

## Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – February 14, 2002

Approximately 25 people attended the special meeting of the TAC, called to discuss the issues involved with a boundary change and/or new definition of the outer area. Chair Anjanette Martin and Vice Chair Stacy Cepello opened the meeting with discussion on the draft “Sacramento River Conservation Area-Background” paper. The document was drafted in response to a request by SRCA Chair Ben Carter. Stacy asked the Committee to review the paper again and offer any suggestions. During the discussion that followed several points were made:

- Because of the confusion some had with the content it was noted the document should include language that emphasized it is a historical document.
- the references to floodline, floodplain, and meanderbelt were confusing and the language should be clarified. (Stacy noted, for consistency it is the 100-year floodplain as defined by FEMA)
- It was noted that over \$300 Mil has been spent on fish screens that started with this program; there are a lot of pieces to this program and many have been of benefit to agriculture.
- Question whether there should be a separate, broader document that included more information starting with the 1989 plan, and how much of the work from that plan has been completed, to the Advisory Council, up to the present.
- The reference to “agricultural practices that were compatible with maintaining a viable riparian corridor” should be reversed to indicate that habitat is compatible with agriculture.

It was determined that Stacy will expand and amend the existing document to reflect the suggested changes and will bring the revised paper to the February 21<sup>st</sup> TAC meeting for review before forwarding to the Board. The expanded document will give the Board as much information as possible on the program’s history to help with their determinations on the issues before them.

Discussion was opened on the Conservation Area and the direction from the Board to (1)examine the consequences if the outer boundary is removed, and to make recommendations to address those consequences or (2) leave the Conservation Area as it is currently in the Handbook and re-define the area as an “Agricultural Land Conservation/Preservation Area” as directed by the Board earlier. One question raised was whether there would be a change in representation on the Board if the boundary is removed because of language in the Bylaws which reads “Directors representing landowners must reside on, own, or manage property in the Conservation Area, as described in the Handbook. Henry Rodegerdts agreed to review the language in the Bylaws. The Committee reviewed the draft “Comparison of SRCA – With and Without Outer River Area” and focused on three critical issues from that document that would be impacted by removal of the boundary (1) area of oversight becomes ambiguous (3) what area are projects subject to review and (9) how to define eligibility. Discussion followed:

- Conversion will continue and questions were raised as to whether or not agencies/private organizations will continue to come forward with projects.
- Some felt removal of the boundary would result in only non-controversial projects coming to the Board.
- Removal of the boundary leaves ambiguous, gray area that is very difficult to work with; now there is early input and agencies are at the table.

- Restoration includes projects other than planting trees – includes winter flooding for wildlife and others.
- It was noted that the agencies have their own checks and balances. State or federal funds that are to be spent on acquisitions require public notification – through the federal register and to all impacted parties.

It was recommended that if the outer boundary is removed, for purposes of project review/tracking and Board member eligibility, the 100-year FEMA floodplain be used in Reach 1 & 2, and within the project levees in Reach 3 & 4. This recommendation would address the eligibility and project review issues that will be impacted with certainty if the boundary is removed. This would also help to clarify and define “near the river”. Discussion will continue on the other issues on the “With/Without” document and some are being addressed in the PILT/Econ and Landowners Assurances Committees. Tom Evans, FWA, noted some objections to the language in the document and will forward suggested changes prior to the next TAC meeting.

There is also a need to determine whether or not the MOA/By-laws will have to be re-initiated if a change is made to the Conservation Area. Burt also noted a possible name change is being considered by the Executive Committee.

The next TAC meeting will be on February 21<sup>st</sup>, 9:00 a.m., Willows City Hall, Willows