



Meeting Summary

Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

August 27, 2009, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

**Location: Woodland Community Center
2001 East Street
Woodland, California 95776**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Ryan Bonea	Sutter County Resource Conservation District; Yuba County	Member
Francis Borcalli	FloodSAFE Yolo; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Bill Busath	City of Sacramento	Member
Bill Center	American River Recreation Association, Planning & Conservation League, CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba) IRWMP	Member
Regina Cherovsky	Conaway Preservation Group LLC;	Alternate
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Miki Fujitsubo	USACE	Member
Mike Hardesty	RD 2068, RD 2098, California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Member
Tim Miramontes	Yolo County Farm Bureau; California Rice Commission; California Farm Bureau Rice Advisory	Member
Nancy Moricz	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Alternate
John Paserly	City of West Sacramento	Alternate
Ronald Stork	Friends of the River	Member
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member
Jeffrey Twitchell	District One of Sutter County; urban and rural interests of Yuba City-Sutter Basin	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
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
Todd Hillaire	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Craig Wallace	MWH Americas Inc	Team

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Name	Organization	Status
Michael Harty	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Janet Thomson	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

*Central Valley Flood Management Planning

**Central Valley Flood Planning Office

***California Department of Water Resources

Absent:

Michael Bessette	City of West Sacramento	Member
Tovey Giezentanner	Conaway Preservation Group LLC; RD 2035; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	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
Julia McIver	Yolo County	Member
Tim Miramontes	Yolo County Farm Bureau; California Rice Commission; California Farm Bureau Rice Advisory	Member
Tom Smythe	Lake County	Member

Observers:

None

WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS (requested by 9/4/09)

- Review and comment on Additional References List (these were suggested by work group members in all regions and are in addition to the original list)**
 - Spreadsheet emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Comments to references (category/reasons) should be inserted into spreadsheet, emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jrstephe@water.ca.gov)
 - Additional suggested references should be emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jrstephe@water.ca.gov) and an electronic or hard copy version of that reference should be provided
- Review and provide comments on the DRAFT Regional Conditions Summary Report for the following sections: Chapter 1: Introduction; Chapter 2: Study Area Description; Section 2.1: History of Flood Control Facility Construction, and Operations and Maintenance; Section 2.2: General Regional Descriptions**
 - Document emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Comments should be made in "track changes" and should focus on errors, omissions, redundancy, mischaracterization, and other major issues with the draft. These should be emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jrstephe@water.ca.gov)

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

3. **Provide any additional input on the “Projects and Programs” exercise (Worksheet 6)**
 - Worksheet emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Additional input should be inserted into the worksheet and emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
4. **Provide any additional input on the “Future Challenges – Drivers and Influencers” exercise (Worksheet 4)**
 - Worksheet emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Additional input should be inserted into the worksheet and emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
5. **Provide any additional input on Community Success Factors exercise (Worksheet 3)**
 - Worksheet emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Additional input should be inserted into the worksheet and emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)
6. **Provide any additional input on the “Introduction to Problems and Opportunities” exercise (Worksheet 5)**
 - Worksheet emailed to work group members on 8/28/09
 - Additional input should be inserted into the worksheet and emailed to DWR lead Pierre Stephens (email: jstephe@water.ca.gov)

ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. Vanessa Nishikawa to report on access to reference documents identified in the Additional References List
2. Pierre Stephens to post the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Member Contact List to the CVFMP Web site
3. Pierre Stephens to report on strategy to engage tribal and environmental justice interests
4. Erin Mullin to report on the recommendations developed in the Climate Change Topic Work Group regarding the period of analysis for the CVFPP
5. Michelle Ng to report on briefings for County Boards of Supervisors
6. Pierre Stephens to distribute the list of Projects and Programs for the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group for review
7. Michelle Ng to plan joint meetings and subcommittees between regional conditions work groups as appropriate
8. Once meeting summaries are finalized, Vanessa Nishikawa to provide hard copies to partners to add to the meeting binders
9. Facilitation team to post draft meeting summaries on the CVFMP Web site so that the documents are available in a timely fashion, noting that the summaries are still in draft form and subject to review and revision

MEETING #2 GROUP RECAP *(Can be used in communications with constituents)*

Members of the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group received an update on the following items:

- Responses to issues raised in Meeting #1
- Input received on Reference List
- Input received on Existing Resources Conditions outline
- Input received on Community Success Factors

Members provided initial input into the development of the Regional Conditions Summary Report in the following areas:

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

- **Projects and Programs** -- Identification of projects and programs approved, funded, in progress or completed by or near 2015 that have the potential to impact the conditions of the region's resources (physical, institutional, socio-economic, etc.).
- **Challenges, Drivers and Influencers** -- Identification of conditions (e.g., population) likely to influence flood susceptibility or be susceptible themselves to flood damage as well as the trends and timeframes associated with those conditions, and the effects/impacts those conditions and trends may have on communities in the region.
- **Problems and Opportunities** -- Initial discussion to identify community assets at risk from flooding, why they are at risk and the consequences of lack of protection from flooding.

The work group will continue to review references, studies and documents that might be included by the technical team in developing the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #3

Time: 9 a.m. to 3:15 p.m.
Date: Thursday, Sept. 3, 2009
Place: Woodland Community Center
2001 East Street, Woodland, CA

Future Meetings:

- September – 24 (Yuba City), 2009
- October – 7 (Yolo County Farm Bureau) & 22 (TBD), 2009
- November – 5 (TBD) & 19 (TBD), 2009 (potential joint meetings with Delta and Upper Sacramento work groups)

MEETING OVERVIEW:

The purpose of Meeting #2 was to continue developing content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR).

MEETING GOALS:

1. Respond to issues raised in Meeting #1 (including coordination among the regions)
2. Summarize input received on Reference List
3. Provide and discuss revised draft of General Descriptions
4. Summarize input received on Existing Resources Conditions outline and provide preliminary draft text
5. Initial discussion of Likely Future Challenges
6. Summarize input received on Community Success Factors
7. Initiate discussion of Problems and Opportunities

SUMMARY

Welcome and Greetings

Pierre Stephens (DWR Lead) and Michael Harty (Facilitator) welcomed the meeting participants. Michael Harty reviewed the agenda which the Work Group approved.

Pierre Stephens provided an update on adjustments to regional boundaries. The entirety of the Cache Creek watershed will now be in the Lower Sacramento Region. Tom Smythe from Lake County, previously a member of the Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group, will join the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group (LSWG).

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Due to a conflict with Floodplain Management Association conference which will be held on the 10th, the LSWG agreed to move Meeting #3 to September 3rd. It was acknowledged that this date, like others, will pose a conflict for some LSWG members.

Opening Remarks and Discussion

Gary Hester (CVFMP Program Manager) welcomed the work group members and reviewed a handout of responses to key questions raised during the initial meetings of the five regional work groups. The handout ("Response to Questions") is available on the CVFMP Web site. In addition to the questions and answers addressed in this document, work group members raised the following issues:

- This planning effort should be more than just an inventory of the facilities.
- There must be a clear distinction between the portion of the flood control system that the state has taken responsibility for and the additional flood control actions identified in the CVFPP. The courts must be able to understand what the state should be held liable for.
- Whether the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) applies because of the Army Corps of Engineers' involvement in this process. [It does not.]
- The importance of addressing the interests of agricultural communities and communities of fewer than 10,000 that are different from those of larger communities.
- It is important that the plan address both floodplain and floodwater management. If the plan only focuses on floodwater management, this could be a fatal problem for small communities.
- Make sure that work that has already been done on these topics is reflected in the report. There have been multi-year discussions about interim erosion, levee repairs, and the issue of rural flood protection. The work that has come out of those discussions should not be lost.
- Add work group alternates to the revised work group contact list.
- A plan for outreach and engagement with tribes and environmental justice communities is important and DWR should present that plan to the work group. Please provide an update on tribal and environmental justice outreach and participation.
- The period of analysis (through 2050) is too short of a planning horizon, especially if the plan is incorporating sea level rise issues due to climate change. [The Climate Change Work Group will address this topic.]
- Please address the role of the Army Corps of Engineers' Risk and Uncertainty Analysis.
- Definition of the 200-year flood is a critical task and appears to be the responsibility of DWR under the legislation. Please clarify how this will take place and whether the regional work groups will be involved.
- There is interest in seeing the content produced by the topic-specific work groups that are scheduled to meet 4-5 times and complete their efforts by late October or early November. [Draft results from the topic work groups will be reported at later regional work group meetings]
- There is interest in knowing whether new flood models are being developed for this process, similar to the new hydrologic models being developed for the Delta.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Pierre Stephens noted that the draft summary from Meeting #1 was distributed via email. Comments and edits on that summary should be provided via email to Pierre within the next several days. Responses to the homework were received from about a third of the group and are appreciated. Homework responses received by the deadline have been incorporated into the next round of documents for review by the work group. Comments received after the deadline will be incorporated in the next round of revisions to the documents.

DWR is also putting together a strategy for how regional conditions work groups can contact the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) groups. In the meantime, Pierre Stephens and his staff are contacting IRWM groups and will provide briefings. Anyone currently in contact with IRWM groups should encourage them to provide comments into this process.

Review References Evaluation, Next Steps

Vanessa Nishikawa (Technical Lead) reported that DWR received over 600 comments covering almost every reference document. Work is underway to compile those comments to capture differing perspectives on various references. Pierre Stephens will send out a list of additional references as homework for this work group to review and provide additional comments and narrative if necessary. DWR is seeking locations for references, such as web links, if partners have that information.

Comment Review, General Descriptions

Pierre Stephens distributed revised general descriptions for Chapter 1 and the first part of Chapter 2 that include comments received from all the regional conditions work groups at Meeting #1. The boundaries have been revised, the section on history has been expanded to include language about mining legacies, floodways, bypasses, and other requested topics, and there is a description of the Cache Creek Settling Basin. Additional topics are included in the general descriptions, such as habitat levee design and reservoirs.

Work group members are welcome to provide additional input on the revised sections of Chapter 1 and portions of Chapter 2. There will be an opportunity to review the content again as part of the complete draft.

Review Augmented Chapter 2 Outline

Vanessa Nishikawa reviewed the augmented Chapter 2 outline, which reflects all the input gathered from the five regions at their initial meetings as well as any input received through August 14th. DWR added notes regarding which region provided the additional information. Some resource areas show up in multiple places throughout the outline (such as agriculture). DWR is also compiling a list of unique conditions for each region. If partners have ideas about additional pieces of information that need to be included in the draft outline, those should be emailed to Pierre Stephens. The augmented outline likely will not be discussed as a separate agenda topic in future meetings although input is welcome.

Status of Preliminary Draft Information for Existing Resource Conditions

Vanessa Nishikawa noted that DWR has been developing content for the Existing Conditions Sections. Draft sections (physical, infrastructure, and institutional) will be emailed to the work group at the end of this week or early next week. As part of the homework, partners should provide substantive comments and focus primarily on content rather than on grammar. The work group will have additional opportunities to review and provide input on this document. The draft sections for biological, socioeconomic, and cultural existing conditions will be provided during the week of August 31st.

Introduction to Future Challenges (Period of Analysis)

Vanessa Nishikawa gave the work group a brief presentation about the period of analysis for the CVFPP. The period of analysis will be through 2050. For a description of the existing conditions the time frame will extend to 2015.

Projects and Programs Influencing Resource Conditions by 2015 (Worksheet 6)

The work group broke into two small groups to develop worksheets that list projects and programs likely to influence the current condition, whether at a local, regional, or state level, up to 2015. For each potential project or program a series of status criteria should be addressed: authorized, approved through completion of NEPA/CEQA/other compliance processes, funded, permitted, or under construction. The discussion of project or program status was not completed for all items.

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project – spillway	2007	Yes	Needs appropriations - - \$1B total	Yes	Yes – U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) No - Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)	
Levee Improvements below Folsom – American River Common Features	Yes – but cost cutting – needs new FS	Not for additional increment	No	No	No	ACE, Department of Water Resources (DWR) and Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA)
South Sacramento Streams Group Project	Yes – approaching ceiling	Yes	Annual appropriations	Yes	Yes, with 2015 likely completion	ACE, DWR, SAFCA
Natomas Levee Improvement Program	Partial; needs federal	Needs more (state and federal)	Needs more (+/- \$200M)	Needs more	Yes, 2015 a goal	ACE
New Bullard’s Bar Outlet Expansions	No	No	No	No	Possible	Yuba County Water Agency
Star Bend Early Implementation Project (EIP)	Yes	Yes	Prop 1E	Yes (Section 408)	Yes	ACE
Marysville Ring Levee	Yes	Yes	Not sure		No, but likely by 2015	Federal
West Bank Feather River Restoration (Thermalito to Yuba City)	No – planning stage	No	Not for construction, only for planning	No	Possible by 2015	

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
Sacramento Bank Phase II, 80,000 Linear Feet	Yes	Yes	Needs annual appropriations	N/A	Likely sections under construction by 2015	ACE
Yuba City Feather River Parkway Recreation and Habitat Restoration						Will affect existing condition for habitat.
Feather River improvements at Abbott Lake Unit and Nelson Slough Unit			Wildlife Conservation Board Funding			Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Feather River Setback Area Management Plan	No	No	No	No	Possible restoration projects by 2015	DFG Just looking at options now
North Levee of Natomas Cross Canal	Yes	No	Partially funded	No	Possible by 2015	
Trees on levee policy						
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Modernization (DFIRM) Websites (Preliminary or Final Maps)					Yes	Eric Simmons or Kathleen Schafer, Andrea Clark to research and provide in homework
SB 5 (200 year protection)						How to address small-scale drainage and other requirements to meet 200-year protection? Is this in the scope of the CVFPP?

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
DWR defining the 200-year flood standard	Yes					
Levee Flood Protection Zone Maps (under FEMA)					Yes	DWR initiative, State levee-protected areas (liability concern)
DWR and CVFP Board 2D Model Entire Flood System (Sutter Bypass)	By CVFP Board and DWR				Yes	Starting with Sutter Bypass
Yuba County Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority (TRLIA)	Reimbursement required for federal share	Mostly	Yes	Yes (section 408)	Yes	ACE, TRLIA
TRLIA Feather Setback Levee Segment 2 - changing hydraulics					Yes, likely completion by 2009	
TRLIA Bear River Setback Levee - changing hydraulics					Yes	Project doesn't change capacity, but does change protection and changes description of state plan of flood control
Upper Yuba River EIP Project				Decision memo from DWR	Planned for 2010	The level of protection issues are based on whether areas were protected prior to project. Located by the gold fields
TRLIA Feather Setback Levee Segments 1 and 3						

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
SAFCA Levees – EIP projects						
West Sacramento Levees						
EIP Projects						
Bear River near Wheatland						
Sacramento Deep Water Channel						It is anticipated that the project will deepen the channel, and only lead to backwater affects, wouldn't change SPFC. May be little effect to CVFPP.
Marysville						Talk to Ric Reinhardt, MBK
Habitat Conservation Plans (Yolo County HCP)						Easement issues and conservation efforts will affect SPFC. What is potential mitigation for levee improvements to be approved? Levee improvement needs to know mitigation opportunities available
BDCP Fremont Weir						Conversion to habitat in the bypasses

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
Cache Creek Settling Basin Modification (methyl mercury)						DWR maintaining agency, CVFP Board is easement manager, and landowners. Potential flood issues for Winters, etc.
Anadromous Fish Passage (Nevada Irrigation District, Placer County Water Agency)						Western Placer streams and flood passage, culverts and weirs modified to allow fish passage
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Hydro-Relicensing (many projects)						Temperature requirements, operational restrictions.
Delta Methyl-Mercury TMDL						Regional Water Quality Control Board
Forecast Coordinated Reservoir/Project Operations and Reoperation						Oroville, New Bullards Bar, Folsom, other projects
Folsom Dam Construction and Modification						Rule curve
J-Levee Near Hamilton City						ACE
Middle Creek Restoration Project						ACE and Lake County. Affects project levees, environmental restoration effort

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
Clear Lake Methyl Mercury Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)						Anticipated to be completed sooner than Delta TMDL
Cache Creek Settling Basin TMDL						
Sierra Northern Pacific Railroad Trestle Removal						Parallel to I-5 in Yolo County
SBFCA No Regrets' projects						Restoration of flood protection
Sutter Butte Flood Control Feasibility Study (West levee of Feather River)						EIP reaches, complete prior to 2012 but some later
Upstream Meadow Restoration, Feather, Yuba, American Rivers (CABY Region)			Some federal funding			Looking for funding out of state bonds
Upstream Forest Management Planning, Urbanization						
Upper Yuba River Studies Plan (CALFED) – Englebright Removal						
Oroville FERC Relicensing						Need resolution of flood control issues, Thermalito operations. DWR, ACE, FERC.

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Project Name	Authorized	Completed Environmental Compliance Process	Funded	Permitted	Under Construction	Notes
New Bullards Temperature Changes affecting carry-over storage						

Work group members raised the following issues and questions based on this exercise:

- Delta-based BDCP projects are not likely by 2015.
- O&M/corrective action projects are not included in existing conditions projects and programs.
- The CVFPP should consider the effects of HCPs in the flood channel that would affect mitigation for other projects.
- How will the CVFPP handle habitat projects that are linked to flood management?
- How will the CVFPP handle IRWMP projects?
- Some of the status categories in the table are more applicable to infrastructure projects than to other types of projects or programs such as floodplain management. Need to include those also.

Q: There are differing opinions about which potential projects might fairly be characterized as “existing by 2015.” How will DWR capture that?

A: DWR expects differing opinions and will capture all perspectives and note where there is disagreement. In addition, this is a multi-phase process, so there will be an opportunity to review this content again. The project team will also share the content that other regional conditions work groups have provided in response to this exercise.

Future Challenges – Drivers and Influencers (Worksheet 4)

The work group shifted its focus to an initial discussion of Drivers and Influencers. Vanessa Nishikawa presented a sample diagram of potential drivers for the CVFPP, with one example being population. The work group broke into two small groups to build their own diagrams/lists of drivers and influencers. These were captured in Worksheet 4. For each driver the group was asked to note the trend of the driver, the timeframe, and why the driver will be important in the region.

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
Population <i>*May not be a driver for floodplain management because rules are already in place to guide future growth</i>	Sacramento Area County of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint (covers 6 counties) shows the trend is increasing population (50% increase by 2035) SACOG Blueprint emphasizes concentrating development in current	Likely to concentrate population growth in highly protected floodplain areas. Not likely to have more communities like Natomas and Plumas Lake (lightly populated basins that grew). Likely to have increased population densities in Sacramento

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
	<p>urban nodes</p> <p>FEMA National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) map modernization program and SB5 are also drivers of population growth, in terms of where developments can be sited.</p>	<p>area.</p>
Socioeconomics	We will have less money to work with	<p>How do you create a sense of fairness when there is a dichotomy between those counties that can develop, and those that can't due to flood risk? Rural counties rely heavily on property taxes to remain solvent.</p> <p>Agricultural areas, particularly Sutter County (and Yolo), provide ecological benefit for everyone. That benefit should be recognized, and perhaps monetized.</p> <p>Need to address the risk of flooding in rural communities hoping to grow (e.g. Biggs and Gridley).</p> <p>Where there is insufficient protection for subdivisions, what are the opportunities?</p>
Environmental Justice		Basic geologic reality determines which areas flood; however, this is altered by the infrastructure that we have developed over the years.
Current System Design		<p>Federal and state governments have backed out of their obligation to do restoration work.</p> <p>Due to cost sharing requirements, local areas cannot restore the flood control system either.</p>
Climate Change and Hydrology	<p>With climate change, higher sea levels will affect river stages near the Delta.</p> <p>More crucial is the mix of snow and rainfall, which affects inflow to and</p>	Flood control system in Lower Sacramento valley needs to consider this. The difference with warmer rains won't be as profound as in parts of the valley that are designed for snow and not rain floods. There may be large floods more frequently, but the magnitudes might not increase that significantly.

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
	outflow from reservoirs. Reduced resiliency of flood facilities	Reduce magnitude of catastrophe (ramp vs. cliff).
Water Supply/Reservoir Operations	Harder to maintain balance of flood control and water supply in reservoirs due to climate change.	Will have to get better at managing groundwater supply and use. Need systems to allow for conjunctive use. Forecast-based operations also useful.
Funding	Funding is very tight.	We will need to determine how much and who pays, as well as where and how to apply the funds (e.g., raising houses or adding levees). (E.g. – Sacramento County considering moving houses or raising them when along small creeks that flood frequently – depends on whether cash is available.) Whose responsibility is it to mitigate for hazards? Need an increase in intergovernmental cooperation.
Institutional Requirements		Need to adapt norms to differing land use realities the region faces. What do we do to allow people to live in flood hazard zones?
Agriculture vs. developed lands	It will be much more difficult to have widely dispersed growth due to SB 5.	People will be driven to live in more concentrated/dense areas.
Vegetation within flood plain	Requirements are getting stricter, stricter lease requirements.	Results in row crops in direction of flow, instead of brushy type crops.
Mitigation lands	Trend towards having to purchase mitigation lands when affecting parcels	Increases flood plains and can affect flood flows
Maintain flood conveyance	Push to keep agriculture in Sutter Bypass vs. riparian habitat	Active management of farming and campgrounds can allow farming in floodways.

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
Competition of uses within floodways		There needs to be an ability to obtain safe harbors when affecting protected species during mitigation projects. (e.g. elderberry bush)
SPFC in areas that are agricultural	Standards for agricultural vs. residential buildings (and could preclude Ag)	Ag will have a lower level of protection
High variability in rainfall	Increasing due to climate change	Creates challenges for agriculture (ability to be industrial), and changes the types of agriculture
Public safety vs. habitat	Could affect climate change by removing vegetation	
Groundwater Regulation	Increasing in monitoring supply and quality, subsidence from increased pumping which affects levees	Affects infiltration and storage, Lower Cosumnes River has potential for conjunctive use and manage floods
Extreme events	Decreased ability to control flood events	Decreased flood security for communities and the region.
Definition of what is a 200-year flood, and how below 200 year is zoned		Affects both agricultural and urban lands.
Public expectations	The trend is the public expects more certainty from a government that they have less trust in	
Aging of population		Decrease in land use and ability to respond to emergencies (not capable of escape). Tax revenue reduced, decreases funding for levees.
Transportation		Need to consider evacuation routes, how good they are, and how they change land use
More flood protection		Improved flood storage from DWR Oroville facility (Thermalito facility)
Increased Flood Storage	Creating more multi-purpose projects, allowing existing structures to balance supply and flood protection.	Integrate many single purpose projects within the same region

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Challenge/Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Affect on region/local community
Environment/Endangered Species Act (ESA)		
Limitations on development (Standards on Development)		
Title 23 - Water Code		
Leasing agricultural lands		Impacts on communities

Community Success Factors (Worksheet 3)

Vanessa Nishikawa distributed a revised Community Success Factors handout that included the input gathered from all the regions at Meeting #1, including input from the LSWG. The content has been summarized and consolidated into major topics. DWR will be refining the list of community success factors in light of the scope of the 2012 CVFPP.

The work group had an extended discussion about the challenge of addressing diverse community success factors across the five regions. Here is a summary of key points:

- It will be important for DWR to provide an opportunity for partners to explore the interests and concerns leading to current differences and even disagreements regarding community success factors. DWR should expect disagreements across regions and should not ignore these disagreements but rather give partners a chance to increase their understanding and perhaps even narrow those disagreements.
- Inter-regional meetings are one possible forum for exploring differences. Planning for these meetings is underway.
- This is fundamentally an input process and DWR wants to understand all viewpoints and bring them into development of the CVFPP.
- It will be important for DWR to acknowledge different regional perspectives on the CVFPP and be prepared to respond flexibly.

Overview of Chapter 3 Outline – Problems and Opportunities (Worksheet 5)

Vanessa Nishikawa asked the work group to hold an initial discussion to identify assets currently at risk of flooding, the cause of the risk, and the potential consequences. The group worked together for this exercise. All information was captured in a worksheet.

Asset at risk from flooding	Because	Consequences
Drinking water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be infiltrated by surface flood waters if wells are unsealed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking water contamination by bacteria or chemicals • Potential contamination impact to broader groundwater system if wells aren't properly designed
Human mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation system (roads and public transit) needed for ingress/ egress will be flooded or inoperable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact to economic activity (local and interstate) • Hazard to public safety – affects individuals needing to leave the flooded areas and affects personnel

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Asset at risk from flooding	Because	Consequences
		responding to the flood emergency
Sacramento Airport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-lying lands subject to overland flood waters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interruption of interstate travel, commerce
I-5 west of Yolo Bypass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cache Creek Settling Basin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep flooding for extended period of time Interruption of interstate travel, commerce
Areas of I-5 at grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-lying lands subject to overland flood waters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep flooding for extended period of time Interruption of interstate travel, commerce
California Highway Patrol (CHP) Academy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levee failure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destruction of facility Disruption of CHP training activities and lesser ability to respond to the flood emergency
Shaded riverine habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal regulations Decisions made about channel capacity and available land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of functional riparian habitat Loss of fish (There is an opportunity here to create multi-purpose facilities)
Provision of utilities (power supply, water supply, sanitation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground utility infrastructure flooded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of power results in inability to provide services (power, water supply, sanitation)
Capacity to farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding of trees, vines, and annual crops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe damage to local, regional economy
Quality of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of safety and loss of material items due to flooding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional toll Potential migration out of area Inability of individuals to recover economically
Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to continue jobs due to changed infrastructure or crops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Departure from community Potential resultant lack of socioeconomic diversity of remaining community members
Public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standing water breeds disease (mosquito-borne vectors and others) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Illness
Faith in the public sphere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to provide for public safety during flooding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of belief in ability of government to provide for public safety
Community infrastructure, regional post office in West Sacramento, Capitol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damage due to floods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruption of economic, social, and political activities

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

The following topics were raised by work group members:

- It is difficult to create a plan to deal with unplanned activities. We need to look at both the intended and the unintended consequences of a plan, such as the loss of riparian shading in waterways in flood-controlled areas.
- Trees on levees are a key issue with Endangered Species Act implications.
- It would be nice to have plans that match the community expectations on the ground. The CVFPP should reflect flood protection, the environment, and the economy.
- Recreation and general public access are both opportunities provided by this planning process. Recreation facilities can be both an opportunity and a problem, since emergencies might destroy those facilities. Private property also provides an opportunity to increase recreation access. Bypasses themselves offer great opportunities for recreation. It should be possible to design and live in concert with a river that floods.
- We need to do additional education work and created increased partnerships to ensure that emergency response is appropriately handled.
- Partner comment: We need education so that the general public better understands the unique character of the areas they inhabit.
- We should consider a way to have some sort of safe harbor to allow levee maintenance to occur without having the onerous mitigation requirements put forward. An integrated habitat management approach would be very useful.

REVIEW OF MEETING OBJECTIVES

Work group members reviewed the objectives for the meeting and agreed that each of these had been addressed.