



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary FINAL

Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Time: August 27, 2009, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

Location: Cosumnes River Preserve
13501 Franklin Blvd. Galt, CA 95632

Presentations and Materials Available Online at www.water.ca.gov/cvfm

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:

Name	Organization
Ronald Baldwin	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services
Steve Bradley	California Department of Water Resources (DWR), BDCP Coordinator
John Cain	American Rivers, California Flood Management
Mark Connelly	San Joaquin County; San Joaquin County Flood Control and WC District; San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
Kara DiFrancesco	Natural Heritage Institute
Todd William Bruce	Dutra Group, Hearing Board Member, Solano/Yolo Air Quality Management District
Linda Fiack	Delta Protection Commission
Marci Coglianesse	Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Subcommittee
Robin Kulakow	Yolo Basin Foundation
Gilbert Labrie	Brannan-Andrus Levee Maintenance District, RD 2067, RD 407, RD 317
Karen Medders	North Delta CARES
Christopher Neudeck	Kjedsen, Sinnock, & Neudeck, Inc.
Michelle Orr	Philip Williams & Associates
Sarah Puckett	Natural Heritage Institute; Friends of Marsh Creek Watershed
Jerry Robinson	San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
Brook Schlenker	US Army Corps of Engineers
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento
Chuck Spinks	American Society of Civil Engineers
Jan Vick	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Jane Wagner-Tyack	Restore the Delta; League of Women Voters of San Joaquin County
Leo Winternitz	The Nature Conservancy

Team Present:

Bryan Brock	DWR (Work Group Lead)
Bill Eisenstein	Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team)
Ibrahim Khadam	MWH (Technical Team)
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting Group, Inc. (Executive Sponsor Team)
Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) (Facilitation Team)
Merritt Rice	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO – Project Lead)

Robert Yeadon	DWR, Regional Coordinator
Josh Yang	MWH (Technical Team)

Observers:

Edward Thurubeck, HDR, Joe Bartlett, DWR.

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

ITEM	OWNER	TIMEFRAME
1. Homework	Workgroup	9/3/09
2. Request someone from the BDCP Steering Committee attend Delta Work Group meetings to discuss which actions in the BDCP relate to flood management	Bryan Brock (DWR)	Future Meeting
3. Include a reoccurring agenda item which will focus on providing update on coordination with BDCP.	Bryan Brock	Next meeting
4. Send the Delta Suisun Marsh Map out to the Work Group electronically	Bryan Brock	9/11/09
5. Send out the revised Delta General Regional Description Section of the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR),.	Ibrahim Khadam (MWH)	Prior to next meeting
6. Email out a revised reference list to the Work Group.	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
7. Consider getting rid of references to Federal and private levees in the RCSR and replace it with consistent use of project and non-project levees.	Bryan Brock Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
8. Create a document version control system for the report review and communicate it to Work Group Members.	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
9. Provide socioeconomic data the Corp has been working on to Ibrahim Khadam (MWH) and Bryan Brock (DWR) to update existing data from the Delta Protection Commission reports.	U.S. Army Corp of Engineers	Prior to next meeting
10. Develop a protocol for submitting comments to MWH and DWR.	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
11. Find a way to provide acknowledgement that work group member comment was received.	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
12. Send out documents to be in a version that can be opened by all Work Group members (Word 2003 "doc" format rather than Word 2007 "docx" format).	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
13. Evaluate making emergency response a major section in Chapter 2 under Existing Conditions, instead of being under Institutional section	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
14. Obtain the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers list of future projects.	Ibrahim Khadam	Prior to next meeting
15. Provide DWR Staff with information on projects they think are highly likely to be approved / on the ground by 2015.	Work Group	On-going
16. Provide Ibrahim Khadam the 2009 list of Special Project requests.	Bryan Brock	9/11/09
17. Provide Worksheet 4 back to participants as requested.	Christal Love (CCP)	9/11/09
18. Survey the Resource Districts not currently participating in the Delta Work Group to see if they have future projects that will be on the ground by 2015.	Bryan Brock	On-going
19. Review list of cities not represented in the Work Group and contact them for future project information.	Bryan Brock	On-going
20. Schedule meetings at locations with wireless internet capability so Work Group Members who also sit on the BDCP Steering	Team	On-going

Committee can move between the CVFMP / BDCP meetings remotely should they be occurring at the same time.		
--	--	--

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group members in their communications)

The Delta Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the Central Valley Flood Management Planning (CVFMP) Program continued its work on August 27, 2009, with the following actions:

- Further review of existing and unique conditions/resources in the area that should be considered in the development of the first Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). The first CVFPP is scheduled to be completed by January 1, 2012, for consideration for adoption by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) by July 2012. These include biological, physical, infrastructure, socioeconomic (including agriculture), cultural, and institutional and other considerations.
- A review of Work Group input on references and community success factors from Meeting #1.
- An initial review of problems and opportunities in Chapter 3 of the RCSR, and discussion of challenges/risks unique to the Delta Region.
- The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCSR, a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCSR will identify resources conditions within the Central Valley, flood management and related problems and opportunities, and goals and objectives for use in preparing the CVFPP. The Delta Work Group is one of five regional Work Groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Respond to issues raised in Meeting #1 (including coordination among the regions)
- Summarize input received on reference list
- Provide and discuss revised draft of General Descriptions
- Summarize input received on Existing Resources Conditions outline (Chapter 2.3)* and provide preliminary draft text
- Hold initial discussion of likely future conditions (Chapter 2.4)
- Summarize input received on Community Success Factors
- Initiate discussion of problems and opportunities of Chapter 3

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Greetings

Bill Eisenstein (K&W) opened the meeting, discussed facility logistics, meeting materials and asked meeting participants to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the meeting agenda, provided a walkthrough of the day's materials/handouts and clarified that late homework would be accepted but may not be reflected in today's handout materials.

Attribution

There was a question as to why the previous meeting summary attributed comments made by DWR, MWH and the facilitation team members to the individual making the comment but comments made by others were non-attributed. Ken Kirby responded that it was a standard practice to record Work Group

Member comments without attributing them to the commenter, but that if a Work Group Member wanted a comment attributed to them to please let the facilitation team know.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Kirby provided opening remarks and presented a handout -“Responses to Questions from Meeting #1” that provided DWR responses to questions that arose during Meeting #1 of the Regional Conditions Work Groups. These questions were compiled from all the Work Groups, not just the Delta Work Group. Comments related to the presentation follow:

- There is a need for validation that the work in this group is being heard (**see Action Item #1**).
- There is a belief the BDCP Steering Committee needs to hear what is going on at these Delta meetings and a request was made to have the subject of a relationship with that group be a reoccurring agenda item (**see Action Item #2**).
- There was an interest in several governance issues:
 1. One person asked how many different governance boards are sitting now which deal with water resource management. Mr. Kirby noted there are numerous current boards sitting to deal with water issues in the Central Valley and added DWR’s is tasked with developing the plan to be submitted to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) for adoption.
 2. Another asked for clarification of the CVFPB structure hierarchy. Mr. Kirby explained that the authority governing water use varies across the state. For flood management, the CVFPB has a primary say in the Central Valley. The CVFPB needs to work closely with the Corps of Engineers for any modifications associated with the State/Federal flood system in the Central Valley.

Review of Previous Meeting #1 Action Items

After a general review the following two topics generated additional comment.

Maps

Brian Brock handed out an 11x17 maps of the Delta Suisun Marsh. One person believed there were some inaccuracies. The map will be out to the Work Group electronically for closer review with a request for feedback on inaccuracies (**see Action Item #3**).

Small and Rural Communities Definitions

Mr. Kirby discussed action on defining “small or rural communities,” noting that there had been concerns with the proposed definition. He noted the Work Group will have a revised glossary soon.

References

The Reference Review homework assignment from Meeting #1 was discussed. This homework assignment asked for additional information related references already compiled. To date MWH has received hundreds of reference requests to be added to the reference list. Once compiled, MWH Staff will send out the revised list and ask Work Group members to comment on the references (**see Action Items**).

General Descriptions

Another Meeting #1 homework item was a review Chapter 2.2 (General Regional Description in the Delta). A number of comments were received and the team is working to resolve any divergent comments as much as possible. MWH is working to incorporate all of these comments, and will send out

a version of the document for Work Group review as soon as it is available (**see Action Items**). Mr. Khadam clarified that while there is a logistical deadline for comments on draft text to be included in timely manner for next Work Group meeting, Work Group feedback is welcome at anytime and will be incorporate for review in subsequent meetings.

Discussion:

- A request was made to remove the term “private levees” from use in the Resource Conditions Summary Report as, while there are some private levees, for the most part, the non-State Plan of Flood Control levees shown on the map are under the ownership and maintained by established reclamation districts. The team agreed to review this (**see Action Items**). There was a question about whether there are more recent socioeconomic figures than 1994. Another member from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers offered to share more recent socioeconomic figures (**see Action Items**).

There was interest in improving the process of reviewing the document including the following:

- Indicate version number such as version 4 or 4 on the document.
- Use color text when indicating assignment for each Work Group.
- Include line numbering in the Word document.
- Develop a comment naming convention.
- Send all documents out in 2003 Word format doc rather than 2007 docx format.
- Provide an email response from staff acknowledging that their comments had been received

Follow on these items are captured in **Action Item #8 and #10**:

Augmented Chapter 2 Outline & Status of Preliminary Draft Information for Existing Resources Conditions

In presenting this items it was noted the Chapter 2 outline of the RCSR was revised based on Work Group responses on Worksheet 1 from Meeting #1 and in general, all suggestions were incorporated.

In cases were comments were in conflict; staff is working to reconcile areas of disagreement. Work Group members were asked to review the outline of Chapters 2 and 2.2. The following comments were generated:

- Emergency response should get its own section in Chapter 2. This should consider include two key issues related to emergency response: (1) responding to flood issues during a storm event and (2) responding to problems after flooding has occurred (**see Action Items**).
- Recreation should be broader than just wild and scenic designated areas and should include all types of both active and passive recreation.
- Add a section describing Environmental Justice programs that serve children as well as subsistence fishers.
- The Wetlands discussion should not be in the land use section.
- Address environmental regulation under influencing factors.

In addition to the Chapter 2 outline, MWH staff has started to populate some of the resources conditions areas. Chapter 2 already contains a great deal of information for many of these areas. The document is very large and will be emailed to the Work Group for comment.

One person asked if Chapter 2 could go into more detail regarding the tidal portion of the Delta and pointed out how different parts of the Delta have different levels of flood risk.

Introduction to Future Challenges (Period of Analysis)

Mr. Kirby explained the CVFPP is not expected to include a detailed analysis on future challenges at this time, but sought feedback on whether the Work Group thought 2050 was a reasonable timeframe. One participant affirmed that when you take into consideration the time it takes to complete projects, 2050 seemed reasonable.

Projects & Programs Influencing Resource Conditions by 2015

The group reviewed the initial outline of Chapter 2.4. Staff noted that although the first CVFPP will be complete in 2012, updates must be done every 5 years. As such, it will be important to identify projects, physical and biological changes, and planning processes that could affect future resource conditions. To avoid confusion with specific dates, Work Group members were asked to think of things that could affect the flood control system in both the near-term and long-term.

A member asked if the list of projects being collecting was going to be used to evaluate cumulative impacts in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review documents. Mr. Kirby responded staff is just trying to identify existing projects. The level of environmental review to be undertaken is still not determined.

The Work Group discussed the merits of including projects that are certain to be approved and on the ground versus also including those that are likely to be approved, and agreed to include all projects that are likely to be funded, permitted and have begun being constructed by 2015 (**see Action Items**). The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers also offered to share their extensive list of upcoming projects with the Team (**see Action Items**). Mr. Brock also offered to provide the 2009 list of special project requests (**see Action Items**).

The following projects, planning processes, and physical changes were identified as near-term issues that could affect the 2017 CVFPP update.

Projects:

Following is a list of projects and programs suggested as having the potential for implementation by about 2015.

- **Reclamation District 17-Early Implementation Project:** Potential for \$62 million grant, a negative declaration Environmental Impact Report is underway, has partial permits from CVFPB, and is likely to be constructed by 2011.
- **Sherman RD 341:** Project to raise profile one foot above 100 year level. Total cost will be about \$5.5-6 million; will consist of just over a mile of levee, and is currently under construction near the southernmost tip of Shadberry Slough.
- **River Islands** development on Stewart's tract. Project has an approved CEQA document and efforts to comply with NEPA are underway. Believe that they will have full NEPA / CEQA documents and permits. (consists of project levees)
- **East Cypress Corridor Project on Hodgkin's Track:** The CEQA document is under legal review. Project allows for 5,000 new homes. (non-project levees)
- **Port of Sacramento Deep Water Ship Dredging Channel:** The channel deepening project is funded. Environmental documentation and detailed design is underway. Construction could be completed by 2015.
- **U.S. Army Corp of Engineers Sacramento Bank Protection Project:** Next phase of construction is expected as early as in the next year. Project element could include a set back levee located at barge canal and river. At 80-90% design. In addition, there are over 30 additional sites that could be initiated by 2015.
- **Cut off wall in portion of South Delta Bypass and Wall Rivers:** Construction of both cut off walls is scheduled to begin next year. There is a funding agreement with local interests in place. Environmental review is in process.

- **West Sacramento Levee Improvement Program:** Environmental review is in process for this project estimated at \$500 million. Consists of 50 miles of levees around the City of West Sacramento and a portion of the deep water shipping channel.
- **West Sacramento General Plan Update:** Should be completed within 18 months.
- **Bridge District Specific Plan:** City of West Sacramento under contract to build \$50 million in commercial unit by 2011. District on the waterfront. Tower Bridge on north and Pioneer Bridge on the south. Council review anticipated this fall following recent completion of public review.
- **Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Project in Oakley:** DWR project, Draft Environmental Impact Report 1,200 acres
- **McCormick Williamson Project:** Final EIR complete; project consists of 1,600 acres of restoration.
- **California Indian Heritage Center:** \$200 million project to build a museum. Will be manipulating levees. Construction would likely begin in 2015.
- **San Joaquin County General Plan Update**
- **Fish Barrier, Holland and Mandaville:** Metropolitan Water District is paying for it; Contra Costa Water District is party; also called the two gates project. Sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation
- **Wildlands / Westervelt** are moving forward with mitigation bank EIR/EA; one will probably be located at Liberty Island. Small ecological enhancement
- **California Water Fowl** have projects permitted
- **Bethel Island Delta Codes** (levee breached, developer bankrupted) Not going to be built.
- **EBMUD North Delta Intercept:** under construction, will take peak flows from the Sacramento River.
- **Central Valley Joint Venture**
- **Contra Costa Water District Waste Discharge Intake Project**
- **RD 404 Flood Improvements**
- **South Sacramento City Stream Groups**
- **Habitat Conservation Plans for Counties**
- **Meins Landing**
- **San Joaquin County COG Transportation Plan**
- **City of Stockton Water Treatment Plant**
- **SACOG Blueprint**
- **Long Range – DILFS**
- **Tule Growing Pilot Projects**
- **Elk Grove S.O.I. Expansion**
- **Discover the Delta Visitors Center**
- **SB 27 Emergency Planning**
- **Delta Protection Commission Resource Management Plan**
- **San Joaquin River Restoration**
- **Flood Contingency Mapping**
- **CalFED Levee Stabilization Program**
- **CalFED 2006 Report Projects**

Future Challenges- Drivers and Influencers

The Work Group's moved to Worksheet 4. The Worksheet lists five initial influence areas: change in population, change in institutional requirements, water supply needs, climate change, and socio economic factors. Each influence was then broken down into "drivers" of varying degrees of specificity (i.e., the actual action or trend resulting from each of the influences). Work Group members were asked to review the chart and provide additional influences and drivers as needed.

For this discussion driver was defined as the big external forces that are going to impose/impact on California and are likely to strongly affect the conditions with which flood protection has to occur.

After considering the items in a small group discussion and populating the worksheet columns, the following additional suggestions and comments were offered during the large group debrief:

- Change the term “climate change” to something like “Nature Disasters” because it is possible to have a natural disaster that goes beyond climate change.
- Some sub-factors have a direct effect on several of the drivers.
- Staff should split the drivers and influencers graph into physical-biological drivers and socioeconomic.
- Displaying the drivers and influencers as a matrix
- Difficult to understanding the terms natural vs. non-natural
- It would be useful to look at what has been a driver for the last 50 years

The Work Group was also asked which driver / influencer will likely happen first during the timeframe under discussion. Some believed regulatory change will happen first. The Team committed to sending Worksheet 4 back to those participants who request it (**see Action Items**).

Small Group discussion: *What are key challenges indicating a need for long-term changes in flood management strategies in your region?* The combined results of flipcharts and notes of the two small groups follow:

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
Seismic Activity	Increasing probability with time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - X% multiple levee failures in next 50 years - Multiple flooded islands - Needs to be dealt with immediately
Subsidence/ “natural” physical changes over time	Slowing? Constant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing probability and depth of flooding - Increases land management costs - Increase risk to life, property, infrastructure, etc. behind Delta levees
Invasive species	Continuing/hopefully reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could impact infrastructure and levee maintenance - Reduce habitat for native species
Hydrology	Increasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase flooding
Climate change	Intensity of sea level rise Extreme event – maximize structural facility improvements, levees, etc. Need for more flood control; slow changing long time-frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change in ecological system - Levee failure; decisions to repair - Extreme event – catastrophe - Increases stress on flood system
Institutional change/policies	Change in land and habitat restoration over next 30 years. Floodplain development More flooded islands – less Agriculture production. Is happening – now Delta from rural/ Agriculture to rural/ Agriculture /ecosystem restoration Faster too fast in some instances/not fast enough in others Increasingly stringent and demanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes in tidal, water quality, land use, environmental restoration - Tax base, jobs, effects communities, private property - Depending on the outcome of policies/legislation they like to see impact - Devastate Delta region permanently eliminate land, communities - Overall loss of revenue land mass - Land use or misuse - Policy does not drive species

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
		protection; sometimes the species decline drives regulatory change - Regulations have made flood control unaffordable
Infrastructure / Levee maintenance funding	Uncertain – looks slower in implementation in spite of more money on paper – if agencies reduce commitment, more flooded islands less reliable transport., thus Agriculture, local economy reduced	
Population decrease – growth slowed or prevented by economics of FEMA	Reduce Delta Projections	- Local economy fails to grow. Some communities unable to sustain themselves - Quality of life suffers - Geography (i.e. isolated smaller communities) could be a major delimiting factor
Change in transportation system – reduction in investment in Delta facilities due to added cost of flood protections	Isolates small Delta communities Continuously more crucial to viability of city of port	- Loss of population /investments/but to economy - Expansion of existing modes - Construction of new facilities Port Bridges, roadways, trails
DWR water management – State owned land	Not efficient to improve levees	
Population increase - Land Use of infrastructure intensification, new investment	More growth, continuously to build out.	- Increase population behind levees - Increase flood rise - Increase stress on Delta protected areas
Water supply	Increasing need; steady growth immediate to long-term	- Often at odds with flood control
Infrastructure - transportation (terrestrial and aquatic)	More traffic through Delta (HWY 12, 4, etc) Cross-valley corridors Major levee roads – eg. Sac River Need for expansion and bridges	- Bottlenecks - Safety - Emergency route - Increase truck traffic - Interruption by flooding - Movement of goods
Infrastructure - Levees	Increasing fragility Sea level rise vs. levee height tidal fluctuation	- Lack of levee protection
Ecological restoration	More intertidal areas	- Change in hydraulics - Levee maintenance - No need to provide flood protection to tidal areas - May increase adjacent levee operations and maintenance (scour, waves) - Flood conveyance - May increase or decrease eg. Yolo - New setback levees
Maintain rural Agriculture when population changes	In primary zone it's leveled off 2 nd zone stressors has sped up	- It hurts the overall region if negative impacts on land use, infrastructure use or abilities
Ecosystem:	Species are decreasing now	- Incorporate habitat restoration into

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
species decline or increase endangered species		flood planning - Change driven by changing institutional values
Water quality issues Methylmercury Contaminated ground water	More – increasing and ongoing	i.e. methylmercury production
Changes in local government. and state government tax policy	Increase, 10 years?	Affects project timing and construction
Public health vector borne diseases: West Nile, avian flu	Increasing	More regulation high priority
Economics		
lack of financing	If it costs too much money to maintain a levee, the State tends to buy the land; the resulting affect on the community is always negative	

Community Success Factors

Worksheet 3 was presented. This was an item the Delta Work Group did not have time to complete during Meeting #1. The group was asked to describe what success in this planning process would look like in the Delta. The following responses were recorded.

Topic Related To	Community Needs / Concerns
Socioeconomic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levee / Flooding impact on development, business/industry • Local and regional economy and resident finances • FEMA Mapping impact on development • Recreational facilities, access to and from water, near water, trails and sites • Institutional and public service capacity and service delivery • There needs to be a certain critical mass of Agricultural acreage base to maintain the viability of our farms support industry and all those ancillary businesses that rely in part on farm workers and farm support personnel for patronage • Incorporate community needs and concerns (i.e. from a discussion with city council) • Address the impact of flooding on development • Address vulnerability of housing on aging population • Consider egress/ingress to community and the potential to be landlocked (Highway 12) • Address devastation to the local economy • Impacts on growth must be addressed • Impacts on fish and fishers must be addressed • Address the need for local planning • Need to identify and measure risks • Maintain viability of regional tax base and economic viability of region • Consider recreational facilities and access to water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect development potential on area • Protect / enhance quality of life • Deliver municipal and other institutional services • In order to maintain and enhance our school curriculums, we need the children of the farm workers and farm support personnel to be enrolled in local schools. Special Districts (Fire, Flood, Drainage, Mosquito Abatement etc) need to maintain their tax bases to be able to provide the services that Delta residents and visitors rely on • Public safety first • Flood risk planning – land use choices recreational opportunities improved fisheries. • Reduced liability to tax payers outside of flood plains.

Topic Related To	Community Needs / Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider institutional public service capacity (i.e. there may not be resources available to run parks) • Increase public safety or reduce loss of life must be addressed • Reduce flood risk • Improve fisheries, both commercial and subsistence • Reduce liabilities to tax payers who do not live in a flood plane • Improve Water supply reliability and quality • Flood plans should be set up to be green house gas neutral • Need to consider water channel capacity; should look at the issue of water conveyance and potentially set up facilities to accept dredge material. Should dredge in the river system. 	
<p>Flood Flow Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic channel capacity is no longer adequate to safely pass current foreseeable flood flows due to the fact that upstream development has increased run off and built over what had previously been flood retention areas. Laginas development in the "Franklin Pond" is one example. Dredging Delta Channels is a potential part of the solution • Levees and channels – siltation issues cause reduced flood capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is ongoing development that is exacerbating this problem. Misconceptions about pollutants in channel sediments render dredging permits expensive and nearly impossible to get. 82 test by DWR as part of the North Delta Program Plan and 18 samples taken by RD 563 (Tyler Island) have proven sediments in the areas tested were clean.
<p>Physical Infrastructure (Levees, weirs, etc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PL 84-99 Standards should be the target on all Delta levees as a minimum level of protection. Weirs and By-Passes should be kept clear of vegetation to allow them to function at design capacities. • Stronger levees 	
<p>Natural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levee operations and maintenance • Current agronomic practices provide habitat for a number of terrestrial, aquatic and avian species as well as reptiles that as special status species enhance property that is already owned by State and Federal resource agencies and by non-profit resource organizations. • Expansion of current model at Yolo Basin Wildlife Area, successful co-existence of flood protection, agriculture, public uses and a diverse wetlands ecosystem. • Recognize ecosystem management not single species, or terrestrial vs. aquatic habitat. • Eliminate the conflict between U.S. Army Corp Levee Vegetation Plan and loss of aquatic habitat • Must substantially increase mitigation cost • Must restore habitat that can be compatible with flood control • Plan must be consistent with HCPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of riparian habitat, aquatic degradation • Destruction of potential value • Substantial increase in mitigation costs, delay in project delivery • Many acres of previously owned intensely farmed lands have been retired from agriculture entirely or not been as intensely farmed to the detriment of the farm support industries, auxiliary businesses, Special Districts, schools and communities in the Delta at large.
<p>Flood Plain Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood ways should be used for there stated purpose, not wildlife habitat. Floodplains are everywhere in the State, not just the Delta. Talking property rights of those that have property in the Floodplains should be considered a "taking" for the public good, landowners should be compensated. • Must address recreational needs • Should create / maintain a diverse ecosystem that will benefit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding is only one of the many treats to life and property. Seismic, hurricanes, tornados, and others are also dangers that are inherent depending upon where you live. Why are landowners in Floodplains being singled out?

Topic Related To	Community Needs / Concerns
all species	
Land Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently zoned property rights should be sacrosanct and any diminishment of those rights should be considered a “taking” for the public good and property owners compensated for taking as provided for in current law. • Agriculture and ranching would continue at economical level • Public uses would continue at Yolo Basin Wildlife Area ~ environmental education, wildlife viewing, hiking, and hunting. • Maintenance of a way of life on the private wetlands (i.e. duck clubs). • Recognition and enhancement of actions in the Yolo Basin Wildlife Area Land Management Plan • Should advise not building near levees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Delta is currently a living, viable growing area that relies on its residents for its strength. Strangle the communities by imposing restrictions to land use that take away our current land use options will cause the Delta to fail.
Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Agencies at both the State and Federal level continue to mandate directives to local Special Districts that are conflicting and mutually exclusive, this must stop. • Improve public safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting, mutually exclusive directives by Federal and State Resource Agencies cause grid lock and nothing gets done at a reasonable cost. • Deal with exotic invasive species at the Federal level, especially with ballast tanks of ocean going freighters.

Overview of Chapter 3 Outline- Problems and Opportunities

Chapter 3 of the RCSR was presented and the Work Group was asked to think of problems and solutions in terms of “risks” and opportunities.” In this context risks are things of value particularly susceptible to flood or those that, if they fail, could cause significant damage.

The group pointed out that how you articulate the problem statement is important when deciding how to craft a response. Working in small groups information was generated and note takers reported back to the larger group to summarize their groups’ discussions as follows:

Asset at risk from flooding	Because	Consequences
Loss of development Regional & local economies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not focus on flood fight • Barriers in organizational coordination • FEMA reimbursement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential domino effect • Flood islands at risk from seepage
Levees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With a minimum design level, when levees start to fail, they almost always completely fail • Undersized • High flows from multiple sources / high volumes • Levee material and conditions (some are partially peat) • 	
Communities / Houses Roads and other transportation Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • often below the flood plain • often co-located with levees • can cause collateral damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial evacuation issues

Asset at risk from flooding	Because	Consequences
Schools Airports Commerce Public services Emergency service Mineral resources Farmland, permanent crops, livestock Natural Gas injection well on MacDonald Island Ship Channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may have been built with old design standards • flood conveyance systems are under designed and lack capacity • Levee conditions and channel conditions • Coordination between local, state and federal • Breaching levees in Delta fills in island – not true elsewhere • 	
Human lives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levees can fail • Definition of “emergency” 	
Habitat / conservation areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not suitable to high volumes or depth of water • salt water intrusion • change in inundation • water velocity • long duration or period of inundation • vegetation clearing activities to maintain navigability 	
Marinas Fish Delta ecosystem Legacy communities – Sacramento River Recreational resorts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood plains have been disconnected from river systems • pelagic species decline (decline could also be associated with water conveyance facilities) • water diversion • rapid change in salinity / hydrology • Decrease in wetland habitat • levees have cut off the systems from the rivers 	
Land outside the levee area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depend on Delta economy • Non-project levees will affect project system 	
Water Supply Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood conveyance systems are under designed and lack capacity 	
Property values Cultural way of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception that the Delta levees will someday fail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower property values
Westside of Stockton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reopener in new Hogan 	
Lodi, Tracy, Lathrop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comanche reservoir is only flood protection 	
Rest of San Joaquin County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood protection for all is connected to non-project levees 	
West Sacramento		
Cosumnes Preserve		

Asset at risk from flooding	Because	Consequences
I-5 Corridor		

Homework Overview, Next Steps, Action Items, and Meeting Recap

An overview of specific action items discussed throughout the day was presented. The group then reviewed the agenda and was asked whether or not the meeting goals were reached. Work Group members did not raise any concerns about reaching the meeting goals. The group was thanked for attending and for providing input.

Adjourn