engineers. These proposals are not what RD 1600 owners wanted in 2011.

Alignment- purple- takes a huge chunk of RD 1600. Justification is that in the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (intent) was that 25% of land acquired will go into wildlife habitat. In the Lower Elkhorn, because landowners opposed the project the State bought the lands in fee.

Ric believes the State has no intention of taking on Operation and Maintenance of new levee, so RD 1600 would have same extent of levee to maintain with one-half or less of land to assess. State doesn't want to take on Operation and Maintenance because of increased environmental restriction, increased costs and lack of appropriations.

Becky Yeung, Why doesn't the State just take the whole area of RD 1600?

See last page of MBK paper.

Alternatives that RD 1600 could determine: sell, flowage easement, habitat, ability to farm. State wants to put more land in habitat. Ric Reinhardt thinks there is an insufficient recognition of what agriculture does in that respect. Backlash after Lower Elkhorn is probably going to affect future projects. Flood control agencies aren't concerned with agriculture, so water supply concerns of ag are not contemplated. Ric attempted to frame issues that need to be explored so Trustees can give Ric topics to add.

Becky Yeung: This reinforces her concerns that RD 1600 needs to be in the driver seat so issues of concern get addressed.

Michele Clark: Who would get finalized copy of paper? Copies to: Steve Rothert at DWR, Gary Bandini at SAFCA, Elisa Sabbatini at Yolo County, with RD 537 be keep apprised.

Ric Reinhardt will get edits in 2 weeks and at March Board Meeting consider action. If threat, and don't want to enable, then stop work. If you share Ric Reinhardt's concerns, and want to be active, then pass resolution and form steering committee. Lay out how project could be done in such a way that District and County could get behind and be supportive. He does not expect implementation in 5 years, depends on money, 7-10 years for decision, CEQA, and appraisals.

Michele Clark asks how do we convey info to other landowners? Doing it by Zoom is difficult; it is important to keep the landowners informed. Maybe after the steering committee meets once or twice, then come back to landowners and get them engaged and involved. These issues are complex and challenging

Nick Zanotti: David's idea and desire to be done hasn't changed.

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1600**

Ric's experience is that it is very difficult to get landowners engaged. Best efforts get info out there, invite them to Board Meetings, etc. Ric has asked comments on his memo before March meeting.

Michele Clark asked Tina, are we doing Prop 218 in March? Yes.

Becky Yeung, Really a good idea to get in front of it. In Lower Elkhorn it was not fun. Just got served, so going to litigation at this point. District here is not leaning toward a specific option, just info. Add this as an agenda item to continue the conversation.

Kyle Lang, feels that we should pursue to be on the front end of the conversation Ric agrees that landowners such as TeVelde, work is impacted so need to have him involved

JVN - keep conversation going let Board of Supervisors know.

CLOSED SESSION- FISH PASSAGE PROJECT
DISCUSS RESPONSE TO DWR

There being no further business to come before the meeting, upon motion duly made, second, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Nolan, Secretary