



## Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

### Meeting Summary Final

### Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

**Time:** October 29, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:45 pm

**Location:** City of Rio Vista Fire Station  
350 Main Street, Rio Vista CA

Presentations and Materials Available Online at [www.water.ca.gov/cvfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfm)

#### MEETING ATTENDANCE:

##### Members Present:

Name	Organization
Ronald Baldwin	Office of Emergency Services
John Cain	American Rivers, California Flood Management
Marci Coglianese	Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Sub-committee
Mark Connelly	San Joaquin County Flood Management Division
Kara DiFrancesco	Natural Heritage Institute
Linda Fiack	Delta Protection Commission
Karen Medders	North Delta CARES
Christopher Neudeck	KSN Inc., Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (District Engineer), CCVFCA, Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency, Habitat Advisory Committee to Delta Levee Subventions Program
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento
Jan Vick	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Jane Wagner-Tyack	Restore the Delta/League of Women Voters of San Joaquin County
Leo Winternitz	The Nature Conservancy

##### Team Present:

Bryan Brock	DWR (Work Group Lead)
Eric Poncelet	Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team)
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting Group, Inc
Ibrahim Khadam	MWH (Technical Team)
Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) ) (Facilitation Team)
Merritt Rice	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO – Project Lead)
Robert Yeadon	DWR, Regional Coordinator
Josh Yang	MWH (Technical Team)

##### Observers:

Dale Hoffman-Flerkey

#### WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

	ITEM	OWNER	TIMEFRAME
1.	Homework (Review Chapter 3, provide additional comments on problems, opportunities and goals, review draft objectives and	Work Group	11/5/09

	the SharePoint tutorial.		
2.	Send draft objectives to Work Group	Christal Love	10/30/09
3.	Add definition of "flood protection" to Glossary	Ibrahim Khadam	11/5/09
4.	Have the Levee Performance Topic Work Group review the importance ratings in the Problems and Opportunities Table	Ibrahim Khadam	11/5/09
5.	Define the following terms: leading indicators vs. lagging indicators outcomes, and outputs	Mark Connelly	11/5/09
6.	Send local government presentation to Work Group members	Ken Kirby	11/5/09
7.	Incorporate Work Group comments into revision of problems/opportunities and goals/objectives documents	Ibrahim Khadam	11/5/09
8.	Provide Delta Risk Management Strategy text on semi-private organizations.	Marci Coglianese	11/5/09

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

The Delta Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on October 29, 2009 with the following actions:

- Review Topic Work Group progress
- Review synthesized problems and opportunities statements from Chapter 3
- Review revised goals for the CVFPP
- Draft initial CVFPP objectives
- Discuss Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and CVFPP coordination

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (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 Delta Work Group is one of five regional Work Groups in the Central Valley.

**MEETING OBJECTIVES**

- Respond to Questions Raised in Meeting #4
- Discuss Refinement of Problem and Opportunity Statements (Chapter 3)
- Continue Development of Goals and Objectives (Chapter 4)

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**SUMMARY:**

**Welcome and Greetings**

Eric Poncelet (K&W) opened the meeting, introduced himself as the facilitator, discussed facility logistics, meeting materials and asked meeting participants to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the

meeting agenda and provided a walkthrough of the day's materials/handouts. He then reminded the meeting participants of the tour at the Dutra Museum that was scheduled to occur after the Work Group meeting.

## Opening Remarks

Ken Kirby (Kirby Consulting Group, Inc) delivered opening remarks, and addressed the issues raised during meeting 4, focusing specifically on the clarification on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District in relationship to the CVFPP Planning Area, the details of later planning steps, the local jurisdiction briefings and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and FloodSAFE coordination.

Mr. Kirby then announced that the Sacramento San Joaquin Valley Wide Forum would be held on February 3<sup>rd</sup> 2010 and provided an update of the State of California bonding status.

### Discussion:

- A Work Group member expressed their interest in seeing Mr. Kirby's local jurisdiction briefing presentation (**see Action Item #6**).

## Review of Previous Meeting #3 Action Items

Bryan Brock (DWR) provided an overview of the status of the action items from meeting 4; stating that the only outstanding action item is the request to add the definition of "flood protection" to the glossary (**see Action Item #3**).

## Roadmap and Overview of Topic Work Group Progress

Mr. Khadam provided the Work Group members an update of the project schedule, tasks, and deliverables of the Topic Work Groups (**see PowerPoint presentation**). He also explained next steps intended for Work Group meetings #6 and #7, disclosing that the Work Group will be looking at the second draft of Chapters 1 & 2, and discussing next steps, including planning for Sacramento San Joaquin Valley Wide Forum in February. He asked for Work Group comments on Chapter 3 to be submitted by November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009 (**see Action Item #1**).

Mr. Kirby then spoke about the CVFPP California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document that would be created beginning early 2010, explaining that the document may include specific actions and will be done in a way to enable it to be incorporated with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. He explained that it is likely but not certain that the CEQA document will be programmatic.

### Discussion:

- A Work Group member questioned how the CEQA document could be anything but at a programmatic level of detail. Mr. Kirby explained that it could be possible to include a package of project elements that would be detailed enough to be incorporated into a project-level CEQA document, for example, the mitigation banking portion of the CVFPP.
- A Work Group member asked what level of coordination with the Army Corp of Engineers (Corp) would be necessary. Mr. Kirby responded that DWR is currently hiring someone to oversee CVFPP environmental compliance, including coordination with the Corp but that that individual had not started yet.
- A Work Group member commented that the City of West Sacramento is currently conducting a study of its entire levee system, and is in the midst of a programmatic CEQA/NEPA document that will require corporation with other agencies. Therefore the City of West Sacramento may not be in the position of adopting project specific recommendations. Mr. Kirby responded that DWR will do as much as it can to allow other agencies to catch up to the CVFPP process, but acknowledged that it may take the Corp a few years to align with the CVFPP. He mentioned that DWR is currently meeting with the Corp quarterly and that the State-Federal flood control partnership is important and will continue into the foreseeable future. Merritt Rice (DWR) added

that he hoped that the Corp could be integrated into the CVFPP now that the cost sharing feasibility document had been completed.

- Several Work Group participants expressed their interest in having the Corp regularly attend Work Group meetings.
- A Work Group member wondered where the CVFPP implementation details would be captured. Mr. Kirby responded that the implementation details would likely be captured in one of the lower tiered documents, the contents of which would have to be adopted into local general plans.

### Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities

Mr. Khadam presented an overview of the planning definitions (**see PowerPoint presentation**) and explained that the planning team was able to condense the input from all of the Regional Conditions Work Groups into seven problem categories and 20 contributing factors . He said that one of the important themes, climate change, was determined not to be a problem, but rather, a driver for other problems. He then explained the major changes, including condensing the seven problem categories down to five problem statements.

Mr. Khadam informed the Work Group that the main objective was to be able to organize the CVFPP Problems, Opportunities, Goals and Objectives handout in a way to be able to come up with at least one goal for each problem statement. He then read through each of the problem statements. Afterwards, Work Group members raised the following questions and comments:

- How did the internal planning team decide to put contributing factor #20 under the flood risk problem grouping. Mr. Khadam responded that flood risk includes issues of frequency and damage severity which relate to #20.
- Found it interesting that contributing factors: 4, 18, 19, 20, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 are considered an issue in all regions while the ecosystem factors are not.
- Wondered if the Levee Performance Topic Work Group reviewed this table and had provided comments on the level of importance. Mr. Kirby responded that they had not.
- The level of importance for contributing factor 2 d) is wrong; there is no subsidence in the riverine Delta system. Also, part c) is wrong as well, the level of importance should be higher.
- Contributing factors 13 and 14 are inconsistent and should be reevaluated.
- The half circles denote a lesser importance, which is not always true. Should consider expanding the number of levels to four.
- Request linking the circles to an explanation / rational in an appendix or companion document. Important to know the underlying assumptions. This could be done with hyperlinks.
- Request eliminating reference to semi-private organizations in Chapter 3. This text is inaccurate. There is a clear description in the Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) (**see Action Item #8**).
- Reference to local funding 2/3 vote on page 3-51 is incorrect.
- Several participants expressed their interest in keeping both the problems and opportunities table and more detailed explanatory text.

The Work Group members were asked to take a detailed look at the problems and opportunities table as part of their homework, focusing specifically on the level of importance and submit any comments to Mr. Brock by November 5<sup>th</sup> (**see Action Item #1**).

### Review Revised CVFPP Goals

Mr. Khadam reviewed the Relationship of CVFPP Problems and Opportunities, Goals, Objectives table. He explained how the CVFPP goals were developed and explained the importance of being inclusive. The Work Group made the following comments regarding goals:

**Goal: Improve Flood Risk Management**

- Should add the word coordinate.
- Removing plants (grass, trees etc) could increase maintenance costs. It is unclear what to do if there is a natural habitat forest in flood lands. The goal is too broad.
- Recommend delete the word “feasible”

**Goal: Simplify Operation and Maintenance of the Flood Management System**

- Strike the word “more compatible” and replace it with “compatible”.
- Recommend adding “coordinate” to the text “and adjust and streamline regulatory and institutional standards”
- Add phrase “and reliable funding”

**Goal: Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System**

- Do not want to send the message that geomorphology can change in a controlled system. Do not think this is a realistic goal.
- Would like clarification as to which “physical processes” are included or targeted.

**Goal: Improve Institutional Support**

- Recommend adding “and development” to the text “land use planning”.

**Goal: Promote Multi-Benefit Projects**

- Some believe that the creation of open water is good for some species. Whatever is done under this goal should relate to flood management.
- Need to make room for rivers to move and subject some land to flooding more often.
- Recommend delete the word “feasible”

**Development of CVFPP Objectives**

Mr. Khadam reviewed handout #9 with the Work Group and explained that there are two parts of the discussion:

1. Go through the matrix. Study the example objectives and articulate the specific measurable goals and discuss whether or not the objectives meet the criteria.
2. Begin to generate concepts for the objectives.

**Comments on Sample Objective #1**

- More weight should be given to those objectives that prevent water from going where it should not go. Habitat restoration is being covered in other processes.
- Is DWR intending for each objective to meet each goal? Mr. Kirby responded no, that the idea was for each objective to meet at least one goal.

**Comments on Sample Objective #2**

- It is hard to explain how you would measure this objective.
- Not certain this objective had anything to do with flood risk.
- Need to create objectives that meet the goal they are intended for.
- Need to capture the assumptions being made while creating the objectives.
- Need to differentiate between leading indicators vs. lagging indicators (**see Action Item #5**).
- Important to measure outcomes rather than just outputs (**see Action Item #5**).

**Discussion with Jerry Johns about BDCP and CVFPP**

Jerry Johns (DWR Deputy Director, Water Resources Planning & Management) provided an opportunity for Work Group members to ask questions about the BDCP and CVFPP processes. The Work Group provided the following comments / questions.

- Request a summary of what is happening at the various process meetings. Mr. Johns mentioned that meeting summaries are added to the respective project website. However, due to the rapid pace and constantly changing information it may not be practical to create a two paragraph summary of each process every month. Mr. Kirby added that DWR is in the process of putting together a document of all of the study programs currently underway. An updated summary of each process could be provided in the future.
- There is a Delta electronic newsletter that could include some discussion regarding integrating the BDCP and CVFPP processes. Mr. Johns responded that that was a good starting point, and that a large amount of synergy exists amongst the two programs.
- The CVFPP should be focusing on flood management issues rather than habitat concerns. This Work Group needs to focus on what there is now and not just address the future state. Mr. Johns responded that DWR needs to fix a couple of the variables before being able to solve the equation. He explained that in order to get beyond the abstract the Group needs to identify specific places where there is overlap, and then agree on how to explore the following:
  - It is clear from the science that restoring habitat will benefit covered species; if not part of the BDCP it will be hard to protect species.
  - Need to address the levee issue.
- Reference was made to the Lower Yolo Basin Planning Forum process and the good ideas that have come out of it despite not having met for several months.
- A participant asked if somebody has put all of the mandates on a single list. Mr. Kirby responded that DWR has committed to making a list of all of the mandates and improve coordination on those areas where the mandates are overlapping with each other.
- Recommend developing some objectives that identify flow and the corresponding level of danger. Need to centralize flood control. Mr. Johns responded that that is why CVFPP is being developed. BDCP is not addressing flood, but it is addressing the impacts of the plan on flooding. DWR will need to evaluate the impacts the processes have on the current flood control projects. Mr. Kirby added that DWR is not starting from the standpoint that the levees will stay in the same footprint.
- A Work Group member suggested starting with the Yolo Basin since it will be one of the more difficult areas to deal with. Mr. Johns agreed.
- It would be wonderful if DWR and this Group could develop a flood management plan prior to the other plans moving forward.
- Would like to see a coordinated effort between DWR and the Corp.
- A Work Group member expressed his interest in seeing DWR help intervene regarding the funding legislation for Delta Levees set to sunset in June 2010. Mr. Johns recommended that the member talk directly with their legislative representative. Mr. Kirby added that the sun setting only decreases cost sharing requirements from 75% down to 50% and that it does not apply to bond funds, which is currently the funding source.

## **Development of CVFPP Objectives (Continued)**

The Work Group proposed the following draft objectives and made the related comments. The draft objectives will be further refined in the coming months.

### ***Objective 1: Provide 100 year or greater level of flood protection to all urban and urbanizing areas in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley by 2015 and 200 year by 2025.***

- A Work Group member commented that the group should focus on getting to the 100 year flood protection level first. Mr. Rice remarked that many flood plain managers believe that this level of protection, especially in developing deep flood plain areas, would be the worst plan of actions as it would place more people and developments at increased risk. He mentioned that there is about a 64% chance of flooding within a 100 year period with the FEMA base flood which is only for insurance purposes.
- A Work Group member felt that this objective was a green light for development within floodplains.

- A comment was made that flood protection can be achieved with things other than levees.

**Objective 2: Support all local agencies to revise their General Plan, adopt and integrate the applicable provisions the CVFPP in their general plans within 24 months of adoption; completion of zoning amendments within 36 month of adoption.**

- A Work Group member remarked that if the State is going to require this action they should provide resources to local jurisdictions.

**Objective 3: develop and flood fight emergency response process for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley that can initiate appropriate remedial action to any threats to levee stability within 8 hours of recognition of the problem by 2013.**

- A Work Group member remarked that there is a need to create a higher standard to responding to levee stability than exists now.

**Objective 4: 90% of Sacramento San Joaquin Valley households will demonstrate awareness of their community flood risks and will have developed personal flood preparedness plans by 2015. \* Program within the Corp called Silver Jackets that sends people into communities to ensure that people know what their flood risk is.**

**Objective 5: Increase the area (by TBD acres) and frequency of inundated floodplain habitat within the flood management system that provides conditions suitable for spawning and rearing native fish. (This could be a management action related to reducing the time it takes to get a permit or the conflict between maintenance and species viability)**

- A Work Group member stated that the Work Group needs to also relate to how achieving this objective relates to flood control.

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

An overview of specific action items discussed throughout the day was presented. The group then reviewed the agenda and was asked whether or not the meeting goals were reached. Work Group members did not raise any concerns about reaching the meeting goals.

## **Adjourn**

**Attachment: The following text was provided by Mark Connelly after the October 29th Delta RCWG meeting in response to Action Item # 5**

Quoting or summarizing thoughts from a book written by Mark Graham Brown, entitled “**Winning Score, How to Design and Implement Organizational Scorecards**” (2000):

**Overall:** Organizations need a combination of “leading” or predictive indicators and “lagging” or output/result oriented metrics on their scorecard (dashboard). The author uses a “chicken efficiency” model that I can share/or explain better in person ... or you can read in the introduction to his book under the section entitled: Mistake #10: Measurements That Drive the Wrong Performance. The author’s main point is that **organizations need a “balanced” way of measuring performance**, hence ... they need to develop/measure a combination of leading and lagging indicators.

-- A good scorecard (dashboard) should include metrics that focus on **meaningful predictive indicators (Leading)** ... e.g. # of students who attend study prep session for final exam (using this example to help Ken and Gary understand!)

-- A good scorecard (dashboard) should include metrics that focus on **output based performance (Lagging)** ... e.g. # of students who passed the final exam with a grade of “B” or higher, demonstrating for example that a key performance criteria has/or has not been attained.

-- A good scorecard (dashboard) **does not just gather data** that tells you what you already know ... e.g. # students who passed an exam.

-- Bottom line (BL), **all metrics/measurements should be “clearly” linked to the strategic plan** ... or the organization should openly question, why are we measuring them? Put another way, you can’t improve what you don’t measure – so organizations should be careful about which metric (leading/lagging) they select to ensure and how they are measured.

-- Quoting from p. 44 of his book:

“One important aspect of a balanced scorecard is that it has a roughly equal number of metrics that focus on past, present, and future perspectives. Past measures provide data on outcomes or outputs that have already occurred. **Such metric are also called lagging indicators because they show performance that has already occurred.** Present-focused metrics tend to look at a shorter time span (i.e., how are we doing today) and at things that can be address to correct poor performance. Future-focused metrics are not predictions or forecasts; rather, they are **leading indicators** that should **serve to predict the performance** of the present or past (or lagging) indicators.” According to the author, **“leading indicators are the most critical of all because they help an organization manage better.”**

So, as we strive to develop performance based metrics for our Regional Workgroups and the resulting plan that goes forth for adoption in 2012 ... my recommendation is that we strive to find the proper balance between leading and lagging indicators. Please call for questions.

Respectfully,  
Mark