



# Meeting Summary

## Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

**June 22, 2010, 1:00pm – 4:30pm**

**Location: DWR West Sacramento Office  
3500 Industrial Blvd, Room 119  
West Sacramento, CA 95691**

### WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Francis Borcalli	FloodSAFE Yolo; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Paula Britton	Upper Lake Rancheria	Member
Daniel Burmester	California Department of Fish and Game	Alternate
Bill Busath	City of Sacramento	Member
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
Jim Cornelius	Sutter County RCD	Alternate
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Miki Fujitsubo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Member
Mike Hardesty	RD 2068, RD 2098, California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Member
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Member
Steve Rothert	American Rivers	Member
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento	Member
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member
Susan Tatayon	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Jeffrey Twitchell	District One of Sutter County; urban and rural interests of Yuba City-Sutter Basin	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Warren Westrup	Yolo County Department of Parks and Resources	Member
Noel Lerner	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Ray McDowell	CA Department of Water Resources	FESSRO*
Erin Mullin	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Loren Murray	CA Department of Water Resources	Regional Coordinator
Cait Plantaric	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Merritt Rice	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Name	Organization	Status
Craig Wallace	MWH Americas Inc.	Team
Janet Thomson	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Christine Lim	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

\*FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office

\*\*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

### ABSENT:

Bill Center	American River Recreation Association, Planning & Conservation League, CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba) IRWMP	Member
Scott Clemons	Riparian Floodplain Joint Venture	Member
Regina Cherovsky	Conaway Preservation Group LLC, Reclamation District 2035, Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Chuck Dudley	Yolo County Farm Bureau	Member
Dan Fua	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Member
Eric Ginney	PWA, Ltd., Environmental Hydrology & Geomorphology	Member
Gary Hobgood	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Gena Lasko	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Larry Lloyd	Sutter County RCD/Yuba County RCD	Member
Stefan Lorenzato	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Member
Tom Smythe	Lake County	Member
Ronald Stork	Friends of the River	Member

### OBSERVERS:

Melinda Terry	California Central Valley Flood Control Association
Michelle Boercker	River Partners

### WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS

1. To join the Climate Change Thresholds Approach Work Group, submit your application by 5:00pm on Friday, June 25<sup>th</sup>.
2. Submit your intent to participate in CVFPP Phase 2 Workshops to Janet Thomson ([jthomson@kearnswest.com](mailto:jthomson@kearnswest.com)) or Vanessa Nishikawa ([Vanessa.nishikawa@us.mwhglobal.com](mailto:Vanessa.nishikawa@us.mwhglobal.com)) as soon as possible.

### ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. DWR will consider the timeframe for when a discussion for rural, small community, and urban areas can take place.
2. The program team will email the Work Group when information for the Round 1 Workshops (draft evaluations of the management actions) are available.
3. The program team will keep the Work Group informed of the vegetation on levee issue.

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

### **GROUP RECAP** (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group (Work Group) for the Central Valley Flood Planning Program (CVFPP initiated its work on June 22, 2010 with the following activities:

- Reviewed the development process, organization, and documentation process for management actions.
- Discussed how solution sets would be created from management actions.
- Prepared for the management actions workshops in summer 2010.

The purpose of the Work Group is to assist DWR in framing management action categories and providing advice on the general approach to incorporating management actions into the CVFPP. The Work Group will also be asked to provide an additional level of review, with a particular eye to regional significance, on the input received during CVFPP management actions public workshops. The Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group is one of five regional work groups for the CVFPP.

### **MEETING GOALS**

1. Launch CVFPP Phase 2 and Affirm Regional Management Actions Work Group Charter
2. Discuss the Relationship of Phase 2 to next Phases of the CVFPP, and the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
3. Receive Feedback on the Management Actions Approach and Structure
4. Organize for Phase 2 Workshops and future Phase 2 work

### **SUMMARY**

#### **Welcome and Greetings**

Janet Thomson, meeting facilitator, welcomed the Work Group participants and reviewed the meeting purpose, objectives, and agenda.

#### **Review RMAWG Charter**

Janet Thomson reviewed the Lower Sacramento Work Group charter with work group partners, who subsequently affirmed the charter. The Work Group is chartered to complete the following tasks:

- Provide input on the management actions framework;
- Provide input on the regional applicability of management actions, including packaging management actions into groups that should be carried forward for further consideration (in Phase 3) or removed from consideration (either within the region or systemwide);
- Provide input on how management actions fit/comply with the intended scope of the CVFPP; and
- Advise about what coordination should occur with Lower Sacramento River region programs and projects as the CVFPP is developed (including rationale and recommendations on how to achieve coordination)

#### **Opening Remarks**

Noel Lerner, DWR Flood Project Office Chief, introduced himself to the Work Group. As the Executive Sponsor for the Lower Sacramento Work Group, Noel represents DWR's executive level and works cooperatively with Jeremy Arrich, CVFPO Chief, to develop the CVFPP. Noel will be helping to coordinate ongoing Flood Project Office projects planned for 2012 – 2017 with the CVFPP.

Noel provided an overview of the 2012 CVFPP, which will provide the framework for the 2017 plan. Phase 1 of the CVFPP planning effort focused on defining regional conditions, Phase 2 (the current phase) focuses on the identification of management actions, and Phases 3 and 4 will address regionally appropriate solution sets and systemwide solutions sets, respectively. DWR has determined that a

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

programmatic Environmental Impact Report is required for the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to adopt the CVFPP. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and corresponding scoping meetings are planned for August-September 2010.

Q: Does the 2012 CVFPP identify or generate specific projects for implementation?

A: No, the 2012 CVFPP provides management direction and a set of alternatives (including what is minimally acceptable) for Central Valley flood protection. The plan also provides a framework and set of solutions that will set the foundation for 2017. DWR is coordinating with the existing flood protection programs to make sure that projects implemented between now and 2017 are consistent with the CVFPP goals and principles.

Q: Several projects geared toward 200-year flood protection for urban areas already have been allocated funds. What projects are planned for non-urban areas?

A: A number of projects and programs are planned, including Proposition 13 projects, Flood Control Subventions Program projects, and several others. Additionally, DWR has Early Implementation Program (EIP) funding to assist with local levees and support the flood corridor program.

Q: How will current projects be considered in the CVFPP's development?

A: Critical to the planning process is defining existing and likely future conditions in the project area, including current and likely future projects. That was a major effort of Phase 1 as described in the Regional Conditions Report. Accordingly, solution sets considered in the CVFPP will be developed on the basis that current projects, including those under construction, are in place and functioning as intended.

Q: Will the systemwide solutions set be a compilation of the minimally acceptable solution sets for each region?

A: Not necessarily. The systemwide solutions will provide an overarching framework of solutions. While the regions may have differing needs, they are not independent from each other and the solutions will need to be considered in light of the inter-related regions.

Q: Plans with goals similar to this one have been developed before without leading to any action. How can we prevent this from happening with the CVFPP?

A: Legislation requires that DWR move forward with the solutions identified in this plan. However, this plan will need participation and ownership from local stakeholders to keep moving forward.

Q: Have the \$5B of funds for flood protection already been allocated? If so, will additional funding be required to develop projects identified between 2012 and 2017?

A: The \$5B has already been allocated, but some of that allocated money could be reprogrammed to projects identified through the CVFPP. DWR may need to seek additional funding for other projects identified between 2012 and 2017.

Q: Will this process influence the selection criteria of future flood protection project RFPs?

A: That should be considered if the projects are consistent with the CVFPP goals and principles.

Q: While we are working on the 2012 CVFPP to set a foundation for 2017, the baseline conditions of this plan could potentially change. For example, other projects or programs might change flows or habitats in the Lower Sacramento region. How can we make sure that the CVFPP remains applicable and relevant while the baseline is changing?

A: There will always be change in the system, but we can look at the impacts and try to anticipate how the system will change so that we can effectively evaluate proposed projects. Additionally, the CVFPP will be updated every five years and will consistently incorporate newly available information.

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Q: What is the relationship between the CVFPP and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)?

A: They are related because they're happening in the same geographic area, but it is not the intent for either to dominate or constrain the other. In the coming summer and fall, DWR will make a concerted effort to coordinate the two processes and inform the public as to their relationship. The CVFPP is an informational document that will explain potential challenges and alternatives to the CVFPP and legislature and will hopefully act as a gatekeeper for solutions and projects that are consistent with the Plan.

Comment: While the Plan clearly provides urban areas with 200-year levels of flood protection, it does not currently specify the protection that will be provided for rural and small communities. We need to focus our discussions on a strategy for protecting rural and small communities before we determine which management actions will achieve that strategy.

Erin Mullin, CVFPP representative, provided an overview of Phase 1, during which the regional work groups identified existing and future conditions, potential problems and opportunities, CVFPP goals, and principles and objectives.

Q: Why is reducing the state's liability not listed as a goal of the CVFPP? The Lower Sacramento Work Group repeatedly identified it as an important issue during Phase 1. Addressing liability in this Plan will increase the ability of getting local buy-in for it.

A: The CVFPP Study Team determined that focusing on liability would be more appropriate as a CVFPP principle or objective than a fundamental project goal, since the goals are focused on providing direction on plan development to meet legislative requirements. There are opportunities as part of the planning process to further develop principles and objectives that could contribute to better defining system responsibilities, and work will continue in Phases 2 and 3 to expand planning principles and objectives for the CVFPP.

*Note: DWR is developing additional information regarding how liability will be addressed in the CVFPP.*

Q: Were regional differences from Phase 1 captured?

A: Yes, they are included in the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) and the Interim Progress Summary #1 (IPS1).

### **Overview of Management Actions Development Process, Organization, and Documentation**

Vanessa Nishikawa, MWH Technical Lead, presented an overview of the Phase 2 management actions process. The goals of Phase 2 are to compile management actions, develop evaluation and screening methods, and initiate the environmental review. The outcomes of Phase 2 will be a second interim progress report (IPS2), a Management Actions Report, and a CVFPP Progress Report.

Management actions are specific actions that contribute to CVFPP goals and address the problems and opportunities identified in Phase 1. Individual management actions will be combined into solutions sets that are both region-specific and systemwide. Phase 1 provided over 800 management actions that were consolidated by the project team and subject matter experts to 82 management actions in 11 different categories. During Phase 2, they will be further refined by Work Group partners and other stakeholders who attend the management actions workshops.

There will be two rounds of workshops to discuss and provide feedback on the management actions. The first round will review and evaluate the 11 categories of management actions. The second round will describe how management actions can be applied to different regions and communities. During Phase 2, there will also be topic-focused work groups that will discuss specific issues such as financing and

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

revenue, climate change, and system operations. The workshops are open to the public and Work Group partners may attend as few or many as they wish.

Additional details about the upcoming workshops, management actions categories, and schedules will be available at [www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp](http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp).

Q: In the topic-specific work groups, there is a topic entitled "Urban Level of Protection Definition." We need a holistic discussion to address urban, rural, and small community levels of protection. Having that discussion during Phase 4 (systemwide solution sets) is too late, because this issue should define an overall strategy for rural and small community flood management and then subsequently guide the development of management actions for those areas.

A: The work group is intended to more clearly define the 200-year level of protection, and may require renaming to better clarify the intent. . Your concern about defining levels of protection is clear, and every attempt will be made to consider how to address that in this process. Initial discussions on the applicability of management actions in urban, rural, and agricultural areas will begin during the second round of workshops in Phase 2, and then will be discussed further in the context of different regions during Phase 3.

Q: A first draft of the evaluation of each management action has been developed by the program team. What feedback would you like us to provide?

A: Any information you can provide to improve or add to the evaluation is valuable. Draft evaluations will be available two weeks before the first round of workshops.

Q. Where did the information incorporated into the Draft Management Actions come from?

A. The existing and available references used in the development of the Draft Management Actions are identified at the end of each Management Action in the table, but some Management Actions may be seeking additional information.

Q: Under which category is water supply?

A: It is included under Operation & Maintenance.

### Looking Forward to Creating Solution Sets

Vanessa Nishikawa noted that in Phase 2, the Work Groups will initiate the creation of solution sets by developing management actions, or building blocks that work together to create regional and systemwide solutions. In this Phase, the Work Group will evaluate whether management actions apply to the Lower Sacramento region, and whether management actions should be further considered in future phases.

Q: We cannot identify the deficiencies in the flood management system without knowing what the standards are for facilities and then determining whether the facilities are operating to those standards. Where and how is that information being developed?

A: DWR is currently working on the Flood Control System Status Report which describes the state flood protection facilities and their status. That document will be available in the fall for public review.

Comment: This is a key issue because if deficiencies are identified and not dealt with, they expose the state to liability claims.

Q: How will evaluation methods be introduced in Phase 2?

A: The evaluation methods will be discussed and vetted through topic work group discussions and efforts. Those evaluation methods will then be applied to regional and systemwide solution sets.

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Q: How will the problems and opportunities identified in Phase 1 be included in Phase 2?

A: The solution sets will need to include the management actions as well as the problems and opportunities.

Q: Although the 2012 CVFPP does not include specific solutions, will it have a level of detail that allows local decision-makers to use the plan to make decisions?

A: The plan will be a high level document but should have sufficient information to allow local decision-makers to make decisions. Local input on Plan development during the workshops is important for making sure the plan is useful for local decision-makers.

Q: As an example, one alternative to keep water out of a region may move it into a different one. How would this be addressed?

A: When systemwide solution sets are discussed, these tradeoffs, benefits, and costs across regions will be discussed. From these discussions, DWR will be able to provide the CVFPB with information to make recommendations to the legislature.

Q: Will there be a state acceptable, operative model to forecast the effects of management actions solution sets?

A: Yes, there will be a tool to make judgments about the relative viability of different solutions.

Q: When does a proposed action trigger mitigable effects?

A: It is our goal to be able to do that now. Different regions have different concerns, so we hope to address those respectively.

Vanessa also explained that each solution set will be judged according to its relative tradeoffs according to level of public safety and flood risk reduction, initial investment, long-term operation and maintenance costs, opportunities to promote environmental restoration, and opportunities to integrate other benefits.

Q: How will these complex tradeoffs be examined, will there be contractors and resources available to conduct these evaluations?

A: The program team is working to put together manageable solutions that bookend our opportunity area (eg: what is the minimally acceptable solution set and the "Cadillac" solution set?). Feasibility studies will be completed on those themes we want further information on. We are initially looking more at a reconnaissance level than at a detail level.

Comment: These are complex issues and having the ability to conduct a more detailed analysis will be fundamental to the success and potential for implementation of this Plan.

Q: These issues are difficult to talk about in the abstract; they are highly dependent on what region is being discussed. Will we address these by region?

A: Yes, this will be the main topic at Work Group Meeting #2, which takes place after the workshops.

Q: I do not understand the process to discuss the tradeoffs. When will we discuss that?

A: This will be done in Phase 3.

Q: Are there tools to know what the riparian habitat looks like in various places so we know how much flexibility we have to conduct restoration?

A: An ecosystems function model is under development. This will be a topic of focus for the environmental work group.

## Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #1

Comment: There is a corridor management plan for the Lower Feather River; hopefully the information from it can be included in the CVFPP.

Q: Are hydraulic models available that show where the system has flexibility?

A: An effort is underway to develop that model, but it will probably not be ready for use in the 2012 plan.

Q: When and how is this process going to look at the issue of vegetation on levees? We have two years to come up with something which may not be enough time.

A: Vegetation on levees is an important issue for effective flood management in the Central Valley. It is planned that this topic will be further addressed in studies for the CVFPP, likely in an upcoming “deep-dive” workshop. Vegetation on levees will be a factor in formulation of solutions sets in the CVFPP.

### **Preparing for Management Actions Workshops**

Janet requested that Work Group partners fill out sign up sheets for the first round of management action workshops, occurring between July 19 and 29, and email them to [jthomson@kearnswest.com](mailto:jthomson@kearnswest.com) or to MWH technical lead Vanessa Nishikawa ([Vanessa.nishikawa@us.mwhglobal.com](mailto:Vanessa.nishikawa@us.mwhglobal.com)).

### **Next Meetings, Action Item Review, Meeting Recap**

Janet thanked Work Group partners for their attendance and encouraged them to attend the management actions workshops.