



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary Final

Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

Time: May 5, 2010, 12:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Location: Bridgeway Lake Park

3650 Southport Parkway, West Sacramento CA

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

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Work Group Members Present:

Name	Organization
John Cain	American Rivers, California Flood Management
Marci Coglianese	Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Subcommittee
Mark Connelly	San Joaquin County Flood Management Division
Sarah Puckett	Natural Heritage Institute
Karen Medders	North Delta CARES
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento/ West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency
Chuck Spinks	American Society of Civil Engineers
Jan Vick	Mayor, City of Rio Vista
Jane Wagner-Tyack	Restore the Delta / League of Women Voters of San Joaquin County

Support Team Present:

Jeremy Arrich	California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Bryan Brock	DWR
Dave Carlson	DWR
Mike Inamine	DWR
Ibrahim Khadam	MWH
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting
Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) (Facilitation Team)
Erin Mullin	DWR
Eric Poncelet	Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team)
Merritt Rice	DWR
Robert Yeadon	DWR
Josh Yang	MWH (Technical Team)

Observers:

Bill Betchert

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

	ITEM	OWNER	TIMEFRAME
1.	Review the Regional Conditions Report (RCR) and Interim Progress Summary No. 1 (IPS1) and provide comments. Comments should be sent to cvfmp@water.ca.gov	Work Group	May 14, 2010

2.	Provide an updated DWR organizational chart showing the new leadership structure	DWR	May 28, 2010
3.	Respond to a letter submitted last year from the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors regarding the Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS)	DWR	May 28, 2010

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Delta Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the Central Valley Flood Management Program (CVFMP) continued its work on May 5th 2010 with the following actions:

- Reviewed the structure of the RCR and how it will fit into the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).
- Reviewed and provided comments on the IPS1.
- Discussed “next steps” and how Phase 1 Work Group input will be used in Phases 2- 4, and ultimately on an integrated and systemwide basis for the development of the 2012 CVFPP.
- Identified gaps in participation in Phase 1 with the goal of securing input – whether in Regional or Topic Work Groups or in Phase 2 topic workshops – for Phase 2 and beyond.

The purpose of the Phase 1 Work Groups was to contribute to the development of content for the RCR, which is a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCR identifies resources, existing conditions within the Central Valley, flood management and related problems and opportunities, and goals and objectives for use in preparing the CVFPP. The Delta Regional Work Group is one of five regional work groups for the CVFMP.

This meeting concluded the work of the Phase 1 Delta Regional Conditions Work Group.

MEETING GOALS

- Close Phase 1 work
- Determine Work Group perspectives regarding the accuracy and approach of the RCR and IPS1
- Orient Work Group members on the revised process of developing the 2012 CVFPP
- Review and augment Phase 1 Stakeholder Assessment findings
- Describe next steps in the process, Phase 2 Work Groups, and opportunities for involvement – invite participation in the next phase

MEETING SUMMARY

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

Jeremy Arrich (CVFPO Chief) welcomed the Work Group and provided opening remarks. Mr. Arrich's remarks included the following updates:

- As of March 2010, Mr. Arrich is the new Chief of the Central Valley Planning Office (CVFPO). He has been learning about Phase 1 and preparing for Phase 2.
- DWR received feedback from the Work Groups that they desired increased involvement from DWR in the CVFPP development process. In response, DWR has spent the last few months educating upper management on this program and finding support for the program moving forward. The Work Groups will see more DWR presence than in the past. The time was also used to receive more input from DWR staff on the RCR and IPS1. Mr. Arrich stated that it was well worth the effort from the DWR's perspective. DWR is currently preparing for Phase 2.

Mike Inamine (DWR) introduced himself as the new DWR Executive Sponsor and explained his role to ensure DWR's concurrent programs are integrated. Both Mr. Arrich and Mr. Inamine expressed their appreciation for the Work Group's participation and contributions.

Discussion:

- The Work Group requested that DWR provide an organization chart that illustrates the new leadership structure (**see Action Item #2**).
- A Work Group member announced that she had reminded Delta Stewardship Council members to both attend the CVFPP Delta Work Group meetings and review documents such as the RCR and the IPS1 to get a better understanding of Delta issues.
- Another Work Group member expressed concern that there has not been enough communication regarding the Delta Stewardship Council. If adequate attempts are not made the opportunity to bring the right experts to the table will be lost.

RCR and IPS#1

Bryan Brock (DWR Lead) began the PowerPoint presentation with an overview of the CVFPP planning process and the four phases of the project. Meeting #8 marks the end of Phase 1. To document the work done in Phase 1, DWR has published two reports: the RCR and the IPS1. Mr. Brock commented that the RCR is a working document and will be updated to include work done in subsequent phases. Comments will be incorporated into future editions. The IPS is a snapshot in time and will not be revised. Instead, an ISP will be issued after the completion of each phase.

- Phase 1 – Define Regional Conditions
- Phase 2 – Identify Potential Management Actions
- Phase 3 – Formulate Regional Management Solutions
- Phase 4 – Develop Systemwide Management Solutions

Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Merritt Rice (DWR CVFPO) reviewed the contents of the RCR. The purpose of the RCR is to document the first phase of the CVFPP by defining current conditions and future challenges, identifying problems and opportunities, and defining goals, principles and objectives. The RCR reflects state, federal, tribal, regional, local and other perspectives.

Ibrahim Khadam (MWH) briefly reviewed the organization of the RCR, the contents and the major changes in each chapter. He then reviewed the purpose and organization of the IPS1.

RCR/IPS#1 Discussion, Feedback, Questions

Mr. Poncelet solicited feedback from work group members using the RCR/IPS1 Discussion Questions handout.

Question #1: *A major goal in the development of the CVFPP is for documents to fairly represent input received during the planning process and more generally, the broad perspectives of those with a substantial interest in the Plan. To what extent does the RCR meet that goal? As DWR and the technical team develop future CVFPP products, what suggestions do you have that will continue to support this goal?*

Question #2: *Many of the Phase 1 Work Group discussions focused on the potential scope of the 2012 CVFPP as well as the long term vision for the plan. With direction from the Legislature and input from Work Group members, DWR worked to clarify the scope by using the RCR and IPS to articulate a series of CVFPP goals and principles. In particular, DWR has explicitly called out Public Safety as a primary goal. Thinking about the steps DWR has taken to clarify the planning area and primary goal, to what extent do the RCR and IPS help establish the scope of the CVFPP? What additional work needs to be done in Phase 2 to address scope and goals issues?*

Question #3: *Thinking about the content of the RCR, please describe any major gaps, inaccuracies of data or other red flags that must be addressed as we move forward into Phase 2.*

Question #4: *The IPS was designed to serve as a summary of work to date and briefing document for broad use by decision makers and interested parties in the CVFPP process. Thinking of how you or others may use the IPS, to what extent does it serve the purpose it was designed for? What suggestions can you offer to improve the IPS for future phases of the CVFPP process?*

Comments and questions in response to the questions above were as follows:

- What other planning efforts are expected to use the RCR for their California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) baseline? Mr. Kirby (Advisor to DWR) replied that the information is available for use by anyone. Erin Mullin (DWR) added that the Army Corp of Engineers will be using the information gathered from the CVFPP process in several of their planning efforts.
- The RCR has been overly homogenized to reflect all five regions; some of the very specific objectives have been lost.
- The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) process is creating smart objectives as well. DWR made the right decision to not try to develop smart objectives before they know whether the objectives are achievable.
- There is a concern that the regional solution sets will get lost in Phase 4. Every region has very specific needs. Careful consideration needs to be given as to how to incorporate all the pieces. Mr. Rice (DWR) replied that DWR may not know how it ties together until Phase 4.
- The way the Delta Regional Conditions Work Group went through the problem statement exercise worked well. The development of a system-wide solution requires more work on the system-wide issues.
- The Work Groups should describe the 4-5 things that they think are the hugely important and should not be lost in the process.
- The cost of the 1997 flood was enormous. The local planner approving development in a flood plain is not connected to the CVFPP process. The City Councils and the Planning Boards need to coordinate with CVFPP.
- The extent to which individual comments were incorporated into the RCR is impressive. Mr. Yung-Hsin Sun (MWH) replied that if comments address something that is misleading or fundamentally wrong in either the RCR or IPS, DWR may issue an addendum. All other comments will show up in the next Phase.
- In order to get to get to a sustainable plan, this process will need to get local buy-in and support. DWR staff should go out and talk to the planning committees. Cities do not understand the implications of SB 5.

- This process must coordinate more with the Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Arrich replied that DWR is currently working on a cost sharing agreement with the Army Corp of Engineers. DWR recently got a commitment from the Army Corp of Engineers that they will get engaged and have more consistent participation in the CVFPP process.
- Local agencies need to be better involved in the vegetation management roundtable discussion.
- How is “urban core” being defined? Mr. Kirby replied that urban core is defined as all communities of at least ten thousand people or urbanizing. Mr. Sun added that DWR is making a handbook user guide to help provide additional guidance on this issue.
- The CVFPP planning process should make increased efforts to engage all reclamation groups.
- DWR should consider doing outreach to planning organizations such as the Association of Environmental Professionals. Mr. Kirby replied that the team putting together the planning handbook is going to conduct outreach to professional societies such as the Association of Environmental Professionals. DWR has no authority over land use planning, nor is there any budget within the scope of this project.
- DWR should create a multimedia (CD or video) similar to what is done by the Water Education Foundation aimed at reaching out to local government officials.
- Mr. Kirby asked the Work Group to pay particular attention to the text on pages 5 and 6 of the IPS1. He pointed out that this plan is not about solving problems except to how they relate to the State Plan of Flood Control. In response members suggested adding a text box listing the other programs that are intended to coordinate with CVFPP and adding a box and pull-out map of the Delta to capture the region specific points.

CVFPP/BDCP Coordination

The Work Group members discussed the importance of coordinating BDCP and Mr. Kirby provided update on the Chrisman memo.

- It is preferable to have all flood protection analysis considered under CVFPP rather than BDCP.
- CVFPP planners are doing a better job integrating with BDCP than the other way around. Mr. Kirby added that even if the BDCP environmental documents are ahead of the CVFPP planning documents, BDCP will still have to consider flood risk.
- Is there discussion occurring between the DWR flood managers and the BDCP consultants? Mr. Kirby replied that some discussion is occurring, but more is needed. DWR has committed to hold annual CVFPP and BDCP joint sessions.
- A request was made for DWR to respond to a letter submitted last year from the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors regarding the Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) (**see Action Item 3**).

Review of Draft Phase 1 Assessment and Next Steps

Referring to the Communications and Engagement Phase 1 External Assessment Executive Summary and the PowerPoint, Mr. Poncelet reviewed the Phase 1 Assessment. He noted that page 24 of the IPS1 summarizes the key points from the assessment. In general, the Work Group agreed with the assessment findings.

Overview of Phase 2 and Next Steps

Mr. Khadam presented a preview of Phase 2. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Khadam remarked that Phase 2 will address Management Actions. The focus will be the development of single actions to address one or more goals. He commented that there may be a need to revisit some of the Phase 1 issues if additional information is needed to develop effective management actions to address a specific issue. He reminded the work group members of the legislative timeline. DWR will forward the Draft CVFPP to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board in January 2012. The Board is required to adopt a Plan by July 1, 2012.

Phase 2 will be structured differently. The Regional Conditions Work Groups are the anchor of Phase 2. They will meet at the beginning and the end of the phase. Two rounds of management action focused

workshops will be scheduled in between to integrate across regions. Topic Work Groups will be mini taskforces to look at specific topics. Their work product will feed back into the Regional Work Groups. There may also be cross-region sub-committees whose work will also feed back to the Regional Work groups. Phase 2 will start in early June and conclude by August or September. Work Group members can chose to attend as many workshops as they wish. The workshops will also be open to the broader public.

Responding to feedback from Work Group members for DWR and the consultants to do initial document development, Mr. Khadam reported that 844 management actions have been developed to date. Currently staff is trying to categorize the management actions to make the process more manageable.

Discussion:

- A Work Group member asked for an example of a management action. Mr. Kirby replied that the management actions are not going to talk about a specific reservoir (for example) but the concept of flood storage. The emphasis will be on conceptual actions. Specific locations will be discussed during Phase 3.
- The Work Group then discussed the need to involve local planning staff during Phase 2. A concern was raised that local planners would have a difficult time staying at the conceptual level and not being specific to their region. Another member was concerned that without local planner involvement early on it would be difficult to ensure management actions are consistent with local General Plans.
- The Work Group then discussed what the Regional Condition Work Groups will specifically be asked to do. Mr. Sun outlined the following Work Group obligations:
 - The focus will be on refining content.
 - Meeting hours will be approximately half of what they were during Phase 1.
 - There will be 2-3 half day meetings, plus the two rounds of workshops.
 - Mr. Rice added that the recruitment effort for Phase 2 is a little behind schedule, however the hope is to convene the next round of Work Group meetings in early June and wrap up in August/September.
- A member asked if the workshops would include a panel of technical experts. Mr. Sun replied that technical experts could be asked to come and share information. Mr. Kirby added that the workshops process will include creating a document related to the topic, asking members to review how the topic is being characterized and suggest any necessary changes. The length of the workshops will be relatively short because the expectation will be that participants will have read the materials ahead of time.

Recruitment for Phase 2

DWR staff invited existing Delta Regional Conditions Work Group members to continue participating in Phase 2. Some indicated their intent to do so. Work group member made the following suggestions for improving work group composition for Phase 2:

- Members suggested asking a representative from the Delta 5 Coalition, Delta Stewardship Council and Delta Protection Commission to attend the CVFPP Delta Regional Conditions Work Group meetings.
- A suggestion was made to reach out to individuals who were on the Phase 1 Work Group but ended up not participating much, presumably because of the large amount of workload required.

Adjourn