



Draft Meeting Summary

Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

October 30, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:15 pm

**Location: City of Sacramento Department of Utilities
1395 35th Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95821**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Mike Bessette	City of West Sacramento	Member
Francis Borcalli	FloodSAFE Yolo; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Bill Busath	City of Sacramento	Member
Bill Center	American River Recreation Association, Planning & Conservation League, CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba) IRWMP	Member
Regina Cherovsky	Conaway Preservation Group, LLC	Alternate
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Miki Fujitsubo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Member
Mike Hardesty	RD 2068, RD 2098, California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Member
Gena Lasko	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Larry Lloyd	Sutter County Resource Conservation District	Alternate
Tom Smythe	Lake County	Member
Ronald Stork	Friends of the River	Member
Jeffrey Twitchell	District One of Sutter County; urban and rural interests of Yuba City-Sutter Basin	Member
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP* Program Manager
Pierre Stephens	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Lead
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Craig Wallace	MWH Americas Inc	Team
Mike Harty	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Ben Gettleman	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

*Central Valley Flood Management Planning

**Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

***California Department of Water Resources

Absent:

Ryan Bonea	Sutter County Resource Conservation District; Yuba County	Member
Dan Fua	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Member
Tovey Giezentanner	Conaway Preservation Group LLC; RD 2035; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Julia Mclver	Yolo County	Member
Tim Miramontes	Yolo County Farm Bureau; California Rice Commission; California Farm Bureau Rice Advisory	Member
Loren Murray	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR*** Regional Coordinator
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member

Observers:

Hoa Ly, DWR

WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS

1. Review Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities and provide comments by November 6, 2009.
2. Review and provide comments on Problems and Opportunities – Revised Draft Summary of Contributing Factors and their Regional Differences by November 6, 2009.
3. Provide additional comments and suggestions on Draft Objectives by November 6, 2009.

Homework assignments should be sent to DWR lead Pierre Stephens, jrstephe@water.ca.gov.

ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. Vanessa Nishikawa will post the flow chart related to jurisdictional requirements for the CVFPP on the CVFMP website.
2. Vanessa Nishikawa will send work group members the PowerPoint presentation that was given to local communities which includes the flow chart regarding jurisdictional requirements.
3. Vanessa Nishikawa will place the Valley-Wide Forum on the SharePoint and CVFMP website calendars. When the meeting invitation flyer is finalized, it will be forwarded to the work group members.
4. Pierre Stephens will ensure that a formal invitation for the Valley-Wide Forum is sent to the Army Corps of Engineers.
5. Ben Gettleman will send work group members the draft meeting #5 summary for review.

GROUP RECAP

The following may be edited and used by Work Group partners in communicating with their constituencies:

The Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on October 30, 2009 with the following actions:

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

- Reviewed and provided comments on revised Problems and Opportunities statements.
- Reviewed and provided comments on CVFPP Goals.
- Reviewed sample CVFPP Objectives and began developing draft Objectives.

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) and Regional Conditions Summary (RCS), a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCR 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 Sacramento Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

FUTURE MEETINGS SCHEDULE

Meeting #6: Thursday, November 19, 2009
California Department of Water Resources
3500 Industrial Blvd.
Room 119
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Meeting #7: Monday, December 7, 2009
City of West Sacramento
1110 West Capitol Avenue
West Sacramento, CA, 95691

MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of Meeting #5 was to continue developing content for the Regional Conditions Report.

MEETING GOALS

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

SUMMARY

Welcome and Greetings

Todd Hillaire, DWR, and meeting facilitator Mike Harty, Kearns & West, welcomed the meeting participants. Following introductions, Mr. Hillaire reviewed the meeting purpose, goals, and agenda.

Todd Hillaire noted that even if work group members were not able to complete homework by the designated deadline, they should let Pierre Stephens know that they intend to submit late homework. While late homework is accepted, there are no guarantees that late comments will be incorporated in time for the next iteration of the document. Mr. Hillaire informed the group that Chapter 3 was emailed on October 29, and that the deadline for sending comments would be Friday, November 6. Vanessa Nishikawa, MWH, added that the sooner comments could be sent the better in terms of incorporating comments into revised versions of documents for Meetings #6 and #7.

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester, CVFMP Program Manager, welcomed the group and provided opening remarks. Mr. Hester also reviewed with the group the *Responses to Questions from Meetings #4* document. Key comments and follow-up questions during the group discussion included:

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

- **Question #1 – Flood management in DWR’s Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program**
 - A work group member familiar with Oroville issues stated that the written response to the question does not address issues of responsibility for the spillway involving DWR, FERC, and the Army Corps. If a more complete answer is not prepared, the key differences to the answer should be on record. [Note: The full discussion of this topic is not included in this summary.]

Response: The CVFPP is an opportunity to look into using the system to improve flood protection. This planning process should identify which broader reservoir operations issues can be considered. The CFVPP will describe potential flood management improvements to the system. If DWR can provide additional safety measures while improving the operations of the reservoir, then that should be explored. The written response is in draft form, and the comments of this work group are noted.

Q: Where is the baseline data being identified? Where should we try to summarize some of these issues?

A: Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities includes a narrative section where it would be important to capture these issues.

- **Question #2 – Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District and CVFPP Planning Area**
 - Q: What group is working on the user guide for local jurisdictions?

A: DWR’s Floodplain Management Branch is currently working with PBS&J on the user guide.

- **Question #3 – Questions related to details of later planning steps**
 - Q: Will the management actions include projects and programs?

A: Yes, these will be identified in future work groups. It is important for stakeholders to help identify the management actions.
 - Q: Do the management actions apply to the broader planning area in addition to the drainage districts?

A: Yes.
 - It is important to show the flow chart that will clarify the 2012 requirement to communities.

Review of Meeting #4 Action Items

1. The program team will consider the following items and report back on them at the next Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group meeting:
 - How coordination is to be conducted between BDCP and FloodSAFE.

Status: Covered in the *Responses to Questions from Meeting #4* document.
 - Flood protection at the Oroville Facilities is not adequately addressed; how interaction with water supply interests near Oroville can be fostered.

Status: Discussed in the *Responses to Questions from Meeting #4* document.
 - How conflicts between recommendations formed in the Environmental Stewardship Scope Definition WG and the Joint Subcommittee for Agricultural Stewardship Scope Definition can be resolved.

Status: Ongoing

Roadmap and Overview of Topic Work Group Progress

Vanessa Nishikawa presented an update of the group timeline and the CVFPP development process. Ms. Nishikawa also provided an update on topic work group progress.

Highlights of the presentation included:

- The Draft RCR will be available for members to review during Meetings #6 and #7.
- The Regional Conditions Summary (RCS) – approximately 20 pages in length – will be prepared for review after Meeting #7.

Chapter 3 – Revised Problems and Opportunities

Vanessa Nishikawa presented on the reorganization and revision of the Summary of Problem Statements. Ms. Nishikawa then introduced the document *Problems and Opportunities – Revised Summary of Contributing Factors and their Regional Differences*, and invited comments from work group members on the document.

Comments on Contributing Factors

Problem: Flood Risk

- Factor #4e: “Insufficient” doesn’t adequately capture the range of challenges. Would like it to be changed to “aren’t sufficiently robust.”
- Factor #5: The original system was not designed for flood control. Levees were designed to pass certain flows, not to provide a certain level of protection.
- The expected level of protection is covered in #6; this should not be included in #5.
- No one knew how much urbanization would happen in the foothills. The levees are no longer adequate. Is there any reference to the urbanization that took place during the 1980s and 1990s?
Response: Factor #14 in Land Use is intended to cover that.
Comment: This is not the same. Urbanization of the foothills should be added as an additional contributing factor under #5.
- There is an opportunity for coordination between CVFPP and the Office of Emergency Services, and this is not included in the factors. This linkage should be made, perhaps in factor #18.
- There is a missing factor concerning public infrastructure and transportation. It is problematic not knowing where highways will flood.
Response: Factor #18f is intended to cover this.
Comment: Transportation is important, and it is not mentioned explicitly in Factor #18.
- Factor #18: “Response” should be changed to “preparedness” in the title and in factor #18b.
- Factor #20: There is not currently a method for communicating risk. Using FEMA maps is not sufficient because they do not reflect the risk. There needs to be a way to communicate the integrity of a levee and the risks of its failure.
- Factor #20b: “Lack of coordination between the State and Federal Government” should be added.

Problem: Operation, Maintenance and Repair

- Factor #7: Should add rehabilitation and replacement to Operation, Maintenance, and Repair.
- Add Factor #7e: Coordination among local LMA.

Problem: Ecosystem

- Factor #8: “Fragmentation” should be inserted between “loss” and “degradation” in the title.
- Factor #9: End of sentence should read “...have negatively impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphic and biological processes due to:” Begin sentence with “Flood management ...”

Opportunity: Other Water Resource Needs

- Factor #15: “Competing” isn’t necessarily the correct word. The needs should all be integrated, but they don’t have to be competing. There is an opportunity for multi-benefit projects.

General Comments

- The changeable nature of the target needs to be addressed more explicitly. These problems do not admit that we’ll never be able to provide the level of flood protection that people expect. We

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

need to set forward an honest statement that the system is designed to handle certain floods and there is variability on which floods will overwhelm the system.

- The base conditions are changing, and we don't know what nature is going to do.
- We are in the risk *reduction* business; we need to communicate this to the public.
- There is the illusion that once a levee is repaired then the risk is gone; the risk needs to be communicated.
- There is a suite of flood reduction and protection strategies; structures aren't the only thing we have to protect floods.

Revised CVFPP Goals

The group reviewed the handout *Relationship of Problems and Opportunities, Goals, and Objectives*. Vanessa Nishikawa invited comments from work group members.

Comments on Problems and Opportunities

- **Operation, Maintenance, and Repair**
 - The title should read "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement."
 - Add "habitat mitigation" to end of the sentence.
- **Policy and Institutional**
 - In the sentence, it should read "...incomplete definition (or description) and consideration..."
- **Other Water Resource Needs**
 - There are concerns with the statement that single-purpose flood management actions are not necessarily a problem. Multi-purpose reservoirs have a history of conflicting goals. It's not clear how single-purpose levees are a problem for the flood plan.
 - The problem is stated backwards. The opportunity lies in looking at ways systems can be managed or integrated into the flood system, not the other way around.
 - Recreation could also be included as some partners do not consider it to be part of other related water resources needs.

Comments on Goals

- **Improve Flood Risk Management**
 - This statement is missing a corollary that refers to flood control and adaptive responses. As it is currently written, the goal doesn't acknowledge the acceptance that flooding will happen. There is a prevention side, and an adaptation side to flood risk management. This statement needs more on the adaptation end.
 - I think the statement adequately addresses the adaptation side as it's currently written.
 - Insert "flood risks and" before "damages" in the last line of the sentence.
 - Should one of the goals be to define the risk that we're talking about (i.e. the probability of flooding)? On a simple level, you should be able to tell local land use agencies where the high risk areas are. You should be able to define what the level of risk is.
 - The communication of the plan to communities is also related to this issue. The last line should read "...emergency preparedness and response..."
Response: Mapping data will be brought in to the plan.
 - Change the end of the sentence to "on lands and property."
- **Simplify Operation and Maintenance of the Flood Management System**
 - "Facilitate" is a better word than "simplify". We don't want to do less.
 - Use "streamline" instead of "facilitate."
 - The text after the dash doesn't necessarily lead to simplification (i.e. making the management of O&M easier on a day-to-day basis). As a flood manager, my goal is not to accommodate natural processes. The levees that are clear of vegetation are much

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

easier to maintain than those that have vegetation. Accommodating natural processes is not easier. The goal should be to make things more inherently simple and maintainable. Changes such as levee slope make it easier.

- There needs to be a separate paragraph for existing projects. This goal refers to new projects.
- Perhaps the underlying goal is to make O&M of the flood management system achievable and affordable over time. Simplification to reduce costs may be one of the objectives. It's important to consider both long-term and short-term costs for a project, and consider both when looking at options for a project.
- A more proactive way of protecting people is to manage the watersheds and runoff. The idea of fixing all the levees in the long term is going to be very expensive. Integrated watershed management can help reduce flooding.

Response: It seems like the group is saying that the goal does not get at what the real issue is.

- The opportunity lies with the rehabilitation and redesign. There is legacy infrastructure that will be hard to change. I agree that this is a capital vs. O&M issue. The goal of the project is getting people willing to invest. If there isn't a promise that the system will be more natural, then you're losing selling points with people that are going to pay the bill.
 - The entire system (flood or water supply) is a game of who is going to pay. There is a disconnect between land use agencies (they see revenue from land use) and flood control agencies (maintenance is a financial burden) and the state won't engage in a project that doesn't make economic sense. Everyone is protecting their costs, which leads to larger costs in the long term.
 - O&M is too costly. We're trying to design a system that requires less O&M, and simplifying the system to make O&M less complicated and expensive.
 - Spending up-front on prevention would save money, but you can't access those dollars for prevention. We end up spending money just to put a flawed structure back together.
- Response: These issues were covered and discussed by the O&M work group. The team for the O&M work group is completing the summary report.

- **Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System**

- Vanessa Nishikawa noted that this goal statement was a result of the work of the Environmental Stewardship Work Group.
- "Flood plains" is not included in this statement.

- **Improve Institutional Support**

- Add "political" after "institutional."
- Add "design" in the list in the parentheses.

- **Promote Multi-Benefit Projects**

- If the problem statement is flawed, then the goal is flawed as well.
- Multi-purpose should be incorporated.
- "Contribute to" could be changed to "are compatible with."
- Sentence should read "feasible flood management and ecosystem projects."

Development of CVFPP Objectives

Vanessa Nishikawa discussed the development of CVFPP Objectives, and introduced Worksheet #9: Develop Draft CVFPP Objectives. Ms. Nishikawa introduced the sample objectives in the worksheet and explained the meaning and significance of the criteria. Ms. Nishikawa then invited work group members to comment and ask questions regarding the sample objectives.

Q: Is the intent of each objective to meet each of the five goals?

A: Not necessarily, but if the language can be changed to meet more than one goal, then it should be considered.

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

Q: Should the objectives address the impact of flooding on just the Central Valley?

A: The objectives should address the entire planning area since we know it's all integrated.

Work group members were then divided into two groups (Group A and B) and asked to develop draft objectives consistent with the draft goals, principles and opportunities. Each group then reported back to the larger group with their results. The draft objectives that were developed are listed below:

Group A Objective:

1. Provide and install flood risk warning and notification systems in 90% of communities greater than 1,000 people by 2025.

Notes from Group A Conversation:

- The technology desired for flood notification exists.
- The plan needs to change the public perception of flood risk.
- Telemetry should be accounted for in relicensing efforts.
- "Robust" means on-site, durable, and accessible.

Group B Objectives:

1. Develop a plan by 2014 to communicate flood risk to the public living in the area affected by the state plan of flood control.
2. Develop a consistent methodology to identify critical state plan of flood control deficiencies in the planning area.

Notes from Group B Conversation:

- Objective 1
 - It is Achievable, because it's nominally expensive.
 - It meets Goal #1, and possibly Goal #4.
 - FEMA maps are not sufficient.
 - There needs to be a way to describe the flood risk and communicate it to the public.
- Objective 2
 - An example is the Lower Feather River system (Oroville dam to confluence of the Sacramento River).
 - The methodology should be consistent throughout the system.
 - This can apply down to specific reaches. This objective will be the starting point on determining how to repair the levees, and what the priority should be.

SharePoint Tutorial

Vanessa Nishikawa gave a tutorial presentation on the information available on the SharePoint site, and how to navigate the site.

Valley-Wide Forum

Vanessa Nishikawa described the Valley-Wide Forum, which has been scheduled for February 3, 2010.

Q: Given the 200-year level requirement that communities will have to meet, does DWR anticipate having a local government outreach component to the plan?

A: Yes, and it will be soon. DWR realizes that there is a short timeline to complete the 2012 plan, and criteria have been developed to measure whether a community has met the requirement. DWR wants to make sure that the people who want to review the criteria have the chance to do so. If the criteria have not been finalized by the forum, DWR will recruit people to review the criteria.

Action Item Review

Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West, and Pierre Stephens, DWR, reviewed the action items for meeting #5.

Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

Meeting Recap

Mike Harty, meeting facilitator, reviewed the meeting #5 goals and objectives. Pierre Stephens and Gary Hester thanked the work group members for their participation and adjourned the meeting.