



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

December 7, 2009, 10:00 am – 2:00 pm

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

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	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
Ren Fairbanks	Farming, SRWP, BSAGU	Member
Pete Ghelfi	Sacramento Area Flood Control Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Jason Larrabee	Larrabee Farms, Glenn County	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency	Member
Ryan Luster	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Ben Pennock	GCID, Sacramento River Water Contractors, Glenn County Water Advisory Committee, Stony Creek Fan Conjunctive Water Management Group/ Partners. Association with groups: Technical Advisory Committee Representative	Member
Marty Stripling	River Garden Farms Co., Sacramento River Westside Levee District, Reclamation Districts 108 and 787	Member
Scott Tucker	Reclamation District No. 1500	Alternate
Gary Hester	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFMP Program Manager
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO*
Jim Eto	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

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Bev Anderson	Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum	Member
Patricia Bratcher	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Randy Dunn	City of Colusa	Member
Stuart Edell	Butte County Public Works	Member
Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	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
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	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

*Alternate attended in their place

ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK:

- Poll e-mailed to work group members regarding possible January meeting dates: January 19, 20, 21
- Determine January meeting date and more northern location (Willows area)
- Member comments on Chapter 4 & 5 by December 21
- Draft Regional Conditions Report out on January 4
- Draft Regional Conditions Summary out on January 13
- Member comments on report and summary due by January 27
- Develop/consider additional process feedback by December 21

Please e-mail homework to Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com or Dan McManus at mcmamus@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 #8

Time: TBD
Date: TBD
Place: TBD (Willows area)

Future Meetings:

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

Potential Meeting Locations:

- Sacramento Refuge Offices, Willows area
- Mendocino National Forest Office, Willows
- City or Glenn County Offices, Willows
- Colusa Industrial Park, Colusa
- City Offices, Colusa

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

MEETING OVERVIEW:

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The purpose for Meeting #7 was to continue developing and reviewing content for the Regional Conditions Report, with the following specific goals:

1. Discuss roadmap for remainder of 2009 and early 2010
2. Continued discussion of Objectives and walk through Chapter 4
3. Discuss next steps

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Meeting facilitator Austin McInerney welcomed the meeting participants, led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

DWR Lead Dan McManus reviewed Action Items from Meeting #6. In other items:

- He said problems seemed to have been worked out with work group member access to the SharePoint site. Please let the plan team know if any problems still exist.
- The Team is still working on a Topic Work Group Summary. The SharePoint site has summaries of the O&M, Levee and Climate Change topic work groups. The Environmental Stewardship summary will be up shortly, while a summary of the Agricultural Stewardship group will be completed in a few weeks.
- The presentation to the Glenn County Board of Supervisors has been postponed until January.

Roadmap for Remainder of 2009 and Early 2010 (Schedule for Document Review)

Roger Putty of MWH, Technical Lead, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Regional Conditions Work Group timeline. Objectives will be separated into their own chapter, Chapter 5. First version drafts of Chapter 4 and 5 will be e-mailed out to work group members that day. The full draft Regional Conditions Report will be made available on January 4 and the draft Regional Conditions Summary on January 13. The draft documents are being released in full form, as work group members requested this so that they could review the entire document at one time. There will be several weeks to review the documents before Meeting #8.

January Meeting Date

Work Group Members have been polled on their availability for a January meeting on January 21, 25-27. In order to explore dates when more members may be available, a poll will be sent out to see what availability would be for January 19-21.

Work group members also asked for a more convenient northerly location, such as Red Bluff or Chico. Since some work group members had previously asked for a meeting location in the Colusa area, meeting in the Willows area was suggested. A possible location is the Sacramento Refuge offices near Willows.

Overview of Chapters 4 & 5 and Continued Discussion of Objectives (Chapter 5)

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Roger Putty, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, discussed the organization, contents and schedule of Chapter 4, which covers goals and principles, and Chapter 5, which covers objectives and next steps.

Members will receive the latest drafts of these chapters in e-mails that day. The drafts incorporate all input from Meeting #6. Comments on the drafts are due by December 21.

Any suggested objectives that the technical team views as management actions are being captured and will be seeds for the next phase starting in February or March of 2010. There will be several iterations of the objectives as they are worked through in the next phase.

Refinement of CVFPP Objectives

One Work Group Member suggested the CVFPP Requirements handout would be helpful to use in this exercise to review if objectives are in sync with the legislation. The document was copied and handed out for Work Group Members to use during the exercise.

Overall Comments:

- Work group members expressed concern about blank columns for the Upper Sacramento Work Group for some objectives, when they believed they had provided recommended language. Plan team members noted that Upper Sacramento input in these cases was actually the Original Draft Objective shown in the table that other work groups responded to.

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
Flood Risk	<p>Other Potential Objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested flood risk measurement objective language: Define and characterize a uniform process to manage flood risk. Is that general enough to be considered an objective?
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"> The objective doesn't address climate change -- does "200-year level" mean the last 200 years or climate change-influenced levels? Reference to page 3 of CVFPP Requirements, Item F. (Response: Climate change has been folded into the goals and principles, and will guide how objectives are met and implemented.) The state will have to move from "200-year" to "design storm." Suggested change: Change "200-year" to "design storm." Comment: The legislation says "200 year." Suggested change: Add "[design storm]" after "200 year." Perhaps add a new objective: To integrate "design storm" into the criteria. It could be a management action related to this

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<p>objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition needed for "design storm." Because the management of a design storm is so critical - it relates to the President's executive order -- it needs a definition. ▪ Q: What is meant by Bullet #4 on Page 1 of the CVFPP Requirements document ("... expanding or increasing use of floodway corridors")? A: setting levies back, more bypasses. I'm fine with more floodway corridors, but if we are going to plug it up with habitat, I have a problem.
<p>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. [Original language: 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.]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the Lower Sacramento comment, the last bullet. ("Consider drafting a new objective that achieves the following: Work with upstream land users to ensure that flood management practices and land-use practices upstream are consistent, in order to ensure the capabilities of the projects long-term. This objective would also need to include an aspect of ownership/management.") This is an area of interest to me. Tag this for consideration. ▪ What kind of protection are we going to get in rural areas? I want as much as we can get. The State of California owes us at least 1957 water surface elevation level of protection. We need it so agricultural protection remains as we've been accustomed to the last 70-80 years. ▪ 100-year flood protection -- I don't think that's beneficial for our communities. I prefer the Lower Sacramento language ("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.]") ▪ The term "flood protection" in the two existing objectives needs a definition.
<p>Ecosystem Restoration</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>Increase floodplain habitat by XXX acres, in a manner consistent with risk reduction and flood capacity goals, with a focus on areas of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why define the number of acres? It seems arbitrary. (Response: We are looking for a way to quantify how that objective is met.) ▪ Isn't it all driven by the health of the environment or species recovery, if species are less threatened or endangered? What happens if the project meets the acreage requirements and everything is still in peril? ▪ Language suggestion: "In an adequate and

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
<p>habitat discontinuity and where wetlands can be restored, by 2025.</p>	<p>appropriate manner."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The whole objective is off target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Shaded riverine aquatic habitat" is not measured typically in acres ▪ The objective only covers one type of habitat ▪ The objective doesn't address the intent of the legislative requirements ▪ How do you qualify that the goal is accomplished and it is getting better? We've seen situations where you plan it, you turn it over, and that's it. Does it really work? Does it just let people get off the hook for mitigation? How do you qualitatively define that it works? ▪ This is the environmental equivalent of "Build an xxx-foot levee out of a good clay substrate." It's very specific, but it's not an objective -- you're not going to get species recovery and ecosystem protection. The CVFPP Requirements language (Bullet #3 on Page 1) calls for increasing habitat quality, quantity and function. It says it in clear terms, and this objective doesn't address it. ▪ As far as recommended language from the environmental organizations, there is no common currency. Perhaps "Increase the quantity, improve the quality and improve the function of habitat in the floodway." It shouldn't say "shaded riverine aquatic" -- that's just one component. The legislative language doesn't say mitigation for environmental damage -- it says improve the quality of the environment as the quality of flood protection improves. ▪ It was suggested to consider using words from the CFVPP requirements handout & language from water code that says "promote the recovery and stability of native species populations and overall biotic community diversity." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would that be a principle? ▪ How do you measure function? ▪ "Biotic diversity," from the Requirements language, is the objective. The only question is the amount: 50%? ▪ How about a reduction in the number of species listed, "reduce the number of listed and endangered species"? ▪ That would be hard to measure. What would be easy is acres. ▪ It would be important to craft language that focused on flood protection-related factors, so flood protection would not be on the hook for impacts caused by other systems. ▪ The CVFPP Requirements third bullet on page 1

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<p>uses the term "wherever feasible." Everybody has their own idea of what's feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perhaps the management actions would pin it down. ▪ Perhaps percentage of flood as part of that project rather than number of acres. The intent of the legislation is to do more for the environment, to be more holistic, but if there are specific numbers of acres, it may not be achievable down the road. ▪ It could be administrative -- an objective could be, "Is it consistent with the recovery plan for endangered species in the area?" ▪ The challenge is that engineers designed the flood protection project, and then regulatory comes in and says, this is the impact and this is the mitigation needed. What they're trying to get to here is before that discussion, you look at the project. How do you approach the project so the goal is in the project design, rather than after the fact? It's important to capture that objective. ▪ Are we changing this completely? It sounds like it. We will see what other work groups say. If it goes to identifying acres, we want to have connectivity and capturing agricultural values. You will have a lot of private property -- are you including how to measure the objective in regards to access to that land? Rephrasing this objective would address those issues. ▪ Suggestion: Create three objectives, each focusing on one of the 3 clauses in the Requirements language. Then add the quantification. ▪ If you are setting targets, you need to look at what has been done: if it's not quality habitat, why not? What can be done to improve that? ▪ Once again, it was mentioned that requiring XXX acres of only certain habitats is not a useful way to accomplish these objectives. ▪ Regarding the "increase floodplain habitat by XXX acres . . ." objective, it was suggested to look at how specifying these requirements will affect private property (this was in regards to the objective listed under Other Potential Objectives to Explore).
<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>Streamlined Permitting</p>	

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
<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"> ▪ We need uniformity between regions, agencies, project types, etc. in the permitting process. ▪ Is there a way to serve all interests by consulting the different affected groups at the beginning of the permitting/planning process, before impacts and mitigation have been identified? This strategy could serve many projects at one time, for permitting and mitigation needs. ▪ Maybe this should be elevated to be a principle - we should look at what other projects are planning to do.
<p>Flood Preparedness and Response</p>	
<p>Design 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"> ▪ Change the word “communication” to “support” ▪ What level of flood recovery can ag expect? We have an interest in that section. The agricultural areas are subject to this the most. I want to make sure it covers areas with less than 1000 population. (It has been changed to cover all agricultural areas).
<p>Operation and Maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add that “existing structures should be maintained and operated to their design standards,” so the areas don't have to be maintained and repaired after the fact. ▪ The federal and state standards are often conflicting. There is conflict on shaded riverine habitat. You're setting yourself up to have constant conflict in your objective. ▪ The objective is designed to make sure you are eligible for PL 84-99, to qualify for federal money if it fails, rather than how to build so it is sustainable environmentally and financially. Isn't it easier to design a system where you're not doing that dance? Focus on finding a pro-active solution to continual issues/failures in the system, instead of just fixing the same break over and over again, or developing new solutions each time. ▪ The problem that there is not sufficient money to support O&M is not addressed here. The problem is with ongoing maintenance, not new projects -- the ongoing challenge to maintain levees in rural areas. Large sums are ONLY available for disaster repairs. ▪ Under O&M, include funding.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
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.	
Achieve XX% annual pass rate for non-urban levees in the Central Valley when inspected according to Federal and State levee standards (e.g., maintenance, encroachment, etc.) by 2025.	
Education and Outreach	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'm highly in favor of increasing education to comply with 2014 requirements, so it's not all focused on us providing the education -- there is a <u>regional</u> outreach program. Perhaps statewide, that may be better. This goes back to the idea that what we do in the upper reach directly affects the Lower Sacramento Valley, the cities of Sacramento and Stockton. ▪ Federal officials don't understand that either. ▪ It helps with a 218 election. ▪ An education campaign needs to be different -- people don't care until it affects them financially. The campaign should be like ACWA did: TV ads, radio ads, very elementary.
Groundwater Recharge	
Diverged 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is a weak statement. It doesn't make sense. The objective is to take advantage of flood waters and use them beneficially. If there were recharge basins and recharge areas that were part of the plan, it would benefit flood control, as well as other things. I'd like to see that in the flood control system. Change the objective to more directly relate integration of flood control operations with groundwater recharge. ▪ The language about a percentage of overdraft is problematic ▪ Why wait until 2050? Can't this be implemented earlier? (The language might have come from the State Water Plan.) ▪ The language should apply to smaller basins, or help bases before there is a major overdraft. ▪ The language doesn't make sense. Better: That X proportion of the flood flows be directed to basins. The original draft objective had better

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<p>language. Flood conveyance channels could be percolating basins, they can be multi-use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work group members agreed that the language is confusing. Perhaps replace the word "divert" with "redirect" or "capture." ▪ This shouldn't be a mandate. This is beneficial multi-use, not a goal of the flood protection system. ▪ This involves storage in the foothills -- Gene Massa knows about this. ▪ As an example, on Rock Creek, we are looking at retention ponds. If it slows it down up there for recharge, there is less water in the system. It's very cost-effective. ▪ We really need this. ▪ The benefits could reduce DWR's costs in regards to meeting 200-year level requirements. You keep it from getting into the system in the first place. ▪ Certain floods provide a benefit. It's a balancing act; the question is how to meld that in. The language as it currently reads is too black-and-white.
Funding	
<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 20XX.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate O&M discussion here (Under funding, include O&M) ▪ This gets to the problem of the benefit cost ratio analysis. It's difficult to get Corps money for rural areas, as the benefit doesn't score as high. Need an objective regarding fixing the B/C ratio to include other benefits not currently represented ▪ You have to look further down the line to see the benefits -- we need to extend it. ▪ It's important to capture multiple use projects here. Example: Hamilton City. The Army Corps cost-benefit didn't work, so nothing moved forward. When the Corps included ecosystem here, the project penciled out and is now moving forward -- 75% and the levee is paid for by system benefits. ▪ Objective: to fund and evaluate funding criteria, giving a higher value to certain benefits.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ They are doing this now at the federal level.
Land Use	
<p>Develop consistent guidelines for conforming to policies specified in the CVFPP for land management within floodplains and flood ways by 20XX.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does "floodplains" include levee protected areas? You're trying to manage the levee protected areas -- Levee protected areas or areas protected by the SPFC should be added to this statement. If I get the benefit certified, do you go away? ▪ Emphasize consistent guidelines throughout the reach. ▪ Who is going to enforce this? The whole problem now is nobody enforces it and makes sure it's consistent with the plan.
<p>Maintain the viability of agriculture in the flood management system by creating compensation and safe harbor agreements for flood easements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the definition of "flood management system"? ▪ The language "by creating" sounds like a management action. This needs to be consistent with other objectives, and not have actions under objectives. ▪ Does "compensation" indicate money, acres? ▪ Quantification would be the health of the agricultural economy, not compensation. ▪ Another possibility would be to flip it and say "Do no harm." Don't do harm by impacting. There are so many factors -- global impacts, etc. -- what is flood control system-related? ▪ One issue we face is with private levees that are meant to be overtopped. If they blow out, we fix them. The damage that occurs we incur as a landowner. We would like to take some levees out, but we can't because of liability. It would be nice if there was a permanent spillway instead. It seems like the system should manage that rather than I., as a landowner, being responsible. So "do no harm" would be a nice concept. It is the system that causes this, the dam, the levee that is designed to fail. ▪ You wouldn't want new projects to be at your expense. How to incorporate that?
Other Potential Objectives to Explore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add an objective to work with FEMA to consider California flood requirements.

Potential Objectives to be Explored	Work Group Comments
Develop 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. (Maybe move to Ecosystem Restoration)	

Executive Sponsor's Remarks

Gary Hester, CVFMP Program Manager, reviewed some important work group member issues discussed in the Responses to Questions from Meetings #5 and #6 handout.

1. The Liability Issue

Does the write-up address the concern?

Comment: If ag has to accept a lower level of flood control than we've been accustomed to, we have to be compensated. In the 1950s, there was no differentiation between rural and urban areas. With FEMA and the legislation, we are doing away with that. I would like there to be a minimal level and we get as much out of that as we can. This is in regard to areas with less than 1000 population.

2. Requirements of Urban Level of Flood Protection in Land-Use Planning

People are saying that this is an unfunded mandate, and, yes, it is. The question today is how to set and vet the criteria. There will be an involved process next year for people to check if they are in compliance.

Q: What information is available for the current general planning processes?

A: That's a dilemma. Hydrology information will probably not be available until two years from now. So there is a gap. Part of that definition has to come from local governments or developers -- the burden is on them to demonstrate they are outside the 200-year level.

Q: Does this apply to rural areas?

A: To urban areas, defined as areas that will have a population of at least 10,000 people within 10 years of the date of the legislation.

Q: How will rural communities meet this? You are saying there will not be development -- you've stopped it. For a rural community with a small development project, it would take millions of dollars to fix a levee problem.

A: That is the huge question. The state does not have enough money.

Q: The state is not accepting liability -- what happens to us?

A: I don't have a good answer for you. Communities are saying that it would shift development from low-lying land to higher areas. The implications are huge. The discussion at the Lower Sacramento Work Group this morning was that this goes beyond the early discussions on the legislation -- is there a need to clarify the legislation? We haven't ruled that out. The intent of the legislation was to tie land-use with improved flood protection, so as not to put more people in harm's way.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

Comment: What this legislation has done is not tied land-use with anything, it has eliminated land use. The two cities in Colusa County can't do anything. The City of Colusa is entirely under water. The City of Williams is a little better. In Glenn County, we can't move development into the mountains. Unless there is state or federal participation, we become not slow-growth counties, but no-growth counties.

Comment: The way it is written, they will become declining growth counties, because they can't rebuild. Can the local communities mandate insurance? The first claim would be against the insurance, not the state. Does that lessen the state's liability? This would be the National Flood Insurance Program, federal insurance.

Comment: This burden is bigger than us and needs to be borne by more people.

Comment: The Feds bear a certain part of the burden, because of their inaccurate mapping. I can see the levee from my home, but I'm not required to get insurance.

Response: The purpose of the local briefings is not to answer questions, but to keep the issue in front of people. We hope that the next round of discussions will get participation.

Comment: The knowledge needs to go back to the administration that it won't work, and why. It will break us -- we will have the choice to fight or cave in. The administration needs to understand that.

Comment: The fact that the Army Corps lost in New Orleans -- the Feds will have to deal with it.

Comment: I'm not advocating development in a floodplain. Also, development must prove they have a water supply, which drives them out of the higher ground -- these rules create a dilemma.

Comment: There are solutions, but if the density is one resident per thousand acres, there are not enough people to get funding.

Comment: If you have one person per thousand acres, there's not a lot of liability to the state.

3. Revised CVFPP Planning Areas

The CVFPP planning areas have been clarified and a map provided.

4. Southern Boundary of Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley

DWR and Fresno are in ongoing discussions about whether this city is within the boundaries of the valley for this project. The Legislature may be approached to clarify the map definition.

Gary Hester said he appreciates all of the comments, and it is important for DWR to hear what the issues are. Everybody wants the same thing: better flood protection and a way to move forward.

In addition, he told the group he will be leaving DWR at the end of December to return to consulting engineering.

Preliminary Feedback

Facilitator Austin McInerney said this item is designed to make sure work group members have an opportunity to communicate their assessment of this first process, so that feedback can be used to inform the next phase.

Work group members took time to fill out a feedback handout seeking their thoughts on whether the process met its goals, what worked in this process, what could be changed, and what are Lessons Learned.

In a discussion following, work group members raised the following points:

- The breakout groups used earlier in the process, when the group divided into smaller groups and then rejoined as a whole, were effective.

Meeting Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #7

- The process was well-organized and the material was good. The only suggestion is that a lot of the work group members are not engineers and are not process people. Sometimes too much time was spent talking about process. It would be helpful to be more succinct and pithy.
- Sometimes the compiled data from the different regions was confusing to read through. Comments didn't seem to be reflective of a mindset. It was sometimes difficult to understand what was coming from the other regions. It might be helpful to hold a caucus of representatives of the different regions to discuss certain items.