



## Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

### Meeting Summary **Draft**

### Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

**Time:** December 10, 2009, 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
**Location:** Department of Water Resources  
 1416 Ninth Street, Room 1142, Sacramento, CA 95814  
 Presentations and Materials Available Online at [www.water.ca.gov/cvfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfm)

#### MEETING ATTENDANCE:

##### Members Present:

Name	Organization
Ronald Baldwin	Office of Emergency Services
Todd Bruce	The Dutra Group, Hearing Board Member, Solano/Yolo Air Quality Management District
Marci Coglianese	Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Subcommittee
Mark Connelly	San Joaquin County Flood Management Division
Kara DiFrancesco	Natural Heritage Institute
Linda Fiack	Delta Protection Commission
Karen Medders	North Delta CARES
Chris Neudeck	KSN Inc., Sacramento San Joaquin Delta, CCVFCA, Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency, Habitat Advisory Committee to Delta Levee Subventions Program
Brooke Schlenker	US Army Corps of Engineers
Jan Vick	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Jane Wagner-Tyack	Restore the Delta / League of Women Voters of San Joaquin County

##### Team Present:

Bryan Brock	California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Eric Poncelet	Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team)
Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) (Facilitation Team)
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting
Robert Yeadon	DWR, Regional Coordinator
Josh Yang	MWH (Technical Team)
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH (Technical Team)

##### Observers:

David Van Riju, US Army Corps of Engineers

#### WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

	ITEM	OWNER	TIMEFRAME
1.	Homework (Review Chapters 4 & 5, submit request for paper or CD copy of the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) to either Bryan Brock (DWR) or Christal Love (CCP))	Work Group	12/21/09
2.	Schedule location for meeting #8	Bryan Brock	12/21/09

3.	Distribute electronic version of the Process Goals Discussion feedback form to the Work Group Members, and request feedback by December 18 <sup>th</sup> date	Christal Love	12/14/09
4.	Coordinate with Mark Connelly, San Joaquin County Flood Management Division, when scheduling the local government presentation for San Joaquin County	Christi Black	12/21/09
5.	Provide more detailed information regarding the Valleywide Forum to Work Group members	Christi Black	12/21/09

**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 December 10, 2009 with the following actions:

- Review Topic Work Group progress and upcoming 2010 deadlines
- Continue Discussion of CVFPP Objectives
- Review contents of Chapters 4 and 5 of the RCR
- Discuss Preliminary Feedback on Process Goals

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 SUMMARY**

**MEETING OBJECTIVES**

- Review Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and early 2010 (Schedule for Document Review)
- Continue Discussion of Objectives and Walk Through RSR Chapter 4
- Request Preliminary Feedback
- Discuss Next Steps

**SUMMARY:**

**Welcome and Greetings**

Eric Poncelet (K&W) opened the meeting, 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.

**Opening Remarks**

Ken Kirby (Kirby Consulting) delivered opening remarks and thanked the Work Group members for their continued participation. He then gave the group an overview of the responses to questions from meetings #5 and #6.

#### Discussion:

- The Work Group discussed the list of communities DWR has been making presentations to regarding the CVFPP and agreed that the best way to track the presentation schedule was via the CVFPP SharePoint site. Mr. Kirby noted that most of the presentations have been with planners rather than planning commissioners. It was suggested that Mark Connelly, San Joaquin County Flood Management Division, be contacted when scheduling the presentation for San Joaquin County (**see Action Item #4**).
- A Work Group member stated that the proposed actions in the CVFPP are going to shut down some communities that will be unable to demonstrate adequate flood protection progress. They asked to have the deadlines pushed back so there is more time to prepare solutions. Mr. Kirby responded that all communities of 10,000 residents or more cannot approve any form of development if said development is located within the 500 year flood map unless they prove they have 200 year flood protection or have taken steps to achieve it.
- A Work Group member questioned whether the CVFPP is based on accurate hydrologic information. Mr. Kirby replied that the interim levee design criteria will set the level and that within the criteria DWR will define what happens when the new hydrology studies are completed.
- A Work Group member noted that in the history of flood control, cities have not been asked to go back and revise their flood protection systems. Mr. Kirby disagreed, referred the group to the American River, stating that the hydrology has changed how it has been managed over the years. He suggested writing the criteria so that if the hydrology comes in different than it is now, there would be a timeframe in which to change the way it is managed.
- A Work Group member asked whether DWR was looking at how the CVFPP interfaces with the Climate Change mandates. Mr. Kirby replied that DWR was going to define what 200 year flood protection means, and stated that DWR wants to write meaningful criteria that will be tied to what local communities are going to be asked to do.
- The Work Group discussed the integration of the planning requirements in regard to flood protection and agreed that this is a topic for a future Work Group to address in the next phase?
- The Work Group discussed the implications of the City of Fresno not being included within the CVFPP boundary.

### **Review of Previous Meeting Action Items**

Bryan Brock (DWR) provided an overview of the status of the action items from meeting 6, stating that all of the action items had been completed. He noted that it is important for Work Group members to let either himself or Christal Love (CCP) know if they would like to receive paper copies of the CVFPP documents. The group agreed to consider asking for the documents on a CD as well by December 21<sup>st</sup> 2009 (**see Action Item #1**). A Work Group member suggested holding meeting #8 at either the Clarksburg community church or the Walnut Grove Library. Mr. Brock said he would look into those two locations (**see Action Item #2**).

### **Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and Early 2010**

Vanessa Nishikawa (MWH) reviewed the near-term communications and engagement milestones and 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**). She also explained what would be covered during meeting #8 and what was included in RCR Chapters 4 and 5 that had recently been sent out for review. Ms. Nishikawa provided the group with an update on the progress of the Topic Work Groups. Ms. Nishikawa then reviewed the CVFPP development process, and explained recent accomplishments and outlined next steps. She described the transition from the regional perspective to the system-wide perspective. She explained the final steps that hopefully will occur in 2012.

#### Discussion:

- A Work Group member asked when more detailed information regarding the Valleywide Forum will be released and how the invitations would be handled (**see Action Item #5**). Ms. Nishikawa replied that MWH is currently working on an announcement for the forum and that the firm Ogilvy Public Relations is currently handling the invitations.
- The Work Group discussed various invitation options for the forum, including targeting the chairs of applicable boards, putting notices in organizational newsletters and distributing information via the DWR and Water Plan electronic news lists.
- A Work Group member commented that there seemed to be a lack of integration between CVFPP and all the other projects/programs occurring right now. Mr. Kirby acknowledged the issue and responded that this has continued to be a challenge for DWR. He stated that right now DWR is focusing on getting through this phase of the project so momentum is not lost. DWR is reevaluating the process for the next phase.
- A Work Group member suggested taking a break between the release of the RCR and the next phase. Mr. Kirby responded that DWR needs to begin defining the criteria for the urban levees and all the potential management actions. He described his recent interest in a new approach that would involve selecting two regions to serve as CVFPP pilot studies. He identified the Yolo Bypass as a potential focal area and asked the Work Group for input regarding another area. A member commented that if DWR does pick the Yolo Bypass as a pilot study area, they will need to coordinate with BDCP. A member stated that if lower San Joaquin was chosen, there is a feasibility study that could be focused on. Mr. Kirby responded that the pilot study would not do exactly what the feasibility study is doing but would be similar. A member suggested looking into the existing Lower Yolo Bypass Forum that already has an established group of stakeholders. Mr. Kirby thanked the group for their helpful suggestions and stated that doing two pilots would not mean DWR can solve anything problem that arises, but rather that DWR wants to take what they learn from the pilot studies and bring that information to future work groups.

### Continued Discussion of Objectives (Walk Through Chapter 4)

Ms. Nishikawa explained the steps MWH has taken to incorporate comments on the draft objectives presented in Chapter 4 and asked the Work Group to focus on the 11x17 table that shows the evolution of changes to the objectives.

Mr. Poncelet then asked the Work Group to review each of the objectives and voice any serious concerns they may have. The Work Group provided the following comments:

Objectives to be Explored	Work Group member Comments
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>• This objective needs a clarifier.</li> </ul>
Develop a set of guidelines for providing flood protection to rural communities and agricultural areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley by December 31, 2025	<p>Mr. Kirby stated that he had concerns about this objective regarding the date and the fact that it would not be a CVFPP objective if it is part of the plan itself. He reminded the Work Group that an objective needs to be things DWR is planning to accomplish after the plan is adopted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objective looks good, but is the date a typo?</li> <li>• A definition for rural communities is needed; what is the difference between rural area and rural communities.?</li> </ul>
Increase 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, by 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the phrase “in a manner consistent” refer to vegetation on levees?</li> <li>• The riparian habitat always seems to include shaded riverine aquatic habitat, but the definition is not clear. Mr. Kirby responded that DWR has recently established a team to work on this issue which includes Gail Newton. He then reminded the group that the ecosystem restoration objectives have to be tied directly to improving flood management.</li> </ul>

<p>Increase floodplain 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shaded riverine habitat can create problems relative to flooding. Mr. Kirby responded that there is literature on shaded riverine habitat and that it can provide a safe harbor to certain species. The health of the species (primarily due to temperature) is dependent on the habitat.</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>	<p>Mr. Kirby stated that he was not convinced that the measurement of this objective is correct. DWR is currently looking at what other measurements could be used. He then stated that there are many groups that believe that the flood protection system would work better if there was better connectivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there something in more detail that lists the needs of native fish in an inundated flood plane?</li> <li>• The multi-objective language originally included was better. Mr. Kirby responded that he thought the multi-objective text was too general.</li> <li>• Suggest changing it to read: Increase the area (by TBD acres) and frequency of inundated floodplain habitat within the flood management system that provides conditions suitable for spawning and/or rearing native fish by 20XX.</li> </ul>
<p>Establish a system-wide / streamlined permitting process to reduce the cost and duration of obtaining permits for design and construction, maintenance, and recovery by 2015.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design construction and maintenance of what?</li> <li>• The timeframe should be reduced.</li> <li>• What does streamlined permitting mean? Mr. Kirby responded that DWR wants to have a systematic view of permitting as well.</li> <li>• Does this address the restrictions of the permit? Mr. Kirby responded that it is meant to look at the whole effectiveness of the permit.</li> </ul>
<p>Develop and implement an emergency preparedness plan for all areas covered by the CVFPP that includes elements to incorporate interagency communications to address flood risk, warning and notification, and hazard communication elements by 20XX.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work group developed an objective at meeting 5 that dealt with emergency management. Where did it go? Ms. Nishikawa responded that the suggested emergency management objective would be put back in.</li> <li>• Simply stating the need to have an emergency preparedness plan diminishes the value of this objective. It does not appear that the CVFPP is very interested in emergency management. Mr. Kirby responded that he was under the impression that there is a group in DWR working with communities on an emergency response plan. Several Work Group members expressed a concern that DWR was not adequately involving community members in the plan development.</li> <li>• The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and DWR are currently working on this; now that they have the memorandum of agreement the Corp will move forward with interviews.</li> <li>• Tell Secretary Chrisman or Lester Snow that DWR needs to do something real regarding emergency response. Give the flood operations center authority to spend money, so this group can feel confident that DWR can respond quickly if there is a flood. The flood response tomorrow would be worse than it was in 1997. The money ought to be down at the local level. \$50 million should be provided so that districts can get loans to deal with their problems.</li> </ul>
<p>Divert 50% of the current overdraft, as defined by the state water plan, acre-feet per year (average annual) flood flows to provide conjunctive use benefits by 2050.</p>	<p>Mr. Kirby stated that he did not think this groundwater objective should be part of CVFPP.</p>
<p>Establish statutory guidance, standards, policies, and procedures to fund and implement projects and activities that contribute to a system-wide approach to integrated flood management by 2012.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective does not work because of the date.</li> </ul>
<p>Maintain the viability of agriculture in the flood management system by creating compensation and safe harbor agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does viability of agriculture mean? This is a management action not an objective.</li> <li>• This objective needs a completion date.</li> </ul>

for flood easements.	
----------------------	--

Work group members were invited to provide additional comments on the objectives following the meeting.

**Preliminary Feedback**

Mr. Poncelet asked the Work Group to provide written feedback on the Process Goals Discussion handout. The feedback is compiled is below.

1. Thinking about the goals for the workgroup effort, to what extent did your Regional Conditions Work Group achieve these goals?

PROCESS GOALS	OUTCOME
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a meaningful opportunity for participants to work together and with DWR to develop content for the Regional Conditions Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meaningfulness has yet to be determined in terms of how this work is actualized.</li> <li>Very organized, beneficial and done as well as could be expected due to challenging topic.</li> <li>Somewhat successful – the speed at which the process moved forward likely limited the amount of input / review the group was capable of doing.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Meaningful will depend on output. Output not complete.</li> <li>Was meaningful, the effectiveness of our input will only be seen in final document.</li> <li>Very well.</li> <li>The timeframe / schedule was so quick the discussion had to be curtailed on occasion. As a result we didn't do the refined quality work we are capable of. Good people staffed our work group and attempted to compensate.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct the work group an open, fair and unbiased manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met extremely well – excellent facilitation.</li> <li>Ken Kirby contributed to honest atmosphere.</li> <li>Successful.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Accomplished.</li> <li>Everyone able to participate, ideas captured well.</li> <li>Very well.</li> <li>I am very satisfied that all work group members were treated fairly. What is not clear is how the input from the various work groups was balanced.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Record work group discussions in a fair and unbiased manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intent was there and this goal was most often met – at times were discrepancies but these seemed based on a lack of understanding on the part of recorder.</li> <li>DWR willing to go extra mile to make sure everyone heard.</li> <li>Successful, although review times impacted the clarity of the process.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Fair.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accomplished.</li> <li>Everyone able to participate, ideas captured well.</li> <li>Very well.</li> <li>Definitely.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a venue for work group participants to work together cooperatively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall good, but at times debates over the same issues occurred repetitively and took time out from the group in what I view as an unproductive manner.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Successful, open discussions with the full group were very successful – breakout groups limited exposure to meaningful discussion at times.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Accomplished.</li> <li>Built up a good group – some apparently stopped, core was good working group.</li> <li>Very well.</li> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide opportunities for partners and other interested parties to review and comment on how DWR used their input</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lots of opportunities to review and comment, but still a bit unclear on the extent to which input will be used.</li> <li>Very good dissemination of information.</li> <li>Limited by time/speed of the process, but still successful overall.</li> <li>Jury is out. We will see hopefully how DWR uses this document.</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>To be determined!</li> <li>Cannot comment.</li> <li>Very well – this process is one of the most open to public I’ve seen so far.</li> <li>Yes, but too rushed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage work group participants, which, as a group, represent the views and interests of this region in the development of the Regional Conditions Summary Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent.</li> <li>I don’t know if our input really reflects how strongly Delta member feel about issues.</li> <li>Successful.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Good.</li> <li>Accomplished.</li> <li>Everyone was very engaged, some important discussions.</li> <li>Very well.</li> <li>This is a coalition of the willing participation was solicited and of those who responded, it’s the usual suspects but not all interests.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide access to relevant information needed in order to participate effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent, but if anything too much info – particularly regarding the extensive resource list.</li> <li>All was available.</li> <li>Challenged by volumes of material and multiple revisions of documents.</li> <li>Went to fast to assemble it all.</li> <li>Okay.</li> <li>Access yes, not enough time to thoughtfully process. Too rushed!</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> <li>• Very well – when something was asked for, every effort made to provide doc or link to doc.</li> <li>• Yes, but the SharePoint site and e-mail system had a lot of early bumps to be worked out. Okay now. Thanks.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct an effective and efficient work group process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent</li> <li>• Everything was organized and on task.</li> <li>• Overall, successful.</li> <li>• Good.</li> <li>• Okay</li> <li>• Process too rushed.</li> <li>• Well done.</li> <li>• Very well done.</li> <li>• The desire of the process is very good but assumes a fair level of process sophistication to understand the principles, goals, and objectives format.</li> </ul>

2. Thinking about the Regional Conditions Work Group process, what worked?

- Some large group discussion, but even more so the breakout groups worked well.
- Facilitation by consultants – I think they did an excellent job keeping the group on task.
- Openness and understanding of group members to opposing viewpoints.
- DWR was open to group ideas, did not steer thinking one way or the other.
- Open discussions, live edits / revisions, input on concepts (etc) that affect the overall plan/product.
- Clean process laid out.
- Format of meetings good. More of an engineer not really a planner sometimes got lost in planning level discussions. Would certainly of liked more objective process but I understand a plan is necessary.
- Multiple regions good however not enough interaction between groups
- Timeframe rushed!
- The step-by-step process, building on what went before. Make-up of group was good. Variety of viewpoints and expertise / interests.
- Mixing up various viewpoint or expertise with others to broaden all perspectives and gain insight to all issues represented at the table.
- Very good facilitation. Due to people being spread thin, not all the agency people were at all the meetings. Same problem with attendance by work group members. Good formatting i.e. process design, once we got a hang of it, it helped speed things along. Very good meeting notes helped a lot.

3. As we move to the next phase, what changes would improve the effectiveness of the Regional Work Groups? (What features of this process do you think should be used to make the next round of work on Management Actions be more effective and efficient?)

- More discussion, less lecture
- More small group work
- Comments on summaries as amount of data will be overwhelming.
- Slow down. Allow people to comment more on concepts that will influence the document. Hold off on multiple reviews of chapters / documents until the major concepts have been laid out (by the group), then put the product together for the major review.
- Break groups into functional specialty (issue teams). At meetings issue teams address their issues separately. They present to larger group which can input but small specialty group

has final say. Project team resolves issues. When larger group of diverse expertise address all issues you waste people's time because they may only participate part of the time. There is more tendency than to drift and get off subject. Larger groups tend to drift more.

- Break groups into "issue teams". Issue team meet meeting objectives for their issue, issue teams present to the group, the group can comment but issue team has last say.
- Become more objective & develop actual management options.
- All day meetings allow time to get input into plan despite not always having time to draft written comments.
- Slow down.
- Focus.
- Was too compressed. Some topics needed more in-depth area several meeting to really provide excellent contribution, outside responsibilities interfered in this tight time-frame.
- Combining knowledgeable people from each region into one subcommittee – very effective to gaining the system wide perspective especially in the early stages of this process.
- Try to keep the Delta Regional Groups (and other regional groups) together and build on the work already accomplish. Won't have to define terms and process. Can dig deeper.

4. What are the other Lessons Learned? (Items to consider include meeting length and frequency, meeting materials, discussions, review and feedback and meeting support – or whatever "lessons learned" you would like to suggest.)

- Everything okay, considering topic.
- Some meetings could have probably been condensed to half day or less. The process has required a lot out of the participants. If possible, just slow down.
- Meeting pre very thorough. A lot of information to digest but if one had the time the information was there to review and comment on.
- Unbelievable hosts as far as meetings go with the lunches / pastries / coffee etc. Great job!
- With meetings more spread out would be helpful to have meeting materials a week (at least) before to have time to review and have ideas ready. Some people don't think "fast on their feet". Frequently too fast – didn't have enough review time, particularly in early stages.
- I think overall process is good – making changes to the process immediately upon recognition of what was thought would work to what will work – work document flow etc.

## **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**

