

CHAPTER 23

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Federal, state, local agencies and other interested parties have participated in the CEQA and NEPA process leading to the development of the Proposed Yuba Accord presented in this Draft EIR/EIS. During preparation of this Draft EIR/EIS, YCWA and Reclamation consulted with resource specialists, agencies with specific expertise in key resource issues, and members of the public. These consultations assisted YCWA and Reclamation in determining the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS, identifying the range of alternatives and environmental protection and mitigation measures, and defining impact significance. Consultation included public meetings, informal agency communications, and formal interagency meetings. YCWA and Reclamation will continue to solicit public and agency input on the project by encouraging review of this Draft EIR/EIS. This chapter summarizes public involvement efforts and agency consultation conducted during the project planning and environmental review process. Signatories and participants in development of the Proposed Yuba Accord include:

- ❑ Yuba County Water Agency
- ❑ Bureau of Reclamation
- ❑ California Department of Water Resources
- ❑ California Department of Fish and Game
- ❑ National Marine Fisheries Service
- ❑ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ❑ South Yuba River Citizens League
- ❑ Browns Valley Irrigation District
- ❑ Dry Creek Mutual Water Company
- ❑ Friends of the River
- ❑ The Bay Institute
- ❑ Trout Unlimited
- ❑ Brophy Water District
- ❑ Ramirez Water District
- ❑ South Yuba Water District
- ❑ Wheatland Water District
- ❑ Hallwood Irrigation Company

23.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Scoping is used under both CEQA and NEPA to determine the focus and content of an EIR or EIS. Scoping is required by NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1501.7), and is described as “an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying significant issues related to the proposed action.” Under CEQA, scoping is optional and may be conducted as part of early public consultation for a project, although scoping is required when a CEQA lead agency prepares a joint EIR/EIS with a federal agency.

The main objective of the scoping process is to provide the public and potentially affected resource agencies with information on the proposed project and to solicit public input regarding the issues and concerns to be evaluated in the environmental documentation. The scoping process is intended to provide the lead agencies with information regarding the range of actions, alternatives, resource issues, and mitigation measures that are to be analyzed in depth in the EIR/EIS, and to eliminate from detailed study those issues found not to be significant.

The following is a summary of the public involvement activities, including public informational and environmental process scoping meetings, for the project that have occurred to date. These activities are discussed in greater detail in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord Public Scoping Summary Report, which may be obtained from YCWA and Reclamation.

23.1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SCOPING

The formal scoping process for the Proposed Yuba Accord began on June 20, 2005 with publication of the NOI in the Federal Register (pursuant to NEPA), distribution of a press release by Reclamation, and publication of announcements in the Appeal Democrat, Marysville Herald, and The Sacramento Bee.

Also on June 20, 2005, an NOP for the Proposed Yuba Accord was filed with the State Clearinghouse (pursuant to CEQA) and YCWA posted its own version of the Reclamation press release on its website. An announcement was published in the legal notices section of the Appeal-Democrat on June 21, 2005. The NOI and NOP were mailed to more than 900 individuals, interest groups, and other organizations. Comments were received and recorded during the 30-day scoping period, which extended through July 20, 2005. Two public meetings were held during the scoping period, as further described below.

23.1.2 SCOPING MEETINGS AND COMMENTS

YCWA and Reclamation held four public scoping meetings during the scoping period; two sessions were held in Sacramento, California on July 19, 2005 and two sessions were held in Marysville, California on July 20, 2005. Attendees at the meetings included various federal, state, and local agency representatives, NGO representatives, and local residents. An agenda and other meeting material hand-outs were provided, including technical briefs on each of the three proposed Yuba Accord agreements (the Fisheries Agreement, the Water Purchase Agreement, and the Conjunctive Use Agreements), comment submittal contact information, and pre-addressed comment cards. The first portion of each meeting was an informal discussion and display session related to the three agreements comprising the Proposed Yuba Accord and explaining the EIR/EIS process. Lead agency representatives and consultant team members answered questions related to the Proposed Yuba Accord and EIR/EIS process, and collected public comments. A brief presentation of the history and overview of the Proposed Yuba Accord was made. At the conclusion of the presentation, meeting attendees were given the opportunity to make verbal comments. The meetings concluded with additional time for meeting attendees to view, ask questions, and comment upon the information display stations and meeting materials. Questions and comments were taken throughout each meeting and attendees were encouraged to provide their comments to the lead agencies in writing.

Key issues that were raised by agency representatives and members of the public at the public scoping meetings and in response to the NOI and NOP include:

- *Alternatives Considerations*
 - Alternatives under consideration
 - YCWA point of diversion
- *Groundwater Resources*
 - Potential impacts on private well owners
 - Potential impacts on fish and wildlife habitat
 - Potential impacts associated with the Conjunctive Use Program
 - Pumping control and monitoring
 - Potential impacts to non-signatories of the Conjunctive Use Agreement

- ❑ *Fisheries Resources*
 - Water release temperatures, quantities, and timing
 - Lower Yuba River flows and water temperature
 - Reservoir water temperature
 - Flow fluctuation
 - Proposed operational and surface water elevation changes in New Bullards Bar Reservoir
 - Feather River flows and water temperature
 - Potential impacts to Delta fisheries
 - Potential impacts associated with the Conference Year Program
 - Fish screening
 - Potential impacts associated with adding Delta pumping facilities as points of rediversion
 - Reduced flows to the Delta
- ❑ *Terrestrial Resources*
 - Impacts on wildlife habitat associated with reduced groundwater levels
- ❑ *Recreation*
 - Potential impacts to angling and other recreational uses
- ❑ *Land Use and Growth Inducement*
- ❑ *Water Quality*
 - Compliance with federal and state regulations
 - Potential impacts at Delta intakes and compliance locations
 - Potential impacts on Bay-Delta fisheries and Delta ecosystem
- ❑ *Water Supply and Management*
 - Changes in CVP and SWP operations
 - Potential impacts to legal water users associated with adding Clifton Court Forebay and Jones Pumping Plant as points of rediversion
 - CVP water supply reliability
 - Reduced flows to the Delta
- ❑ *Power Production and Energy Consumption*
 - Potential impacts and changes to hydroelectric power production
- ❑ *Socioeconomics*
 - Potential impacts on rice production and the local agricultural economy

23.2 RESOURCE AGENCY CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

In compliance with the federal and state consultation requirements outlined below, YCWA and Reclamation have been involved in coordination and informal consultation activities with various resource agencies since 2005. This section summarizes agency consultation and coordination requirements, activities to date, and ongoing consultation efforts.

23.2.1 FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Section 7 of the ESA requires all federal agencies to ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry-out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. To ensure that the Proposed Project/Action avoids jeopardy, YCWA and Reclamation must consult with the USFWS and NMFS, if the federal agency determines that its action might impact a listed species. NMFS jurisdiction under the ESA is limited to the protection of marine mammals and fish and anadromous fish; all other species are within USFWS jurisdiction.

YCWA and Reclamation have had numerous meetings with NMFS and the USFWS (see Section 23.2.7), where discussions focused on determining the scope of work, identifying listed and proposed species potentially affected by the Proposed Project/Action and alternative ?, as well as developing a suitable approach for assessing the potential effects of the federal action (i.e., the Proposed Action) on listed and proposed species and their habitat, as part of the Section 7 consultations required by the federal ESA. NMFS and USFWS representatives assisted in defining the scope of analysis for the Biological Evaluation, which defines and evaluates the potential effects of the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord on fish, wildlife, and plant species that are either listed under the federal ESA or proposed for such listing, and where applicable, their designated or proposed critical habitats.

23.2.2 MAGNUSON-STEVENSON FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

The MSA establishes a management system for national marine and estuarine fishery resources. Section 305(b)(2) of the 1996 reauthorization of the MSA added a provision for federal agencies to consult with NMFS on impacts to EFH. EFH only applies to commercial fisheries; therefore, the requirements of the MSA applies to all Chinook salmon habitat but not steelhead habitat. EFH includes specifically identified waters and substrate necessary for fish spawning, breeding, feeding, or growing to maturity. Consultation with NMFS for the ESA simultaneously addresses consultation requirements under the MSA. YCWA and Reclamation's ongoing coordination efforts with NMFS satisfy the analytical requirements for EFH for species managed under the MSA.

23.2.3 CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

The CESA (CDFG Code Section 2050 et. seq.) establishes state policy to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance threatened or endangered species and their habitats. The CESA mandates that state agencies should not approve projects that jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species if reasonable and prudent alternatives are available that would avoid jeopardy. Unlike the federal ESA, under CESA there are no mandated state agency consultation procedures. For projects that would affect a species that is federally and state-listed, compliance with ESA satisfies CESA if CDFG determines that the federal incidental take authorization is consistent with CESA (CDFG Section 2080.1). For projects that would result in take of a state-listed species, the project proponent must apply for a take permit under CDFG Section 2081(b).

YCWA and Reclamation have had numerous meetings with CDFG (see Section 23.2.7), where discussions focused on determining the scope of work, identifying listed and proposed species potentially affected by the Proposed Project/Action, as well as developing a suitable approach for assessing the potential effects of the action on listed and proposed species and their habitat. Upon review of the Proposed Project/Action and associated mitigation measures (where

applicable), CDFG will issue a written finding based upon its determination of whether the Proposed Project/Action would jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat essential to the continued existence of the species. The written finding will also include CDFG's determination of whether the Proposed Project/Action would result in any taking of an endangered or threatened species incidental to the Proposed Project/Action (Fish and Game Code Section 2081).

23.2.4 FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT

The FWCA (PL 85-624; 16 USC 661-667d) requires that all federal agencies consult with USFWS, NMFS, and the states' wildlife agencies for activities that affect, control, or modify waters of any stream or other bodies of water (Cylinder *et al.* 1995). Under the authority of the FWCA, resource trustees review water development projects and wildlife is given equal consideration and coordination with other features of the project.

While preparing this Draft EIR/EIS, YCWA and Reclamation have been in contact and closely coordinated with NMFS and the USFWS regarding the scope and content of this Draft EIR/EIS. These activities and continuing coordination meets applicable consultation/coordination requirements of the FWCA.

23.2.5 INDIAN TRUST ASSETS AND NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

YCWA and Reclamation are responsible for evaluating potential impacts to ITAs. Potential effects on ITAs stem from actions or activities that would affect Indian Trust lands, and federally reserved hunting, fishing, gathering, water, or other rights. During preparation of this Draft EIR/EIS, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) representatives were contacted to discuss and confirm the likely locations of ITAs within the project area. There are no ITAs on project area reservoirs or in the Delta region. Potential impacts to ITAs and the health of Tribes in the Yuba Region resulting from the Proposed Project/Action have been evaluated and no significant adverse impacts have been identified. In the event an impact is identified, consultation with affected recognized tribal governments would proceed through the proponent agencies, the BIA, the Office of the Solicitor, and the Office of American Indian Trust. Government-to-government consultation would take place to determine interests, concerns, impacts, applicable tribal regulations, and appropriate avoidance measures. Ongoing consultation would involve YCWA, Reclamation, BIA, and the Regional Solicitor's Office.

23.2.6 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT/STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER CONSULTATION

The NHPA requires federal agencies to consult with the ACHP concerning potential effects of federal actions on historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP. The evaluations of cultural resources as part of this Draft EIR/EIS comply with the NHPA as it applies to the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives. In addition, notices of public meetings for this project have been sent to the SHPO, which acts as an intermediary for the ACHP.

A copy of this Draft EIR/EIS has been sent to the SHPO, as a unit of the CDPR, requesting review and soliciting input on the project. Reclamation will continue to coordinate with the ACHP and SHPO as necessary, consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA.

23.2.7 AGENCY INVOLVEMENT AND COORDINATION

Key meetings, deliverables, decisions, and other activities related to the evaluation of the Proposed Project/ Action effects are summarized as follows:

- *May 11, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, NMFS, USFWS, CDFG and the Yuba Accord Project Team met to discuss ESA compliance and coordination, including the Accord Environmental Compliance Process Timeline, identification of ESA and CESA compliance topics, opportunities to tier from recent environmental compliance documentation, and the proposed 2006 Water Transfer and Yuba Accord Fisheries Agreement Pilot Program.
- *May 17, 2005 and June 16, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, SWRCB, CDFG, USFWS, NMFS, NGOs, Member Units and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in Project Kick-off Meetings to discuss the project objectives, purpose and need for the project, action items, environmental compliance timeline, the CEQA/NEPA Compliance Plan, and the key steps and participants in the environmental compliance process.
- *June 22, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, NMFS and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance meeting to discuss the Draft NMFS ESA Compliance Strategy Plan, the ESA compliance process and documentation requirements, the Draft Environmental Compliance Timeline, and the relationship of the ESA process to the CEQA/NEPA process.
- *June 23, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance meeting to discuss the draft USFWS ESA Compliance Strategy Plan, the ESA compliance process and documentation requirements, the Draft Environmental Compliance Timeline, and the relationship of the ESA process to the CEQA/NEPA process.
- *August 31, 2005.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss the relationship of Proposed Yuba Accord ESA compliance and OCAP.
- *September 7, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, CDFG and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance meeting to discuss the Draft CDFG CESA Compliance Strategy Plan, the CESA compliance process and documentation requirements, the Draft Environmental Compliance Timeline, and the relationship of the CESA process to the CEQA/NEPA process.
- *September 20, 2005.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, CDFG and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance meeting to discuss the Proposed Action description, the definition of the Action Area, confirmation of the special-status species lists for Terrestrial and Fisheries Resources, and development of the Terrestrial and Fisheries Resources Assessment Methodologies.
- *November 22, 2005.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss the relationship of Yuba Accord ESA compliance and OCAP.
- *December 6, 2005.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss the ESA analysis of the Yuba Accord as an OCAP-related project.
- *December 22, 2005.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss ESA modeling assumptions.
- *December 28, 2005.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss proposed project and cumulative effect scenarios.

- ❑ *January 18, 2006.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss ESA and OCAP modeling assumptions.
- ❑ *February 9, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation and DWR met to discuss ESA compliance issues related to OCAP.
- ❑ *February 14, 2006.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss the approach to ESA consultation for the Proposed Yuba Accord.
- ❑ *February 27, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation and DWR met to discuss ESA compliance issues related to OCAP.
- ❑ *March 17, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, CDFG, Member Unit representatives, and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a TRT meeting to discuss finalization of the CEQA, NEPA, and ESA modeling approach for the Proposed Yuba Accord. Also, comments regarding the Modeling Technical Memorandum were provided and discussed at the meeting.
- ❑ *March 27, 2006.* Reclamation/USFWS policy meeting regarding consultation approach.
- ❑ *April 11, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, CDFG, Member Unit representatives, CVP/SWP contractor representatives and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a TRT workshop to discuss the effects assessment methodologies for various resource topics to be included in the Yuba Accord environmental documentation.
- ❑ *April 21, 2006.* YCWA requested an official species list, by USGS 7½ minute quadrangles, from USFWS for the Yuba Accord local study area (Yuba Region).
- ❑ *April 24, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, USFWS, NMFS and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance meeting to review draft Biological Evaluation (BE) (?) outlines, and to discuss preliminary modeling and salvage results for the Proposed Project/Action.
- ❑ *April 27, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, CDFG, Member Unit representatives, CVP/SWP contractor representatives, and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a TRT meeting to discuss questions and comments related to the Proposed Yuba Accord analytical approaches presented at the April 11, 2006 TRT workshop.
- ❑ *May 4 and 5, 2006.* YCWA and DWR met to discuss Yuba Accord ESA and CESA compliance.
- ❑ *May 9, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, NMFS and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a technical assistance conference call to review preliminary modeling and salvage results for the Proposed Action.
- ❑ *May 10, 2006.* YCWA, NMFS and USFWS met to discuss ESA compliance issues related to OCAP.
- ❑ *May 17, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, CDFG, NGOs, Member Unit representatives, CVP/SWP contractor representatives and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a TRT meeting to finalize the Proposed Yuba Accord analytical approach for various resource categories to be evaluated in the environmental documentation.
- ❑ *May 31, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation and DWR met to discuss Yuba Accord ESA compliance issues.

- ❑ *June 29, 2006 and July 7, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, CDFG, NGOs, Member Unit representatives, CVP/SWP contractor representatives, and the Yuba Accord Project Team participated in a TRT meeting to discuss comments regarding the Modeling Technical Memorandum and review the analytical format and preliminary modeling results for the Proposed Project/Action.
- ❑ *August 1, 2006.* YCWA submitted letter to Reclamation requesting applicant status for the Yuba Accord ESA consultation.
- ❑ *August 15, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation and USFWS met to discuss effects of reinitiation of OCAP consultation on Yuba Accord ESA compliance.
- ❑ *August 25, 2006.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss effects of reinitiation of OCAP consultation on Yuba Accord ESA compliance.
- ❑ *August 31, 2006.* YCWA and Reclamation met to discuss effects of reinitiation of OCAP consultation on Yuba Accord ESA compliance.
- ❑ *September 15, 2006.* YCWA sent Reclamation a letter describing its proposed approach to ESA compliance for the Yuba Accord.
- ❑ *September 19, 2006.* YCWA sent NMFS a letter requesting species list confirmation for ESA compliance.
- ❑ *September 29, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation and DWR met to discuss ESA compliance process for Yuba Accord.
- ❑ *October 20, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, and the Yuba Accord Project Team met to discuss the BE and ESA modeling assumptions.
- ❑ *October 23, 2006.* Reclamation submitted a letter informing YCWA, USFWS, and NMFS that YCWA will be considered an applicant for the Section 7 ESA consultation process.
- ❑ *November 1, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, MWH, and the Yuba Accord Project Team met to discuss ESA modeling assumptions.
- ❑ *November 15, 2006.* YCWA, Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and the Yuba Accord Project Team met to discuss ESA modeling assumptions.
- ❑ *February 1, 2007.* YCWA, Reclamation, and DWR met to discuss CEQA/NEPA cumulative considerations.

23.3 PUBLIC REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

The Public Draft EIR/EIS is available for review and comment for 60 days following filing of the Notice of Completion of the EIR with the California State Clearinghouse and the Notice of Availability (NOA) of the EIS with the EPA. In addition to filing with the EPA, the NOA also has been published in the Federal Register.

The purpose for public review of the Draft EIR/EIS is to receive comments from interested parties on its completeness and adequacy in disclosing potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project/Action. After the close of the public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS, a Final EIR/EIS, including responses to public and agency comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, will be prepared. YCWA is responsible for certifying the EIR as adequate by issuing an NOD in compliance with CEQA. Reclamation is responsible for adopting the EIS by issuing an ROD in

compliance with NEPA. After adoption and certification, the agencies will use the EIR/EIS to make their determination whether or not to approve the Proposed Project/Action.

23.3.1 EIR/EIS DISTRIBUTION LIST

The Draft EIR/EIS is available for public review at YCWA, Reclamation and DWR offices, as well as at several libraries, which are listed in **Table 23-1**. Additionally, the NOA or copies of the Draft EIR/EIS have been distributed to federal and state government officials and resource agencies; regional and local government offices; water districts, agencies, and utilities; other interest groups and organizations; and individuals as identified in **Table 23-2**.

Table 23-1. Locations Where the Draft EIR/EIS is Available for Public Review

Agency Locations	Library Locations
Yuba County Water Agency 1402 D Street Marysville, CA 95901	Yuba County Library 303 2nd Street Marysville, CA 95901
Department of Water Resources 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814	Sacramento Public Library 828 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
Bureau of Reclamation 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, CA 95825	

Table 23-2. Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Receiving the Notice of Availability or Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS

U.S. Government Officials
Barbara Boxer, United States Senate
Dianne Feinstein, United States Senate
Dennis Cardoza, United States House of Representatives, District 18
John Doolittle, United States House of Representatives, District 4
Wally Herger, United States House of Representatives, District 2
Barbara Lee, United States House of Representatives, District 9
Dan Lungren, United States House of Representatives, District 3
Doris Matsui, United States House of Representatives, District 5
George Miller, United States House of Representatives, District 7
Jerry McNerney, United States House of Representatives, District 11
George Radanovich, United States House of Representatives, District 19
Ellen Tauscher, United States House of Representatives, District 10
Federal Government Agencies
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
National Marine Fisheries Service
Native American Heritage Commission
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office
U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division

Table 23-2 (continued)

State Government Officials
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor
Sam Aanestad, California State Senate, District 4
Dave Cogdill, California State Senate, District 14
Dave Cox, California State Senate, District 1
Jeff Denham, California State Senate, District 12
Michael Machado, California State Senate, District 5
Don Perata, California State Senate, District 9
Darrell Steinberg, California State Senate, District 6
Tom Torlakson, California State Senate, District 7
Greg Aghazarian, California State Assembly, District 26
Mark DeSaulnier, California State Assembly, District 11
Doug La Malfa, California State Assembly, District 2
Dave Jones, California State Assembly, District 9
Alan Nakanishi, California State Assembly, District 10
Roger Niello, California State Assembly, District 5
Lois Wolk, California State Assembly, District 8
State Government Agencies
California Air Resources Board
California Bay-Delta Authority
California Department of Boating and Waterways
California Department of Conservation
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Food and Agriculture
California Department of Forestry
California Department of Health Services
California Department of Parks and Recreation
California Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Office of Historic Preservation
California State Attorney General's Office
California State Clearinghouse
California State Lands Commission
California State Reclamation Board
California State Water Resources Control Board
California Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
Regional and Local Government Agencies
Alameda County
Alpine County
Amador County
Butte County
Calaveras County
City of Marysville
City of Sacramento
Colusa County
Contra Costa County
El Dorado County
Glenn County
Lassen County
Madera County
Mariposa County
Merced County
Modoc County
Nevada County

Table 23-2 (continued)

Regional and Local Government Agencies
Placer County
Plumas County
Sacramento County
San Joaquin County
Shasta County
Sierra County
Siskiyou County
Solano County
Stanislaus County
Sutter County
Tehama County
Trinity County
Tuolumne County
Yolo County
Yuba County
Yuba County Office of Emergency Services
Water Districts, Agencies and Utilities
Alameda County Water District
Association of California Water Agencies
Brophy Water District
Browns Valley Water District
California Urban Water Agencies
Central Valley Project Water Association
City/County Office of Metropolitan Water Planning
Contra Costa Water District
Cordua Irrigation District
Dry Creek Mutual Water Company
East Bay Municipal Utility District
Hallwood Irrigation Company
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Ramirez Water District
Reclamation District 784
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
South Yuba Water District
Wheatland Water District
Environmental Organizations
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Striped Bass Association
California Waterfowl Association
California Trout, Inc.
Environmental Defense Fund
Federation of Fly Fishers
Friends of the River
South Yuba River Citizens League
The Bay Institute
Trout Unlimited
Individuals and Other Interests
Rick Anderson
Candyce Baker
James Baker
Dan Boom
James Butler
Sue Cunningham
Russell King
Steve Kraces
Vernon Kuska

Table 23-2 (continued)

Individuals and Other Interests (continued)
Ted Lowe
Mimi Mathews
Rickey Matos
James and Patricia Myers
Darrell Ommen
Clifford Pound
Bill Shearer
William Short
Roscoe Smith