



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

October 5, 2009, 9:00 am – 2:15 pm

**Location: Colusa Industrial Properties
100 Sunrise Boulevard, Colusa, CA**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
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 Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
John Linhart	City of Colusa Planning Department	Member
Ryan Luster	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Jas O'Growney	Tehama County RCD	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
Amy Lyons	California Department of Fish and Game	Alternate
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
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional Coordinator
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Scott Stewart	MWH Americas Inc	Technical Team
Austin McInerney	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ariel Ambruster	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support / Notetaker

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Patricia Bratcher*	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Randy Dunn	City of Colusa	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
Leigh W. McDaniel	Glenn County BOS, Nor Cal Water Assn, Tehama Colusa Canal Authority, Colusa Basin Drainage District, Farm Bureau	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	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

*Alternate attended in their place

Observers:

Lady Bug	Central Valley Flood Control Board
----------	------------------------------------

ACTION ITEMS/WORK GROUP HOMEWORK (requested by 10/15/09):

Homework

- Please, if desired, review and provide further input on the day's materials on Problems & Opportunities and Goals & Principles and provide via e-mail by October 15.
- For the PARTIAL DRAFT text for Section 2.3, **Existing Resources Conditions**, which includes **Cultural Resources** and **Emergency Planning, Response and Recovery**; and the DRAFT text for section 2.4, **Likely Future Conditions** (emailed 10/4/09):

Please review and provide comments following these guidelines:

§ Please focus on errors, omissions, redundancies, mischaracterizations, and other major issues with the draft.

§ Suggested revisions and comments should be captured in track changes.

§ Please remember to include your name on the file name.

§ Please email your completed reviews by 10/15/09.

§ If you think you may not be able to submit your work 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.

- The first draft of Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities will be emailed out to the work groups after all have completed their #4 meetings.
- As objectives will be the focus of our next meeting, review the goals and principles and begin developing your proposed objectives for our discussion at Meeting #5 on October 29.

Please e-mail homework to Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com or Dan McManus at mcmanus@water.ca.gov. If you prefer to fax, you can fax your input to the attention of Erica Bishop at (916) 924-9102.

Action Items

- Dan/Roger: Confirm membership on the Joint Subcommittee on Agricultural Stewardship, with coordination with the California Department of Food and Agriculture
- Work Group Members: Brainstorm the definition of agricultural stewardship in regards to flood control, an e-mail to Dan/Roger

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

- Plan Team: Snacks at next meeting

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

A DATE HAS BEEN SET FOR MEETING #7: Monday, December 7.

Meeting #5

Time: 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Date: October 29, 2009
Place: TBD

Future Meetings:

- November 19, 2009
- December 7, 2009

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Mendocino National Forest Office, Willows
- Bureau of Reclamation Office, Willows
- City or Glenn County Offices, Willows
- Colusa Industrial Park, Colusa
- City Offices, Colusa
- Woodland
- West Sacramento

MEETING OVERVIEW:

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The purpose for Meeting #4 was to continue developing content for the Regional Conditions Summary, with the following specific goals:

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

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Dan McManus, DWR Lead, and meeting facilitator Austin McInerney welcomed the meeting participants, led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester, DWR Executive Sponsor, welcomed the group and provided opening remarks. He provided an update on a number of items in response to previous questions from members of the five work groups. (These items are summarized in the document, "Responses to Questions from Meetings #2 and #3"). A key item includes a revised plan for the work groups, with fewer meetings, and a valley-wide forum planned for February 2010 that will incorporate dialogue among the work groups.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Q: How can participants track their input/revisions to documents?

A: There has been a discussion about the way to incorporate input. We are looking at different options, including incorporating meeting minutes into this report. It will be up to individuals to look at chapters to see if their items are addressed. During the meeting, we will talk about some of the more specific issues that have been raised, and discuss issues more generally as well. It's important for people to feel that their comments are acknowledged. There clearly will be opposing views, and the team will synthesize the information. You should at least know that your comment was acknowledged.

Q: How will the valley-wide forum meetings be publicized?

A: We will use the media and the web.

Comment: The California Department of Food and Agriculture should participate in the Agricultural Subcommittee

Comment: In regards to the Agricultural Subcommittee, I hope that is not a closed group that is participating. It is harvest time now, and there are not many farmers on the list so far.

Comment: There are some late applicants to the Agricultural Subcommittee.

A: There will be two meetings, the first October 20, and the second may be determined at the first meeting to ensure that most people can participate. We will be asking at the first meeting, "Who needs to be here?" in an effort to make sure all stakeholders are represented.

Q: I haven't signed up -- can people still sign up?

A: Yes. It will be easy if you are already in a work group, as you will already be familiar with the process. Dan and Roger are the points of contact. They will send out an updated list of members, as the latest list to be publicized is out of date.

Comment: Explain how liability to the state could be increased. I'm not sure if what we are doing is productive, if we cannot recommend changes in the state flood control system. I would recommend changes in the Butte Basin levee -- the state has denied any responsibility for it.

Q: Where is the tangible line in regards to liability? We are creating something. How will we know if we have crossed that line?

A: Good point. We need to improve the flood control system. The focus is who is responsible. The content should focus on when an improvement is made, where is responsibility for maintaining it?

Comment: Perhaps documents can have a place for further recommendations in order to avoid crossing that line.

Comment: Improving the system should help liability.

Comment: We need an agreement on the baseline to start from, the state and the reclamation districts.

Response: We are looking for a way to move forward without getting caught up in court. We can do better if we stay out of court.

Comment: It may be that the courts will determine the line in regards to liability.

Response: This is an important discussion, and it will continue.

Comment: The document should describe the Valley, pre-flood control systems. It should describe why the systems were built, for flood control first. (This comment was seconded by two other people.)

Comment: The Sacramento River flood protection system should be treated as a system.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Response: We need to tell the history, and the intent of the State Plan of Flood Control. It wasn't in our original scope of work. We've heard what you are saying from our attorneys, as well.

Web-Based Repository for Documents under Review by Workgroups

Roger Putty discussed the new SharePoint website that will be a central hub for all documents under review. All work group members with e-mail addresses have been e-mailed a username and password that will provide them with access to the site. Documents can be read or downloaded from the site. Work group members will have an opportunity to look and see how their comments are incorporated. Comments can then be e-mailed to the plan team. The site will also have a work group calendar.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Dan McManus provided a recap of homework and action items from past meetings. He reiterated the importance of providing input, and gave examples of the types of content comments have provided to date.

Chapter 1:

- Incorporate comments (Introduction, Background, etc.)

Chapter 2:

- Review detailed outline
- Incorporate comments:
 - 2.0 Study Area Description
 - 2.1 History
 - 2.2 General Regional Description

Chapter 3:

- Generated input on prioritizing Challenges & Drivers→Categorizing Problems→looking at Problem Statements
- Homework: Review 2.3 (partial chapter) Existing Resource Conditions

This Meeting:

Chapter 3: Refine Problem & Opportunity Statements

Chapter 4: Begin Goals, Principles, Objectives

Comment: I am concerned that data, specifically actual numbers, regarding biological and environmental data is not being included. The data is out there on what is the baseline.

Comment: There is not enough detail in the discussions of habitat concerns.

Overview of Roadmap and Topic Work Group Progress

Roger Putty of MWH, Technical Lead, reviewed the revised work group timeline, with seven meetings now planned instead of 10. Changes include the creation of a Companion Document that will include a reader's guide, discussion of lessons learned and discussion of the level of agreement reached by the various partners on issues discussed in the Regional Conditions Summary Report. He also reviewed the work and schedule of the topic work groups and the Joint Subcommittee for Agricultural Stewardship.

Review Synthesized Problems & Opportunities Statements

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

Roger Putty introduced the section, reviewing portions of a PowerPoint included in the packet on Chapter 3 content development on Problems and Opportunities. The whole group then reviewed a draft summary table of problems and opportunities, developed based on work group input to date, and provided feedback on it.

The Work Group provided the following comments and proposed changes:

Category Changes

- III - Habitat Quality, Quantity, and Connectivity, should include "Wildlife" in the title
- V - Water Supply and Quality: Add "Water Transport" to title; water supply to the south affects the Upper Sacramento system, including causing high summer flows.

What is missing?

Category I - Flood System Performance

- 1a: Unchecked vegetation
- 1b: Needs to address the cause of sediment accumulation; add "erosion upstream" as cause
- An overarching issue is lack of maintenance
- Some channels aren't working because they were not intended for flood control; for example, some are natural channels
- 3a: Add accumulation of sediment and vegetation in regards to weirs
- 2f: It says because of large woody vegetation, but that is not yet proven
- Hopefully different perspectives will be captured/discussed in the narratives
- 3: Add an Item d: Facilities not constructed to Army Corps of Engineers standards (Example: 3Bs)
- 2: Add "Poorly located"
- 3: Add "Lack of maintenance"
- 5d: Add "Dedicated bypass channels being used by refuges"
- 2, under h: Add that illegal public access can hinder maintenance
- 6a: Add "and/or" levels...
- 4a: Add "reservoir," but not limited to
- 4c: Not using best available datum
- Add a 4d: "Coordinated releases"
- 6: Butte Basin not being operated as intended

Category II - System Maintenance and Repair

- Add a new item: Inadequate staffing/money/capacity at small rural districts for maintenance
- Need for O&M manual updates, COG updates
- Section 23 needs updates
- 7c: Cost of mitigation for tree removal is excessive for trees that should not be there to begin with
- *Need for more modeling to determine priorities for maintenance -- no way to develop priorities.
- Consider adding "system design" maintenance

Category III - Habitat Quality, Quantity and Connectivity

- 8a: Does not make sense - redundant with title. Consider just "fragmentation."
- 8e: Mitigation is not the problem - rather lack of successful mitigation is the problem
- Clarify different aspects of mitigation

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

- Move to 7e

Category IV - Policy and Institutional

- 14: Restoration causing impacts/altered flows
- Add lack of clear coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- SS impacts from new legislation and policies
- 12: Impacts of Proposition 218 on funding
- 12c: More credit/process for valuing agriculture

Category VI – Emergency Response and Post-Flood Recovery

- 19g: Poorly defined/communicated recovery process

Category VII - Information and Education

- 20: Lack of communication regarding water and flood system - need for more media coverage, need for more storytelling on this topic

Introduce CVFPP Goals, Principles, Legislative Requirements & Objectives

Roger Putty introduced the section, reviewing portions of a PowerPoint included in the packet, and described how the team is defining goals, principles and objectives. The day's work will focus on reviewing and providing feedback on goals and principles. Next meeting will focus on objectives. The item also includes a handout on legislative requirements for the CVFPP. The group as a whole then reviewed the draft goals and principles.

The following comments were received on goals and principles:

Goals

- Agriculture needs to be captured in the goals: "Protect and enhance agriculture." There is mention of agriculture in the Central Valley Flood Protection goal, but what is "appropriate level of protection"?
- Perhaps capture agriculture in the Objectives
- What is the goal for communities with populations under 10,000?
- Integrate the funding plan into the goals
- "Assist local governments with flood control" as a goal
- What is the definition of "natural processes"? Better language would be: "Protect and restore habitat, wildlife."
- Balance environmental goals with agriculture, the developed environment
- The issue is that flood control is not a natural process
- Possible language: "Learn to manage the system so it is more compatible with natural processes."
- Floodplain managers need to develop capacity/ability to work in a way that is compatible with natural processes.
- The issue will be finding a balance
- One of the goals needs to be public safety and protecting people behind levees
- Another goal needs to be to sustain economic growth, in agricultural and urban communities
- One important goal or principle should be maintaining the current system. The state can minimize liability by maintaining the current system
- In relation to the first goal, Central Valley Flood Protection: Will this define the current level of protection for agriculture and urban areas, if the system is working?

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

- The goals need additional words, a verb to indicate the intent of the goal: "X Implementation Framework," "X Natural Processes."
- Define the current level to provide

Principles

- Agriculture as a principle
- "Protect and restore" - as what? What is the ultimate goal?
- A principle should be to decrease flood risk and increase public safety
- Another principle could be to promote coordination and collaboration
- What does the principle "Leverage State investments to provide maximum public benefits" mean? There should be a principle on how to make funding happen, how to implement the goals.
- The principle "Adapt flood management to cope with climate change": how are we going to cope with climate change?

Discussion on funding goals and principles:

- We need to integrate standards with funding plans -- we need to avoid unfunded mandates
- There needs to be funding beforehand - the money needs to be there, to be set aside
- When the state prioritizes flood control projects, rural areas don't have the votes to get high enough on the priority list
- Perhaps a "beneficiary pays" approach could distribute the costs more evenly, if it takes into account the valuable land in urban areas that will be protected. It's important to look at who will really benefit.
- Will funding be retroactive for the existing system? Is it a goal, or, a principle by which you do business? The way of doing business should be to maintain existing systems, before building more.