

CVFMP Delta Regional Forum Summary Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 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 Delta Regional Forum Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 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 Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION (AFTERNOON SESSION) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: What do you mean by ‘integrated flood management’? Do you mean regional flood problems or water supply and flood management opportunities?

A: We mean both. We need to tie into a system wide plan across watersheds and the legislation directs us to consider multi-objective projects where possible.

Q: What are the lessons learned, in particular from the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Comprehensive study? Has that been looked at and considered?

A: We are considering it in a lot of ways including using some of the technical information that may still be useful if it is still warranted. Also, we are trying to get input earlier in this plan as one lesson learned. We want the public to help define the problem and propose actions. Also one big difference is that Comp study was largely quantitative with a lot of modeling and technical data, whereas this one is more about promoting understanding and developing a broadly supported vision.

Q: What about non-project levees?

A: The Legislation requires us to focus on lands that receive protection from the state and federal levees. We are looking at non-project levees that the same lands such as in Stockton. If there are ones that are connected or if their performance affects state or federal levees then they’ll be looked at as well.

Q: What other countries have you looked at?

A: We are trying to learn from everyone that has work underway and have looked extensively at the Danish studies for example. We will include all pertinent information, but if there are other countries we should include, please let us know.

Q: Regarding improving river ecosystems and the Corps vegetation standard – it seems to be disconnected. The Corps plan would destroy the riverine ecosystem, but this plan suggests restoring them – how will that be addressed?

A: We recognize that for the flood system to be sustainable, operations and maintenance needs to be sustainable, too. There are two initial work groups set up - one for operations and maintenance plus an environmental stewardship group. These are not mutually exclusive. Also, the Corps has clarified its position on vegetation. There is an interim framework document to improve inspections and maintenance of levees with vegetation and they are moving toward a nationwide policy. Also, there will probably be some regional variance where applicable. They have commissioned research about the real effects on levees and on removing vegetation from levees.

Q: While the effort to integrate should be applauded, to date there has been no successful integration. Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) is on a fast track. The Delta Levees and Habitat Committee has argued that there should be integration with levee planning process because the core of BDCP is suggesting major changes to the landforms in the Delta. Their response is that they are working with the flood guys. How exactly are you working with them?

A: We haven’t done enough yet to make the integration happen. Steve Bradley has been asked to take on the leadership of integrating BDCP and FloodSAFE and to coordinate more regularly. Mark Cowin is now deputy director of FloodSAFE and will work with others to ensure we get better representation for flood objectives. In terms of timing, BDCP will not be able to implement without the information from this plan.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

Comment: You need to coordinate with current legislation being drafted, the development of a Delta plan and other studies, not just BDCP.

Response: It is a challenge and today there is representation here from many of those groups. Let us know if there are opportunities to do that better since this rapid pace makes it difficult. We are open to all suggestions on how to improve.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: REGIONAL CONDITIONS SUMMARY REPORT

Q: Do you have the data you need for identifying deficiencies in the system?

A: We have information that evaluates urban levees from DWR's FloodSAFE activities, and we are working on non-urban levee evaluations now. Given the 1600 miles of levees, we need to be strategic, and recognize that the final data will not be perfect.

Q: Given that the budget crisis is holding up contracts and in turn the evaluations will not all be completed, is there any effort to request a time extension from the legislature? Rushing to produce an inaccurate document by 2012 based on poor data will not help clients.

A: Rather than delay, we recognize we will not resolve everything in the first iteration of the plan given the complexity of the system and the issues. A recommendation in the 2012 version may indeed be about where additional investment is needed for 2017. Furthermore, DWR will work with you to incorporate local information about levee performance in the early deliverables, like this regional conditions report and the flood control system status report.

Q: The Delta overlaps with two other areas, so how do you plan to put these various work groups together?

A: DWR and the consulting team will integrate what we hear from the different regions into a system wide view of things. We believe we can do a good job of capturing regional perspectives in this plan, and that differences between adjacent regions will come out there. Lastly, the Central Valley-wide forum will be a place to discuss this, with representatives from each regional group making a presentation.

Q: How will you incorporate entities that are beyond your control - -namely, the upstream dams?

A: That will be part of the focus of a work group on reservoir operations.

Q: How will the risk be analyzed for the different areas?

A: Flood risk is largely dependent on the hydrologic information we have for the 2012 plan, and a starting point for this will be the Comprehensive Study. New hydrologic information is probably two to three years away from being complete, assuming no budget limitations. The other key element is to integrate what we've learned from the levee evaluation program about actual performance compared with original designs. The flood control system status report is already looking at what the design flows are in terms of the water surface profile, given today's channel conditions, and that's another piece of the risk evaluation.

Thoughts and comments on the outline and Table of Contents

- It was not clear what the content of the regional report would be. It sounded like this would include levees and flood control, but we felt there is much more to such a report – topics like flood management, land use conditions of floodplains, consequences for the ecosystem, what it is on the floodplains you're trying to protect, etc. Although Mr. Hester helped clarify this in the small group, it wasn't in the presentation.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

- We know more now about how the system works.
- Seismicity is a threat that needs to be addressed.
- We also talked about regional self-sufficiency, and how best to use water during a flood or high water times – that is, move it into aquifers and recharge groundwater. The upstream-downstream issues are likely to be a major stumbling block – it needs to be clear who will have authority and who will make what decisions.
- You need to examine the interconnection between land use decisions and the performance of the flood system: these can drive the positive or negative performance of levees, channel conveyance, etc. You cannot separate land use from this discussion.

Thoughts and comments on the Scope of Work

- The scope seems vague. We suggest the technical data from past efforts are brought into this, including but not limited to the Comp Study.
- The statement about current conditions is very broad, and the work group will need direction – the boundaries cannot be overly restrictive, but need to be focused.
- Need to make sure we're working on a solid foundation of facts. A lot of the science and earlier studies are contested, like DRMS. Peer review and assuring you have the proper people in the work group are two critical ways to achieve this.
- There is a lot of information to be collected, coalesced, and brought to the surface to support public input. It's ridiculous to think that the public can come into a planning session like this, or even work groups, with good sound ideas. The Sacramento Valley Flood Working Group was formed to bring together flood planners north of Sacramento. The same thing is starting up in San Joaquin, though we haven't made it all the way up that valley yet. These are formidable groups that speak as one voice for these two planning areas; they have gathered much of what is on the table and have very sound ideas that translate into technical, foundational levee concepts. A lot of the documents show that the system is working relatively well, and you shouldn't lose sight of that.

Comment: If you are going to seek local input, you need to recognize that in the past local participation hasn't been valued by some people. You will need to overcome this. We don't want to just be notified of what you've figured out for us, we want to be part of the decision-making process. We want to know: What's the process for blessing these things? How will we be genuinely involved? I don't want to put all this time into comments and then have you make the choice. We should have a voice in where we're going.

The Sacramento Valley Flood Working Group was convened 9 months ago, essentially all the major flood management agencies are at the table with the understanding that "review and comment" is not a model we're willing to participate in. We're either in the decision-stream of this effort or we'll simply wait until you produce something. We seriously offered to write the Sacramento Valley plan for you, but our offer wasn't accepted. The concept is very simple: the on-the-ground agencies need to be part of the entire process from the beginning and not half-way down the road. If we're not at the table up front, you won't hear what you need from partner agencies in flood control. You somehow need to develop more trust in local agencies. That's a challenge for you.

Response: We're really at step one of first trying to get engaged, and make sure you have opportunities to review and comment as products get developed. That's why the forums are important if you can't get involved in a work group. We will make sure the comments are there for everyone to see and react to. We also want to establish the work groups to help develop content to be used in the document in the future.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: PLANNING AND ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

Q: Regarding solution sets – to what degree are you developing them? What level of flood protection for example?

A: This will be largely based on what we already know, compiling the current level of solutions and early implementation projects for example. It is possible new bypasses will be proposed, but we can't do detailed hydrologic analysis on everything. All regions will have some solutions, but the degree of information will vary. Public involvement will help develop these solutions so they work best for that area.

Q. What are the opportunities to integrate water conservation into flood management? When you skip to flood protection planning – is that intentional?

A: The way the legislation is written, we have to look at flood management, not just flood protection – that is just the name. But our primary goal is flood protection. Integrated flood management is a priority for DWR.

Q. What is the geotech data?

A: Our levee evaluation program is underway and we are gathering a lot of information on that in any number of various scenarios. There is a fact sheet on that on the table and on the department website for more detailed information.

Q. What about the 3 documents - a status report, summary and this plan? How do they all fit?

A: These are companion documents that stand alone, but also work together. They'll build on each other.

Comment: IRWMPS need to include good flood management plans.

Response: Mr. Kirby responded that locals need to be involved and the IRWMPs are a good opportunity for that. The CVFMP process will engage with local interests in a way that works for you. There should be options to come to one or two groups and still be engaged. The CVFMP team wants to accurately represent the perspectives from the region as well as the state, federal, tribal perspective, etc. Where there is good representation such as an already organized group like the one in San Joaquin, then yes, that group should be involved.

Q: How does Delta Vision fit in? The Federal entities overrule the State. Delta Vision talks about non-project levees, so it may not be the case. It notes that as levees breached they will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as to whether they will be restored. That concerns those of us whose homes are located next to those levees.

A: The state may make the case that some levees are not economically feasible to restore. However, no levees are currently on a DNR (do not resuscitate) list. There may be a list developed like that in the future. The Delta Island Levees Feasibility Study (DILFS) may tackle this issue. It is a fact that we do not have enough money to fix every levee in the system. There will be some hard choices. But, being engaged throughout this process and helping to inform the data gathering will be extremely helpful.

Q: Is there availability for public input to that process?

A: We will act as an information resource to that process and let you know when it gets started.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

Thoughts and comments on key aspects for Planning and Engagement
(from flipcharts)

- Who will write the plan?
- Challenge – there are different existing efforts at different levels of completeness (specifically, ongoing local planning, Delta Vision Strategic Plan, etc) There is a concern over “competing” plans potentially negating the CVFPP development.
- Delta Levees Habitat Advisory Committee and Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee
- How will minority views be expressed?
- How are regular work group ideas rolled up to CV level?
- How will input from different regions be integrated with other regions?
- How will CVFPP process be integrated with other DWR/Delta, etc efforts?
- Take advantage of existing efforts (e.g.: existing work groups – lower San Joaquin River study)
- Local people and local efforts need to be included. It can not be top down. The perception of some of the other processes such as Delta Vision and BDCP is that local people were not involved, therefore local input needs to be at all levels of the process including the executive level. For example, what local involvement has already been included to date?
- Who is not here that should be?
- Locals can help DWR understand local governance issues.
- DWR needs to understand local, day-to-day operations and work on the relationships with local people.
- Is there an oversight committee for this process? There should be some experts or a regional steering committee or subgroup.
- Suggest that the topic work groups be broken down by geographic area as well, then bring together for coordination after developing recommendations.
- Invite all stakeholders and identify specific people who should be included.
- Integrate the work into what is already working such as the IRWMP processes. (Flood management and water supply) Need to involve the flood side at similar levels as integrated regional water management.
- Include stormwater and flood flows as potential source of water. Also groundwater and others in addition to environmental. Look at historical floodplains as options.

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

- This seems like a diversion of attention as only major levees will be breached and the entire formation of “regions” needing protection will be changing. Slow things down.
- How are you going to guarantee that all stakeholders are represented at all meetings? Is there a list of stakeholders?
- Engagement should happen through both the Central Delta Water Agency and the University of the Pacific Natural Resources Institution.
- Are you interested in areas affected by the State Plan of Flood Control only?
- Current conditions and future challenges – Does this include a description of the valley in 50 years? Land use, population, transportation, jobs, economic factors.
- Where does affordability come in?
- I do feel the timeline is a little hurried and to get effective and comprehensive input it might be better to slow things down.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

- DPC Resources:
 - Assistance with public outreach to stakeholders
 - Use of DPC website to post materials and other process items for public consumption
 - Planning progress at DPC commission meetings
 - Working with DPC to ensure planning process is in compliance with the DPC Act on efforts effecting the primary and secondary zone.

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Discussion on definition of Environmental Stewardship

(as recorded on flipcharts)

- “Sustainability” – scary for Delta folks
- Define “sustainable manner” and “available”
- Suggest “integrate” instead of “sustainable”
- Climate change
- Include co-equal goals, incorporating local management plans
- CALFED integration approach: Delta waterways and tributaries as corridors
 - Flood control
 - Water supply
 - Habitat (migratory and resident) – swimmers, fliers, walkers
- Insure that agriculture is included in sustainability
- A commitment to responsibility not action
- Make available for future generations without burden (don’t overburden taxes)
- Add “enhance” to manage and protect
- How do goals and objectives get included in RCSR?
- Add current models, data to be used in ES workgroup

Discussion on scope of work for Environmental Stewardship

- Use corridor concept and incorporate in plan
- Approach all issues with stewardship approach
 - Integrated into all analysis
 - How?
- See changes in incorporating ES across all regions
 - Will take lots of coordination
 - Think about regional differences
 - Acknowledge regional differences
- Delta is the downstream end
- Acknowledgement that ES is important to stakeholders
- Integration in planning
- Resulting in healthy and viable population increase (later in the process)
- How will work group be most effective?
- Create or respond?
 - What are current requirements?
 - Maintaining agencies are currently environmental stewards
 - Participation of other agencies (state, federal, local, regulatory)

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

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

- To be credible, this process should include those in academia and it should be peer-reviewed.
- Consider the human compassion element.
- Include strong and significant (80%) reduction in the use of toxins and chemicals such as pesticides and other agricultural runoff into Delta waterways. There will be a re-establishment of healthy and abundant native and endangered fish populations and habitat through adequate water.
- Do an inventory of existing environmental stewardship and current status' and obstacles.
- Not sure why the caveat "to the extent possible" is included; if goals and objectives aren't developed at this state, when will they be developed?
- Need more information about the end goal – This scope of work doesn't mention multi-species and floodplain conservation strategy, but the presentation said that would be a key product. Sounds like that will be handled at a subsequent phase?

BREAKOUT DISCUSSION: NON-URBAN LEEVE EVALUATION

Q: What about seismic criteria – how and when will that be done?

A: That is a separate track and a larger policy question that is a part of work taking place outside the non-urban and urban levee evaluations that we're conducting. We are looking at doing work in conjunction with the UC system and work that has already been done in countries like Japan, Taiwan, and South America to see how they've addressed their issues in terms of policy and technical response such as putting things back up right after an earthquake and longer term remediation.

Q: Will that come back into the planning process at some point and will it be public?

A: Absolutely. The first instance will be the posting of interim levee criteria on the website.

Q: On levee evaluations, are you making assessments of seismic performance capability as a part of that?

A: We are, and this pertains right now only to the urban program. We're doing a termed seismic vulnerability assessment – for about 350 miles of the 460 urban levees, we'll be assessing that based on 200 year anticipated ground motions.

Further response: Mr. Kirby clarified that this pertains to the levee evaluation program and looking at levee design which is beyond the scope of the CVFPP, although it will be looked at as well.

Q: Will it come out of the hydrology work?

A: Yes, and whether it performs according to design is based on hydrology and studies done.

Q: What are the standards you are choosing for strength and stability (is it FEMA 65-10 or PL-99 for example?)

A: In urban areas, those standards are right and we have to meet them. For non-urban areas, we're looking at FEMA program, but will need to make strategic financial decisions so things like spacing of holes, type of exploration and what makes the most sense about how to spend the limited money most efficiently will be considered. We will try and use the same design criteria, but the density of exploration and those strategic questions will be based on local input and efficiencies.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

Thoughts and comments on scope of work for Non-Urban Levee Evaluation
(as recorded on flipcharts)

Question #1 – Is the proposed approach for specific site selection this summer clear? How could it be clarified?

- Yes the criteria is appropriate, but be willing to add in others based on evaluation of other potential criteria priorities
- What is the philosophy behind the criteria? What are the objectives?
- Population shouldn't be only criteria although it is a good first step
- Create a decision tree for the criteria – ensure there is a definitive list
- Suggestions:
 1. People first – Public safety (schools, infrastructure)
 2. Transportation
 3. Water quality

Question #2 – Is the proposed approach for specific site selection on target? Do you have any comments or suggestions?

- Adjacent to critical infrastructure, safety (eg: water, sewage treatment plants, facilities, schools, emergency response, etc)
- Islands with proposed development (population would then increase) so consider that
- Agriculture/smaller population areas need to be considered
- Do the common sense fixes. Don't allow big trucks with heavy loads on levee roads.
- BRTF Plan – recommendations about meeting the vision? The no-action response has concerns for levee communities.
- Sampling strategy for larger group of levees? DRMS had an absence of information – ensure there is good information for full spectrum of levees (Phase 2?)
- Ask and allow local agencies to fund borings (so they can ensure data is included)
- What are the next steps after Phase 1 and 2?
- What about agriculture levees? Are any related to through-Delta conveyance?

CONCLUDING COMMENTS – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: How do people sign up for work groups?

A: There is a station in the back of the room with applications. You can also download applications online at the CVFMP website. We will be accepting applications and nominations until June 19.

Q: What is the selection process?

A: We would like to know what your background and experience is and who you represent so we can ensure broad representation. Additionally, because the groups will be developing content, we'd like to know your level of expertise with flood management. The Forums will be collaborative – sharing information and voicing opinions. The work groups will be facilitated, led by DWR staff and will develop content for the plan. They will have a more intensive time commitment.

Q: What is the time commitment?

A: It is expected the work groups will meet 2-3 times a month for approximately 5-6 months. It may be up to 40 hours a month in work.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

Q. How will groups like the Sacramento River Flood Working Group, already engaged with the department, fit in to this process?

A: There are many opportunities for interest-based groups to be involved. Appointing someone to a work group is one option. Inviting DWR staff to attend ongoing meetings is another. All documents will be circulated via the website and email list. They will also be discussed at future forms. Our hope is that when we get a draft plan, you will have seen the information many times.

Mr. Kirby noted that it is understood there are trust issues and concerns about how DWR is running its planning processes. DWR wants to make sure that what is contributed will be used in good faith. The reality is that you will have to come and see – work with us in this framework, although we are open to suggestions on how to modify it if needed. If you feel you are not being heard, please let us know. We want this plan to be useful, to be implemented and to work.

Mr. Hester commented that the department received very good input today and that the issues raised need to be addressed. He thanked the numerous members of the public for attending and hopes to see them in the future as this process moves forward.

**CVFMP Delta Regional Forum – Comment Summary
Ryde (Walnut Grove), CA – June 8, 2009**

ATTENDANCE

Leslie Albright, DHCCP
Bill Betchart
Fran Borcalli, local resident
Richard Braun
Robin Brewer, DWR
Kris Brown, DWR
Ben Carter, CVFPB
Roger Churchill, SJAFCA
Marci Coglianesse, Bay-Delta RAC
Mark Connelly, San Joaquin County
Gilbert Cosio, MBK Engineering
Barbara Daly
Bill Darsie, KSN
Patrick Dell, NOA
Peter Downs, Stillwater Sciences
Bill E, Sutter-Butte
Gregg Ellis, Jones and Stokes
Mike Englemann, DWR
Tom Flinn, San Joaquin County, Dept. of Public Works
Ann Fritch, Snug Harbor
Jim Giottonini, SJAFCA
Kim Glazzard
Mike Hardesty, RD 2068
Scott Huntsman, Shaw Group
Rich Kranz, DWR
Terry Macauley, CBDA
Leila Mazo
Karen Medders, local resident
Keith Millard, DWR
Rich Millet, URS-DWR
Michael Moncrief, MBK Engineers
Scott Morgan, DWR
David Mraz, DWR
Toby Mraz, DWR
Christopher Neudek, KSN
Edward Phillips, Burlington-Northern-Santa Fe Railroad
Yogi Pirathapan, DWR
Judi Quan, Delta Protection Commission
Teri Rie, CVFPB
Vincent Rodriguez, DWR
Sabrina Simpson, Stillwater Sciences
Arasan Singanayaham, DWR
Jan Vick, City of Rio Vista
Jane Wagner-Tyack, League of Women Voters – San Joaquin County
John Webber, RD 999
Tom Zuckerman, Central Delta Water Agency