



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary FINAL

Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Time: October 6, 2009, 9:00 am – 2:00 pm
Location: Robert J Cabral Agricultural Center
 2101 E. Earhart Ave.
 Stockton, CA 95206

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Name	Organization	Status
Susan Dell'Osso	Reclamation District 2062	Member
Wes Fujitani	City of Lodi	Member
Alex Hildebrand	South Delta Water Agency	Alternate
Mary Hildebrand	San Joaquin Farm Bureau, South Delta Water Agency, California Central Valley Flood Association	Member
Kevin Kauffman	Stockton East Water District	Member
James Nelson	Stormwater Consulting	Member
Dave Peterson	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Julie Retner	River Partners	Member
Steve Winkler	San Joaquin County	Member
Joe Bartlett	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO)	CVFPO Representative
Gary Hester	DWR	CVFPP Program Manager
Carolyn Lott	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)	Facilitator
Sam Magill	Center For Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support
Mark Nordberg	DWR	DWR Lead
Keith Wallace	MWH	Technical Lead
Scott Woodland	DWR	Regional Coordinator

Absent:

Deedee Antypas	RD 2074	Member
Roger Churchwell	San Joaquin Area Flood Agency (SJAFCA)	Member
Jim Giottonini	City of Stockton, SJAFCA	Member
Koosun Kim	City of Manteca	Member

Tony Refuerzo	Stanislaus County Planning Department	Member
Jesse Roseman	Tuolumne River Trust	Member
David Zezulak	California Department of Fish and Game	Member

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK

1. **STANDING ACTION ITEM:** Work Group members will submit comments on all materials (glossary, references, etc.) as needed.
2. Gary Hester will provide updates to the Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) on the following topics:
 - a. The process for completion and format of environmental documentation for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).
 - b. Developing assurances that the hydrologic effects of floodwaters outside of the CVFPP Study Area (such as the Kings River) will be analyzed as part of the CVFPP.
 - c. The briefings to local governments on local compliance requirements within the CVFPP.
 - d. The repository for all reference materials used in the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR) and CVFPP.
 - e. A new description for the Agricultural Stewardship Subcommittee that does not reference “promoting the farming lifestyle.”
 - f. Separating the “sustainable management” CVFPP into two distinct goals: one for sustainable management of the floodplain; the other for sustainable management of the flood system itself.
 - g. CVFPP requirement H and the opportunity to look at improving and constructing dams and reservoirs, instead of only looking at their removal.
3. Staff will contact Work Group members to ask for volunteers for the Agricultural Stewardship Subcommittee.
4. MWH will email member-specific passwords to each Work Group member, along with instructions for accessing the SharePoint RCSR comment repository.
5. Scott Woodland will follow up with DWR staff to find out when the “no regrets” project description document will be available for Work Group review.
6. Keith Wallace will revise the Delta Flood Protection CVFPP goal based on Work Group comments for review at the next Work group meeting.
7. Work Group members will review the draft CVFPP goals and provide all comments to staff as homework before the next meeting.
8. Work Group members will review the CVFPP requirements and be prepared to discuss them at the next Work group meeting.

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

The Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on October 6, 2009 with the following actions:

- Continued review of problems and opportunities. Review draft problems and opportunities for Chapter 3 of the RCSR.

- Review the draft goals, objectives, and principles for the CVFPP and propose additions to the principles as needed.

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:

- Clarify the 2012 CVFPP report structure and content
- Address issues raised in meeting # 3
- Provide roadmap of remaining meetings - process, content, document
- Provide status updates on Topic Work Groups
- Continue refinement of Problem and Opportunity Statements (Chapter 3)
- Introduce and begin work on Goals and Objectives (Chapter 4)

SUMMARY:

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

Welcome and Greetings

Carolyn Lott opened the meeting and introduced Joe Bartlett for opening comments from DWR.

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the Regional Condition Work group "swim lane" process overview chart, and reminded meeting participants that the Work Group should focus on defining problems and opportunities, and then move into reviewing/confirming objectives for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR). He also noted that there have been a number of changes to the overall regional conditions work group process. Gary Hester would provide a more detailed review of these changes later in the meeting.

Ms. Lott then continued by explaining that the agenda contained several goals for the meeting. She added that the two most important goals included reviewing the problems/opportunities statements and reviewing the suggested goals, principles, and objectives worksheet.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Hester delivered opening remarks and reviewed a document entitled "Responses to Questions from Meetings 2 and 3." The document explains the change in process and provides responses to 13 specific questions asked by all of the work groups in meetings 2 and 3. A summary of each response is provided below, along with any discussion by the Work Group of each question.

- 1) Revised Plan. Mr. Hester reminded the Work Group that at the last meeting an announcement was made that the schedule would change. Additional information on the schedule change was available later in the meeting in a presentation by Keith Wallace.
- 2) Interaction among all regional conditions work groups. The Work Group initially expressed a desire to interact with the other work groups. Staff determined that it would be easier logistically and more effective to hold two valley wide forums open to the public instead; one in the Sacramento Valley, the other in the San Joaquin Valley. Staff will ask for Work Group member participation in the valley-wide forums.
- 3) Integration of input from all regional conditions work groups. Mr. Hester reminded the Work Group that there are four topic work groups in addition to the regional conditions work groups. DWR is waiting for these topic groups to conclude their effort and provide input for the RCSR. Each topic group will then have the opportunity to review the RCSR to ensure that the information they

provided was captured properly. Their work will essentially function as a stand alone section of the RCSR.

- 4) Systems approach to the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). Mr. Hester noted that this is a complex issue. DWR will continue to have a dialogue about what the intent of the state plan of flood control was and what the charge of the CVFPP is. It is important to reconcile how non-project levees will be addressed, as they lie outside of the state plan of flood control, but play an important role in flood control nonetheless. Mr. Hester reminded the Work group that there is no intention to expand the state's liability as part of the CVFPP process. As such, the Work Group must be very clear about its recommendations for improvements on a system-wide basis.
- 5) Coordination with BDCP and other Delta activities. Mr. Hester explained that Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman has drafted a memo aimed at explaining coordination efforts between the CVFPP and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Additionally, Steve Bradley, DWR, is working to coordinate the two efforts internally within DWR.
- 6) Overall plan for environmental documentation for the CVFPP. DWR will work on this aspect of the CVFPP over the next year. Mr. Hester explained that one of the keys here is getting the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to adopt the CVFPP by 2012. It is unlikely the CVFPB would approve this effort without proper environmental documentation/compliance. Mr. Hester added DWR will give the Work Group updates as the environmental report work proceeds (**see Action Item #2**).
 - a. A participant asked if the environmental documentation would be a stand alone document or be incorporated into the CVFPP. Mr. Hester explained that the two would be closely linked, but be separate documents to make sure the CVFPP and RCSR are both easily digestible by their intended audiences.
- 7) Agricultural Stewardship Subcommittee. Mr. Hester noted DWR made a commitment to ensure the issue of agriculture in relation to flooding was properly addressed. The intention of an Agricultural Stewardship Subcommittee is to assemble a group of volunteers from the various regional conditions work groups for two meetings to discuss agricultural issues. The first meeting is scheduled for October 20th; staff will contact work group members to put together a roster (**see Action Item #3**).
- 8) Update on coordination between the Central Valley Flood Management Program (CVFMP) and tribal representatives. DWR continues to work on tribal coordination, and is using the California Water Plan (Water Plan) tribal coordination effort to get started. Additionally, Barbara Cross from DWR is helping the CVFMP directly engage the tribes by scheduling up to 8 briefings with tribal councils, 4 of which will take place by the end of 2009.
- 9) CVFPP Planning Area. Revising the planning area of the CVFPP is still under deliberation by DWR. Including the Fresno Metropolitan area is a big issue; Fresno feels that it is outside of the planning area defined in SB5 (Machado) in 2007. The revised boundary is included in this Q&A document.
 - a. A participant noted that the planning area does not include the Kings River, and raised the concern that a substantial amount of flood water enters the San Joaquin River system through the Kings. Mr. Hester explained that although the CVFPP will not look at structural improvements on the Kings River itself, it will study the hydrological effects of Kings River water on the San Joaquin River. Participants suggested that it will be important to look at both reservoir operations and the magnitude of storage available for flood risk management. Mr. Hester committed to holding follow up conversations to ensure that assurances can be provided to the Work Group that an analysis of the Kings River will be included in the CVFPP (**see Action Item #2**).
- 10) Update on local jurisdiction compliance with CVFPP requirements. Mr. Hester noted that DWR is in the process of briefing local public works departments, and will eventually brief county boards of supervisors and city councils. This local coordination is a critical component of the CVFPP, and will be outlined in a separate report that details guidelines for local compliance. This report is intended to be released by the end of 2009.
 - a. A participant asked if this report is mainly concerned with local general plan updates. Mr. Hester confirmed that the report will address local general plan updates, and noted that one of the biggest things will be explaining the 200 year flood event elevations. This hydrological information will not be available for the 2012 update.

- b. Another participant noted that the lack of funding for local general plan updates is an important concern for many cities and counties. Mr. Hester agreed, and said that this would be in topic of discussion in local briefings. He also agreed to give updates to the Work Group on these briefings as more information becomes available (**see Action Item #2**).
 - c. One Work Group member noted that 200 year elevations won't be complete until reoperation of dams is analyzed. It was explained that the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is actively looking into this option.
 - d. One participant commented that the guidelines report should contain explicit recommendations/requirements for local compliance. Mr. Hester agreed, adding that it will be easier for local jurisdictions to respond to specific requirements as opposed to high-level guidelines.
- 11) Repository for documents undergoing review by the regional conditions work groups and staff. Mr. Hester commented that this question is in response to the thoughts about the most efficient way to provide input on work group comments. An online repository is being constructed that will contain versions of the RCSR and password-protected ability for individual work group members to respond to the drafts and ensure that their comments were captured correctly. He added that staff consultants from MWH will email individual passwords to Work Group members by the end of the week (**see Action Item #4**).
- 12) Repository for reference documents. Mr. Hester explained that this repository is still being discussed. It will take some time to assemble all of the documents in the regional conditions work group reference list. DWR will provide updates on this effort as more information becomes available (**see Action Item #2**).
- 13) Data collection for management action development. Mr. Hester explained that this issue is about how DWR and consultants will take advantage of data provided by Work Group members as the process moves forward. Work Group members with data relevant to the RCSR and CVFPP should send it to Yung Hsin-Sung, MWH.

General Discussion on "Responses to Questions..." document:

- On page 4, question 5, a participant noted that the purposes of BDCP and CVFPP seem to be at odds, as BDCP recommends converting large portions of the Delta from levee-protected agricultural land to flooded tidal marsh/aquatic habitat. This could have significant implications for flood risk management in the Delta. Mr. Hester responded that the Delta Regional Conditions Work Group meetings will now include dedicated staff from BDCP to address these types of concerns. Additionally, this will be a topic for discussion during the regional forums discussed above. He added that the memo from Secretary Chrisman will likely state that there can't be conflicting recommendations between BDCP and the CVFPP. Participants and staff alike noted that increased coordination between the two efforts is necessary, and that BDCP staff should be made aware that the use of eminent domain and willing seller purchases is likely to cause negative impacts to landowners and the local tax base.
- A participant asked that the phrase "continuation of the farming lifestyle" be struck from the description of the agricultural stewardship subcommittee, as protecting the agricultural lifestyle is not an appropriate goal for the CVFPP. Meeting participants generally agreed, and Mr. Hester agreed to work on rephrasing the description (**see Action Item #2**).
- Participants expressed their appreciation for the "Questions..." document, and commended DWR for the process design.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Ms. Lott asked DWR staff for any input or updates on actions items/homework from previous Work Group meetings. Mark Nordberg responded that there have been three homework assignments since the last Work Group meeting: the first was on institutional conditions, the second on reviewing section 2.3 of the RCSR, and the final assignment on cultural resources, and emergency planning/response. The final

assignment is due October 15th. Mr. Nordberg asked that all outstanding assignments be completed as soon as possible.

Overview of Regional and Topic Work group Progress

Mr. Wallace delivered a presentation on the revised timeline and progress to date. This presentation is available on the website listed above. He noted that the “findings” portion of the timeline has been removed from the process. This will allow the Work Group to utilize the remaining meetings to ensure comments received to date are properly incorporated into the RCSR. The RCSR will ultimately be incorporated into the CVFPP as the first four chapters. There will also be a companion document that will explain the RCSR, the lessons learned in the overall regional conditions work group process, and the level of agreement within and between each work group. Topic work group input will be incorporated into chapters 2-4 of the RCSR.

Discussion:

- A participant noted that the revised timeline doesn’t appear to include space for defining early implementation projects. Mr. Woodland explained that there is already a process underway within DWR to build these “no regrets” types of projects as soon as possible. A document is being produced outlining those projects; Mr. Woodland will follow up with DWR to find out when it will be available for Work Group review (**see Action Item #5**). Mr. Hester added that promoting improvements within the South Delta and Lower San Joaquin regions could be incorporated into the RCSR.

Review Synthesized Problems and Opportunities Statements

Mr. Wallace delivered a presentation on the problems and opportunity statements developed by staff and based on Work group input. These statements will form the basis for chapter 3 of the RCSR. After an initial Work Group discussion, Ms. Lott instructed Work Group members to look at the worksheet entitled “Problems and Opportunities (Chapter 3) - Working Draft Summary of Regional Differences” and provide input on each statement as needed.

Initial Discussion:

- Participants suggested that the title be adjusted to read “Problems, Solutions, and Opportunities/Enhancement.” Mr. Wallace responded that the solutions discussed will not only address the problem they are associated with, but also be designed to provide incidental benefits to other resources such as habitat or water quality.
- A participant suggested that there should be an overarching principle of linking flood risk management directly to water supply, as the two issues are inextricably linked.
- One Work Group member commented that the definition of problems provided in the presentation was very direct and succinct, but that the definition of opportunities could lose sight of the primary purpose of the CVFPP, flood risk management.
- Meeting participants generally agreed that the definition of opportunities could be confusing. “Opportunities” are commonly understood as many to be solutions to a problem. The definition provided appears to suggest instead that opportunities refer to “enhancement opportunities” that may address many things besides the problem that they are directly associated with.
- A participant noted that reducing flood stage (instead of just strengthening storage/levees) should be a primary goal of the CVFPP.

The following is a summary of the worksheet exercise to address the proposed problems and opportunities statement, organized by category (I-V) and specific problem statement.

Category I- Flood System Performance

- A participant suggested that title of this category should be changed to “Flood System Performance and Level of Protection.”

Problem Statement 1: Channel does not convey design capacity due to changed channel conditions

- Loss of vegetation within the channel may be a risk and lead to levee instability.
- Sedimentation lowers water levels, increases brush amounts, and pushes water against levees to increase erosion.

Problem Statement 2: Levee structural integrity is compromised

- Design deficiency is due to inadequate levee cross sections. The Corps and state have ignored the problem of winter storm floods as well. This can only be addressed by reducing flood stage.
- Structural integrity may be compromised due to incomplete or inadequate repairs.

Problem Statement 3: Hydraulic features (including weirs, gates, bifurcations, and overflows) are difficult to operate or do not perform to design standards

- The problem statement should be revised and “gates” should be removed since they are already captured in bifurcations.
- “Bypasses” should also be included in this problem statement.
- Problem statement 3(a) should be revised to read “accumulation of sediment, snags, or debris.”
- Add 3(d): Climate change will reduce snowpack and increase the influence of rain on snow events and exceed design standards.

Problem Statement 4: Prescribed reservoir releases under current water control manuals can result in flows that exceed downstream capacities

- Add 4(d): Climate change has reduced snowpack and increased the influence of rain-on-snow events.
- 4(b)(i) should be revised and made into it’s own problem statement.
- Sea level rise should be included in this problem statement. Statements regarding sea level rise must be based on logical science, and it should be noted that this statement is a likely future issue, whereas most of the other problem statements refer to current problems.
- Add 4(e): Water control manuals were constructed based on an insufficient period of record.
- Add 4(f): Reservoir uses are in conflict with each other (i.e., water supply AND flood control functions are inherently at odds).
- Add 4(g): There are insufficient snow and flow sensors.

Problem Statement 5: Original design no longer provides intended level of protection

- Add 5(d): New data.
- Clarify this problem statement to specify WHICH designs are no longer functioning to the intended level of protection (i.e., levees, dams, the entire system?)

Problem Statement 6: For many communities in the Central Valley, the existing flood management system does not provide the level of protection desired and/or required

- Add a statement on the difficulty of permitting flood risk management improvements/repairs.
- Add a statement on the difficulties Section 408 place on flood risk management improvements. Under this system, all upstream repairs, modifications, or improvements must take into account any effect they may have on downstream communities, making flood improvements difficult to get approved.

Category II- System Maintenance and Repair

Problem Statement 6: It is difficult to adequately maintain levees and channels according to operation and maintenance manuals

- Include statement on the importance of reservoir operations.
- This problem statement should note that regulatory conflicts are a significant challenge.
- The problem statement may need to be revised to separate levee issues and channel issues, as most operations and maintenance manuals only speak to levee performance, not channels. The same can be said of bank protection issues. Formerly there were no requirements to prevent in-channel erosion; now if there is any erosion within 35 feet of the levee, the local reclamation district is required to fix it.
- Add 7(e): There is no responsibility for most channels, and ownership of the channel is clouded in most cases. Furthermore, improvements to the channel for flood risk management are often in conflict with habitat goals.

Category III- Habitat Quality, Quantity, and Connectivity

Problem Statement 8: There has been a loss and degradation of native habitat and species

- This statement should note that channel meander may cause a loss of habitat.
- Add 8(f): A landowner's fear of environmental regulation enforcement on their land may compel them to avoid allowing habitat/species to establish.
- Meeting participants had a general conversation on the appropriateness of including this problem statement. Two issues in particular were discussed. The first is the appropriateness of including this as a problem statement generally, as it suggests that the flood system is the main reason habitat degradation occurs. The second issue was over choosing the correct baseline (i.e., year) to judge habitat degradation against. No consensus was reached on this discussion. Mr. Hester noted that SB 5 does say that environmental enhancement will be one of the purposes of the CVFPP. Staff noted that this conversation should be a central discussion for the environmental work group.
- A participant noted that habitat loss should be the main stressor on species, as things like fishing, climate change, and pollution all have substantial impacts on species as well.

Problem Statement 9: Flood system development has negatively impacted natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes

- Add "regulated dams/reservoirs" to the problem statement.
- Strike "negatively" and state that "The flood system, including dams and reservoirs, has impacted..."

Category IV- Policy and Institutional

Problem Statement 10: Flood management is often made difficult by the large number of agencies and entities involved, and their complex jurisdictional roles and responsibilities

- Add 10(e): Conflicting and costly regulations.

Problem Statement 11: The trend towards strict liability for damages due to levee or other flood control facility failure is a deterrent to the construction of flood management projects

- A participant noted that this issue goes beyond construction of new projects, and noted that both ownership and management of a flood project (new or old) opens managers up to liability. Something akin to a Good Samaritan law for flood risk management would help protect flood managers from lawsuits.

Problem Statement 12: Current federal, state, and local funding mechanisms are not adequate to sustain effective flood management

- Add 12(e): Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance requirements detract from the ability to assess the public.

- Add 12(f): Proposition 219 restrictions on the ability to tax local jurisdictions should be created.
- Add 12(g): Cost/benefit assessments don't recognize cumulative impacts.
- Add 12(h): Arbitrary grant funding is tied to liability issues.

Problem Statement 13: Land use decisions at the local level may not adequately consider flood risk

- Add 13(c): There have been no mandatory restrictions placed on local land use to date.
- Add 13(d): There has been loose enforcement of land use restrictions and ordinances at the local level.
- Add 13(e): Local land use decisions lead to fragmented vs. regional decision making. Local agencies are not forced to analyze anything on a system-wide basis.
- Add 13(f): Land use decisions at the local level may not consider flood risk because a local entities *entire* jurisdiction may be subject to flooding.

Problem Statement 14: The consequences of flooding are increased by certain land use practices

- "Obstruct flow paths" in 14(b)(ii) refers to large scale land leveling and its affect on natural drainage patterns.
- "High value crops" are intended to include permanent orchard crops that may impede flood flows.
- Participants noted that state-owned facilities such as schools are not under local jurisdictions, and may be sited poorly in some cases.

In addition to the draft problem statements for Category IV above, a participant proposed the following new problem statements:

- Acquiring new lands for flood control or habitat creation requires either a heavy hand or huge amounts of capital.
- Levees were designed with factors of safety at lower levels than other civil works.
- Federal policy for levees does not recognize hazard/loss of life to the same degree it analyzes property damage, and the NED results in understated projects.

Category V- Water Supply and Quality

Problem Statement 15: Integrated flood management is made difficult by competing needs for flood storage, water supply, power generation, the environment, and recreation

- Additional clarification may be needed on what constitutes "integrated flood management."

Problem Statement 16: Floods can impair water quality

- 16(b) should be revised to read "...contaminants in the floodplain and watershed."
- Add 16(c): mobilization of sediments.

Problem Statement 17: Flood system maintenance, such as dredging and clearing, can disturb sediment and negatively impact water quality

- A statement should be added that reservoirs are filling up with sediment, diminishing the capacity for flood storage and water supply.

A participant noted that an additional problem statement could be added under Category V to read "floodwater represents the only new water supply available to inland areas, but due to storage restraints, is very difficult to put to beneficial use."

Category VI- Emergency Response and Post-Flood Recovery

Problem Statement 18: Effective emergency response to flooding is limited

- Add 18(e): Critical facilities are located within the floodplain such as care facilities and evacuation locations.

- Add 18(f): Critical infrastructure is located within the floodplain such as evacuation routes and waste water facilities.

Problem Statement 19: Existing post-flood recovery plans and programs do not adequately address debris removal, timely restoration of utilities, jurisdictional responsibilities, coordination, agricultural recovery, and regional economic recovery

- No comments received

Category VII- Information and Education

Among the public there is a general lack of understanding of flood risk

- Add 20(d): Public perception of the flood risk is incorrect or insufficient

After the discussion of problem statements, Ms. Lott asked meeting participants to look at the ranking of importance for each problem statement by region. The follow comments were received regarding the Lower San Joaquin Region:

- On problem statement 2(b), a participant noted that there aren't piping issues in the Lower San Joaquin region. This should be denoted by a half circle.
- Problem statement 2(i) should be a full circle.
- Problem statement 3(b) should be a full circle
- 2(e) should be a full circle
- 8(b) should be a full circle
- A participant noted that discussing the habitat issue rankings is dependent on what the baseline used for analyzing habitat is.
- 16(b) should be a full circle
- 16(a) should be a half circle.
- 17 should be a half circle, as much of Paradise Cut is above water and wouldn't cause a problem to water quality.
- Participants asked that the chart include a notation under Category VI that San Joaquin County is much better at emergency response than many other counties.

Introduce CVFPP Goals, Principles, Legislative Requirements, and Objectives

Mr. Wallace delivered a presentation that outlined definitions for the CVFPP and RCSR goals, objectives, principles, and requirements. This presentation is available online at the website listed above.

The CVFPP goals are derived from the broader FloodSAFE goals and vision. The CVFPP objectives, in turn, grow out of the CVFPP goals. These objectives define the specific things the CVFPP should accomplish. In addition to the goals and objectives, there are also a number of specific requirements outline by the legislation; DWR has a legal responsibility to accomplish these things with the CVFPP. Delta Flood Protection is defined separately as it is not necessarily part of the State Plan of Flood Control, but has an affect on other regions within the State Plan.

Discussion:

- A participant asked if the Delta was separated out because of its role in protecting the state and federal water projects. Mr. Wallace and Mr. Woodland responded that staff understands that the Delta does play a flood risk management effect on the levees within the State Plan of Flood Control, and that it serves as a control point for most flood management efforts.
- Another Work Group member noted that from the Lower San Joaquin region's perspective, it would actually benefit flood risk management in the region if the Delta was underwater. Mr. Hester responded that from a system wide standpoint, the Delta must be taken into account. It is also part of the CVFPP study area outlined in SB 5.
- Participants noted that the Delta Flood Protection goal may be unclear. The Work Group suggested it be revised to read, "Recognizing the role of the Delta to the entire state from

- flood control, water supply, an environmental perspective...” Mr. Wallace will revise the goal and report back at the next Work Group meeting (**see Action Item #6**).
- A participant noted that the Central Valley goal to protect urban and urbanizing areas could downgrade the level of protection needed in small communities by allowing looser land use restrictions in areas with a population of less than 10,000.
 - The Work Group will review the goals in the presentation and provide any comments, additions, or deletions as homework (**see Action Item #7**).
 - A participant asked if upland areas have a role in the CVFPP, as some communities outside of the floodplain can affect the channel capacity in a way that affects downstream communities. Mr. Wallace responded that the intent is to consider outside influences. Mr. Hester added that while this may be analyzed, it is unlikely to result in any additional restrictions. He acknowledged that this issue needs to be revisited at a later date, and agreed to update the Work Group when more information becomes available (**see Action Item #2**).
 - A participant noted that the “sustainable management” goal of the CVFPP could be separated into two goals: one for floodplain management and maintenance, and one for maintenance of the flood system itself. Mr. Hester agreed to follow up on this point and report back to the Work Group as more information becomes available (**see Action Item #2**).
 - Work group members were instructed to review the CVFPP requirements and bring any questions to meeting #5 of the Work Group (**see Action Item #8**).

After the initial presentation and discussion, Mr. Wallace directed participants’ attention to the document entitled “Draft CVFPP Goals, Principles, and Objectives (Chapter 4)”. This document is available on the website listed above. Ms. Lott asked the Work Group to review the example principles. Ms. Lott went over potential additional principles members had suggested during the course of the meeting including:

- Consider water supply when discussing flood management.
- Include upstream impacts of floodwaters outside of the planning study area in all CVFPP analysis.

Discussion:

- A participant suggested adding the objective of streamlining the regulatory and permitting process to facilitate planning and implementation of CVFPP components.
- Participants suggested that the draft principle of restoring and protecting natural floodplain processes should be revised to say, “Enhance natural floodplain processes.” This avoids any misunderstanding that all flood control structures should be removed to benefit the environment.
- One participant noted that the draft principle #1 should be revised to say “mitigate adverse impacts...” instead of “avoid adverse impacts,” and added that some impacts will be unavoidable.
- A participant commented that collaboration with other large planning efforts like BDCP should be a CVFPP principle.
- A Work Group member noted that the principle of building flood protection to avoid catastrophic damage may not be possible, and recommended revising it to read, “Establish and defend prudent factors of safety.”
- A participant added the principle to “examine the potential unintended consequences of planning actions.”
- One member asked what the principle of “leveraging state investments” refers to, and added that is unclear what this means from a policy perspective since it is difficult to quantify the benefits of things like habitat improvements.

Homework Overview and Next Steps

Mr. Wallace asked Work Group members to look at the CVFPP requirements and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting. He also noted that one set of homework was sent out on October 5th. Chapter 3 will be sent for review on October 9th. He added that there may not be time to incorporate all changes on Chapter 3 of the RCSR to date, but committed to including it in the next iteration. Ms. Lott added that if

Work Group members have any other principles they would like included, these should be sent to staff as soon as possible.

Meeting Recap

Ms. Lott thanked participants for coming and noted that all meeting goals were met. She then asked the Work Group for any final comments. One participant noted that letter H of the CVFPP requirements discusses facilities to be removed, and added that it should also mention facilities to be constructed or improved. Mr. Hester agreed to follow up on this point and report back at future meetings (**see Action Item #2**).