



Meeting Summary

Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

November 17, 2010, 8:30 am – 12:30 pm

**Location: Colusa Industrial Properties
100 Sunrise Boulevard, Colusa, CA**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Patricia Bratcher	California Department of Fish and Game	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
Eric Larsen	UC Davis Department of Environmental Design	Member
Eugene Jr. Massa	Colusa Basin Drainage District	Member
Kelly Moroney	USFWS - Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge Complex	Member
Ernie Ohlin	Water Resources for Tehama County	Member
Max Sakato	Reclamation District No. 1500 and CCFVCA	Member
Oscar Serrano	Colusa Indian Community Council	Member
Mark Tompkins	Newfields	Member
Jeremy Arrich	CA Department of Water Resources	Chief, CVFPO*
Keith Swanson	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Michele Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO Lead
Scott Rice	CA Department of Water Resources (consultant)	Regional Coordinator
Natasha Nelson	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Mary Randall	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Roger Putty	MWH Americas Inc.	Technical Support
Dorian Fougères	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitator
Ariel Ambruster	Center for Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support / Notetaker

*Central Valley Flood Planning Office

Absent:

Lewis Bair	RD 108, Sacramento River West Side Levee District, Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	Member
John Carlon	River Partners, RHJV	Member
Steve Greco	UC Davis	Member

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Les Heringer	Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	Member
Ashley Indrieri	Family Water Alliance	Member
Tom Karvonen	USACE	Member
John Linhart	Glenn County Planning & Public Works Agency	Member
James Strong	Farming, BSAGU	Member
Gregg Werner	The Nature Conservancy	Member

Observer:

Amber Leininger	Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy
Brian Smith	DWR
Steven Lipman	CCP

ACTION ITEMS:

- Please provide any additional input on the draft regional objectives by close of business on Monday, November 29. The team will append your input to the work group member input already provided and distribute this combined input back out to the work group along with the final meeting summary.
- Please provide additional references documents you think would be helpful for DWR to review for preparation of the history report.
- If you have questions about how your comments were addressed in CVFPP documents, please let us know so that we can contact you directly.
- Send any comments on the Draft Management Actions Report and Interim Draft Progress Summary Report 2 to us by the close of business Thursday, November 18, 2010.
- Ernie Ohlin will send the technical team the Army Corps of Engineers federal legislation documents, which the team will distribute to the work group members.

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

The purpose for Meeting #3 was to discuss RMAWG comments on Draft Management Actions Report (MAR) and Interim Progress Summary No. 2 (IPS2), develop regional objectives, and discuss next steps in the 2012 CVFPP development process.

1. Discuss feedback on MAR and IPS2
2. Outline what the 2012 CVFPP will include
3. Develop list of proposed regional objectives building on Subcommittee initial draft
4. Describe Phase 3 process and opportunities for involvement

SUMMARY:

Welcome and Greetings

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson and CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich welcomed the meeting participants and thanked them for their involvement to date. Facilitator Dorian Fougères led introductions and reviewed the day's agenda.

Jeremy Arrich discussed the upcoming schedule for the 2012 plan. There is a growing concern that we may not be able to deliver a quality product in the 13 months left. DWR is currently reevaluating the

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

schedule. Phase 3 will begin early next year, although it's not clear at this point exactly when. There are no further details at this time, but DWR will report back as soon as there is more information.

Opening Remarks

Executive Sponsor Keith Swanson noted two important CVFPP documents, the Progress Report, required to be completed by the end of this year, which will describe what the 2012 plan will include; and the Notice of Preparation for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the CVFPP. DWR has started to hold scoping meetings for the notice of preparation.

The Valleywide Forum will be held December 9. DWR leaders hope Work Group Members can attend and that their ideas will be represented. Work Group members will receive more information as it is developed.

Document Update

CVFPO Lead Michele Ng reviewed the schedule for upcoming CVFPP documents.

- The State Plan of Flood Control is expected to be released in late November. The Work Group's comments were very helpful.
- The Flood Control System Status Report is expected to be released in the first quarter of 2011.
- The History Document will be released as a draft so that the public and the Army Corps of Engineers can review it and provide comment. The draft will be released for comment in mid-2011. DWR has also found that there are more archives and references that it would like to review. If Work Group Members know of additional references that would be helpful, please e-mail Michele Ng.

Comment: One additional helpful document would be the Knights Landing Ridge report of 1912.

Draft Management Actions Report, Draft IPS2 Discussion/Comment Session

CVFPO Lead Michele Ng reviewed the Management Actions development process, noting that the technical team has developed the draft Management Actions Report and Interim Progress Summary Report 2, which were distributed to Work Group Members for review and comment. The next steps will be working with place-based Management Actions in Phase 3 to develop regional solutions. The not place-based Management Actions will be further refined and developed and brought into Phase 4 as part of developing systemwide solutions.

She described and reviewed the organization of the Management Actions Report and its appendices, and described that the IPS No. 2 report is a short summary document of the CVFPP development process and Phase 2 work and findings.

Comments on these documents were to have been submitted last week. Work Group Members can provide comments now, or until close of business tomorrow, Thursday, November 18. The documents are scheduled to be released December 1.

Comment: The documents are somewhat getting on the mark, from my perspective. My main concerns are the descriptions of each Management Action, and how they fit with our region, or don't. The descriptions are what people will rely on in the future. The way I look at it, when we're not here anymore, and others are in our place, the description has to make sense to those new people who weren't here when the language was developed. Also, I'm not totally clear on how or whether they have been revised

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

so far – but if we have a difference with a Management Action description for our region, how is that going to sort out? Or are they being applied everywhere all the time?

Response: From my perspective, when it comes to local application, it has to make sense. There are always exceptions and complications.

Response: I agree. If a Management Action doesn't meet a specific application in your region, we will make another one, or make a supplemental one for that region. We will make it work. So if your comments don't get addressed in this round, when it comes to the application, we will be open to making them work regionally. We will refine the description as it applies to this region.

Comment: What Michele just said is key to me – she said the Management Action "could" apply to your region, rather than "will" apply to your region.

Comment: For example actions, you could add a column for the Management Actions, on how these map back to the broader Management Actions report, a place to have those local caveats.

Q: It would be useful for me to get access to comments from my organization. Are those available?

A: We were reluctant to have a comment log, because of the workload required. If it is not incorporated or not quite addressed, please get in touch with us.

Overview of 2012 CVFPP: What Is It, How Will We Get There, and Where Do We Go from Here?

CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich presented PowerPoint slides to show how the 2012 plan fits in with the broader FloodSAFE program. The CVFPP is a central element of the program, and its recommendations and implementation framework will influence core DWR flood management programs.

The CVIFMS is an Army Corps of Engineers Central Valley flood protection study that needs to be completed by 2017. DWR is hoping to receive a companion document from the Corps by 2012.

Q: In 2012, you transition from planning to construction. How much money is in the pot, with the state and local programs funded by propositions 1E and 84, and Army Corps programs with the cost share component?

A: The details haven't been worked out yet. We are transitioning from a tactical to a strategic response, and we want to make sure we don't move too far ahead or not far enough. A measure of success will be in 2016, if we are able to get an additional infusion of funding. There is \$5 billion from propositions 84 and 1E, but out of that, for the Central Valley, there is only \$3 billion. It's a lot of money, but the expenditure level needed and the time frame are large. In 2016, we hope there is a second bond or some sustainable funding. We want to make sure there is enough funding available in the post plan. We are considering developing a grant program to deal with extraordinary maintenance, with legacy issues of design or obsolescence.

Q: How much money would that involve?

A: Not nearly enough, hundreds of millions rather than billions.

Q: How will your large flood system project improvements work vis-à-vis the Army Corps of Engineers, when they will be cutting back?

A: That is a key issue. The legislature requires that a long-term sustainable financing plan be developed. Realistically, by 2012, we will have a strategy rather than a full plan. We can't only rely on bonds – there might also be a statewide assessment on a beneficiary-pays approach.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Q: The Army Corps of Engineers is developing a new federal levee policy. People with Bureau facilities -- the Bureau is left out of the picture. How does that work with this process? Or applied to our own levees at the county level, aside from the Bureau system? It is happening mainly in DC.

A: I hadn't heard of this. My initial thought is the department has started a statewide flood protection program, looking at a broader area than this process -- it might be a venue to coordinate things that fall outside the scope of this plan.

Jeremy Arrich discussed the development of the CVFPP and the numerous other studies that are being completed that will feed into the 2012 plan. Some are not completed yet, so DWR is using the best available tools. The level of detail will be less in 2012 than in 2017, because there will be newer and better data available in 2017.

Q: Most of this is still planning and evaluations through 2017. Will there be a process where people have projects they have been working on that they can move forward before 2017?

A: We could establish recommendations to move forward with more studies. We may recommend projects, or may set forth guidelines to help your project. We don't want to interfere with local projects.

Jeremy Arrich described how the 2012 CVFPP will have three components, a vision for integrated flood management, a framework for implementing projects to achieve division, and initial recommendations. The 2012 plan will build on information from the SPFC, the FCSSR, the history report and other technical documents. The program-level environmental impact report is moving forward. DWR will not select a single alternative.

Q: I wanted to get a clarification on terminology: You use the term "flood management" on the first block, and "flood control" on the lower block. What is the distinction?

A: In FloodSAFE, we are trying to stay away from "control" -- we aren't necessarily controlling floods, but trying to provide protection. "Flood control" is the language in the legislation. Outside of the legislation, we lean towards "protection" or "management." We realize there are all these interests; they are legitimate interests, so we are looking at the system, which is why we got into using the term "management."

Comment: Perhaps the glossary could clarify these terms.

Response: That's a good suggestion.

Comment: In essence, you are treating it as a floodplain management term.

Facilitator: I heard that in the document, when the term is used, that it be given context.

Comment: I've had issues with "management." I like "control" better, or "protection." When the Sacramento area flood control agency changes their name to the Sacramento area flood management agency, I might understand. Their attitude is flood control.

Comment: Yes, we don't want to let it out of the banks.

Response: Flood management, flood protection -- you can expect to hear both. Flood control will be within the name of a document. To me the important thing is, do we have a system that meets our public safety needs, plus, equally valid, are we dealing with species issues? A middle ground. I think there is room for it all. Success on one side doesn't mean failure on the other.

Overview of Phase 3 Regional Solution Sets - How They Will Be Formed, Evaluated, and How Regional Objectives Will Be Used

Roger Putty of MWH said Phase 3, which will focus on the regional level, will occur during the bulk of the early part of next year. Phase 4 will address systemwide solutions. The intent is to focus on the local, sub-regional level and to look at how solution sets meet the regional objectives.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

The solution sets will include various combinations of Management Actions in order to provide information on the costs, benefits and trade-offs of different approaches. The solution sets are:

1. Restore SPFC Design Capacity
2. Protect High-Risk Communities
3. Manage Consequences of Large Floods and
4. Modify Flood System for Enhanced Benefits.

Q: I'm having trouble understanding the utility of these categories. How are they useful? And they are unclear.

A: The purpose is to provide a broad range of approaches.

Q: Are they different kinds of approaches? Themes?

A: The first is required by the Legislature. The second is more of a benefit/cost ratio approach. It helps with the programmatic environmental impact report document to discuss themes, but the EIR won't come up with alternatives. These are packaging different Management Actions as a basis for what gets analyzed for initial investment, time, benefit/cost, long-term investment and productivity.

Comment: One benefit is educational; to give people an idea of the different approaches comparatively. Is there more value as the groups are looking at nuts and bolts to weight the objectives? Are we using the solution sets to evaluate the objectives?

Response: It's more that we would be looking at a region's regional objectives as we evaluate the solution sets, to compare how solution sets accomplish regional objectives.

Comment: For clarity, you should say that there are four of them, or these are just examples of more. The first one I'm fine with. The third one is nonstructural. The fourth is structural. This second, I'm okay with this, but in the north part of the state, we have a lot of rural and agricultural areas -- where do we fit in?

Response: The first one makes the existing system work better, but it's expensive to operate, because of conveyance capacity and systemic erosion issues. So maybe you do something else to lower the long-term O&M costs. Those are the kinds of comparisons we'd like to engage in.

Q: I understand, but what about the town of Vina?

A: It has to make sense at a local level. "High risk" does not only mean Natomas, but also smaller communities with deeper, rapid flooding, where we would have trouble evacuating quickly.

Roger Putty said that the Phase 3 planning process will refine the Management Actions and ground truth their application, looking at specific actions to address a basin's issues, and combining across local basins to form the regional solution sets. Tools would include hydraulics information, reservoir re-operation studies and local characteristics such as population, land use data and local flood system characteristics. He displayed a sample map the Army Corps of Engineers and DWR have used of economic areas and protection areas to give work group members a general idea of the scale of the sub-areas that might be used for more focused discussions in Phase 3.

Q: Could you send this out with the county boundaries and the five regions shown?

A: The map is not quite ready. This is from the Army Corps of Engineers. These maps need to be right. It will be important to capture emergency response plans and other such types of local information.

Comment: Perhaps you could put it out in draft form at some point.

Response: We need to engage the people who live in the basins.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Develop Regional Objectives

Roger Putty of MWH reviewed handouts used by the Subcommittee in developing its draft list of recommended regional objectives (Handout #3) for the entire Work Group to consider. The handouts included Handout #1, Guidelines for Developing Regional Objectives; Handout #2, CVFPP Goals; Handout #4, Upper Sacramento RMAWG Member Input to Subcommittee; and Handout #5, Phase 1 Work Group Discussion Topics for Regional Objectives. The focus of the Subcommittee's work was intentionally limited to the primary goal of improving flood risk management, which includes reducing the chance of flooding, reducing the consequence of flooding and improving regional flood system performance. He noted that there will be more opportunity to work on the regional objectives, and the discussion is just the beginning. The work group will have an opportunity to work on developing regional objectives for the supporting goals at a later time. He described objectives as needing to be specific and including a metric to judge how well a solution addresses a particular objective.

Subcommittee Report

Stuart Edell, Subcommittee Delegate, described the Subcommittee's process. The group met once in person. After the technical team and facilitators turned the Subcommittee's work from that meeting into a draft product, the group met again by conference call to refine their recommendations. He said it was a good discussion and the Subcommittee members all fed off each other.

Discussion of Subcommittee's Recommended Draft Regional Objectives

Subcommittee Delegate Stuart Edell then reviewed each of the 11 recommended objectives, and Work Group members provided comments. Comments are recorded below:

Draft Regional Objective #1

Comment: The sub-bullets are more like actions, with levels of protection in certain areas.

Comment: I would suggest adding "prevent/" before "minimize" to this objective and the second one.

Draft Regional Objective #2

Comment: There needs to be coordination between law enforcement and flood protection. Law enforcement doesn't always understand when flooding is critical.

Comment: I agree. There is a breakdown between the local and the state -- we need to integrate police and fire.

Comment: This extends to the news media. In 1997, the news media were describing areas that were not impacted.

Q: "Protective evacuation routes" -- what does that mean? Signs? Raise them?

A: Ensure they are available.

Comment: At our county, there is a connection between law enforcement and flood protection, everyone knows. We don't have a variety of levee districts in our county.

Response: We want NIMS evenly implemented across the region. If the locals are overwhelmed, it would move up to the next level.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Comment: At the EOC in Sacramento County, none of the reclamation districts were there. These roads and access points -- it's important for the law enforcement agencies to understand what's going on.

Comment: When this is established, consult with the counties so there isn't an extra set of rules they have to abide by.

Draft Regional Objective #3

Comment: This is a great idea, but there needs to be security for the equipment.

Draft Regional Objective #4

Comment: What about essential or key infrastructure such as electrical substations, petroleum pipelines, transmission lines, essential block valves for petroleum pipelines?

Draft Regional Objective #5

Comment: What about manufacturing facilities that have chemical storage?

Comment: Perhaps you should add "not limited to," or "etc." People will say that we can't require it because it isn't on the list.

Response: As we develop basin plans, it would be incumbent on us at that time to identify key facilities.

Comment: Where this is going, is you won't be able to create new chemical storage facilities in levee-protected areas, or you have to deal with grandfathering them in, or having a number of years to get them out.

Comment: Another element is storm water discharge requirements and regulations about impervious surfaces, signage in drainage areas, etc.

Draft Regional Objective #6

No comments.

Draft Regional Objective #7

No comments.

Draft Regional Objective #8

Comment: an example of this is using spreading basins to slow water down to let the peak flows pass by.

Comment: Could we say: to minimize local flooding in a way that provides habitat?

Comment: I'm not opposed, but when you look at taking people's ground and calling it "habitat," and you're trying to get acceptance, I'm not against it, but I'm trying to get buy-in.

Facilitator: It could be cross-referenced to the related habitat objective.

Comment: At this level, I'm worried about how it will be perceived; it could be torpedoed before it starts.

Comment: How about the word "multi-benefit"?

Comment: With this group, we need balance. We need a placeholder, not a torpedo.

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Roger Putty said that when the process looks at combinations of actions, objectives will be looked at collectively. Collectively means using all the regional objectives developed for the CVFPP goals together to evaluate combinations of actions, like actions that when combined provide both flood protection and habitat benefits. So if the group can't resolve how to address habitat during today's discussion, this could get resolved by the group during Phase 3 when further discussion and development of regional objectives around the other CVFPP goals takes place. This relates to another discussion the group will have at a later date about what to do when the objectives conflict.

Comment: Perhaps we might extend the area covered by this. Small communities such as Maxwell and Williams have nuisance flooding that might factor in.

It was agreed to clarify the wording under Example Actions Discussed to indicate that the Deer Creek project is an example. In addition, the language in the objective relating to Tehama County and the Colusa Basin Drainage District would be removed, so that the objective could apply to other areas as well.

Draft Regional Objective #9

Comment: A recent USGS conference had good papers on sediment routing, and how sediment goes down the Sacramento River -- if the flows get too high, it goes into the bypass and sediment drops into the river. There could be consideration of sediment routing processes to minimize the effects we have now.

Draft Regional Objective #10

Keith Swanson explained that this related to the state budget cycle that delays funding for operation and maintenance, so that money is no longer available during the window of opportunity.

Draft Regional Objective #11

Comment: We have confusion over how the objectives get to a systemwide flood risk reduction. It would be helpful to take two pieces of the flood risk equation, frequency and consequences, and have them go into the metrics, and what each Management Actions speaks to. Some Management Actions might address both frequency and consequences.

Comment: The word "exemption" is a concern. Preferable language would be about operating within the system.

Comment: In my mind, there was a primary goal and four supporting goals. This is one reason I wrote my memo in regards to the supporting goals of promoting ecosystem functions and promoting multi-benefit projects. This is the only one that mentions enhancing the environment.

Q: When do we talk about supporting goals?

A: In Phase 3. The details have not been decided yet. The group could talk about them in the remaining time now.

Comment: I feel I need to extend and develop what Tricia Bratcher started, probably during this phase. As the process moves forward, there is a danger that people will consider this early work as the end product.

Comment: Isn't this part of what we were to have done by the end of Phase 2? Could we do it the first meeting of Phase 3?

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

Response: This is part of the transition into Phase 3, so it's okay.

Response: While the schedule is up in the air, we don't want to sacrifice quality.

It was agreed that Work Group Members will provide additional thoughts on draft regional objectives by November 29 to the technical team, which will make sure the new input is distributed to all work group members for review.

Discussion of Other Issues

Two work group members discussed one item that was raised in the Subcommittee but wasn't finalized, the issue of agricultural sustainability (Handout #4 of Work Group Member input, page 6).

Comment: The purpose of this would be so that agricultural operators can plan and work around an expected flood frequency, and so they are compensated or mitigation occurs for impacts to their operations from habitat development.

Comment: My first suggestion would require that if you designate an area for flooding, you acquire the easements to do that and fortify the levees on the inside, because it's not designed to handle that. My suggestion for redressing impacts to agricultural land would include third-party impacts also. This has to be planned for, or there won't be buy-in from the agricultural community.

Response: We are starting to talk about beneficiary pays and redefine who is benefiting from the flood management system. It may not be popular, it could involve fees, but bond money is like using a credit card.

Comment: Ben Carter from Colusa County attempted to develop a landowner assurance program, including a resolution process and a fund to compensate the affected parties. Everybody could agree on the types of problems, but with the resolution process and fund, we ran into a stone wall. We didn't feel their safe harbor agreement represented landowner concerns for neighboring farmers. We felt our concerns weren't included. These are real economic issues for those of us in the farming community.

Comment: I was involved in that process. I think it's an issue that still needs to be worked on. I don't know how it relates to flooding. There is a safe harbor for species in the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is a state safe harbor process in its infancy -- I don't know much about it. Unless you could build in flooding and affects on a landowner in relation to a listed species. It's worth exploring.

Comment: Going forward, it would be helpful to design restoration sites to minimize the potential for this on those sites -- include capacity in the roughness.

Response: I think the concern is not just in the design, but in maintenance.

Because of time constraints, continued discussion of draft regional objectives was postponed to a later meeting.

Phase 2 Assessment Process and Feedback

Associate Facilitator Ariel Ambruster said that Facilitation Team is conducting an assessment, as they did at the end of Phase 1, to hear from work group members about their satisfaction level with Phase 2 and suggestions for improving the engagement process in Phase 3. She asked work group members to fill out a brief written survey. In addition, the facilitation team will be interviewing a few work group members by telephone. If work group member would like to be interviewed by phone, please feel free to approach the

Summary: Upper Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

facilitation team after the meeting. If they would like, an interview can be arranged with a member of the facilitation team other than Dorian or Ariel.

Action Item Review, Next Steps

Associate Facilitator Ariel Ambruster noted that the Valleywide Forum will be from 1 to 5 p.m. on December 9 at West Sacramento City Hall, West Sacramento.

In regards to Phase 3, she noted that the process for signing up for the new phase has been streamlined. Work group members will now automatically be signed up for Phase 3 unless they opt out.

Closing Remarks

CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich, when excusing himself earlier to leave for a meeting, told the Work Group that the CVFPP planning process is in a critical transition into Phase 3 and urged Work Group Members to stay involved, as this will help in developing and achieving solutions.

One of the agricultural work group members thanked him for conducting a local site visit to his farm.

CVFPO Michele Ng thanked members for their participation so far and encouraged them to continue participating in Phase 3.

To ask questions or comment about content, contact Roger Putty at roger.putty@mwhglobal.com. To provide comments or ask questions about logistical issues, contact Ariel Ambruster at aambrust@yahoo.com