



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary **DRAFT**

Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Time: August 19, 2009, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm
Location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
 3290 N Ad Art Rd
 Stockton, CA 95215

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Name	Organization	Status
Roger Churchwell	San Joaquin Area Flood Agency (SJAFCA)	Member
Susan Dell'Osso	Reclamation District 2602; River Islands at Lathrop	Member
Mary Hildebrand	San Joaquin County Farm Bureau, South Delta Water Agency, California Central Valley Flood Association Board	Member
Kevin Kaufman	Stockton East Water District	Member
Koosun Kim	City of Manteca	Member
James Nelson	Stormwater Consulting	Member
Julie Rentner	River Partners, CNPS	Member
John Shelton	California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)	Member
Jesse Roseman	Tuolumne River Trust	Member
Alex Hildebrand	South Delta Water Agency, Reclamation District 2075	Alternate
Dave Peterson	SJAFCA	Member
Carolyn Lott	Center for Collaborative Policy (Center)	Facilitator
Rajaa Hassan	MWH America Inc. (MWH)	Technical Team
Gary Hester	California Department of Water Resources (DWR)	CVFMP Program Manager
Roger Lee	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO)	CVFPO Representative
Sam Magill	Center For Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support
Keith Wallace	MWH	Technical Lead
Scott Woodland	DWR	Regional Coordinator

Absent:

Deedee Antypas	RD 2074	Member
Wes Fujitani	City of Lodi	Member

Jim Giottonini	City of Stockton, SJAFCA	Member
Scott Miner	US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)	Member
Tony Refuerzo	Stanislaus County Planning Department	Member
Steve Winkler	San Joaquin County	Member

WORKGROUP ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK (HOMEWORK REQUESTED BY 8/28/09)

1. Workgroup members will receive the Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study FAQ sheet at the next meeting.
2. Workgroup members will be asked to provide their contact information for the Central Valley Flood Management Planning (CVFMP) Program public website.
3. DWR/Staff will investigate Valley-wide forums proposed for early December and report details back to the Workgroup.
4. Staff will investigate using the Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley as a potential venue or resource for Valley-wide forums.
5. Sam Magill will send out a list of who can attend each proposed meeting based on the meeting poll.
6. Staff will discuss how to reconcile conflicts with proposed meetings 3, 6, 8, and 9 with Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study project development team (PDT) meetings.
7. DWR will discuss how to include the EJ/Tribal Perspective with Barbara Cross, DWR, and report its findings back to the Workgroup.
8. Workgroup members will send responses for homework assignments to staff in any one of three ways: by the due date, explaining when homework will be finished, or that they have no comments on the assignment in question.
9. Workgroup members will review and provide comments on the new references from Meeting #1 homework in the reference list.
10. Workgroup members will provide staff with copies of/links to new references they added to the reference list whenever possible.
11. Staff will send out copies of the Study Area Background in redline so Workgroup members can see where changes were made.
12. Staff will email the complete, populated version of Chapter 2.2 of the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR). Workgroup members will review and comment as needed.
13. Staff will provide a link to or description of each project and program influencing resource conditions in the meeting summary.
14. Workgroup members will provide additional comments on Worksheet 5, Problems and Opportunities.
15. Staff will contact Stanislaus County representative to get their input on the outline for RCSR Chapter 2.4

16. CVFMP Program management will investigate the creation of an Agricultural Stewardship topic workgroup.

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

The Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Workgroup) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on August 19, 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) 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 Workgroup 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 Lower San Joaquin 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 Lower San Joaquin Work Group is one of five regional Work Groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES (Note: Section numbers have been changed to reflect the addition of Section 2.1– History of Flood Management):

- Respond to issues raised in Meeting #1 (including coordination among the regions)
- Summarize input received on reference list
- Provide and discuss revised draft Chapter 2.2 – General Regional Conditions
- 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

SUMMARY:

****ALL PRESENTATIONS AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT
www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp****

Welcome and Greetings

Carolyn Lott opened the meeting, discussed facility logistics, and asked meeting participants to introduce themselves. She then introduced Roger Lee, who reviewed the meeting agenda and provided a walkthrough of the day's materials/handouts.

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester provided opening remarks and presented DWR responses to questions that arose during Meeting #1 of the Regional Conditions Workgroups. These questions were raised across all of the workgroups, not just the Workgroup. Responses to all questions are contained in the document entitled "Responses to Questions from Meeting #1". At the conclusion of Mr. Hester's overview, the following comments were recorded:

Discussion:

- A FAQ sheet on the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Central Valley Integrated Flood Management Study (CVIFMS) is available. Workgroup participants will receive a copy of this document at Meeting #3 (**see Action Item #1**).
- DWR would like to make the Workgroup roster available for public review if possible. Staff will contact Workgroup partners to get their approval to release contact information to the public (**see Action Item #2**).
- In addition to joint meetings of the Lower San Joaquin, Upper San Joaquin, and Delta workgroups, two larger forums will be held in either December 2009 or January 2010 for the entire Sacramento Valley and the entire San Joaquin Valley. Updates will be delivered to the Workgroup as more information becomes available (**see Action Item #3**).
- A participant asked who the target/audience will be for any local compliance guidelines in the CVFPP. Mr. Hester responded that anyone involved in planning and land use at the local and regional levels will be the target of these guidelines. DWR will reach out directly to boards of supervisors and city councils to ensure the correct individuals are contacted. He also noted that because the 2012 CVFPP is expected to be more of a "vision" document than a list of specific projects, these guidelines will take the form of criteria for local projects.
- The concern was raised that no specific actions have been planned to fix the flood system since the 1997 flood. A recent letter from the South Delta Water Agency to DWR Director Lester Snow illustrates this concern. Mr. Hester responded while the 2012 CVFPP won't contain site-specific recommendations, the Early Implementation Projects (EIP) will move forward in parallel with the planning process. Additionally, other agencies like the Corps are making site specific proposals. For example, the Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study will make site-specific recommendations and will be incorporated into the CVFPP.
- One Workgroup member suggested the Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley would be a good venue for outreach on the CVFPP and the Valley-wide forums discussed above. Mr. Hester agreed, and said that staff will follow up with the Partnership to explore this possibility (**see Action Item #4**).
- A participant asked whether the CVFPP will inform the Corps' Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study or visa versa. Mr. Hester confirmed that information and recommendations from the Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study will be included in the CVFPP. Additionally, DWR is holding a meeting with the Corps in the near future to figure out how to use its Central Valley Floodplain Delineation Work into the Feasibility Study.
- A participant asked how the CVIFMS will be used for the CVFPP. Mr. Hester explained that while it is a separate study, there is a federal/state partnership to ensure there is ongoing coordination between the two efforts.
- A participant raised the concern that joint meetings between the regional conditions workgroups may not be useful. DWR and staff will contact Workgroup members for more information. Additionally, Sam Magill will send out the list of Workgroup participants available for each Workgroup meeting (based on the previously released meeting poll) (**see Action Item #5**).
- Meeting participants raised the concern that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) doesn't have a definitive planning horizon or a statement that population growth requires a larger and more reliable food and water supply. Another participant added the California Legislature is currently considering a proposal to adopt the BDCP as law, and asked if such a law would

supersede the CVFPP process. Mr. Hester acknowledged that this is a concern, and explained that there is still a great deal of uncertainty about how the BDCP will be implemented.

- Two participants noted the Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study Project Development Team conflicts with meetings 3, 6, 8, and 9 of the Workgroup. DWR/staff will discuss how best to reconcile this issue and report back to the Workgroup. One possibility is to move Workgroup meetings from full to half day meetings (**see Action Item #6**).
- A Workgroup member noted the response to Question #10 in the “Responses...” document says Proposition 1E and 84 money can be used for CVFPP planning and implementation, and asked if the non-site specific nature of the 2012 CVFPP could conflict with this statement. Mr. Hester reiterated even though the 2012 CVFPP won't include site specific recommendations, there will be still be implementable criteria and it will include discussions of who will be responsible for specific actions, what needs to happen, and how much these actions will cost.
- A participant noted the absence of the environmental justice (EJ) and tribal perspective in Workgroup meetings could cause problems for the overall process. Mr. Hester responded that this issue has been brought to Barbara Cross, DWR, for investigation. As more information becomes available, DWR will report back to the Workgroup (**see Action Item#7**).

Review of Previous Meeting #1 Action Items

Ms. Lott reiterated the importance of completing assignments in a timely fashion, but acknowledged that not every Workgroup member will have input on each assignment. She asked that Workgroup members respond for all assignments in one of three ways (**see Action Item #8**):

- Complete homework by the assigned date
- Contact Mr. Magill by the assigned deadline explaining that more time is needed
- Send a response to Mr. Magill explaining you do not have input on the assigned task

Review References, Evaluation, Next Steps

Keith Wallace reviewed the Reference assignment from Meeting #1, and reminded the Workgroup that they were asked to look at the reference list, comment, and make additions as needed. Staff is in the process of compiling comments at this time. Once compiled, staff will send out the revised list and ask Workgroup members to comment on the references added by Workgroup members after Meeting #1 (**see Action Item #9**). Workgroup members were asked to provide copies of (or links to) any new references where possible (**see Action Item #10**).

Comment Review of Chapter 2.2 – General Regional Descriptions

Mr. Wallace noted that a review of the Lower San Joaquin General Regional Description Section of the RCSR was a homework assignment from Meeting #1. A number of comments were received; staff is working to resolve any divergent comments as much as possible. Additionally, Workgroup members asked for info on general elevations, specific citations for any references, and a specific reference to projects associated with Paradise Cut. Staff is working to incorporate all of these comments, and will send out a version of the document for Workgroup review as soon as it is available (**see Action Item #11**). Staff will also investigate the potential of sending a “redline” version for review.

Discussion:

- A participant commented that Section 2.2 in our materials here looks a lot different than the first version. Should we comment on this version? Mr. Wallace said that was fine. In the final version of the RCSR, it will combine into a single project study area.

Review Augmented Chapter 2 Outline

Mr. Wallace noted that the Chapter 2 outline of the RCSR was revised based on Workgroup responses on Worksheet #1 from Meeting #1. In general, all suggestions were incorporated. A few divergent comments were received; staff is working to reconcile these areas of disagreement. Workgroup members were asked to review the outline of Chapters 2 and 2.2 and provide additional comments as needed (**see Action Item #12**).

Review Preliminary Draft Information for Chapter 2.3 (Existing Resources Conditions)

Mr. Wallace noted that in addition to the Chapter 2 outline, 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 Workgroup for comment (**see Action Item #13**). Ms. Lott asked that comments include citations for specific information that may be missing.

Discussion:

- A participant asked if this chapter will be broken into all 5 regions, and noted this will make the document difficult to manage. Mr. Wallace responded the intention is to break Chapter 2 into Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, and Delta Regions. For things like social and economic conditions that may be similar across the regions, a more “high level” review will be created.
- Another participant asked if resource areas discussed in one of the workgroups will only be looked at in the corresponding region, or across all regions. Mr. Wallace responded they will be reviewed across all regions.

Introduction to Chapter 2.4 (Future Challenges) and Period of Analysis/ Projects and Programs Influencing Resource Conditions by 2015

Mr. Wallace reviewed the initial outline of Chapter 2.4, and noted that a major part of this chapter will be developing a planning horizon in the RCSR. Although the 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, Workgroup members were asked to think of things that could affect the flood control system in both the near term and long term. The following comments and projects, planning processes, and physical changes were identified as near term issues that could affect the 2017 CVFPP update. Where possible, staff have included references to each of the projects/processes below (**see Action Item #14**):

Discussion:

- The implementation of BDCP and Delta Vision (www.resources.ca.gov/bdcp and www.deltavision.ca.gov)
- All shovel ready projects should be considered. Permitted processes can't be considered as existing conditions, since many of these processes may not ultimately be implemented.
- The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy expected to be completed in 2015 should be considered. It will contain mandates on how to deal with climate change, even though the effects of climate change may not be felt for some years to come (<http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/adaptation/>).
- The Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study.
- The CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) (<http://www.delta.dfg.ca.gov/erp/>).
- Reclamation District (RD) 17 physical improvements, the Smith Canal closure, the Stockton Delta Water Supply Project, the Moore Water Project, and the San Joaquin County General Plan Update. Participants noted that because many cities and counties may be updating their general

plans in the near future, a thorough review of all general plans should be considered in the RCSR.

- Smith Canal Closure Device
- The Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan (VAMP) (<http://www.fws.gov/stockton/jfmp/vamp.asp>).
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing of all dams on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries.
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) projects within the San Joaquin and Delta region must be considered.
- Stockton Delta Water Supply Project
- The fish screen projects for the Patterson Irrigation District and Stanislaus Irrigation District.
- Any endangered species recovery plans and local Habitat Conservation Plans/Natural Communities Conservation Plans (HCP/NCCP).
- New Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps.
- Groundwater Management Plans for the Stanislaus and Tuolumne Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWMP).
- The Freeport Project.
- Paradise Cut Project.
- Relocation of the Atlas Tract Levee.
- Seepage berms constructed to address FEMA certification issues.
- Ongoing studies related to FEMA provision accreditation.
- General Plans
- Critical Erosion Program (Lower Calaveras River and San Joaquin River)
- Bay-Delta Conveyance Plan (BDCCP)
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) pipeline addition?

Future Challenges- Drivers and Influencers

Mr. Wallace directed the Workgroup's attention to Worksheet #4. The chart listed 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). Workgroup members were asked to review the chart and provide additional influences and drivers as needed. The following comments were recorded (specific additions in the attached Worksheet):

Discussion:

- Participants asked for additional definition of drivers, challenges and influences. Specifically, the question was asked what time frame the Workgroup is to consider for this exercise. Staff responded the Workgroup should consider a near term time frame (specifically, 2015). Workgroup participants noted the 2015 timeframe was confusing, as the CVFPP as a whole has a much longer planning horizon. Mr. Hester and Ms. Lott agreed, and asked participants to think in terms of the more general categories of "near term" and "long term."
- Participants asked why "change in population" is listed as a major influence. One participant added that land use and property protection specifically should be the influence; population growth is a driver of that influence.
- A Workgroup member noted that legislation appears to be the main driver of the CVFPP process (as opposed to external influences). External influences like population growth and climate change are unlikely to result in any meaningful physical changes in the very near term, but legislation designed to deal with these issues *could* affect the way that the CVFPP is implemented. Mr. Wallace noted this exercise and Worksheet #4 should be used to identify trends in these areas, even if the immediate effect of physical changes is not felt.
- A participant asked how the CVFPP will influence local general plans. Mr. Lee responded it won't change current general plans, but that local and regional governments will have 24 months to come into compliance with the CVFPP after the 2012 deadline.

Community Success Factors

Mr. Wallace revisited Worksheet 3 from Meeting #1, and reminded the Workgroup they had asked for more time to complete it. After a brief review of the responses to this worksheet, Workgroup participants requested that all members have the opportunity to comment on what other groups suggested on the worksheets. Ms. Lott asked Workgroup members to consider the responses to this worksheet in the context of the following question: If you were to draw a picture of what success would like in your region, what would be the top [insert resource area] achievements you would need to see demonstrated? The following responses were recorded:

Exercise Results:

- Socio economic:
 - A plan for funding improvements the most important issue
 - A plan that is fully permitted is important
 - A plan that adequately protects existing land uses is important to make sure there is no “down zoning” of property
 - A plan that reflects current best practices in ecosystem restoration technologies (soft infrastructure, cheaper to maintain, widening floodplains, bypasses)
- Flood flow management:
 - The CVFPP must look at ways to improve flood protection without armoring or widening levees (such as channel maintenance, lowering flood stage, etc.)
 - Be aware that flood protection improvements such as raising levees and dredging channels could have negative downstream effects. The CVFPP should think of flood control as a regional system, not as a local issue!
 - Expanding the floodway may cause issues if wide channels are forced back into narrow, urbanized channels downstream.
 - Educate communities about where the Delta is, and whether they are in the floodway
 - Improved flood protection for “at risk” urbanized areas.
- Physical Infrastructure
 - Address flood protection as a system. In Stockton there are both project and non-project; both play a critical flood protection role.
 - Systems must be sustainable and easily maintained.
 - Multiple goals should be addressed by the same physical structure.
 - Plan for and adequately fund future maintenance.
 - Acknowledge that agricultural levees have significant benefits for urban areas. Protecting agricultural levees could prevent a “domino effect” on adjacent levees. At the same time, we must ensure that improvements to levees are comparable to the land uses they protect from a cost/benefit perspective.
 - The CVFPP should include a process for effective and efficient permitting for operations of all physical infrastructure
- Natural Resources
 - Stormwater/snowmelt in winter floods must be considered in the CVFPP. While the system may be able to avoid flood releases in excess of 74,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) from dams, it can’t protect against them downstream.
 - Groundwater recharge must be considered.
 - The CVFPP should stress that food protection is a national security priority.
 - Develop soft infrastructure to benefit natural resources in the floodplain.
- Floodplain management
 - Recreational uses/open space must be protected.
 - Expand the use of soft infrastructure such as floodways and bypasses instead of building new, armored levees.
- Land Use
 - Don’t build in the 200 year floodplain when possible. Locate land uses within the floodplain (recreation, etc) that are consistent with floodplain uses.

- Keep local land use decisions local.
- If the rules for land use decisions are changed as a result of the CVFPP such that current owners cannot continue to enjoy currently permitted land uses, compensation must be made.
- The state must preserve its rights to protect public safety.
- Other
 - Levee maintenance is currently decentralized; the CVFPP should maintain this strategy.
 - Determine levels of liability for levee breaches. If a levee is inspected by the state, approved, but then breaks next year, is the CVFPP should clarify whether the state is liable or not. The issue of liability is very complex and needs more study. The general issue of flood liability should be included as a future challenge. There is a cost associated with paying for flood damages that must be discussed.

Overview of Chapter 3 Outline- Problems and Opportunities

Mr. Wallace delivered a presentation on Chapter 3 of the RCSR. This presentation is available online at the website listed in the Summary opening.

After the presentation, Ms. Lott asked the Workgroup to think of problems and solutions in terms of “risks” and opportunities.” She added that the risks should be key pieces of infrastructure particularly susceptible to flood or those that, if they fail, could cause significant damage. The following risks and (where possible) opportunities were identified. Workgroup members will incorporate additional comments into Worksheet #5 for homework (**see Action Item #15**).

Risks and Opportunities

- Risk: Urban areas like Stockton have 100 year protection, but anything larger than that puts other adjacent areas at risk. While Stockton is striving to reach higher standards, there is still some residual risk that can't be accounted for regardless of the level of protection.
 - Opportunities: Physical infrastructure improvements will also include ecosystem, recreation, etc. benefits.
- Risk: RD 2075 has unstable sections of levees at their base.
 - Opportunity: By doing a thorough survey, very specific fixes to individual levee reaches can be identified.
- Risk: Communications, transportation, and power infrastructure runs throughout the Lower San Joaquin region. Many levee reaches in this area south of RD 17 are at 50 year protection levels. All of these were impacted in 1997.
- Risk: Future climate change is likely to exacerbate existing flood issues. There will be some extreme events that are spikes of heavy rainfall. Floods from rapid snow melt during rapid warming events can also cause bigger floods.
- Risk: The majority of Stockton would be under water in a flood event for at least a week.
- Risk: Livestock harmed in flood.
- Opportunity: Some areas need to be flooded. For example, riparian bird populations need flooding and need vegetation in the floodway to thrive.
- Opportunity: Riparian brush rabbit needs vegetation from flooding, but also needs areas of refuge. As the system is upgraded, both vegetation and areas of refuge could be increased.
- Risk: If Roberts Tract floods, Stockton will not. However, its wastewater treatment would be knocked offline for some time, and is outside of SJAFCA's jurisdiction.
- Risk: Increasing protection in some areas increases risk in other areas.
 - Opportunity: There are tidal and flood flow power generation possibilities
 - Opportunity: The “Delta Corridor Plan” allows the “big gulp” out if it gets in.

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

Mr. Magill provided an overview of specific action items discussed throughout the day. Ms. Lott then reviewed the agenda and asked the Workgroup to consider whether the meeting goals were reached. Workgroup members did not raise any concerns about reaching the meeting goals. Mr. Hester and Mr. Lee thanked Workgroup members for attending and provide input.

Adjourn