



Meeting Summary

Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

August 6, 2009, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

**Location: Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corporation
1227 Bridge Street, Suite C
Yuba City, California 95991**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Michael Bessette	City of West Sacramento	Member
Ryan Bonea	Sutter County Resource Conservation District; Yuba County	Member
Francis Borcalli	FloodSAFE Yolo; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Bill Center	American River Recreation Association, Planning & Conservation League (president), CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba) IRWMP, Planning Committee and Coordinating Committee member	Member
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
Mike Dietl	USACE (for Miki Fujitsubo)	Alternate
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Dan Fua	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Member
Mike Hardesty	RD 2068, RD 2098, California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Member
Gary Hobgood	California Department of Fish & Game, North Central Region; North Central Region Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (Staff Env Sci & Lead Person); Interagency Flood Management Collaborative (Member); Regional Variance Group (Member); Small Erosion Repair Program Group (Member); Sacramento River Bank Protection Project Interagency Working Group; Lower American River Task Force	Member
Steve Lambert	Butte Co (Supervisor District 4); Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency (Member); Sac River Conservation Area Forum (Member); Butte Basin Water Users Assn; FERC Relicensing Subcom (Member); Natl Assn of Counties (Member) Cal Assn of Counties (Member); Upper Sac River Advisory Council (Member); Butte County General Plan 2030	Member

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

Name	Organization	Status
	(Director)	
Julia McIver	Yolo County	Member
Tim Miramontes	Yolo County Farm Bureau; California Rice Commission; California Farm Bureau Rice Advisory	Member
Julia Pokrandt	River Partners (for Helen Swagerty)	Alternate
Jeffrey Twitchell	District One of Sutter County (District Engineer); urban and rural interests of Yuba City-Sutter Basin (LD-1 Sutter Co, Yuba City, and Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency)	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP* Program Manager
Erin Mullin	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Pierre Stephens	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR*** Lead
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Program Manager
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Craig Wallace	MWH Americas Inc	Team
Michael Harty	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Benjamin Gettleman	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

*Central Valley Flood Management Planning

**Central Valley Flood Planning Office

***California Department of Water Resources

Absent:

Bill Busath	City of Sacramento	Member
Miki Fujitsubo	USACE	Member
Tovey Giezentanner	Conaway Preservation Group LLC; RD 2035; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Ronald Stork	Friends of the River	Member
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member

Observers:

Butch Hodgkins	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
Diane Fales	RD 1001

WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS/ (requested by 8/13/09)

1. Review and provide comments on general description of Lower Sacramento Region from draft Regional Conditions Summary Report

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- Document emailed to work group members on 8/7/09
 - Suggested revisions and comments should be captured in track changes, emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
2. **Review Master Reference List based on familiarity with studies/reports**
 - Spreadsheet emailed to work group members on 8/7/09
 - Comments to references (category/reasons) should be inserted into spreadsheet, emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
 3. **Complete Worksheet #3: Initial Identification of Community Success Factors**
 - Worksheet emailed to work group members on 8/7/09
 - Members should consult with their constituencies to fill out worksheet, email to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
 4. **Other**
 - Facilitation Support to send calendar invitations for future work group meetings
 - Work group members to confirm their offers of meeting locations
 - Work group members to share CVFPP information with their constituencies
 - Facilitation Support to send out meeting summary to work group members
 - Members to send any clarifying comments to Pierre Stephens
 - Pierre Stephens to start working on coordinated plan to contact IRWM groups
 - DWR will consult internally and provide additional information about access to electronic versions of documents by the next work group meeting

GROUP RECAP

The following may be edited and used by Work Group partners in communicating with their constituencies:

The Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group of the Central Valley Flood Management Planning Program (CVFMP) initiated its work on August 6, 2009 with the following actions:

- An initial review of existing and unique conditions/resources in the area that should be considered in the development of the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). These include biological, physical, infrastructure, socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional and other considerations
- An initial review of reference documents/studies that might be used to study and evaluate resource conditions related to flood management in the Lower Sacramento region
- An initial review of the community success factors necessary to further a shared vision of and support for flood management in the Central Valley.

The Work Group's purpose, described in its charter, is the development of content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR), a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCSR, incorporating input from all five regions of the Central Valley, will identify resources at risk in the absence of an integrated, sustainable statewide flood protection plan as well as the opportunities for that plan to address flood prevention and protection in a comprehensive and integrated manner that reflects community priorities.

FUTURE MEETINGS SCHEDULE

The following meeting dates and locations were agreed to by work group members. While it is not possible to find dates for all meetings that work for all schedules, this schedule appears to fairly balance schedule conflicts. The meeting facilitation team will send Microsoft Outlook calendar invitations to the work group for the following schedule:

- August 27, 2009 (Woodland)
- September – 10 (DWR) & 24 (Yuba City), 2009
- October – 7 (Yolo County Farm Bureau) & 22 (TBD), 2009

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- November – 5 (TBD) & 19 (TBD), 2009

MEETING OVERVIEW

The goal of the first of up to ten meetings of the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group was to introduce and establish a shared understanding of:

1. The context for and relationships among the CFVPP, FloodSAFE Initiative, RCSR, State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and five regional conditions work groups.
2. The purpose of the RCSR as the description of regional resources conditions in the Central Valley, as the first step to develop a vision in the CVFPP. The plan is to develop a systems approach for integrated flood management in the Central Valley, with an emphasis on areas currently receiving protection from the facilities of the SPFC.
3. The role of the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group in developing content for the RCSR based on their knowledge and understanding of the regional area and existing conditions as they relate to past, current and potential threats from flooding.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Confirm group charter: purpose, deliverables, membership, schedule, and process
- Clarify relationship of work group to the larger FloodSAFE effort
- Outline RCSR – the main deliverable of this work group
- Receive initial input on “Study Area Descriptions” (Chapter 2)
- Receive initial input on unique existing “Resource Conditions” (physical, biological, infrastructure, socioeconomic, cultural, institutional and other)
- Receive initial input on priorities pertaining to the Resource Conditions
- Receive initial input on the compiled “Reference List” of Central Valley flood-related studies, documents and resources that might be used in the development of the CVFPP
- Initiate identification of the “Community Success Factors” necessary to further a shared vision of and support for flood management in the Central Valley

SUMMARY

Welcome and Greetings

Pierre Stephens (DWR Lead) and Michael Harty (Facilitator) welcomed the meeting participants.

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester (CVFMP Program Manager) welcomed the group and provided opening remarks.

Overview: FloodSAFE & Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Michele Ng (CVFPO) gave a PowerPoint presentation on FloodSAFE and the CVFPP. The PowerPoint is available on the CVFMP Program Web site: [<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp>].

Q: How high a priority is it to address issues involving potential state flood liability in the CVFPP? How will this issue be addressed within this work group and the broader CVFPP?

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

A: There is specific language in legislation to protect the state from liability. DWR expects to develop a long-term vision that represents all the resource conditions; these will be taken into account with respect to liability.

A work group member emphasized the importance of not increasing the state's liability associated with flooding through this effort, and to consider actions that will reduce the state's liability.

Charter Review

The facilitator and participants reviewed the work group charter for mission and deliverables, membership, roles and responsibilities, decision-making process and work schedule. The charter is available on the CVFMP Program Web site:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/docs/CharterLowerSacramentoRCWG20090724.pdf>

The facilitator noted that the facilitation team is content neutral, and that members should engage with MWH and DWR staff concerning the content of the RCSR.

The facilitator also noted that this is an input process, and the work group will not be making decisions that require consensus. If there are disagreements we will learn as much as possible and note them but we will not seek unanimity.

Regarding written products, the facilitator clarified that members will have the opportunity to review drafts and indicate their level of support for the products, as well as what could be done to maximize their level of support.

Glossary

The group reviewed the glossary for common understanding of terms, names and acronyms.

Regional Conditions Summary Report Overview

Vanessa Nishikawa (Technical Lead) described the RCSR, including its purpose and contents.

Purpose: Define resource conditions for each region of the Central Valley

Scope:

- Define/document current conditions and future challenges
- Identify flood management and related problems/needs
- Identify ecosystem problems and opportunities
- Define CVFPP goals and objectives

Utility:

- Provide the background for future discussions of management actions
- Define what the CVFPP is to accomplish

Q: The outline includes topics that typically would be included in an Environmental Impact Report. Will there be a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document associated with this plan?

A: It is possible that there could be CEQA documents associated with the CVFPP.

Q: Will areas not included within the focus regions be taken into account?

A: The RCSR will be looking at the entire watershed.

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

Q: In terms of data sources and references, should the work group members be providing all the data/content in the watershed?

A: The first step is to review the list of references prepared by the project team and make sure it is accurate and complete. If there are gaps that can be filled, that information should be provided to DWR. Final decisions on content reside with the DWR Director.

Q: Will the CVFPP define how the state will participate financially?

A: Early implementation projects are underway now. The CVFPP needs to address not just how the voter-approved \$5 billion will be spent, but also give recommendations on future actions to improve the flood protection system. Funding strategy is a key component of the CVFPP.

Resources Conditions (Worksheet 1)

The work group reviewed the initial list of resource areas and topics in the draft Chapter 2 outline and made additions to the list.

Q: What integration/coordination exists among all the forums and initiatives addressing issues that involve flood management, e.g., Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) plans?

A: DWR is making coordination a priority. We are aware of the complexity of integrating the efforts, and we recognize that it needs to be done.

Q: Will the work group distinguish between the SPFC and the CVFPP? It's in the state's interest – and it's very important – to draw attention to the distinction.

A: It is important to be clear about the scope of the CVFPP. The messaging is important to promote understanding and support.

Work group member comments prior to break-out groups:

- A conditions report for the Lower Feather River was recently completed, and it could be helpful for this exercise (a copy of the report was circulated among work group members for a quick initial review).
- It would be helpful for DWR to identify the major efforts that are going on, and create a list of major planning efforts so that members will be aware of them. The list would help members identify the interplay between the efforts. (it was noted that the California Water Plan is addressing this).
- The IRWM regions are defined differently from regions being used to develop the RCSR and CVFPP.
- The state has a unique problem – it has taken on more responsibility for floods than other natural disasters like earthquakes.
- The CVFPP should be easy to understand for non-engineers.
- It will be important to test key assumptions to ensure they are not out of date (e.g., soil hardness, changes in land use and management).
- The CVFPP can raise the bar on hazard classification. The Federal Emergency Management Agency maps aren't very good.

The work group members divided into two break-out groups to define important regional resources conditions. One group focused on the Physical, Biological, and Infrastructure conditions. The other group focused on Socioeconomic, Cultural, and Institutional conditions. Each break-out group reported back to the larger group summarizing their discussion. A note taker in each small group compiled input in a master worksheet.

The results of the Worksheet 1 exercise are embedded below.

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

References List (Worksheet 2)

The work group reviewed the Master Reference List of about 200 studies, reports and resources that could be helpful in preparing the RCSR. The members then reviewed a shorter list of sample references (Worksheet 2). They assigned selected references a code based on its value and utility and provided an explanation (narrative) of the basis for their judgment.

Q: How will there be access to the references?

A: DWR is collecting the references as part of this project, but they are not all available through the DWR FloodSAFE web site at this time. If there is a reference of particular interest it can be provided so long as it is in electronic form. The master reference list indicates what DWR currently can make available electronically.

The results of the Worksheet 2 exercise are embedded below in the worksheet chart.

Community Success Factors (Worksheet 3)

The work group members divided into two break-out groups to identify important community success factors (what the CVFPP will need to be successful). Each break-out group reported back to the larger group summarizing their discussion. A note taker in each small group compiled input in a master worksheet.

Socioeconomic

- Land Use Planning Tools/Blueprints
 - The region needs to take a very detailed look at existing planning 'blueprints' and make sure the CVFPP is consistent with adopted blueprints.
- Small communities
 - Success factors for helping small communities must involve developing some mechanism that allows them to comply with the legislation without relying upon a cost/benefit ratio (i.e. mitigation or social policy). It is also important to distinguish small communities that are part of the SPFC from those that aren't.
- Agricultural
 - Agriculture interests would like to see no changes in operations. They would lose agriculture, money, community, and food production.
- Setback levees
 - Fair compensation will be needed to ensure rural community support.
 - If setback levees are constructed, main levees would possibly not be maintained to the appropriate standards
- Financial impact
 - Must be sensitive regarding compensation and loss – it will have an impact on public perception. It will be important not to contribute to a mistrust of government in agricultural communities facing these issues.
 - Plan should acknowledge realities of projects that have a cost-sharing element
- Alignment of economic incentives
 - We need to have an economic discussion of the long-term costs of flood control

Flood Flow Management

- We need to provide the science – documenting examples--showing that flow management and vegetation can co-exist.

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

Natural Resources

- The plan should be multi-objective
 - A successful plan is one that everyone wants the plan to succeed. There should be an opportunity for every interest involved to pursue its goals.
 - Flood control projects should be viewed as ecological systems – shouldn't just be concrete systems
- Environmental stewardship
 - Should be an important part of the plan, not an afterthought
 - Native habitat can be used as an effective flood management tool
 - Connectivity between habitat is important
- Climate change
 - Riparian corridors will be essential as a safety mechanism

Additional Perspectives to Capture

The group was asked what people and perspectives were not represented in the room, and should be included in this process in some capacity.

- Recreational:
 - Fishing
 - Hunting
 - Rafting
 - Ducks Unlimited
- Bay Delta Conservation Plan
 - DWR
 - State contractors
- Tribes
- Water quality
 - Wastewater treatment plant operators
- Tax-payers group
 - Group representing citizen interests

Q: How will you engage with these additional perspectives?

A: One approach will be to set up *ad hoc* discussions with groups whose input is needed. DWR wants to take advantage of existing forums as much as possible.

Member comments regarding additional perspectives:

- We should use a “step-down” approach to engage the community, instead of having large community meetings where people don't know what's going on.
- When you develop the list of groups/councils to contact, you need to ask them how they want us to communicate with them.
- Engage with IRWM groups as soon as possible.

Summary of Worksheet #1 Responses: Resource Conditions

PHYSICAL

The group added the following factors to consider:

- Habitat
- Mercury/Heavy Metals Transport
- Climate
- Changing of landscapes (runoff patterns)
- Mining legacy

Designated floodways and flow easements (CVFPB)

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

Unique Conditions to focus on in the CVFPP:

- Mining legacy (the region has a unique mining history specific to the Yuba River)
- Higher river elevation (most levee channels within region were designed to move water quickly, so water surface tends to be higher than that of the land protected by levees.)
- Response to precipitation (the system is very responsive to precipitation events, thus making the system even more sensitive to climate change.)
- Reservoir dependent (depends on multipurpose reservoirs, and lacks control on the Yuba River system)
- Bypass system (the bypasses are unique to the region and the Yolo Bypass really has no capacity left. In addition, the bypasses are extremely sensitive to changes upstream in land use and local flood runoff.)
- Land subsidence (caused by increased groundwater pumping has reduced the performance of levees.)
- Levee design (the materials used to build the levees, e.g., clay placed over sandy soils) and how agricultural levees are now protecting urban areas.
- The system is so complex that it will be difficult to modify
- Land use (gravel mining) in the Goldfields could create a new channel.
- Non-project levees were built to protect land from flooding caused by the project levees.

BIOLOGICAL

The group added the following factors to consider:

- Riparian
- Floodplains
- Agriculture
- Recreation (hunting/fishing)
- Native/Non-native/Invasive species
- Connectivity
- Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) / Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) efforts
- Working landscapes
- Forest management

Unique Conditions to focus on in the CVFPP:

- Vegetation on levees (there is a unique challenge to the region for maintaining flood protection while trying to preserve riparian habitat.)
- Bypass system (the bypass system has a unique land development pattern in that it was originally farm land that became floodways. Farming still occurred in the bypasses, but eventually bypasses were relied on for habitat.)
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) Migration Corridor (the region is a unique ESA migration corridor, and the Yuba River is the only natural producing habitat in the region.)
- Reclamation Districts (there is a unique history of the RDs adapting from Agricultural to Urban environments. A unique challenge facing the RDs is how to manage their districts going forward)
- Proximity to the Delta (the close proximity to the Delta provides unique ecosystem enhancement opportunities. Example: Different flow volumes and tidal wetlands opportunities.)
- Non-native and invasive species (there are unique invasive species in the creeks and floodways within the region)
- Interconnection (there is a unique interconnection to the flood control system, water supply system, and the ecosystem.)

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- Small community legacy (there is a unique challenge facing small communities that must comply with the legislation but face challenges related to benefit-cost analyses)

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

The group added the following factors to consider:

- Population and projected growth
- Land use and planned growth
 - Development projects “in pipeline”
- Insurance rates
- Built landscape
- Small communities (subsets) – an inventory would be helpful
- Interaction of flood management and water supply (including groundwater)
- Politics and governance
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments Blueprint
- General Plans

Unique Conditions to focus on in the CVFPP:

- Setback levees – potential conflict between some agricultural and flood management interests
 - Agriculture is part of the regional culture
 - How this conflict was handled on the Lower American could be used as a “best practice” example
 - It’s important to identify examples of agriculture that have successfully existed within the floodplain
- Vegetation/trees on levees
 - The trees have an aesthetic and monetary value to homeowners
 - You can’t just cut down the trees – people will be angry
- Recreation
 - Greater access to rivers could lead to greater public awareness and support for solutions that are developed
 - Recreation areas must be consciously managed, not ignored
- Interface between agriculture and natural habitats
 - There is potential for conflict (i.e. animals eating farm crops), and this needs to be monitored and managed proactively
- Risk perception
 - New residents need to be educated about flood issues
 - Changing demographics affect public’s perception of risk
 - There is often a collective short-term memory on floods and flooding
- Development is a key issue
 - Plumas Lake Development, Natomas Basin, Cross Canal improvement are significant development projects – impact on flooding landscape
 - Development should not preclude future flood structure options
 - We should discourage development where flood management infrastructure might be needed
- Smaller creeks
 - There are downstream consequences of upstream development
- Sacramento Airport expansion
 - Poses limits on use of airport lands for mitigation – potential bird strikes

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- Building homes inside of levees [river side] is still happening
 - Boards are allowed to permit variance to the regulation
- Upstream building codes
 - The area has a lot of localized flooding; this is not captured by the larger system
- Williamson Act – inadequate funding

Pertinent Programs, Projects and Plans:

- Historical flood map would be helpful
- UC Davis – Eric Larsen
 - Computer modeling of how the Sacramento River has changed
- Local Government Commission resources
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments – Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS)

CULTURAL

The group added the following factors to consider:

- General history of area and sub-regions
- Community character (heritage towns)
- Significance of flood control system

Unique Conditions to focus on in the CVFPP:

- Legacy of mining/goldfields, resulting environmental issues
- Native American tribes
 - We don't want to wait until the last step to include in the process
 - Significant sites along all rivers need to be taken into consideration
 - Many of the sites are kept secret, making it challenging
- History of flood management system as it exists
 - History of debris dams is telling
- Role of agriculture
 - Driver of cultural resources
 - Changes the physical landscape
- Cultural evolution
 - We've moved from being an adaptive culture to asking the government to guarantee our safety – taking responsibility has changed
- Access to rivers/levees
 - Part of the culture
 - High/gated levees take away recreational opportunities

Pertinent Programs, Projects and Plans:

- *Battling the Inland Sea: Floods, Public Policy, and the Sacramento Valley* – book
 - History of flood management
- Book on the history of debris dams
- Feather River Feasibility Study – look at bibliography for references
- Attorney General's office (Environment Division) has documents on Yuba river history
- Pacific Institute recently issued a report on the future of agriculture – look at bibliography for references
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) located in CA Department of Parks and Recreation, State Parks – Place to start for Native American documents
- Chico State – has documents on history of Native American history
- State Parks – source of information

Regional Priorities:

- OHP – must be engaged early in the process

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- Engage local tribal councils
- Document impact of mining and agriculture on flood system

INFRASTRUCTURE

The group added the following factors to consider:

- Levees
- Roads
- Dams
- Bypasses
- Encroachments
- Reservoirs
- Useful Life
- Irrigation and Drainage District information
- Transformation to urban
- Drainage and flood control
- Channels
- Diversions, fish screens, and ladders (fish barriers)
- Ports
- Local flood control projects (connection to the larger system (SPFC))
- SPFC facilities
- “Be clear on scope” – need to have clear messaging

Unique Conditions

- Highways (there are multiple highways within the region (I-5, 80, 99, 70, 113, 16, 20), and it is believed to be the only region to have had two major highways closed due to flooding during the same event)
- Encroachments (there are numerous encroachments throughout the region)
- Unique standards (there are unique standards for levee designs (e.g., the Garden Highway area)
- Wastewater treatment plants (there are several WWTP that are at risk during extreme flooding events within the region.)
- Railroads (there are certain stretches of railroad that could be vulnerable during floods.)
- Port of Sacramento (the Port of Sacramento levees have a unique legacy in that the levees have been maintained differently than project levees.) These levees were built to facilitate navigation, and although it is providing flood protection, it is not maintained to the same standards as a flood protection levee.
- Multipurpose reservoirs (most reservoirs within the region are operated for multiple purposes, e.g., water supply and power).
- Transfer of hydraulic impacts (changes in land use and levees downstream can lead to flooding upstream by backing up water.)

INSTITUTIONAL

The group added the following factors to consider:

- Jurisdictional/issues and distinctions
- Considerations for funding
- Local/regional

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

- Local cost and share and indemnification
- Coordination amongst disparate single-use entities
- Robust and accessible telemetry system
- Laws and regulations (federal/state/local)
- Emergency planning, response and recovery (how the system “ramps”)
- Insurance (risk management)
- Behavior modification
- Residual risks to flooding
 - Management
- Institutional responsibility and planning processes (e.g., IRWM plans, forest management plans, etc.)
- Validation of assumptions made (changes in land use and management)
- Hazard classification (related to FEMA maps)
- Relationship between governmental/structure and funding
 - Single purpose

Unique Conditions to focus on in the CVFPP:

- Complex maze of government agencies
 - Difficult to manage/navigate various levels of jurisdiction – can hamstring things from getting done
 - Overlap of regulatory agencies
 - Example: drainage districts overlap with water supply districts, which overlap with city and county jurisdictions
 - Emergence of flood control agencies – good example of regional flood control
 - Lack of coordination and authority among single-purpose agencies
 - Small, underfunded organizations with significant responsibility (Local Agency Formation Commissions)
 - The purpose of some institutions has changed
 - US Army Corps of Engineers vegetation and levee policy – need to document
 - Plethora of entities control structures of rivers



Meeting Summary

Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group

Meeting #1

Summary of Worksheet #2 Responses: References

During the August 3, 2009 meeting the work group conducted a first pass review of the references and indicated the value they assigned to the reference for this study and the reasons why. There is a homework assignment to consider the references in more depth.

CATEGORY CODES

MUST	Extremely important, must include
GOOD	Good general reference
USE	Use – but with caution

IRR	Irrelevant
NO	Not acceptable

SUP	Superseded by later documents/studies
UNK	Unknown

REFERENCE NAME	CATEGORY	NARRATIVE
DWR. 2005. White Paper. Flood Warnings: Responding to California's Flood Crisis. January.	GOOD	Documentation of the system Documents how the system was developed for agriculture, but that now we have urbanizing areas Lays out the framework for why we developed the legislation- helpful background
DWR. 2006. Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Planning and Managing California's Water Resources.	GOOD	Helpful references regarding potential changes in river runoff timing and magnitude

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

REFERENCE NAME	CATEGORY	NARRATIVE
DWR. 2008. Draft FloodSAFE Strategic Plan, May.	MUST	If you're interested in being involved, you read this
USACE and Reclamation Board. 1999. Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study Phase I Documentation Report. March.	MUST/USE	Background Technical aspect is helpful/essential Good source of hydrological information on the Central Valley Be cautious - not enough outreach in creating the document, and changes have been made since
USACE and Reclamation Board. 2002b. Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins California Comprehensive Study, Interim Report. 2002.	See above	See above

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

REFERENCE NAME	CATEGORY	NARRATIVE
USACE. 1955. Sacramento District. Standard Operation and Maintenance Manual for the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. Revised May.	MUST	Historical background Guides the Operations & Maintenance Foundation of the system
USACE. 1959. Sacramento District. Standard Operation and Maintenance Manual for the Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries Project, California. April.	GOOD	Good reference Not directly applicable to this region
USACE. 1978. Maps, River and Harbor, Flood Control and California Debris Commission. Sacramento District, Civil Works Projects.	SUP	Newer maps have been made

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #1

REFERENCE NAME	CATEGORY	NARRATIVE
USACE. 1999. Post-Flood Assessment for 1983, 1986, 1995, and 1997 Central Valley, California. Sacramento District.	GOOD	Documents what we know about the system Documents what happened during stressful events Helpful economic data