



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

October 29, 2009, 9:00 am – 2:30 pm

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

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Bev Anderson	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum	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
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	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
Marty Stripling	River Garden Farms Co., Sacramento River Westside Levee District, Reclamation Districts 108 and 787	Member
Amy Lyons	California Department of Fish and Game	Alternate
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
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Program Manager
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Lead
Erica Bishop	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 #5

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Patricia Bratcher*	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Randy Dunn	City of Colusa	Member
Ren Fairbanks	Farming, SRWP, BSAGU	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning Department	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
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCVFCA	Member
David van Rijn	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Member

*Alternate attended in their place

ACTION ITEMS/WORK GROUP HOMEWORK (requested by 11/6/09):

Homework

- Please provide comments on the first draft of Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities, which has been mailed out.
- Continue developing suggested Objectives, using Worksheet 9. A Microsoft Word copy of Worksheet 9 will be e-mailed to Work Group Members on Friday.
- If desired, provide suggestions for additions to the Glossary.

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

The Plan Team seeks input from Work Group Members on the following items:

- Are there better ways to gather your comments on draft Summary Report text?
- Please, if desired, provide ideas for the definition of agricultural stewardship
- What would be the most acceptable forms and levels of flood protection for rural areas?
- Does Chapter 3 capture your perspective on issues of importance to you?

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #6

Time: 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Date: November 19, 2009
Place: Yolo County Farm Bureau, Woodland

Future Meetings:

- December 7, 2009
- February 3, 2010: Valley-Wide Forum at San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Mendocino National Forest Office, Willows

This summary consists of raw notes of Work Group discussion. The team attempts to capture all opinions accurately but this document is not a report nor a decision document for the CVFMP. This Draft document is provisional and subject to change upon further review by the Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group.

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

- 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 #5 was to continue developing content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report, with the following specific 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

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

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Dan McManus provided a recap of homework and action items from past meetings. He noted that there has been a drop-off in the number of homework items turned in, and asked for suggestions from workgroup members on better ways for the Plan Team to seek input.

Comment: Later in the meeting, one Work Group Member said more time for review would be desirable.

Opening Remarks

Yung Hsin Sun of MWH Americas Inc., Technical Team Program Manager, and Dan McManus provided the opening remarks. Yung Hsin Sun 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 Meeting #4"). A key item is that by mid-November, all the draft chapters will be on the website available for the Work Groups to review.

Dan McManus provided an update on the Joint Subcommittee for Agricultural Stewardship Scope Definition, noting that it now includes 25 people, including a representative from the State Department of Food and Agriculture. The group will meet again November 5. He asked for ideas from Work Group Members on the definition of agricultural stewardship.

Comment: Agricultural Stewardship group members have asked for a larger history section in the Report.

Comment: The 1999 Post-Flood Assessment includes a couple hundred pages on history that could be used directly.

Comment: In our district, we feel that a very big part of history is when the system went into decline. It is still in decline, and there was a definite point.

Comment: My idea on history was the recent history -- when Sacramento was flooding every year. How the system was designed, and why. Why they built Sutter's Fort where they did.

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

Response: There will be a separate document, including a separate historical document. It will probably be referenced with a link. The history document will take time to put together, and may not be ready until spring. Agricultural subcommittee members wanted the history to reflect that some of the levees were built because land was reclaimed for agriculture, so that will be added.

Comment: The document is for the general public. We have to be careful -- we have to agree on the scope of the history. Two thirds of it now is ancient history. In the document, it would be hard to find the paragraphs that people are requesting. In the document as a whole, a layperson would be lost in the first chapter because there is so much information. The layperson is going to be inundated -- there is a lot of stuff that's not pertinent. Take an executive summary approach -- people are busy.

Response: It is difficult to be comprehensive and include all the comments, yet be readable. To be comprehensive yet succinct is a constant effort. The CVFMP will be looking at a number of ways to present the data so that the layperson does not have to read every page to understand the problem and proposed solutions.

Q: How is the Plan Team addressing the competing interests? Getting to tangible outcomes?

A: The work at this and other meetings this week will create draft objectives which will have to be reconciled. The important part will be occurring right after this work group meeting. The next section of the report, Management Actions, and following work groups will address these issues.

Q: Will that be developed by DWR and the consultants, or in a process like this?

Comment: Keep these work groups that are in existence now.

A: We are looking at that now. The general direction is to use the work groups. It would be a challenge to have all new faces. We are hoping -- it's a big time commitment, but hoping people will want to continue. There may also need to be new people at the table to help with implementation.

Comment: The issue came up in the agricultural subcommittee that the legislation addresses increased urban flood protection, but what about rural? This was a concern to a lot of people in the agricultural work group -- where do we fit in? It sounds like the urban folks are going to get it, and us...

Response: We have requested \$30 million for non-urban grant programs for non-structural improvements as part of Prop 1E early implementation. There is still some room for non-urban and rural communities. As this group is noting, there are benefits to the urban areas from addressing non-urban areas.

Q: What is an example of nonstructural flood control?

A: Raising foundations, possibly ring levees.

Comment: On page 27 of the MOU for the Sacramento River Flood Control Plan between the Army Corps of Engineers and the State Reclamation Board (now the Flood Protection Board), there were no differences in standards between urban and rural areas, back when things started.

Comment: There is a 200-year flood protection for urban areas. DWR is focusing more of the money on urban areas -- \$200-\$300 million versus \$30 million.

Comment: When you look at implementation, you have to look at the original legislative intent. During implementation, it often gets revised and implementation doesn't reflect the original intent.

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

Response: Can Work Group Members help us determine what form of protection would be more acceptable to rural communities? We are thinking of a systemwide approach. There could be a lot of activities at the local level. We have heard that rural areas prefer ring levees – is that true? We would like more input on this question. The need for evacuation, issues with livestock, there are a lot of opinions -- what is the preferred way?

Comment: I'm not hearing protection for agricultural uses in any of this.

Response: I think it is. Agriculture is a part of Central Valley land use. You can't leave it out.

Comment: I represent an urban area, but what I hear here is the legislation says 200 for urban, but give us as much as we can get. Not emergency response, but something in regards to levee improvements. When you run out of money, what is left for us? In relation to all funds, both existing bond funding and long-term funding. It is important to first know what level of protection we can afford before we can determine the level of protection to implement.

Comment: It's not that we want 200-year flood protection, but we do want as much as we can get. We need to explain to the public the funding issues, and why there are differences between rural and urban.

Response: Please look at Chapter 3, and see that we have captured these perspectives appropriately.

Q: Will there be money for local governments to amend their general plans in accord with the Report?

A: That's part of the reason for the early informing, so that there are no surprises, and local governments have time to seek legislation, if necessary.

Q: The legislation says that the locals assume responsibility. If the levee breaks at a 50-year event, how can I tell it's a 50-year event?

A: That's a really great question. We need a better definition of 200-year protection. It is a frequency-based definition that keeps changing.

Comment: The state would be better off with the Army Corps of Engineers standard project flood.

Q: What can the county use in its defense?

A: Two hundred-year protection would cover local flooding as well as major levees.

Q: Why would the state want to get involved in that?

A: At the local level, DWR will have no enforcement power – it would just be state law.

Roadmap and Overview of Topic Work Group Progress

Roger Putty of MWH, Technical Lead, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Regional Conditions Work Group timeline, revisions to and organization of the CVFPP document, and progress of the topic workgroups.

Q: Why did three of the topic work groups not address goals and principles?

A: The original thinking was that none would, and instead they would go through a checklist for success factors. The challenge for the Environmental Stewardship group was that that is a new initiative within DWR, and there were a lot of different ideas about what environmental stewardship means. The work group spent time thinking about goals and principles to refine the definition. They were told that their goals and principles would not be adopted verbatim.

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

Comment: For the Levee Performance group, it would have been helpful to develop goals and principles.
Response: We are learning as we go along.

Chapter 3 (Problems & Opportunities) & Review of Revised CVFPP Goals

Roger Putty introduced the section, reviewing portions of a PowerPoint included in the packet on Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities revisions. The whole group then reviewed a handout table called Revised Draft Summary of Contributing Factors and their Regional Differences, as well as another handout called Relationship of CVFPP Problems and Opportunities, Goals, and Objectives, and provided feedback on the two documents. A third handout, an Excerpt on 3.2 Operations, Maintenance, and Repair from Chapter 3 Working Draft Problems and Opportunities, provides an example of how the text will discuss each of the problems and its contributing factors and related opportunities.

The Work Group provided the following comments and proposed changes:

Problem: Flood Risk

- 1): Is this perception or fact supported by data? It's important that it reflect reality. (It may be both. It should be clarified. The Plan Team will try to cite references if they exist.)
- 1) c) subsidence – isn't it a big problem in the Lower San Joaquin? It shows a half circle there. (Plan Team will look into -- issue is better reflected in 2) d). Clarification that the Lower San Joaquin area is the northern part of the valley, not the southern part.)
- 1) d): unclear what "meander" is referring to. It refers to oxbows, cutoffs and the effect on the capacity of the channel.
- 1) d): The word "changed" should be revised to increased or decreased
- 2) f) is the only item with an asterisk noting that "There are different perspectives..." More asterisks could be added to this table.
- 2) f): There is a detailed discussion of both sides needed for woody vegetation, perhaps in the text.
- 2) f) In discussing woody vegetation, discuss the differences between attached and non-attached woody vegetation
- 3) e): Facilities -- this item should be of high importance in the Upper Sacramento region, because of 3B's and Phelan Levee upstream of the M&T overflow.
- 5): Add an item f: Lack of maintenance is a problem. This is captured at 7) d), but should be reflected in both places in the document.
- 5) e): bypass channels are allowed to degrade
- 17): You can also improve channel capacity -- the item should reflect multiple perspectives.
- Contributing factors for flood risk -- urbanization and increased runoff -- should be captured.
- There should be direct responsibility for land-use decisions that cause increased flood risk.
- 19: Are there existing post-flood recovery plans??
- 19) g) What does this mean? The ecosystem should be benefited by natural events -- if you create something artificial, you have to battle nature to keep it that way. This problem should be clarified, or dropped. Possible: recovery activities.

Problem: Operation, Maintenance, and Repair

- 7) b) should have two parts, i) On levees; ii) In channels. This is an item of high importance to the Upper Sacramento.

Problem: Ecosystem

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

- 8) d): this should be an item of high importance to the Upper Sacramento region, as well as all of California.

Comments on the Problem Statements

Work Group Members were asked if the problem statements adequately capture the history they would like to see incorporated. The following comments were made:

- Butte Basin's three weirs are not operated as intended in the 1960s. What is important is where and when water leaves the system -- it floods prime agricultural land.
- The whole system should operate to original design -- Tisdale Bypass issues are an example

General Comments about the Table

- The continuity of the document is an issue. The problem is maintenance to design standards, it causes flood risk. 1) a) should be deferred/lack of maintenance, then the document could refer to a later section for details
- It is difficult to determine priorities from this chart, or you should clarify that this chart does not prioritize
- The table is confusing.

Discuss Development of CVFPP Objectives

Roger Putty introduced the section, reviewing portions of a PowerPoint included in the packet. Objectives need to be "SMART," meaning specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-based. Participants divided into two breakout groups to work with Worksheet 9, Develop Draft CVFPP Objectives. Work Group Members are asked to work individually on drafting possible objectives as homework.

Group work is captured at the end of this document.

SharePoint Tutorial, Next Steps

One Work Group Member has tried to access the SharePoint site, but was unable to because of his work site firewall. Plan Team members will try to work to resolve the issue. Soon, documents may be too large to e-mail to Work Group Members, so it will be important that they can access SharePoint to review and download draft chapters and other parts of the Regional Conditions Summary Report as they desire.

Q: Is it possible to see summaries of where the other work groups are heading? There are only two meetings left.

A: The documents you receive have included comments from all the work groups. In addition, meeting summaries from all the work groups are posted on the DWR website at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/meetings/>.



PART II – DEVELOP OBJECTIVES FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE CVFPP

Draft Objective	Specific Is there enough specificity related to the resolution and scale of the objective (e.g., how big and over what terrain)?	Measureable Are the measures appropriate for the objective (metrics such as % pass rate for levees, # of acres)? Are there other, more effective ways to measure contributions?	Achievable Is the objective realistic? How do you determine whether it is achievable? If you can't, what needs to be done to develop that information?	Relevant Which goals the objective helps meet and how					Time-based What is the timeframe the objective covers (e.g., "by ____" date or timeframe such as monthly, annually, etc.)? And if there isn't one, how do you determine an appropriate one?	Notes
				CVFPP Goals						
				Improve Flood Risk Management	Simplify O&M of the Flood Management System	Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System	Improve Institutional Support	Promote Multi-Benefit Projects		
[Flood Risk]. Understand existing levee structural performance by X date, and what the risks associated with failure are. Using uniform criteria, well-documented, clearly, timely manner within State Plan of Flood Control.	Yes	All SPFC levees	Yes	Y	Y	N	Y	Somewhat	2012	Intent with this objective is that we should understand existing performance before making changes. This would include an evaluation inventory of existing problems with levees. It is expected performance up to par? Yes/no. If no, set up plan. Give us a baseline of information.
[Flood Risk]. Accurately define a XXX year event water surface elevation, at a resolution of ± 1 foot, within the SPFC area. Establish technical standard for 10-20, 30, etc. year flood elevation by XX date.	Yes	Yes	Yes (but maybe not realistic)	Y	N	Somewhat	Y	Somewhat	2012	
[Ecosystem Restoration]. Identify existing restoration objectives/goals of other agencies and baseline data for future performance monitoring within the Sacramento San Joaquin river watersheds by 2012	Yes	Yes	?	N	NA	Y	Y	Y	2012	1. First step: inventory 2. Second step: needs/gaps
[Flood Risk/O&M Initial Idea]. Adequate flood protection or minimization of risk so agriculture can remain as a viable business										Need to quantify from a time versus impact versus economy versus acres
[Institutional]. Establish a central clearinghouse, a joint venture between private engineering firms and DWR, as a one-stop shop for permits for flood planning, maintenance, preparedness, response, recovery. The aim of the clearinghouse would be to enhance local compliance with rules and regulations and enhance technical competency.										

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

[Multi-Benefit Projects Initial Idea]. Support synergistic efforts, such as watershed projects that include the removal of invasive species and replacement with native species, which would help with conveyance and ecosystem restoration.										
[O&M Initial Idea]. Implement annual maintenance to our flood control system to reduce flood risk.										
Investigate/research various agricultural crops to determine appropriateness for certain areas, i.e. floodways vs. channel										
Define criteria for 100 year flood and explain how criteria are defined. State needs to define criteria for how developers know if they are meeting standards.										
Adopt standards for knowing when you are in compliance for general plan updates, i.e. what is a 200 year flood event.								2012-2013		
Investigate/research various agricultural crops to determine appropriateness for certain areas, i.e. floodways vs. channel										
Prevent land development in floodway - amend general plans	Challenging?			X				x		Possible principle needs more review
Undertake focused outreach to educate on potential flood risk		# of people notified, # of general plans discussing topics								
Maintain capacity for flows by removing snags/debris		restore to design capacity	by 2012	x	x	x			seasonally or as needed	need to achieve and maintain capacity, need to consider unintended consequences
Evaluate whether or not "design capacity" is entirely adequate or is even the standard we should go by										
Pursue a holistic approach to ecosystem management, need to have multiple benefits from any public project *we need to consider cumulative impact analysis on proposed actions to not worsen conditions in another area with our repair, etc.										this could be a principle, should be applied to all objectives

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

Provide 200-year (or greater) level of flood protection to all urban and urbanizing areas AND 100 YEAR PROTECTION FOR RURAL AREAS in the Sacramento - San Joaquin Valley by December 31, 2025.	Yes ("what" and "where" specified)	"Done" when all areas have the minimum level of protection	Technically feasible, but unclear if it could be funded and accomplished within the timeframe	Y	N	?	N	?	Yes, specific date identified	This objective could contribute to the third and fifth goals depending upon the types of improvements made (for example, new surface storage to manage flood flows could also provide water supply or other benefits, contributing to the fifth goal).
Streamline permitting across all agencies; be upfront about what is needed from the beginning. Local permitting agencies should be responsible for regulations, not federal authorities that are disconnected from the region and resource										



Meeting Summary Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5