



# Draft Meeting Summary

## Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

**November 19, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:30 pm**

**Location: California Department of Water Resources  
3500 Industrial Blvd., Room 119  
West Sacramento, CA 95691**

### WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
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
Jim Cornelius	Sutter County Resource Conservation District	Alternate
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
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Jim Eto	CA Department of Water Resources	
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP* Program Manager
Loren Murray	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR*** Regional Coordinator
Roger Lee	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO**
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
Janet Thomson	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker

\*Central Valley Flood Management Planning

\*\*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

\*\*\*California Department of Water Resources

## Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

### Absent:

Mike Bessette	City of West Sacramento	Member
Ryan Bonea	Sutter County Resource Conservation District; Yuba County	Member
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Dan Fua	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Member
Tovey Giezentanner	Conaway Preservation Group LLC; RD 2035; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Tim Miramontes	Yolo County Farm Bureau; California Rice Commission; California Farm Bureau Rice Advisory	Member
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

No observers were in attendance.

### WORK GROUP HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS

1. Submit additional potential objectives by Friday, November 20, 2009.
2. Provide any additional comments on Regional Conditions Report (RCR) chapters 1-3 as soon as possible.
3. Provide any comments on the Meeting #5 summary by Wednesday, November 25, 2009.
4. After RCR chapter 4 is distributed, submit comments by December 21, 2009.
5. Notify others about the Valley-Wide Forum, to be held on February 3, 2010 at the San Joaquin Delta College.
6. Consider involvement in the upcoming Potential Management Actions Work Groups, which will be launched in February 2010.

Homework assignments should be sent to DWR lead Pierre Stephens, [jstephe@water.ca.gov](mailto:jstephe@water.ca.gov).

### ACTION ITEMS: PROGRAM TEAM

1. DWR will review input regarding state liability and provide further information to the Work Group at a future meeting.
2. Vanessa Nishikawa will add "system-wide" to the Regional Conditions Report glossary.
3. Janet Thomson will poll the work group partners to identify the best date (between January 21 and January 27) to hold Meeting #8.

### 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 continued its work on November 19, 2009 with the following actions:

- Reviewed and provided comments on revised CVFPP goals, problems and opportunities statements, and principles.

## Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

- Reviewed potential objectives and recommended additional objectives.
- Discussed planning for the Valley-Wide Forum.

### FUTURE MEETINGS SCHEDULE

Meeting #7: Monday, December 7, 2009  
City of West Sacramento  
1110 West Capitol Avenue  
West Sacramento, CA, 95691  
*Note: Half-day meeting*

Meeting #8: Date TBD, between January 21 and 27, 2009  
Sacramento Utilities Department  
1395 35th Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95821

### MEETING OVERVIEW

The purpose of Meeting #6 was to continue developing content for the Regional Conditions Report.

### MEETING GOALS

1. Review roadmap for remainder of 2009 and early 2010
2. Review overview of the outline of the Regional Conditions Summary
3. Review comments received and status of chapters 1, 2 and 3
4. Continue development of goals, principles and objectives (chapter 4)
5. Discuss next steps

### SUMMARY

#### Welcome and Greetings

Pierre Stephens, DWR, and facilitator Mike Harty welcomed the meeting participants. Following introductions, Pierre Stephens reviewed the previous meeting's action items.

#### Review of Meeting #5 Action Items

1. Vanessa Nishikawa will post the flow chart related to jurisdictional requirements for the CVFPP on the CVFMP website.  
**Status:** Complete
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.  
**Status:** Complete
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.  
**Status:** The calendars are up to date. The meeting invitation flyer is still under development.
4. Pierre Stephens will ensure that a formal invitation for the Valley-Wide Forum is sent to the Army Corps of Engineers.  
**Status:** Once the meeting invitation flyer is complete, Pierre Stephens will send this to the Army Corps of Engineers.
5. Ben Gettleman will send work group partners the draft meeting #5 summary for review.  
**Status:** The draft meeting summary is in the Meeting #6 packet.

### Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and Early 2010

Vanessa Nishikawa, MWH, explained the future meeting schedule for 2009 and early 2010. The program team has added a Meeting #8, to be held in late January, to provide a greater opportunity for work group members to review and provide comments on chapter 4 of the Regional Conditions Report.

The milestones over the next few months include:

- Work group partners receive RCR chapter 4 (covering goals, objectives, principles, and requirements) at Meeting #7 (December 7, 2009)
  - Work group comments on RCR chapter 4 will be due on December 21, 2009
- Work group partners receive the complete RCR (chapters 1-4) on January 4, 2010
  - Work group comments on RCR chapters 1-4 will be due on January 27, 2010
- Work group partners receive the Regional Conditions Summary (RCS) on January 13, 2009
  - Work group comments on the RCS will be due on January 27, 2010
- Valley-Wide Forum will be on February 3, 2010
- Potential Management Actions Work Groups will begin in February 2010
- The revised RCS and RCR, including public comment and the last round of work group comments, will be distributed in March 2010

All the topic work groups have completed their meetings, with the exception of the agricultural stewardship work group, and are finishing their summary documents. These products will be incorporated into the RCR and RCS as they become available.

Q: What is the purpose of the RCR?

A: The RCR is the first part of the planning phase and it identifies the background, history, existing conditions and likely future conditions, problems and opportunities, goals, objectives, principles, and requirements. The RCR will provide the basic information needed to develop management actions.

Q: How will the RCR differ from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Comprehensive Study (Comp Study)?

A: This effort will incorporate work from the Comp Study, but this will involve a broader look spatially, a broader look across interest groups, and a focus on planning and implementation.

Q: What is the scope of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and is it intended to serve as the primary document used by a future court to determine liability?

A: The SPFC defines the state's current facilities. The Flood Control System Status Report (FCSSR) will define the current conditions of the system, including what is working and what is not working. The CVFPP will define how we want to move forward with flood protection.

Comment: The program team will need to clarify how these documents address the fundamental issue of defining and limiting the scope of the state's liability with respect to flood protection.

### SPFC Descriptive Document

Michele Ng, DWR technical lead, described the purpose and outline of the SPFC Descriptive Document. This document is defined in the Public Resources Code and it contains the existing programs, facilities, lands, operations and maintenance, conditions, and programs and plans related to the SPFC.

Q: Do the lands identified in the SPFC Descriptive Document include reservoirs?

A: Those are not included in the SPFC, but they are included in the CVFPP as related facilities.

## Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

Comment: It is crucial to be specific in the inventory and the planning documents, and to understand the roles that the SPFC Descriptive Document and other related documents will have in managing the state's liability for flood protection.

Comment: The three distinct units (Delta, San Joaquin, and Sacramento watersheds) should be clearly separated in the SPFC.

Q: What is the purpose of the programs, plans, and updates section of the SPFC?

A: It shows what we have at this point.

Comment: The programs, plans, and updates may be a confusing section of the SPFC. By issuing this document, the state should not be committing to programs, plans, or updates that have not or cannot be accomplished.

Preliminary observations made from compilation of the SPFC include that: the state needs better property information access; there is incomplete or missing information; there are opportunities to remove features; there is a need to update operation and maintenance manuals; there are un-permitted encroachments; there is an opportunity to improve SPFC permanence; there is inconsistent river mile information; and additional land rights may be needed to conduct operations and maintenance.

The administrative draft of the SPFC Descriptive Document is currently available on the CVFPP Work Group SharePoint site. The Draft SPFC Descriptive Document will be available in late December 2009 for review. The administrative draft of the FCSSR will be available in January 2010 and the final FCSSR will be available in December 2010.

Comment from work group: In the SPFC Descriptive Document, it would be useful to show explicitly how the design standards have evolved over time, and what design standards exist today. Having clarity about the design standards will help the state to identify where the state is deficient in providing flood protection.

### Remarks from the CVFMP Program Manager

Gary Hester, CVFMP Program Manager, provided a few updates to the work group.

- An interim levee standards group, mostly focusing on urban levees, will be developed from the levee performance topic work group.
- The local jurisdiction briefings are ongoing.
- Fresno County staff is working with DWR to clarify the southern boundary of the San Joaquin watershed. Fresno County had thought they would be outside the boundary of the San Joaquin watershed based on the maps used at the time of the legislation directing development of the CVFPP.

Comment: The interim levee standards group should also focus on rural levees because there is still ambiguity about rural levee design.

Comment: Even if the state is not going to assume liability for certain areas, DWR might want to require higher flood protection standards for certain areas where serious and catastrophic damage might occur. The distinction between providing assurances and dictating good public policy is critical.

### Outline of Regional Conditions Summary

Vanessa Nishikawa explained that the RCS will include the following items: a letter from the Deputy Director, purpose statement, introduction, explanation of the CVFPP development process, interim findings, and next steps. Overall, the document is likely to be 20-25 pages in length.

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

Vanessa Nishikawa provided an overview of the comments received to date on chapters 1-3. The revised chapters 1-3 will be available for review on January 4, 2010, when the entire revised RCR (chapters 1-4) is distributed to work group partners.

**Review Revised Goals and Problems Statements**

Vanessa Nishikawa introduced the revised goals and problems statements for work group discussion and review. The CVFPP goals describe the broad and enduring values, direction, or desired conditions we want to achieve. The problems and opportunities describe the basic problems or undesirable conditions and outline how we could contribute to other needs/benefits while addressing the identified problems.

Mike Harty led the work group in a roundtable discussion of the goals and problem statements, affirming that previous work group comments have been appropriately reflected. The content of the discussion is captured in the two tables below.

CVFPP Goals	Work Group Comments
<p><b>Improve Flood Risk Management and Reduce Flood Damage</b> – Identify, coordinate, and implement structural and non-structural projects and actions that improve public safety, preparedness, and emergency response and reduce flood damages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On lands currently receiving protection from facilities of the SPFC</li> <li>• In the Delta</li> <li>• In other areas of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley</li> </ul>	<p>Add a sub-bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct existing flood system deficiencies</li> </ul>
<p><b>Facilitate and Streamline Operation and Maintenance of the Flood Management System</b> – Reduce system-wide maintenance and repair requirements by modifying the flood management systems in ways that are compatible with natural processes, and adjust, coordinate, and streamline regulatory and institutional standards funding, and practices.</p>	
<p><b>Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System</b> – Develop flood management system improvements that incorporate the recovery and restoration of -self-sustaining ecological functions, native habitats, and species, where feasible.</p>	<p>Suggested alternative: Current public policy creates tension between objectives of flood management and ecosystem management.</p>
<p><b>Improve Institutional Support</b> – Develop stable institutional structures and financial frameworks that enable effective and adaptive integrated flood management (designs, operations and maintenance, permitting, preparedness, response, recovery, land use and development planning) in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley.</p>	<p>An objective should be added to support this goal: Property owners living in floodplains should all have flood insurance</p>

CVFPP Goals	Work Group Comments
<p><b>Promote Multi-Benefit Projects</b> – Identify and implement feasible flood management projects and actions that also contribute to related water resources benefits and other needs.</p>	
	<p>Add a new goal, either as a separate goal or as an over-arching goal:</p> <p>Reduce the state’s liability for flood protection by fixing the existing deficiencies. Develop a finance plan to make this feasible.</p>

Problems and Opportunities	Work Group Comments
<p>CVFPP Problems and Opportunities</p>	<p>As stated, these are problems and not opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Flood Risk</b> – The Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley has been subject to flooding and increased flood risk to people and property due to physical and operational constraints of the existing flood management systems, increasing use of facilities for multiple purposes beyond original intent, and changing land uses in flood prone areas stemming from limited understanding of flood risk. Flood risk is likely to continue to increase in some areas of the Valley due to changes in climate and other conditions.</p>	<p>This problem statement should include that there is a lack of clarity over the responsibility, and resulting liability, for protection of and recovery from flood events in some areas of the Central Valley.</p>
<p><b>Operation and Maintenance, and Repair</b> – Operation and maintenance, and repair of the flood management systems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley are difficult and costly due to original system design characteristics, existing permitting and mitigation requirements, lack of reliable funding sources and financial instruments, system encroachments, and inconsistent standards and practices.</p>	
<p><b>Ecosystem</b> – The development of the flood management systems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley have contributed to the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of native habitats</p>	<p>Proposed alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Development in the Sacramento – San Joaquin Valley has contributed to the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of native</li> </ol>

Problems and Opportunities	Work Group Comments
<p>and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.</p>	<p>habitats and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. “The original single-purpose design of the project does not address all the current public policy requirements and values.”</li> <li>3. “The development of the flood management systems in the Sacramento – San Joaquin Valley are now seen to have contributed to the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of native habitats and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.”</li> </ol> <p>Note that this problem statement is linked to the “other water resources and needs” problem below, with ecosystems as one of the “other needs” of the system.</p>
<p><b>Policy and Institutional</b> – Lack of common understanding and coordination of flood management agency roles, responsibilities, and policies, conflicting agency requirements, incomplete understanding and consideration of flood risk in land use planning, and inadequate project funding lead to ineffective flood management in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley.</p>	<p>There is a need to clearly articulate the responsibilities of the state, various institutions, and the citizens with respect to flood protection, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. [This concept is linked to a potential liability goal, if developed.]</p> <p>There is a need for improved communication to the public about residual risks of flood events.</p>
<p><b>Other Water Resources and Needs</b> – Conventional, single-purpose projects are likely to create incompatible outcomes or missed opportunities to address water resources and other needs in the system.</p>	

### Review Revised Principles

Vanessa Nishikawa introduced the revised principles and reminded the work group that the principles define how we go about doing business. These are things we want to do, or avoid doing, as we develop and implement the CVFPP.

Mike Harty led the work group in a roundtable discussion of the revised draft principles, affirming that previous work group comments have been appropriately reflected. The content of the discussion is captured in the table below.

Revised Draft Principles	Work Group Comments
--------------------------	---------------------

## Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach flood risk management on a system-wide basis and avoid (where possible) or mitigate adverse impacts.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach flood risk management on a system-wide basis and avoid (where possible) or mitigate adverse or redirected hydraulic impacts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrate land use planning with flood risk management.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage and support flood management projects and programs that offer multiple or regional benefits.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and restore natural floodplain processes and promote environmental stewardship.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and restore natural floodplain processes and promote environmental stewardship as a general public benefit.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct flood protection infrastructure to minimize unexpected failures within design parameters.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct, operate, and maintain flood protection infrastructure in accordance with established design standards and practices.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote adaptive flood management strategies that respond to ongoing and future challenges such as climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adapt flood management strategies to respond to ongoing and future challenges such as climate change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide accurate information about flood risks and flood preparedness to help residents, communities, and public officials make safer decisions.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide accurate information about flood risks and flood preparedness to help residents, communities, and public officials make safer decisions, and provide mechanisms for insuring against that risk.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverage State investments to provide maximum public benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too open-ended to be a useful principle; clarification would be useful.</li> <li>• “Leverage” is a loaded word. Consider another wording choice.</li> <li>• Consider adding a principle about funding; such a principle might articulate that an objective is to achieve a “beneficiary pays” policy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide equitable access to decision process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define “equitable.” Is this intended to promote transparency in decision-making?</li> <li>• Consider editing to: “adequate access” and add “transparency of the decision-making process.”</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suggested New Principles:</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote coordination and collaboration with other large State, federal, local, or regional planning efforts.</li> </ul>	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate and collaborate with other large State, federal, local, or regional planning efforts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term system-wide goals for improving flood protection should include consideration of post-flood recovery.</li> </ul>	

## Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize the value of agriculture in communities and to the State's economy.</li> </ul>	
	<p>New suggested principle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize the primacy of flood control in relation to ecosystem and other objectives.</li> </ul>

Q: Will funding be covered in the CVFPP?

A: Yes.

Comment: It would be useful to recommend at least consideration of a "beneficiary-pays" concept.

Q: Will the plan take up any discussion of redirected impact, such as pushing fiscal or other effects to other individuals or parts of the system?

A: We will be looking at this on a system-wide basis.

### Continued Discussion of Objectives

Vanessa Nishikawa explained that the potential objectives outlined in Worksheet #10: Developing Draft CVFPP Objectives originate from the objectives developed by the regional conditions work groups and are sorted into ten topic categories. The objectives specify what we want to accomplish with the CVFPP. They will undergo continued refinement in the future Potential Management Actions Work Groups. The objectives may change as new information is developed during the planning process, as their feasibility is assessed, and as the goals and management actions are refined and the objectives undergo subsequent alignment.

Mike Harty led the work group in a roundtable discussion of the potential objectives to be explored. The work group developed a new proposed objective. The content of the discussion is captured in the table below.

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
<b>Flood Risk</b>	
Provide 200-year (or greater) level of flood protection to all urban and urbanizing areas in the Sacramento - San Joaquin Valley by December 31, 2025, and to provide interim 100-year protection by 2015.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider and clarify the scope of this objective. Is this for SPFC areas only?</li> <li>Note – this is directly linked to legislative mandate.</li> </ul>
Provide 100-year (or greater) level of flood protection to all rural and agricultural areas in the Sacramento - San Joaquin Valley by December 31, 2025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested alternative: "Provide adequate/appropriate level of flood protection to rural and agricultural areas in the Sacramento – San Joaquin Valley by December 31, 2025." [Consider specifying the exact standards which designate the adequate/appropriate level of protection.]</li> <li>Consider and clarify the scope of this objective. Is this for SPFC areas only?</li> <li>This objective is not achievable due to economics.</li> <li>This objective might be counter-productive – once areas have 100-year protection they will likely be developed and</li> </ul>

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<p>will in turn require 200-year protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider drafting a new objective that achieves the following: Work with upstream land users to ensure that flood management practices and land use practices are consistent, in order to ensure the capabilities of the projects long-term. This objective should also clarify who would manage this effort (e.g., the Central Valley Flood Protection Board).</li> </ul>
<b>Ecosystem Restoration</b>	
<p>Increase the floodplain and shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the flood management system by XXX acres, with a focus on areas of habitat discontinuity and where wetlands can be restored, by 2025.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be clarity that the overall goal is flood protection. Ecosystem restoration benefits are desired as long as flood protection is achieved.</li> <li>• This objective could seek to facilitate multi-objective flood control projects that address flood-risk reduction and flood management, consistent with available restoration funding.</li> <li>• Potential alternate language: “Accommodate increases in floodplain and shaded riverine aquatic habitat by XXX acres, in a manner consistent with risk reduction and flood capacity goals, with a focus on areas of habitat discontinuity and where wetlands can be restored, by 2025.”</li> <li>• As part of this objective, seek out funding partners to cover ecosystem benefits.</li> <li>• Consider and clarify the scope of this objective. Is this for SPFC areas only?</li> <li>• Consider whether the comments above are better suited as principles or management actions, rather than as objectives.</li> </ul>
<p>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 by 20XX.</p>	
<b>Streamlined Permitting</b>	
<p>Establish a system-wide/streamlined permitting process to reduce the cost and duration of obtaining permits for flood planning, maintenance, preparedness, response, and recovery by 2015.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify whether this applies to ongoing O&amp;M.</li> </ul>
<b>Flood Preparedness and Response</b>	

Draft Meeting Summary: Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
<p>Implement an emergency preparedness plan for Central Valley communities with greater than 1,000 people that includes elements to address flood risk, warning and notification, and hazard communication elements by 20XX.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate interagency communications (among the agencies that conduct emergency response) into this objective.</li> <li>• Consider and clarify the scope of this objective. Is this for SPFC areas only?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Operation and Maintenance</b></p>	
<p>Achieve 90% annual pass rate for urban levees in the Central Valley when inspected according to Federal and State levee standards (e.g., maintenance, encroachment, etc.) by 2025.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If this objective is part of a continuum of desired improvement, indicate that within the objective.</li> <li>• A prior objective should be to develop or define the O&amp;M standards. (Tie this to the existing O&amp;M manuals.) The objective should be to set the standards and then meet the standards.</li> <li>• Clarify the link between O&amp;M and funding.</li> <li>• Note that O&amp;M goal and the objectives do not correlate.</li> </ul>
<p>Improve the annual pass rate for non-urban project levees in the Central Valley by 30% when inspected according to Federal and State levee standards (e.g., maintenance, encroachment, etc.) by 2025.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same comments as above.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Education and Outreach</b></p>	
<p>Implement a focused outreach program to educate public on potential flood risk, and to support local agencies on revising their General Plans by 2014.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed edit: “Implement a focused and continuous outreach program to educate public and political officials on potential flood risk, and to support local agencies on revising their General Plans by 2014.”</li> <li>• The objective should seek to provide clear, regular, consistent communication about residual risk, at least annually, to the public and political officials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Groundwater Recharge</b></p>	
<p>Use XXX acre-feet per year (average annual) flood flows to provide groundwater recharge benefits by 2050.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective is not applicable or feasible in the Lower Sacramento region.</li> <li>• Clarify how this objective is linked to flood control.</li> <li>• This objective, if altered to include conjunctive use, might better be characterized as an ancillary benefit.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Funding</b></p>	
<p>Establish guidance, standards, policies, and procedures for the funding and implementation of projects and activities that contribute to a system-wide approach to integrated flood management by 20XX.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider editing to: “Establish guidance, standards, policies, and procedures that fund and implement projects and activities that contribute to a system-wide approach to integrated flood management by 20XX.”</li> <li>• Add statutory changes to the objective.</li> <li>• Consider clarifying that the intent is to develop the ability to</li> </ul>

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<p>tap multiple sources of funding for multiple activities. A potential management action could say that the state needs to develop a mechanism whereby state agencies can work together and join funds more effectively than they do today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add “system-wide” to the glossary to clarify the scope of this objective.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use</b>	
Develop consistent guidelines for land management within floodplains and floodways by 20XX.	Note that the CVFPP doesn't have jurisdiction in floodplains.
Contribute to the maintenance of a viable agricultural industry and acknowledging the environmental value of agricultural lands by preserving XX acres of agricultural lands within the flood management system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify that “flood management system” mainly means “floodplains” and not “floodways.”</li> <li>• Consider a management action in which mitigation for agricultural land development comes in the form of agricultural land protection in adjacent levee-protected floodplains. This might require the state to set an equity mechanism for the instances in which land transfers are to areas outside of 200-year floodplains. This could be created as an annual payment to the area with mitigated lands so that the funding can contribute to ongoing O&amp;M. This merges the HCP/NCCP concept into the flood protection context.</li> <li>• If the objective is to preserve the existing area, consider basing the number of acres on projections of development.</li> <li>• Consider and clarify the scope of this objective. Is this for SPFC areas only?</li> </ul>
<b>Other Potential Objectives to Explore</b>	
Implement a long-term conservation strategy by 2017 that provides effective and efficient environmental mitigation for flood management activities on a system-wide basis, and results in lasting environmental benefits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edit the objective to say “develop a long-term conservation strategy.” The implementation of that strategy would be the management action.</li> <li>• The reason this objective is frequently not achieved is due to a lack of funding for ongoing O&amp;M. It would be useful to have a management action that provides a mitigation bank of dollars that can be used to fund these projects once they are identified.</li> <li>• Note that there are economy of scale results for both capital projects and O&amp;M.</li> </ul>
<b>New Objectives</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider a new objective that seeks to manage residual risk. There would be a management action that requires insurance for all property-holders within floodplains.</li> </ul>

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve project capability long-term, system-wide (especially downstream), and retain upstream infiltration and attenuation of peak flows.</li> </ul>

### Discussion of Valley-Wide Forum

Mike Harty provided an overview of the Valley-Wide Forum, which has been scheduled for February 3, 2010 at San Joaquin Delta College. The three basic purposes of the event will be to:

- Provide an opportunity for discussions among the members of the regional conditions work groups and the topic work groups;
- Provide an opportunity for engagement in the CVFPP by other FloodSAFE programs and projects, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers programs and projects; and
- Foster a high level of engagement by partners and interested parties in the development of the CVFPP.

The group affirmed Bill Edgar as the panel representative for the Lower Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group at the Valley-Wide Forum. During Meetings #7 and #8, work group partners will prepare information for the panel presentation and discussion.

Comment: It would make more sense for the fourth panel (DWR State Plan of Flood Control and Flood Control System Status Report; Integration with other programs) to be conducted first because of its importance.

Q: Do you have a sense of what the utility of the CVFPP will be? Will it be a vision document, or project-based, or guidance for implementation?

A: That is still being determined to some extent, but the document will not be project-specific.

### Next Steps, Action Item Review, Meeting Recap

Pierre Stephens reviewed the action items from Meeting #6. Pierre Stephens and Mike Harty thanked the work group members for their participation and adjourned the meeting.