



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

August 24, 2009, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

**Location: Mendocino National Forest Supervisor's Office
825 N. Humboldt Ave.
Willows, CA 95988**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Patricia Bratcher	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Stuart Edell	Butte County Public Works	Member
Tom Ellis	Sacramento West Side Levee District, Land owners in the Colusa Basin, Member of the Board of Directors of Colusa County Farm Bureau.	Member
Ren Fairbanks	Farming, SRWP, BSAGU	Member
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indreiri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County, and Butte Creek Watershed Conservancy	Member
John Linhart	City of Colusa Planning Department	Member
Ryan Luster	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	Member
Ben Pennock	GCID, Sacramento River Water Contractors, Glenn County Water Advisory Committee, Stony Creek Fan Conjunctive Water Management Group/ Partners. Association with groups: Technical Advisory Committee Representative	Member
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCVFCA	Member
Tom Smythe	Lake County Flood Control District	Member
Marty Stripling	River Garden Farms Co., Sacramento River Westside Levee District, Reclamation Districts 108 and 787	Member
David van Rijn	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Member
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP Program Manager
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO*
Dan McManus	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Lead

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Name	Organization	Status
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional Coordinator
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Program Manager
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Erica Bishop	MWH Americas Inc	Technical Team
Dave Ceppos	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ariel Ambruster	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support / Notetaker

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Leigh W. McDaniel	Glenn County BOS, Nor Cal Water Assn, Tehama Colusa Canal Authority, Colusa Basin Drainage District, Farm Bureau	Member
Jas O'Growney	Tehama County RCD	Member

ACTION ITEMS/WORK GROUP HOMEWORK (requested by 8/31/09):

Homework Instructions

Please remember to include your name on each homework item. Please email or fax your completed homework to DWR lead Dan McManus (email: mcmanus@water.ca.gov and facilitation support Ariel Ambruster (aambrust@yahoo.com), or if preferred fax to the attention of technical support Erica Bishop at (916) 924-9102.

The deadline is 8/31/09. If you think you **may not** be able to submit your homework by this deadline, or if you are not able to get it done at all, please let us know so that we are aware of what to expect.

- **Please give particular attention to the draft text review (items 2 and 3 below)**, as we will be finalizing this draft text in the next couple weeks.
- **Regarding items 4 through 7**, members provided input on these items as part of the individual and group exercises conducted during Monday's meeting. For homework, please focus only on providing additional information. Also note that we will be spending additional time discussing your input at work group meetings 3 and 4.

1. Review and comment on *Additional References List (Agenda Item #5)*

- Comment on new references that you are familiar with (same process as after Meeting #1)
- Comment on those references that you feel are critical documents to flood management planning in the region
- Instructions for sorting the references by region:
 - Click the arrow located on the Upper Sacramento Region column in the spreadsheet
 - When prompted, click "Sort A to Z" to group all references associated with the Upper Sacramento region.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

2. **Review and provide comments on DRAFT Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 sections 2.0 (Study Area Description), 2.1 (History...) and 2.2 (General Regional Descriptions) (Agenda Item #6)**
 - Please focus on errors, omissions, redundancy, mischaracterization, and other major issues with the draft, rather than making editorial comments
 - Please place suggested revisions and comments in track changes
3. **Review and provide comments on Chapter 2 Augmented Detailed Outline (Agenda Item #7)**
 - Please provide any additional comments beyond those given Monday
4. **Add additional projects and programs to *Worksheet 6: Projects and Programs* (Agenda Item #11)**
 - If you turned in a worksheet on Monday, please provide only additional projects/programs on this attached worksheet
5. **Add additional drivers to *Worksheet 4: Drivers and Influencers* (Agenda Item #13)**
 - On Monday, individual members identified "drivers" that will affect future conditions in the region and have influence on integrated flood management in the region. The group worked together to address driver trends, timeframe and effects. Please use the attached worksheet to complete this activity for any additional drivers you identify.
6. **Review, comment and add additional items to the DRAFT Summary of Community Success Factors handout (Agenda Item #15)**
 - On Monday, the workgroup provide additional input on this document. Please add any additional items you may have to the document. It may be helpful to use Meeting #1 Worksheet 3: Initial Identification of Community Success Factors as a guide for this assignment (PDF attached).
7. **Identify additional problems and opportunities to *Worksheet 5: Introduction to Problems and Opportunities* (Agenda Item #16)**
 - On Monday, group members identified some assets at risk, causes of the problems, and consequences. You may provide additional input on this worksheet.

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #3

Time: 9 a.m. to 3:15 p.m.
Date: Sept. 3, 2009
Place: Colusa Farm Bureau Offices
530 Market St., Colusa

Future Meetings:

- September 23, 2009
- October 5 & 15, 2009
- November 19, 2009 (joint meeting with Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group)

Tentative Dates for Future Meetings:

- October 29, 2009 (October 26, October 28, November 2)
- December 2, 2009 (November 25, November 26, November 30)
- December 14, 2009 (December 9, December 10, December 17)

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Colusa Industrial Park, Colusa
- Colusa Farm Bureau, Colusa
- Blood Source Building, Chico
- Butte County Library, Chico
- Mendocino National Forest Office, Willows
- Bureau of Reclamation Office, Willows
- US Fish And Wildlife Service Office, Red Bluff
- City or Glenn County Offices, Willows
- City Offices, Colusa

MEETING OVERVIEW:

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The goal for Meeting #2 was to introduce and establish a shared understanding of:

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 Regional Descriptions.
4. Summarize input received on Existing Resources Conditions outline (Chapter 2.2) and provide preliminary draft text.
5. Initial discussion of Likely Future Conditions of Chapter 2.3.
6. Summarize input received on Community Success Factors.
7. Initiate discussion of Problems and Opportunities of Chapter 3.

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Dan McManus and meeting facilitator Dave Ceppos welcomed the meeting participants and led introductions. Dave Ceppos and technical lead Roger Putty reviewed activities at Meeting #1 and went over the agenda. Dave Ceppos asked participants to confirm their contact information and alerted them to a planned joint meeting on November 19 with the Lower Sacramento Work Group.

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester welcomed the group and provided opening remarks. He reviewed the Response to Questions from Meeting #1 hand-out with attendees, stressing that these are preliminary answers, and inviting members to continue asking questions until they are satisfied.

Q: What is the status of funding for Army Corps of Engineers participation?

A: The Corps requires a local cost share before it can use its federal money for a specific purpose.

Q: What is the definition of "legacy town"? Could you add a definition?

A: A town that does not fit the urban definition because it is less than 10,000 people. The term is defined in the legislation. They need protection as well as larger towns. Adding a definition is a great suggestion.

Comment: Please provide a definition of "disadvantaged community" in the glossary.
[DWR will report back on these two definitions and add them to the glossary.]

Q: Should Lake County participate in Lower Sacramento work group?

A: Recent work group boundary changes have shifted Cache Creek into the Lower Sacramento work group. You can choose your preferred work group.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Comment: Be sure that the CVFPP team and IRWMP team at DWR are coordinating on boundary definitions.

Answer: the team is working on that coordination and is likely to report back on this.

Comment: Regarding economic disadvantage -- small communities are not covered as an "interest group" and may still be at risk due to current trends and conditions in regards to economics and land values.

Answer: The idea of the term is that government should not take actions that disproportionately impact disadvantaged communities.

Comment: A huge disadvantage to the north state is that a lot of projects do not consider agriculture as a benefit in their cost-benefit analyses.

Answer: We acknowledge that the traditional approach doesn't address the issues you've been raising, and that is one reason an agricultural topic group is being considered.

Q: What is the status of coordination with tribal representation in the work group process? The Colusa tribe owns a significant amount of land near levees and has been heavily affected

A: DWR is trying to do that in an appropriate way by working through Barbara Cross, who has tribal contacts.

Comment: There needs to be discussion in the text on the impact of environmental restoration on agriculture (i.e., impact of setback levees). Restoration brings in endangered species, which impacts existing land uses.

Answer: This could be discussed by the agricultural stewardship work group. Another question is if there is enough agricultural representation on the environmental stewardship work group. There needs to be coordination between the agricultural/environmental stewardship groups.

Comment: A member requested clarification that the plan will not result in new compliance requirements.

Response: This was confirmed, but it was also noted that the conditions identified in the legislation may affect or result in future compliance regulations.

Comment: A participant then provided an opinion that the northern valley partners should not be burdened with new liability for providing improved flood protection under the plan.

Comment: I'm concerned that Northern California could be held responsible for solving or creating future flood impacts in the Delta.

Q: Is the Comp Study being reengaged by the Army Corps? What data will be used in the CVFPP from the Comp Study? What data will the Corps use for the CVIFMS study?

A: The Corps was considering amending the Comp Study as a way to use the cost-sharing to participate in this process. However, it has sunsetted. The Corps will try to use information from the Comp Study that is viable and good. That will be determined by the Corps and the state and other stakeholders looking at the hydraulic models. DWR would like to get specific comments from work group members on the Comp Study as part of the references review -- please raise cautions if you have them.

Comment: Once the agencies have gotten together on the Comp Study, it would be great to have a one-hour study session on the topic at this work group.

Q: Is this a "fixed" plan or will it change/update over time?

A: it will be updated every five years, including updated hydrology.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Dan McManus noted that the team had received roughly 3 to 4 comments per action item. He reiterated the importance of workgroup members submitting comments. DWR plans to finalize the Upper Sacramento general regional description soon, so please think about and provide any comments in the next few days.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Review References Evaluation

Roger Putty provided an overview of comments received from the Work Group on references. The team has identified 100 new references from input provided by the five work groups. As homework, please review these new references. Work Group members had questions and discussion about the expectations of this particular piece of work, given that few individuals are familiar with many of the documents.

Team members suggested:

- Comment only on those documents, or parts of documents, you are familiar with.
- Provide the team with information on reports you feel are critical.
- When you do comment, it's helpful if the comment is as specific as possible.
- Team members are interested in hearing cautions that work group members may have about particular references, or particular parts of a reference.
- It would also be helpful if work group members identify references that are particularly important to their particular region or community.

Q: How will the comments be used?

A: This is not a popularity contest. It's to identify the cautions that we need to be aware of.

Q: Will references be cited?

A: They will be referenced or cited in the document.

Comment: It would be helpful if we could sort by region.

Answer: The team will provide directions on how to sort.

Additional reference questions collected later in the meeting include:

Q: Are references important to the future design of the system or for history to this point?

B: Both.

Q: How should members emphasize that a reference is important locally?

A: Emphasize in comments that it is a document of major local importance.

Comment Review, Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Study Area Description, and Chapter 2.1, General Regional Descriptions

Dan McManus presented Chapter 2.1, the Upper Sacramento General Regional Description, which has been updated with the comments work group members have provided. Because work group members asked how it would fit into the report, and asked for historical information, the team has provided Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 Study Area Description for context. The team can provide track changes versions of Chapter 2.1, but it is difficult to read. The team will e-mail Microsoft Word versions out tomorrow.

Review Augmented Chapter 2 Outline

Roger Putty presented the augmented Detailed Outline for Chapter 2, which incorporates feedback from work groups in italics. He sought further comments from work group members. A draft will be brought back at the next meeting.

Q: Why are there no new topics from Upper Sac?

A: The Upper Sac discussion concentrated on unique conditions of the region, rather than new outline topics. The regional references in parentheses are confusing to the reader and will be removed.

Q: What is the definition of "floodway corridors" from SB5?

A: We will include this definition.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Q: How is identifying endangered species getting to an action? It would be helpful to use language consistent with SB5.

Group recommendations/suggestions included:

- It would be helpful to include watershed assessments. There are federal and state (CWAM) information sources on how to do watershed assessments that would be helpful to this process.
- Groundwater should be in Physical Conditions.
- Item 2.3 Land Use: Include FEMA mapping program -- new areas may be mapped into the 100 year floodplain.
- Include trespass issues.
- In Item 2.1 and 2.2, add floodplains.
- Item 2.2.5, Local Flood Control: This should include Butte Basin, how the system is designed, how both private and public levees are important to continue the designed function.
- Item 2.3: Anytime future projects are discussed, there must be funding.
- The legislation promotes natural hydro-geomorphic processes. How will this capture that? The legislation includes: 1. Look for opportunities to reconnect floodplains; 2. Identify number and value of habitat acres; 3. Biotic diversity of special status species (from Chapter 1, page 4).
- Under Item 2.2.6 Escape/Evacuation Routes, discuss Butte Basin, the routes are flooded.
- Under Institutional, include who is responsible for structures, and discuss private levees and their influence on the state system.
- Under Geomorphology, include a geology section.
- In Biological Conditions, order the items intuitively and consistently (will provide).
- Under Institutional, Funding: Include CVPIA restoration money.
- Item 2.2.6 Funding (Lower Sacramento): Local cost shares are required to maintain federal and state facilities. That should include Upper Sacramento too.

Comment: Existing Resource Conditions should include historical aspects-- both physical and policy.
Answer: the drivers discussion could include that.

Q: Page 4, Item 2.2.5: Is flood control structures repeated?

Q: Recreation is in Item 2.2.2 and in Item 2.2.3.

A: Items will be repeated.

Q: Mercury is under geomorphology -- should it be under water quality?

A: It depends on the context of the Mercury discussion, so it may be in two parts.

Comment: Page 6, Institutional: This should include shared liability -- locals and state issues. Funding for rural communities, the cost-benefit approach for funding for flood control, a description of the current situation - all these should be discussed.

Answer: That might be in the problem statement in Chapter 3.

Comment: One issue for the Institutional or Socioeconomic section: Liability waivers -- state borrows county general fund money which would go to operations and maintenance costs. If it is mandated, it needs to be funded or waived. Discuss current funding for O&M.

Answer: This might be treated as a problem in Chapter 3, and in future solutions.

Q: Item 2.2.5 Infrastructure, Page 5, Irrigation and Drainage information: What information will be included? It's important to include land reclaimed for agricultural use.

A: One item would be irrigation structures that cross floodways, such as the Cherokee Canal and Folsom Canal.

Comment: In Item 2.2.2 Agriculture, there needs to be a definition for "working landscape."

Answer: Part of the definition is that this land is serving other purposes, such as habitat.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Comment: Under Item 2.3 on Page 7: The concept of sustainability should be added, whatever is done should be sustainable.

Answer: Sustainability is in the glossary, we are defining it to include the three E's, economics, environment and equity, are needed.

Comment: Item 2.2.2 Vegetation should include the effect on flood flows of vegetation.

Answer: That could go under channel geometry and capacity, and under 2.2.5 Infrastructure. It could be discussed in Chapter 3 problems, and also in the flood easements section.

Comment: Inventory reach roughness – it is critical to increasing flood flows.

Answer: A lot of these issues will be looked at in the evaluation of management actions section.

Q: Will the plan address maintaining existing structures, or new facilities?

A: That will be covered in the evaluation of management actions.

Review Preliminary Draft Information for Chapter 2.2 (Existing Resources Conditions)

Roger Putty introduced this item, saying the plan team is beginning to put together taxed based on references and workgroup member feedback. He suggested that members not present at Meeting #1 may want to look at the Meeting #1 summary and provide comments on unique conditions that have not yet been listed. There is no handout at this meeting, but there will be a progress report and possibly an initial draft at the next meeting.

Projects & Programs Influencing Resource Conditions by 2015, Worksheet 6

Roger Putty introduced the section. The period of analysis is near-term, to 2015. The criteria for local projects and programs are:

- Authorized
- Approved though completion of NEPA, CEQA, and ESA compliance process
- Funded
- Permitted
- Under construction

Participants can fill out the worksheet at this meeting or afterwards, if they desire.

Chapter 2.3, Future Challenges – Drivers and Influencers

Roger Putty introduced the section. The period of analysis is long-term, to 2050. Group members added additional drivers to a large chart on the wall and then met in small groups to identify key drivers.

Additional major drivers added:

- Change in Land-Use
- Ecosystem Function
- Biology
- Water Quality
- Physical Change in System
- Politics

The chart will be amended to incorporate these and the sub-drivers added by workgroup members.

Future Drivers and Influencers (Worksheet 4)

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

Driver	Trend/Timeframe	Effect on region/local community
<p>Water Supply Needs</p>	<p><u>Trend</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move water through as efficient, fast as possible • Need to change this to store the water. Stay out of the valley. • Increased reliance on groundwater • Increased cost of agriculture • Decreased reliability • Conflict of what the purpose of a reservoir is • Flood versus supply/environment needs <p><u>Timeframe</u> Past, present, future</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of efficient transport of flood flows poses risk to local lands/communities • Moving water faster poses risk to downstream communities (i.e. Colusa Basin, Yolo Bypass) • Increased agricultural cost from pumping groundwater • Risk of subsidence • Loss of water table height • Water quality impacts: salinity, municipal and industrial drinking water, etc.
<p>Land-use -- Physical and policy decisions</p>	<p><u>Trend</u> Increased regulation. Change from local to state/regional decision influence. Reactivity due to national events. Paterno -- shift in liability conflict between decisions for land-use and responsibilities if something goes wrong. Flip argument is that locals don't have authority to maintain and ensure sufficient protection.</p> <p><u>Timeframe</u> Immediate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shifting liabilities • System/approach to decisions does not provide long-term protection. Should be a better way to manage this. • Increased financial responsibility. Communities can't grow without funds. Can't get funds without protection. • Lack of accountability by Feds/state.
<p>Socioeconomic: Financing</p> <p>A. Cost B. Will</p>	<p><u>Trend</u> Rural to suburban. (Votes). SB5, SB17 -- protects urban areas.</p> <p><u>Timeframe</u> Now</p>	<p>A. Cost: Example: It would cost \$80 million in flood money to protect the city of Colusa</p> <p>Example: Agriculture can't pay for flood protection. Benefits as quantified is narrow -- doesn't capture project implications</p> <p>Issue: Differential among agriculture. Napa County can pay for it – the central valley cannot. The scale here for flood control projects is huge.</p> <p>B. Will:</p>

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

		We aren't willing to tax ourselves. Example: TRLIA in Yuba County, Sutter-Yuba Counties. Gets to the driver of political
<p>Driver above connects to another driver: Politics</p> <p>Locational -- proximity to Sacramento.</p> <p>Driven by cost-benefit analysis?</p> <p>North-south split.</p> <p>Urbans don't care about ag land; don't understand the importance of it.</p>		
<p>Two drivers above connect to another driver: Project Evaluation</p>	<p><u>Trend</u> Continuing</p>	Example: Agriculture can't pay for flood protection. Benefits as quantified is narrow -- doesn't capture project implications
<p>So there is a circular relationship between the drivers of financing, politics, land-use, institutional/evaluation</p>		Example: Plumas Lakes development. They put in flood control improvements, but the development was needed in order to pay for them.
<p>Driver: water supply</p> <p>There is too much water.</p>		
<p>Driver of external water supply needs: BDCP, i.e., politics driver</p> <p>Unmet needs for regulated water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • urban needs • environment • flood control <p>All three can be addressed through the IRWMP process</p>		
<p>Regulation -- this leads to the driver of institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration versus flood control • State in regards to locals. • How state regulations are 	<p><u>Trend</u> Increasing</p>	

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

interpreted • Regulations in regard to large reservoirs		
--	--	--

Discussion of Draft Summary of Community Success Factors

Roger Putty introduced this item.

Q: How broadly as "community" defined?

A: What would be most helpful is if you are specific, in how to be successful to address your needs. The way we will use this is we will be coming back in two or three meetings and looking at the goals and objectives of the plan.

Comment: There is concern over the term "community success factors." It could be misleading. "Community issues" is preferred.

The following edits were proposed by members:

Additions:

Recreation

- Salmon fishery
- Access to river
- Public, private hunting
- Boat launches
- Reservoir management

Protection of land values

Success would be a positive effect.

Financial Impacts

One major issue is the effect of levee maintenance requirements, the cost share, on locals and the state. Success would be an equitable cost share agreement.

Clarify the definition of the second bullet under financial requirements

Success factor: Public awareness of additional costs to agriculture of flood cleanup, increased understanding by the public of this issue.

Economic impact analysis has not identified full costs.

Opportunity costs: investors won't support.

A success factor would be fair compensation for trash removal, and fire and law enforcement needs caused by public access.

Communication: A success factor would be general public understanding in regards to flood impacts.

Q: what is the difference between multiple objective and multiple benefit? Are these different or the same?

A: A benefit may not necessarily be an objective, but may be a positive benefit that will occur from a program.

Check the following boxes for Upper Sacramento:

11

August 24, 2009

This summary consists of raw notes of Work Group discussion. The team attempts to capture all opinions accurately but this document is not a report nor a decision document for the CVFMP.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

- Socioeconomic: Third-party impacts of habitat restoration
- Flood Flow Management:
 - Coordination of reservoir operations and discharges
 - Bypass areas
- Physical Infrastructure: O&M

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

Roger Putty provided an introduction of the section.

Results of work group discussions:

The following asset is at risk	Because	Consequences
I-5/Westside railroad	Flooding/shut down the corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to structures • Structural loss • Regional/coastal economic impact
Sutter Bypass/environs at risk	US Fish and Wildlife Service refuge -- old-growth vegetation north of Tisdale	Likely contributed to Meridian levee break
South Avenue in Tehama County Woodson bridge crossing of the Sacramento River	Closure of bridge in four-year and higher events	Lack of emergency services, diverted river crossing
Highway 113/Town of Robbins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection corridor • Commercial use • Escape route for Yuba City • Loss of substantial crop storage and production 	Similar to above
Bank erosion on upper Sacramento River and Feather River caused by longer/higher duration of flood flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion • Loss of riparian private/public land • Sedimentation 	Loss of land asset. Effect to whole system D/S sedimentation
Sacramento River channel Colusa to Knight's Landing Tisdale Bypass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colusa and Sutter basin • Sedimentation and snag buildup • Threat to levees failure • Freeboard decrease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact to agricultural production • Impact to agricultural infrastructure for processing/storage • High costs to reclaim flooded basins/damage
The northern portion of Williams	Lack of flood channel maintenance and an adequate planning of flood control designed to coordinate with development	Risks to infrastructure and water quality
192.25 river mile, a private levee on the left bank	It is in danger as the Sacramento River meanders towards it. It maintains flood flow splits into Butte Basin. No bank maintenance is done.	Excess flood waters because design flow is exceeded into Butte Basin. It compromises the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. There are impacts to

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #2

		public safety, transportation and infrastructure.
Butte Basin	3B overflow structure is a critical part of Butte Basin. It is a silt weir not constructed to federal/state standards. In initial flooding, there are head cuts that cause Butte Basin to be flooded below warning stage. In 1998, there were 28 consecutive days of flooding. One of the three weirs was designed but not built.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding of roads • Killing orchards • Agriculture can't plant rice and other crops • Impacts to public safety • Impacts to transportation • Impacts to infrastructure • No capacity to handle Sacramento River flows if there is a second flood
Hamilton City area	Sewage ponds are in the floodway, on the wet side of the levee. There are a number of places where wastewater systems are not well placed, or where sewage is released during flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to infrastructure • Impairment of water quality
Sacramento River at Missouri Bend	Sand levees, water boils, conflicts with downstream Army Corps of Engineers levee design	Levee failure, overtopping

Group discussion:

Q: Are we going to have discussion of these? My concern is we're going to put forth recommendations with no basis in science.

A: You might want to look at the PowerPoint on process. The idea is to initially allow discussion to occur, and then, when we get to solutions, to look at the issues more rigorously.

Comment: It can be helpful when people raise an issue, to identify if there are any supporting documents.