

Meeting Record

To:		From:	
Name:	Tony Dana, Earl Nelson and meeting attendees	Name:	Elizabeth Boyd
Firm:	DWR - DFM	Firm:	AECOM
Fax number:		Date Sent:	April 20, 2011
Meeting Date:	March 17, 2011		
Project Name:	Lower Feather River Corridor Management Strategy		
Project Number:	08110038.16		
List of Attendees:	See last page for attendee list		

Subject: Lower Feather River Corridor Management Strategy Meeting

Distribution: Attendees

The following is a summary of the meeting held on March 17, 2011.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
1. Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitation & Note taking • Review Meeting Notes from last meeting (February 17, 2011) • Review Meeting Agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency (SBFCA) would like to give a presentation at the next meeting. This will be added to the agenda.
2. Corridor Management Plan Status Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are currently nearing the end of Phase 1 and have completed almost all the tasks associated with this phase. • We are now working on preparing the Task Order for Phase 2, which will hopefully be in place in the next three or four weeks. • The goal was to be done with the first Task Order at the end of March and then the second will take us to the end of the year. We would like to have a plan in place and approved by the Board by June 30, 2012. We are also hoping to have implementation at the same time we are working through 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Phase 2 and 3 of the permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All deliverables are complete except the Permitting Letter Report, which is expected to be completed on March 31st. • DFG Feather River Wildlife Area MOU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a meeting this afternoon to discuss who has long-term liability for special status species when Department of Fish and Game (DFG) does restoration in areas where future mitigation may be necessary due to maintenance needs. • The Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) is reluctant to approve a restoration project if maintenance would result in future mitigation requirements for special status species due to the restoration project. 	
<p>3. Hydraulic Modeling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latest Update on Hydraulic Modeling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a major item included in the Phase 2 Task Order. • During the March 2nd meeting, attendees agreed that there was a need to meet with folks who would be reviewing these models from a regulatory perspective. • The primary focus is to get models to replicate baseline conditions that really show what the levees actually look like. • QUESTION – What is the issue with the models? • ANSWER – We just want to make sure that the models are consistent and not in competition with each other (PBI models & our models) • The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 57 design and how that relates to what Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority (TRLIA) has been using and what SBFCA will be using: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No matter what happens in this corridor the 57 line will remain the same. It was part of USACE’s original levee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule a meeting between this subgroup and the Sutter Butte team. Bring back issues with the modeling and how we move forward. (Jeff or Paul can be the contact from this group) • Department of Water Resources (DWR) will post current version of models on the website, which are dated March 2, 2011 and alert Wood Rodgers when/where they are posted.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QUESTION – It is my understanding there isn't the capacity to handle the 200 year flood at the 350 CFS flow? • ANSWER – If you make a change to the height of the levee you will run into a 200 year issue with the State and a 57 issue with USACE. • QUESTION – Is it true that the model accounts for some roughness that does not currently exist? • ANSWER - Yes, there is capacity to go up and not violate the 200 year flow. Below River Mile 17 it will be really difficult to do restoration. • QUESTION – With regard to hydrology in Nelson Slough, if a flood stage is created by backwater from Sutter Creek, would a setback levee be beneficial? • ANSWER – There might be benefits. Other planning efforts in this area include Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). They are looking at opportunities for increasing transitory storage. It all needs to integrate and mesh. Setback levees might provide an opportunity to deal with a variety of needs including storage. • Expansion of Nelson Slough would also help with sedimentation, which is what the Nelson Slough was designed for. • Within the model, where the 200 year and 57 baselines are close, this represents where intense operation and management costs would need to be focused. • For specific projects you would compare your effects to the 57 profile for permit approval purposes. • The intended outcome would be that a project could be represented in the model in relation to the expected flow. Adjustments would be made to account 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	for roughness and other variables.	
<p>4. Permitting Subcommittee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency Permitting Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We received input on strategy at the March 9th meeting. • Major point of feedback is that the agencies need a project description which details what activities are covered under the permits. Until the regulatory agencies know what we are doing they can't advise us on what permits are needed and the strategies associated with obtaining them. • By providing the agencies something in writing it gives them the opportunity to consider some permitting options and also the ability to include others in their office in the discussion and then provide us with good feedback. • Important direction from USACE: They won't be revising the scope of analysis to incorporate areas outside their jurisdiction for Section 7 consultation. • If we can work together it will simplify the regulatory process for everyone. There was unanimous agency support for the process. • QUESTION – My understanding is Section 7 Consultation would be a short-term solution. If this won't work were there any ideas put forth for an alternative solution? • ANSWER – We will likely have to use Section 7 Consultation in some way because an HCP and NCCP are not short-term solutions. • We are not completely throwing out past processes and plans to use these ideas and concepts to come up with something focused on this program. • Next Steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony will schedule a meeting to discuss short term permitting solutions.
<p>5. Task Order phase II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Order Phase II – Scope of Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A draft Task Order was submitted to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule a meeting with the Sutter Basin

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>DWR on March 16th. Deliverables associated with this task order were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Outreach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder outreach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR believes there are two tiers of outreach: these management meetings and the public outreach component. • We are looking at possibly holding seven meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational meeting to Sutter and Yuba County Board of Supervisors. • Public meeting in the Marysville/Yuba City area to garner public input on what should be included in the plan. • Scoping meeting not related to environmental aspects. • Environmental scoping meeting involving the public once we get to the point of a solid Project Description. • Meetings to present the finished plan to the public once it is finished. • Public hearing once the environmental documents are finished. • The last two could be combined depending on timeline. • It is important to be very careful with language used in the Task Order. Calling a meeting a scoping meeting could have legal implications. • Plan is for Sutter Butte environmental work to kick off in April. • The Sutter Basin Feasibility Study has recently been accelerated. • Some thought needs to be given as to who we are trying to reach, what boundary we are trying to capture. 	<p>Workgroup.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information to Yuba County Water Agency. (Paul can be a conduit to make this happen) • DWR will send a letter saying DWR recommends going with the California Levee Roundtable Agreement as opposed to the USACE Levee Vegetation Policy.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We could use mailing lists but we need to ensure that they are constantly updated. • QUESTION – Have we thought about what we are going to send to the public in advance of the meetings? Is this part of the plan? • ANSWER – Yes. • DWR’s thinking was to consolidate all the mailing lists we have. • Yuba County Water Agency would like to know more about the LFRCMP. 	
<p>6. Project Description, Activities, & Threshold Discussion</p>	<p>There was a presentation on possible approaches for permitting, including the areas to be addressed and the level of activities addressed. Comments on these and other topics related to the project description are recorded below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of Maintenance Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Regions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern (River Miles 22-28). • Middle (River Miles 16-22). • Southern (River Miles 7-16). • Three Maintenance Levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine (similar to actions found in a routine maintenance agreement [RMA]). Covers more than DFG exemption. Currently RMAs don’t cover DFG actions. <u>There was some discussion whether this level should be covered under the CMP.</u> • Middle (above RMA level w/ a programmatic agreement but not significant actions). <u>There was general agreement that this level of action should be covered in the CMP.</u> • Major (significant actions requiring EIR/EIS analysis). <u>There was general agreement that this would NOT be covered in the CMP.</u> • Northern end is part of the Sutter County Feasibility Study (Parkway Plan), which 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule another field trip to the project site for new folks. Would be a good idea to include people from the maintenance yards in this trip. May timeframe. • Distribute Sutter County Feasibility Study to the group. (RCD will give to Tony who will distribute to the larger group) • Incorporate decisions from Delphi Meeting into this discussion. • Combine Delphi meeting outcomes, restoration concept meeting outcomes and field trip and submit to subcommittee. (Tony) • Create a subcommittee to discuss Tony’s results. (DWR) • Go back to local maintaining agencies and get a feel for what they are looking for. • For future reference, if this group is going to go over maps, notify Kelly

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>deals with recreation and restoration. These should be coordinated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 of the Feather River Parkway is done and they are ready to get underway with Phase 2. • We want recreation to be a part of the CMP and it makes sense to put intensive recreation close to the populated areas. • In the southern end the sediment issue is important. Include Nelson Slough sediment removal in the CMP. • Recreation activities would likely require their own permits and environmental documentation. • List of activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debris and obstruction removal. • Silt and sediment removal. • Vegetation control in channels. • Maintenance of mitigation and restoration areas. • Repair of previous erosion control work. • Minor erosion control work. • Minor grading work. • Rodent control. • Three main activity areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intense – requires individual permit. • Soft – requires programmatic agreement. • Maintenance. • Restoration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planting in new areas. • Removal of non native habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation control on levees. 	<p>so she can bring preserve staff.</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roughness patterns. • NC Habitat. • The plan may need to consider agriculture. This should be discussed further. • We are dealing with two things: overall vision and what we need specific permits for. • We need to figure out what is covered in the plan and what we have to permit. • There are Urban Greening Grants available to fund these efforts. 	
<p>7. Next Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify date (April 21st meeting), location & suggested agenda topics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBFCA will brief the group at the next meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add SBFCA briefing to the agenda.

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by AECOM within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

**Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan
 Thursday, March 17, 2011 Meeting
 Work Group Member Attendance**

Participant	Affiliation	Telephone #
Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
Tony Dana	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-2738 916-531-2410 c
Kelly Barker	Department of Fish & Game – Northern Central Region	916-358-4353
Debra Bishop	H.T. Harvey	530-753-3733 x 102
Paul Brunner	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	906-574-2236
John Carolon	River Partners	530-894-5401 x 224
James Cornelius	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461
Terri Gaines	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
Ryan Larson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-7568
Ray McDowell	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-651-7192
Jeffery E. Twitchell	Levee District 1 & Yuba City Basin	916-631-4555
Matt Wacker	AECOM	916-266-4907
Elizabeth Boyd	AECOM	916-414-5852
Anne Hoagland	AECOM	916-414-1626
Juleah Cordi	Sutter County RCD	530-674-1461
Larry Lloyd	Sutter County RCD	530-674-1461 x130
Jonathan Kors	Wood Rodgers, Inc.	916-326-5294
Ron Unger	FPCP Department of Water Resources	(916) 574-0381
Stanley Cleveland	Sutter County Board	530-713-7502