

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #6

November 19, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:30 pm

**Location: Yolo County Farm Bureau
69 W Kentucky Ave
Woodland, CA 95695**

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
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
Ryan Luster	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	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
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCFVCA	Member
David van Rijn	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Member
Amy Lyons	California Department of Fish and Game	Alternate
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP Program Manager
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO*
Joseph Bartlett	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
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

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

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

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
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	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
Jas O'Growney	Tehama County RCD	Member
Marty Stripling	River Garden Farms Co., Sacramento River Westside Levee District, Reclamation Districts 108 and 787	Member

*Alternate attended in their place

ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK:

- Determine 12/7 and January meeting locations
- Solicit availability for January meeting
- Enable easy document download
- Develop concise topic work group summary & explanation as to how work is incorporated into CVFMP
- E-mail out local jurisdiction presentation to work group
- E-mail map from SVFCAWG
- Work group comments on SPFC by December 1

Please e-mail homework to Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com or Dan McManus at mcm Manus@water.ca.gov. If you prefer to fax, you can fax your input to the attention of Erica Bishop at (916) 924-9102.

MEETINGS SCHEDULE:

Meeting #7

Time: 10 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Date: December 7, 2009
Place: TBD

Future Meetings:

- Jan 21-27, 2010
- February 3, 2010: Valley-Wide Forum at San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Mendocino National Forest 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 #6 was to continue developing and reviewing content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report, with the following specific goals:

1. Discuss roadmap for remainder of 2009 and early 2010
2. Provide overview of Regional Conditions Summary outline
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

Dan McManus, DWR Lead, and meeting facilitator Austin McInerney 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 reviewed new definitions added to the Glossary, including a definition of agricultural stewardship developed by the agricultural stewardship subcommittee.

Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and Early 2010

Roger Putty of MWH, Technical Lead, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Regional Conditions Work Group timeline, including a new Meeting #8 that will be held in late January prior to the Valley-wide Forum. This meeting will give work group members an opportunity to review the entire Regional Conditions Report, Chapters 1-4. Meetings #7 and #8 would both be half-day meetings. Meeting #8 would be held in the January 21-27 timeframe. It would include a presentation by the topic work groups.

Work Group Members were asked their preferences for the December 7 meeting time. Meeting from 10 AM to 2 PM would make driving easier during the winter fog season, one Member suggested.

Comment: The e-mail link to the SPFC document didn't work.

Response: The technical team will resolve the issue and resend the link.

Q: How is the work of the topic work groups going to be integrated into the report?

A: The input is being integrated in the drafts you see.

Q: Is the O&M work group working on a manual? Our county operates under an O&M manual. We would need to sign a new manual before we could agree to do things differently. There is a legal issue there.

A: The work group is dealing with problems and issues, not producing a manual.

Comment: The process would not necessarily result in changing O&M manuals; the aims are to streamline the process, and to make it easier to do O&M.

A: Part of the task of the Flood Control System Status Report is to gather all the manuals and report on their status.

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

Outline of Regional Conditions Summary

Roger Putty gave a PowerPoint presentation on the potential outline for the Regional Conditions Summary and reviewed a handout on the potential outline.

Questions on the Outline

Technical Team Members provided the following information in response to questions:

- The "Level of Agreement" section is intended to capture the degree to which different perspectives agree or disagree on the various issues. The intent is to capture the level of agreement on goals, objectives and the like. Work group members will have an opportunity to read a draft version.
- The "Lessons Learned" section is to summarize what has been learned from this process, to address and bring into development of the next document development process. Is this work group process working, or can it be improved upon? It will be important to get work group members' input on this question, and gathering that may include a confidential questionnaire.

Work Group Members provided the following comments:

General Comments on the Outline

- How is it specific to a region? If it's all melded into one, how do you know what problems are where, and how to identify where the fixes are needed? A report for each region is preferred. (It was noted in response that Chapter 2 talks in specifics about the five regions.)
- It doesn't seem that there has been sufficient time to develop a comprehensive document for the whole Central Valley. Regional sections are needed first.
- Legislative representatives think in terms of their region.
- Include information about how this relates to the BDCP
- In the Introduction, the information on flood risk in the Central Valley should be more than one short paragraph.
- Under Interim Findings, place Problems and Opportunities after Requirements, so they are defined in the context of goals, objectives and requirements.
- Historical context should have a section of its own: Flood Control Development History
- "Interim" suggests that there will be final findings later. Perhaps replace with "Findings to Date."
- The term "swim lane" was unclear.
- Perhaps the labeling could be changed. "Interim Findings" is more like "Framework" and would include goals, objectives, principles and requirements. A new heading called "Preliminary Determinations" could include Problems and Opportunities, Level of Agreement and Lessons Learned.
- Perhaps Lessons Learned would be better as a stand-alone internal separate document. Someone not involved in this process wouldn't need to see it.
- The document needs to read clearly that SB 162 doesn't apply to the whole planning area, as many of its requirements are far-reaching.

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

Roger Putty gave a PowerPoint presentation on the revised drafts of Chapters 1, 2 and 3, including a summary of the major topics of comments received.

Comment: It is difficult to find the changes without track changes.

Review Revised Goals and Problems Statements

4

November 19, 2009

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

Roger Putty gave a PowerPoint presentation on the revised CVFPP Goals and Problems Statements. The work group reviewed a handout on the latest revision.

Overall Comments:

- Sentences are too long. Make the first sentence the problem statement. Follow that sentence with "This is caused by..."
- The first column is labeled "Problems and Opportunities" but does not include opportunities, just problems. Perhaps make the second column "Goals and Opportunities," and include any opportunities there, perhaps as bulleted items.
- Use consistent language throughout the document -- is the Sacramento San Joaquin watershed the same or different from the Sacramento San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento San Joaquin Drainage District?
- Concern was expressed that the language is so general that, if the public reads problems/opportunities/goals, they will miss the message.

Handout with Proposed Revisions Underlined and Comments:

Problems and Opportunities	Work Group Comments
CVFPP Problems and Opportunities	
<p>Flood Risk – 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>Edit to:</p> <p>Flood Risk – The Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley has been subject to flooding and increased flood risk to people and property due to physical <u>failures</u> 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>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The language skirts around the issues. Why? Levees were not designed appropriately. ▪ The whole statement bothers me. Facilities built to deal with floods need to be used for that purpose - - not multiple purposes. ▪ Does this refer to housing or farmland as problematic?

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

Problems and Opportunities	Work Group Comments
<p>Operation and Maintenance, and Repair – 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>Edit to:</p> <p>Operation and Maintenance, and Repair – 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>Comments:</p> <p>The wording makes it sound like one giant system design is there, but that's not the way it was designed. "Flood management systems" doesn't match.</p>
<p>Ecosystem – The development of the flood management systems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley have contributed to the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of native habitats and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.</p>	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Ecosystem – The development of the flood management systems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley have contributed to the loss, fragmentation, and degradation of native habitats and species, and adversely impacted natural hydrologic, geomorphologic, and biologic processes.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Suggest rolling ecosystem goal into policy/institutional and/or other resource and needs.</p> <p>My breakout group felt that ecosystem is not an appropriate stand alone 'problem'. The conflict between natural processes & flood management is the problem. Therefore it is an institutional/policy & multi-purpose problem. We should keep the ecosystem restoration, however it should be added//incorporated w/the aforementioned problems. NOTE; Amy Lyons representing DFG was in my group & noted objective from the ecosystem goal was too much like mitigation & metrics were not effectively achieving the goal.</p> <p>The system as is does protect the environment in some areas, why is this not noted?</p> <p>This speaks to the need for a separate opportunities column.</p>

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

Problems and Opportunities	Work Group Comments
<p>Policy and Institutional – 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>Edit to:</p> <p>Policy and Institutional – 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>Comments:</p> <p>We have conflicting maintenance regulations from all agencies, why aren't we on the same page?</p>
<p>Other Water Resources and Needs – Conventional, single-purpose projects are likely to create incompatible outcomes or missed opportunities to address water resources and other needs in the system.</p>	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Other Water Resources and Needs – Conventional, single-purpose projects <u>may [DELETE are likely to]</u> create incompatible outcomes or missed opportunities to address water resources and other needs in the system.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This sounds like a potential problem rather than an existing problem ▪ Look at water code 9212

CVFPP Goals	Work Group Comments
<p>Improve Flood Risk Management and Reduce Flood Damage – 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"> • On lands currently receiving protection from facilities of the SPFC • In the Delta • In other areas of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley 	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Improve Flood Risk Management and Reduce Flood Damage – Identify, coordinate, and implement structural and non-structural projects and actions that improve public safety, preparedness, [DELETE and] emergency response <u>and public awareness</u> and reduce flood damages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On lands currently receiving protection from facilities of the SPFC • In the Delta • In other areas of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley <p>Comments:</p>

CVFPP Goals	Work Group Comments
	<p>In general throughout this document there is reference to flood management and flood risk management. The wording should be flood protection and management. It is a flood protection plan. Why are they building levees? Protection. Disagree with the idea that this language would give a false sense of hope.</p>
<p>Facilitate and Streamline Operation and Maintenance of the Flood Management System – 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>Edit to:</p> <p><u>Improve System Performance. Modify Operation, Maintenance and Repair in Ways... Facilitate and Streamline Operation and Maintenance of the Flood Management System</u> – <u>Adjust, coordinate, and streamline regulatory and institutional standards funding, and practices. [DELETE reduce]</u> Improve system-wide maintenance and repair requirements by modifying the flood management systems in ways that are compatible with natural processes.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to make sure system performance is expected. ▪ Nowhere here does it say, "build to 200-year requirements, maintain it better." This is purely an environmental fix; it misses the hard and fast stuff. ▪ The words are there, but you have to look hard. The language is not clear and concise. ▪ Future new designs should incorporate a reduced/easier O&M into them, add a new line. Differentiate between new construction O&M and current system O&M. ▪ The point of the whole process & reality is the existing system, how can we fix or alter it. We don't need a wish list of new ideas. Concentrate more on current; it's too hard to mix all together. ▪ "Improve" covers all. "Reduce" is asking for trouble. ▪ I don't think we want to do that - reduce maintenance and repair requirements. ▪ Suggest reduced maintenance on a new levee, can't imagine funding agency would allow a levee to grow over etc. Investment won't be protected, this is not intent. ▪ Promoting multi-benefit projects can incorporate these improvements but should try to improve O&M on current.

CVFPP Goals	Work Group Comments
<p>Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System – Develop flood management system improvements that incorporate the recovery and restoration of -self-sustaining ecological functions, native habitats, and species, where feasible.</p>	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Restore Ecosystem Functions in the Flood Management System – Develop, <u>operate and maintain</u> flood management system improvements that incorporate the recovery and restoration of -self-sustaining ecological functions, native habitats, and species, where feasible.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compared to the last draft, this is watered down. "Develop, operate and maintain" is now just "develop." This discounts other actions. ▪ "Management system improvements" needs clarity. ▪ Need to wordsmith this. It is inferring that the levee itself will incorporate habitats, as opposed to the system. ▪ Go back to the original statements -- "physical processes" has been removed. ▪ The last two words make this seem optional. Why does this category have caveats and not the others? Where does the terminology come from? Is it in the legislation?
<p>Improve Institutional Support – 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>Edit to:</p> <p>Improve Institutional Support – Develop stable institutional structures, <u>funding</u> 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>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the definition of "institutional structures"? ▪ Replace "structures" with "processes"?
<p>Promote Multi-Benefit Projects – Identify and implement feasible flood management projects and actions that also contribute to related water resources benefits and other needs.</p>	

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

Review Revised Principles

Roger Putty reviewed the revised CVFPP Principles with the group. The group provided the following suggested changes, additions shown in underline and deletions shown in brackets, and comments to the draft document:

Revised Draft Principles	Work Group Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach flood risk management on a system-wide basis and avoid (where possible) or mitigate adverse impacts. 	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach flood [DELETE risk] management on a system-wide basis and avoid (where possible) or mitigate adverse impacts. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term "flood risk management" is not consistent with the rest of document. This narrows the focus too much. Just "flood management." We haven't talked about "reduce flood risk" anywhere. Another partner view: Basic premise is to reduce flood risk and this isn't stated. Risk is what we want to say, not everyone is protected, and we don't want to promise that, but reducing risk includes many things (education, etc.).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate land use planning with flood risk management. 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This item should be associated or combined with item 7 on providing accurate information and flood preparedness. It should be up to the CVFPP to make sure needed information is provided to counties in regards to land use. Land-use planning is not what the CVFPP does. Add explanatory text; local governments say they already do this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage and support flood management projects and programs that offer multiple or regional benefits. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and restore natural floodplain processes and promote environmental stewardship. 	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and [DELETE restore] <u>rehabilitate</u> natural floodplain processes <u>where feasible</u> and promote environmental stewardship. <p>Comments:</p> <p>WG CONSENSUS ON THE TERM "REHABILITATE."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The way this is worded is not good. Need to change to say how we get to this process without going all the way back to pre-system. "Restore" tries to turn the clock back too far. There's no way to have a natural process with dams. Perhaps "provide environmental benefits" rather than "natural processes." Consider goals and principles devised by environmental stewardship group.

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct flood protection infrastructure to minimize unexpected failures within design parameters. 	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct flood protection infrastructure to <u>reduce flood risk, improve flood capacity/conveyance and minimize</u> [DELETE unexpected] failures within <u>new</u> design parameters. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there expected failures?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote adaptive flood management strategies that respond to ongoing and future challenges such as climate change. 	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This item appears in problems, but not goals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accurate information about flood risks and flood preparedness to help residents, communities, and public officials make safer decisions. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage State investments to provide maximum public benefits. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide equitable access to decision process. 	
<p>Suggested New Principles:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote coordination and collaboration with other large State, federal, local, or regional planning efforts. 	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote coordination and collaboration with other [DELETE large] State, federal, local, or regional planning efforts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term system-wide goals for improving flood protection should include consideration of post-flood recovery. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the value of agriculture in communities and to the State's economy. 	<p>Edit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the value of <u>agricultural land</u> in communities and to the State's economy and its role in <u>regard to flood risk and recovery. Protect potential growth and sustainability of agricultural lands.</u> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at agricultural stewardship group's guiding principles here. • What does this have to do with flood protection? We don't have specific principles for any other interests. • This is attempting to capture the issue that people don't

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

	recognize the food value of agriculture in the context of flood management. It's not getting the same level of protection. If there is a reduced level of protection, there needs to be some compensation, or credit given.
--	---

Executive Sponsor's Remarks

Gary Hester, CVFMP Program Manager, provided the following updates:

- The project is about one third of the way through conducting its local jurisdictional briefings. Fresno, Shasta County and Colusa County have been briefed. Glenn County and the Sutter Buttes area will get briefings. The briefings presentation will be e-mailed out to work group members.
- The Levee Performance topic work group is wrapping up and will participate in interim levee design performance meetings.

Q: In regards to the 200-year requirements, who is responsible for the levees? My county maintains them, but the state owns them. I want everyone to be able to be clear on the process. What will happen with private levees? That will be an arduous task.

A: Most of the bond investment will be on state liability. The presentation includes a decision tree that local governments can work through. Outside the SPFC, the burden falls to locals to develop responses to the legislation.

Q: All we did was sign a maintenance agreement. The state owns the levee. Why are we now told we have to do this, when we don't own the levee?

A: Clearly the state has a responsibility to help urban areas covered by the SPFC. The intent of the legislation is to connect land-use decisions to flood control systems. This is related to development, approval of development. It is really big.

Q: If I have houses burn down, does each need to be protected to a 200 year level or not built?

A: I don't know enough about land-use to say. We need to check into that.

Comment: We don't have enough stream gauges to tell if a flood is a 200-year event or a 50-year event.

Response: I understand the challenge. It's really important that we have participation in developing the 200-year criteria early next year.

Comment: You'll come up with a design storm event -- no one can chase a fluctuating 200-year event.

Response: Yes.

Comment: We have barely talked about the legislation. Shouldn't the focus be on how to meet the 200-year flood protection?

Response: This is the key topic in developing the management actions next year.

Q: How do the 200-year flood protection requirements jibe with FEMA requirements, where the focus is to save structures?

A: There is a focus on saving lives. We are updating the hydrology -- it will take two years. It will identify the 200-year elevation and provide maps. You have worked really hard on this process -- I want to give you answers head on.

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

Comment: One thing to think about is the ambiguity in the language "urban or urbanizing," it seems to shut the door on non-urbanizing areas. It needs clarifying. Are we setting up a situation where communities will develop to 9950 units? It's not about the number -- it's about qualities or rates of growth, not quantity.

Continued Discussion of Objectives

Joseph Bartlett of DWR's Central Valley Flood Planning Office introduced the section, reviewing planning definitions and discussing the iterative process of developing objectives.

Dan McManus of DWR passed out copies of agricultural issues talking points developed by the Sacramento Valley Flood Control Action Workgroup, which speaks to problems and objectives to solve them.

Max Sakato said the Workgroup is composed of 37 entities, including both non-urban and urbanizing areas. He provided one correction to the document: on Page 1 of the Talking Points, Bullet 8, strike out the words "does not."

The Work Group provided the following comments and proposed changes:

Overall Comments:

1. Without being able to read the related Management Actions, a reader wouldn't understand what the intended objective really is. It was suggested that all related management actions be referred to from the objective, if not included as bullet items under the objective. Don't make it hard for people to find the management actions.
2. Objectives should be more specific and action oriented.
3. Ecosystem is not an appropriate stand alone 'problem'. The conflict between natural processes & flood management is the problem. Therefore it is an institutional/policy & multi-purpose problem. We should keep the ecosystem restoration goal, however it should be added//incorporated w/the aforementioned problems. NOTE; Amy Lyons representing DFG was in my group & noted objective from the ecosystem goal was too much like mitigation & metrics were not effectively achieving the goal.

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
Flood Risk	
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.	Group prefers language from the legislation, whether it is "provide" or "design." Perhaps "Evaluate, design and build" Suggested objective: Understand existing level of flood protection of the flood control system, and what the new 200-year capacity is for these levees.
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.	
Ecosystem Restoration	Once again, restoration is needed as an impact from

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

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	other goals; it seems out of place, just like the problem/opportunity statements.
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.	Specify XXX acres for each habitat type, not lumped together.
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.	
Streamlined Permitting	
Establish a system-wide/streamlined permitting process to reduce the cost and duration of obtaining permits for flood planning, maintenance, and recovery by 2015.	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Establish a system-wide/streamlined permitting process to avoid duplication and reduce the cost and duration of obtaining permits for flood planning, maintenance, preparedness, response, recovery, construction or rehabilitation by 2012-2015.</p> <p>Suggested objective:</p> <p>Make data available to expedite flood planning, O&M, preparedness, response, recovery (this is an attempt to develop an objective that would incorporate the clearinghouse management action).</p> <p>The clearinghouse management action should include all state and federal agencies, not just state agencies.</p>
Flood Preparedness and Response	
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>Edit to:</p> <p>Develop and implement an emergency preparedness plan for all areas covered by the CVFPP that includes elements to address flood risk, warning and notification, and hazard communication elements by 20XX.</p>
Operation and Maintenance	
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>Is 90% sufficient for urban areas?</p> <p>Suggested objective:</p> <p>Align state and federal levee standards.</p>

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

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
<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>	<p>Edit to:</p> <p>Improve the annual pass rate for non-urban project levees in the Central Valley by 30% up to XXX% when inspected according to Federal and State levee standards (e.g., maintenance, encroachment, etc.) by 2025.</p> <p>Suggested management action:</p> <p>Reevaluate criteria for levee inspections (intent here is to establish more reasonable criteria)</p>
<p>Education and Outreach</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>	
<p>Groundwater Recharge</p>	
<p>Use XXX acre-feet per year (average annual) flood flows to provide groundwater recharge benefits by 2050.</p>	
<p>Funding</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>	<p>Suggested Objectives:</p> <p>Provide and develop adequate sustainable funding for ongoing O&M to meet project requirements by streamlining permitting and O&M activities.</p> <p>Reduce O&M costs by providing funding to allow local maintaining agencies to do work in their own area, through programmatic permits.</p> <p>Suggested Management Action:</p> <p>Study successful and unsuccessful programmatic permit programs (ACIP) to guide implementation of such programs in the CVFPP area.</p>
<p>Land Use</p>	
<p>Develop consistent guidelines for land management within floodplains and floodways by 20XX.</p>	

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

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
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.	
Other Potential Objectives to Explore	
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.	Move to ecosystem restoration category instead

SPFC Descriptive Document

Michele Ng and Joseph Bartlett of DWR's Central Valley Flood Planning Office gave an overview of...

Q: There is an "opportunity for facility removal" section. What type of facilities would be removed?

A: This would not include removing protection from anyone. This would address facilities that are now obsolete due to natural processes or system changes.

Discussion of Valley-Wide Forum

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/>.