



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary **Draft**

Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

Time: November 17, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:30 pm

Location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation
3290 N Ad Art Rd, Stockton, CA

Presentations and Materials Available Online at www.water.ca.gov/cvfm

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:

| Name | Organization |
|-------------------|--|
| Marci Coglianesse | Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Sub-committee |
| Mark Connelly | San Joaquin County Flood Management Division |
| Bill Darsie | KSN Inc |
| Kara DiFrancesco | Natural Heritage Institute |
| Karen Medders | North Delta CARES |
| Brooke Sharideh | US Army Corps of Engineers |
| Dave Shpak | City of West Sacramento |
| Chuck Spinks | American Society of Civil Engineers |
| Jan Vick | Mayor, City of Rio Vista |

Team Present:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Eric Poncelet | Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team) |
| Yung-Hsin Sun | 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:

Michael Hardesty, Central Valley Flood Control Association

Matilda Evoy-Mount, US Army Corps of Engineers

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

| | ITEM | OWNER | TIMEFRAME |
|----|--|---------------|-----------|
| 1. | Homework (Review Chapters 1-3, provide additional comments on problems, opportunities, goals and draft objectives) | Work Group | 12/4/09 |
| 2. | Clarify document review deadlines | Christal Love | 11/30/09 |
| 3. | Add definition of “flood protection” to Glossary | Yung-Hsin Sun | 12/30/09 |
| 4. | Distribute Climate Change paper to Work Group members | Yung-Hsin Sun | 11/30/09 |

| | | | |
|----|--|---------------|----------|
| 5. | Poll Work Group members regarding their preference to have either electronic or paper copies of the Regional Conditions Summary (RCS) and Regional Conditions Report (RCR) | Christal Love | 11/30/09 |
| 6. | Poll Work Group members regarding their availability to attend the Delta RCWG meeting #8 during the week of January 21 st through 27 th | Christal Love | 11/30/09 |
| 7. | Determine if the Delta RCWG meeting #7 can be co-located with the BDPAC meeting on December 10 th | Bob Yeadon | 11/24/09 |
| 8. | Distribute a word version of the State Plan Flood Control (SPFC) Description Document to Work Group members to facilitate review process | Christal Love | 11/30/09 |

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 November 17, 2009 with the following actions:

- Review Topic Work Group progress and upcoming 2010 deadlines
- Review the outline of the Regional Conditional Summary (RCS)
- Review comments received and status of Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the RCR
- Review Revised Goals and Problem Statements and Revised Principles
- Continue discussing CVFPP objectives
- Discuss SPFC Descriptive Document and the Valley-Wide Forum

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCR, 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 Delta Work Group is one of five regional Work Groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and early 2010 (Schedule for Document Review)
- Overview of the outline of the Regional Condition Summary
- Review Comments Received and Status of Chapters 1, 2 and 3
- Continue Development of Goals, Principles and Objectives (Chapter 4)
- Discuss Next Steps

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.

A Work Group member announced that the 7th Delta RCWG meeting scheduled to occur on December 10th conflicted with a BDPAC meeting and requested that the meeting be rescheduled or co-located (see **Action Item 7**).

Opening Remarks

Gary Hester (DWR) delivered opening remarks and thanked the Work Group members for their continued participation. He then gave the group an update regarding the discussions currently underway between DWR and the City of Fresno regarding whether Fresno is included within the boundaries of the CVFPP.

Discussion:

- A Work Group member stated that DWR should develop a consistent, principled way to deal with such issues.

Review of Previous Meeting #3 Action Items

Merritt Rice (DWR) provided an overview of the status of the action items from meeting 5; stating that the only outstanding action item is the request to add the definition of "flood protection" to the glossary (see **Action Item #3**). He then stressed the importance of reviewing the regional conditions summary report in its entirety when made available.

Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and Early 2010

Yung-Hsin Sun (MWH) provided the Work Group members an update of the project schedule, tasks, and deliverables for the remainder of 2009 and into the beginning of 2010 (see **PowerPoint presentation**). He also explained that Work Group meeting #7 would be split into two meetings, with a meeting #8 to be held in January. Mr. Sun provided an update on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Wide Forum to be held on February 3rd 2010. He then provided the group with an update on the progress of the Topic Work Groups.

Discussion:

- A Work Group member asked for hardcopies of the draft documents to be provided at some point. Mr. Rice agreed to make hardcopies of the RCR available to those Work Group members who request them the next time all of the chapters are available (see **Action Item #5**). The Work Group member then stated the importance of putting the right information into the Regional Conditions Summary (RCS), saying that this document could be a point of contention in the future.
- A Work Group member asked if it was too late to provide comments on the latest version of chapters 1, 2, or 3, or if it would be more appropriate to wait until January 2010. Mr. Sun responded that the sooner comments are received the better, and that partial comments would be better than waiting and commenting on a document that is out of date. Mr. Sun requested that any additional Work Group comments on Chapters 1-3 be submitted by December 4th, 2009 (see **Action Item #1**). Mr. Sun then announced that Chapter 4 of the RCSR would be distributed to the group by January 7th.

Outline of Regional Conditions Summary Report

Mr. Sun presented an overview of the RCS outline (see **PowerPoint presentation**) and asked the group to provide any comments they have on the outline. He said that the RCS would be available the 2nd week

of January 2010 and stressed the importance of providing comments on the RCS on time so that steps can be taken to ensure that the RCS and the RCR are consistent.

Review of Comments Received and Status of Chapters 1, 2, and 3

Mr. Sun reviewed the comments received so far on RSR Chapters 1 and 2 and explained the outline of each chapter. He showed a bar graph of the comments received broken down by subject. Mr. Sun presented the following review schedule:

- Chapter 4 will be made available on December 7th; comments will be due on December 21st.
- The back check review of the RCR will be due on January 4th.
- The draft review of the RCS will begin on January 13th.
- The meeting #8 will occur during the week of January 21st through 27th.

Afterwards, Work Group members raised the following questions and comments:

- Was MWH able to use the HNH data? Mr. Sun responded that MWH was using HNH information, and that DWR is currently engaged in a parallel process to update the information.
- With regard to climate change, is there a potential issue with DWR using old data with a lot of uncertainty. Mr. Sun responded that there is still some uncertainty regarding the specific effects climate change will have on California. He said there is a need to understand and manage the risk, and he stated that the planning team is currently working on this issue. Mr. Sun presented a diagram illustrating the realm of probabilities and other methods to represent uncertainty, and then explained where the Work Group is in its decision making. Mr. Sun committed to transmit a copy of the technical paper containing the diagram to the work group members (see Action Item #4).
- DWR needs to develop a vocabulary to deal with the level of uncertainty in both the RCR and the RCS.
- One of the problems with ecosystem risk analysis is that there are numerous factors involved that create the need to capture many different scenarios.
- It would be preferable to conduct experiments to improve our knowledge of the system before spending billions of dollars on inflexible pieces of infrastructure in the Delta.

Review Revised CVFPP Goals and Problem Statements

Mr. Sun presented the Revised CVFPP Problems, Opportunities, and Goals table. Afterwards, Work Group members raised the following questions and comments:

- Work group members expressed confusion regarding the difference between problems and opportunities. Mr. Rice explained that when the process first started, problems and opportunities were treated as the same thing. A Work Group member expressed his desire to revise the Problems and Opportunities table to show the relative importance of the objective statements.
- Several members of the Work Group expressed an interest in having ecosystem related items removed from the list of problems, stating that they did not fit as flood risk management problems. Other Work Group members articulated the relevancy of ecosystem management, stating that the natural system has the capacity to absorb some of the flood water. There was disagreement regarding whether ecosystem should be included as a problem/opportunities statement or if it should be included as a management action. Mr. Sun reminded the group that the legislative intent was for this plan to build an integrated flood management system. Mr. Rice clarified that there were ecosystem related floodSAFE goals that came from the legislation, but that the ecosystem components were not coequal with flood control.
- A work group member pointed out that nowhere in the list of goals is there anything about maintaining and improving the flood capacity system. This should be explicitly called out somewhere. Mr. Sun replied that the issue of flood capacity was intended to be included in the first goal.

- A work group member suggested adding a bullet under the Improve Flood Risk Management and Reduce Flood Damage Goal that reads: Correct existing flood protection system deficiencies.
- A work group member suggesting moving the Ecosystem Problems and Opportunities text below the Policy and Institutional text in the table.
- Work group members suggested two revisions to the Ecosystem Problems and Opportunities text:
 - Ecosystem – Continuing development and operations and maintenance of the flood management systems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley can contribute to the recovery connectivity and improvement of native habitats and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.
 - Ecosystem – Current public policy creates tension regarding conflicting objectives of flood protection and ecosystem restoration.
- A request was made to reconsider the use of the word “lack” in the Policy and Institutional text.

Development of CVFPP Principles

Mr. Sun reviewed the draft CVFPP Principles handout and reminded work group members that principles apply to how DWR will go about doing business (e.g., things to do, things to avoid doing) and how it will develop and implement the CVFPP. Work group members provided the following comments on the Principles listed below.

Integrate land use planning with flood risk management

- This principle seems important and simple enough; however, it will be difficult to accomplish.
- Add the word “statewide” after integrate.

Protect and restore natural floodplain processes and promote environmental stewardship

- Some work group members suggested combining agriculture with environmental stewardship, while other recommended that they be left separate.
- Add “protect natural processes to the extent possible”.
- This principle needs to address improvements at the landscape level. Consider combining this Principle with the first one.

Suggested NEW Principles

- Public benefits should be paid for by public at large (with role for some local responsibility as well).
- Recognize the inherent difficulty of flood management issues in the Delta in regards to flood management.
- The Delta is distinctly different than the Central Valley.

Continued Discussion of Objectives

The Work Group broke into two smaller groups and reviewed the Draft Work Group objectives that resulted from meeting #5 discussions and the synthesized versions of those objectives. Work Group members also proposed new objectives under the various objective categories. Key suggested revisions or new objectives included the following.

Flood Risk

- Work group members expressed general support for the two synthesized objectives as written and stated that both apply to the Delta. Work group members saw the first synthesized objective

as relating to “goal” #1 but not to goal 3 or 5. Work group members confirmed the link between the second synthesized objective and goal #1.

- Work group members did not believe that the second objective (from the left hand column: “Define criteria for 100 year flood...”) really fit in to the first synthesized objective. Group members felt that this bullet was more focused on disclosure by land developers. As such, it should have its own objective. Group members did not suggest text for a new objective but concluded that the new objective should apply to goal #4.
- NEW objective: “Provide 100 year (or greater) level of flood protection to all legacy communities in the Delta by December 31, 2015.
- NEW objective (builds on the first management action in the list): “Devise levee design and construction standards to ensure resilience under the greatest range of conditions (e.g., overtopping, earthquake, wind/wave erosion, etc.) and reduce O&M frequency and costs and extend life cycle, by 2025.

Ecosystem Restoration

- A group member suggested defining the boundary conditions to identify flood control benefits.
- Work group members commented that this is not a flood control objective and suggested getting rid of existing objectives and replacing them with this one:
 - NEW: Support and pursuer multi-objective flood protection projects consistent with flood management needs and available ecosystem funding.
- Ecosystem proponents need to buy-in on flood control and ecosystem joint projects.
- Work group members suggested revising the first objective accordingly: Increase the floodplain and shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the flood management system.

Streamlined Permitting

- Work group members recommended one edit to the synthesized objective. Insert “design and construction,” after “flood planning” and before “maintenance.”
- Work group members confirmed that the synthesized objective pertained to the Delta region.

Flood Preparedness and Response

- Work group members confirmed that the synthesized objective pertained to the Delta region.
- Work group members confirmed the draft synthesized objective as written, but added two new related objectives:
 - NEW: Implement an emergency preparedness plan for Delta legacy communities that includes elements to address flood risk, warning and notification, and hazard communication elements by 20xx.
 - NEW: Implement a flood recovery plan for Central Valley communities with greater than 1,000 people and legacy communities in the Delta that includes levee repair, flood water evacuation, and property and infrastructure rehabilitation by 20xx
- NEW: “Develop a coordinated flood system response across the multiple responsible agencies in the Delta.” Note: the group recognized that this was likely a management action.

Operations and Maintenance

- Work group members confirmed that the synthesized objective pertained to the Delta region.
- Work group members confirmed the synthesized objective but made the following edit: added “project and non-project” after “urban” in the first line.
- Work group members commented that both synthesized objectives here need to be revised to better specify how things will be measured. The group found “90% pass rate” and “improve the annual pass rate...by 30%” to lack clarity.

Education and Outreach

- Work group members suggested that the first and fourth original objective statements also applied to the Improve Institutional Support goal.
- Work group members revised the objective accordingly: Implement a focused outreach program to educate public on potential flood risk and to support and fund local agencies on revising their General Plans by 2014.
- Another suggested revision was: Develop and implement a plan to educate the public on potential flood risks by 2014.
- A suggestion was made to move this objective to the funding category.

Education and Outreach

- Work group members discussed removing this objective or at least specify that it should not apply to the Delta region.

Funding

- Work group members suggested revising the first original objective to read: Finance flood protection for rural communities and / or urbanizing areas.
- Work group members suggested that the Funding objective also applied to the Improve Flood Risk Management and Reduce Flood Damages goal.

Land Use

- Work group members revised the second objective to read: contribute to the maintenance of a viable agricultural industry and acknowledge the environmental value of agricultural lands by preserving agriculture.
- Work group members suggested the following NEW objective: Reduce statutory and regulatory conflicts in land use by 2017.

Other potential objectives to explore

- Work group members confirmed the synthesized objective as written and that it pertained to the Delta region.
- Work group members felt that this objective belonged under the “Ecosystem Restoration” category.
- The following revision was suggested: Implement a long-term conservation strategy by 2017 that provides effective and efficient sustainable environmental mitigation for flood management activities on a system-wide basis, and results in lasting environmental benefits and meets flood management objectives.

OTHER NEW OBJECTIVES DEVELOPED

- [Applies to goal #5] Implement a long-term, comprehensive program, by 2017, to develop recreation infrastructure, where consistent and compatible with levee development and O&M, in concert with levee development and rehabilitation/repair. The program shall identify the types of compatible recreation uses and facilities, generally locate these features, and describe the means for funding capital development and life cycle costs as a public benefit. The program shall coordinate with the Great California Delta Trail, State Parks, and local parks.

OTHER NEW CATEGORIES DEVELOPED

- Revise existing programs and implement / fund successful elements
 - NEW objective under new category above: Develop a reliable CVFPP levee subvention program by 2012 and implement by 2017.

SPFC Descriptive Document

Mr. Rice provided an overview of the State Plan Flood Control (SPFC) descriptive document that was distributed to the Work Group the previous week. He stated that the document is an administrative draft and should not be publicly distributed. He stress that DWR welcomed all comments, ideally by December 1st. Mr. Rice then presented an outline of the document.

Discussion of Valley-Wide Forum

Mr. Poncelet reminded the Work Group that there will be a Valley-Wide Forum held in February 2010. He explained the goals of the Valley-Wide Forum, who is anticipated to attend, and reviewed the preliminary agenda items. He pointed out that the Planning Development Team has already begun looking for individuals to participate in a panel at the Forum. Panel members would be required to represent the views of their work groups. Mr. Poncelet announced that Marci Coglianese (BDPAC and Delta Levees & Habitat) was invited by the Planning Development Team to represent the Delta RCWG. Ms. Coglianese remarked that she would be happy to serve as the Delta panelist as long as she had the support of the group. The Work Group members in attendance unanimously agreed that Ms. Coglianese would make a good representative.

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

Mr. Poncelet presented an overview of specific action items discussed throughout the day. 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