

**AGENDA**  
**July 15, 2010**  
**Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan Meeting**

LL-20 Conference Room (JOC); 916-574-2556 - Conference Line

*The purpose of the Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is to develop a integrated strategy and long-term vision for managing the river corridor between the Yuba River and the Sutter Bypass in a way that facilitates and promotes economic sustainability and compatibility in future land uses, flood protection system management, maintenance of flood control facilities, and the restoration and enhancement of ecosystem functions and habitats*

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Lead</b>
9:00 am	<b>Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Meeting Agenda.</li> </ul>	Earl Nelson
9:15	<b>Field Trip Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review field tour logistics</li> <li>• Observations and recommendations</li> </ul>	Tony Danna
9:45	<b>Task Order</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase I Consultant Deliverables – what is planned for AECOM work.</li> <li>• Future Phases discussion.</li> </ul>	Earl Nelson Matt Wacker
10:00	<b>Funding Source and Sustainability Sub-committee Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for improvement</li> <li>• Discussion on findings</li> </ul>	Paul Brunner
10:30	<b>Goals and Objectives Review</b>	Earl Nelson
10:45	<b>Break</b>	
11:00	<b>Working Group Exercise – Design issues and possible projects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grassland high-flow channel</li> <li>• Vegetation restorations - Star Bend Pinch Point</li> <li>• Silt removal – Nelson Slough</li> <li>• Recreation enhancement – Recreation Trails - Maintenance</li> </ul>	Earl Nelson Tony Danna
11:30	<b>Working Group Members Activities in CMP region</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LD1 – Star Bend Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, &amp; Rehabilitation (OMRR&amp;R) Agreement with CVFPB – Jeff Twitchell</li> <li>• Others Work Group Members announcements</li> </ul>	Working Group Members
11:55	<b>What Next?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify next meeting (<u>August 19<sup>th</sup></u> date) agenda topics.</li> </ul>	Earl Nelson
Noon	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**Thursday, July 15, 2010 Meeting  
JOC DWR LL-20  
Work Group Member Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Telephone #</b>
Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
Tony Danna	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-2738 916-531-2410 c
Paul Brunner	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2236
John Carlon	River Partners	530-894-5401 x224
James Cornelius	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461
Stacy Cepello	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-698-5287
Steve Fordice	River District 784	530-742-0520
Terri Gaines	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
Gary Hobgood	Department of Fish & Game	916-983-6920
John Langston	FPEIP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2880
Ryan Larson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-7568
Andrea Mauro	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	916-574-0332
Charles Rabamad	Department of Water Resources	916-574-2982
Scott Rice	Department of Water Resources	916-837-6415
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	530-894-5401 x227
Jennifer Stephenson	Department of Water Resources	
Jeffrey E. Twitchell	Levee District 1	916-631-4555
Matt Wacker	AECOM	916-266-4907
Tim Williamson	DFG – North Central Region	530-538-2236
David Wright	DFM – Department of Water Resources	916-574-2644

**Policy Team Members:**

- Paul Brunner (TRLIA)
- Scott Rice (DWR)
- David Wright (DWR)

**Conference Call in Telephone Number = 916-574-2556**

**Draft Minutes**

**Introductions**

- Member Introductions around the table made.
- Follow-up from last meeting:
  - Status of the Abbott Lake DWR / DFG MOU: May be out of legal review from DFG.  
**Action Item** - Need to check up on Status with DFG.
  - Tony Danna – The Lower Feather River CMP Website is up and running at:  
WebSite: <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/fmo/msb/>  
**Action Item** – Update Minutes and MOU data. Add land ownership maps.
  - Earl Nelson - On hydraulic modeling, need to find a contractor to work with AECOM.  
**Action Item** – Subgroup needed to review and suggest hydraulic modeling contractor to AECOM.

## May 27 Field Trip Report

- Tony Danna - The primary Goal of the field tour was to provide workgroup members with a first-hand view of the existing river, channel, floodplain, levee, and adjacent upland conditions. Tour Objectives were:
  1. Acquaint workgroup members with existing ecological conditions, including sensitive ecological communities such as shaded riverine aquatic habitat, riparian forests, and habitat for special-status species and discuss opportunities to enhance ecological conditions through active ecosystem restoration.
  2. Acquaint workgroup members with factors currently affecting channel conveyance and discuss opportunities to enhance conveyance through structural (e.g., levee improvements) and non-structural (e.g., roughness reduction) measures.
  3. Acquaint workgroup members with factors currently affecting channel maintenance (including USACE levee vegetation standards) and discuss opportunities to enhance channel maintenance activities and meet USACE guidelines.
  4. Acquaint workgroup members with other uses (e.g., agriculture and recreation) within the existing channel and discuss opportunities to incorporate, and enhance where possible, these uses where compatible with enhancement of ecological conditions, channel conveyance, and channel maintenance.
  5. Document additional future concerns for work group consideration.
- Stops made (south down river from Yuba City) and discussion topics were:
  1. Shanghai Bend -DFG - Wildlife habitat discussion;
  2. Boyd's Pump – Discussion at launch, since boat tour was cancelled due to low river flow;
  3. Abbott Lake -LD1 & DFG & River Partners discussion on riparian restoration;
  4. O'Connor Lakes -LD1 & DFG & River Partners riparian restoration discussion;
  5. Nelson Slough DFG Wildlife Area - Mature Riparian Habitat & silting conditions;
  6. One additional stop made at the southern end of the Nelson Slough Wildlife Area to discuss the silt sediment on flats for future removal.
- Workgroup Summarized Discussions
  - Provided workgroup members with a first-hand view of the existing river, channel, floodplain, levee, and adjacent upland conditions.
  - Since the tour was only on the right bank, and no boating river tour was done, only a third of the area was observed.
  - The right bank levee conditions and the restoration work done by the River Partners on two DFG Wildlife Areas were seen.
  - The Workgroup did talk about methods used for riparian vegetation restoration and the concerns of the levee districts for maintaining river flows in the channel.
  - The natural riparian vegetative species composition and threatened wildlife species.
  - There was some discussion on the river channel changes over the past two decades and work that has been done to widen the channels with setback levees.

- The Workgroup discussed the orchards and other agricultural fields adjacent to the levees.
- A main point of discussion dealt with corridor flows and the restriction (or roughness factors) and impacts of different kinds of native versus agricultural plant species on stream flows.
- Recreation opportunities discussion including hunting, fishing, hiking, boating, picnicking, swimming, and bird watching.
- Recreation use was observed near Yuba City on the levee, at the Shanghai Bend Falls and at Boyd's Pump Boat Launch.
- The levee appeared to be used by walkers and joggers near the city,
- Another use was by American Shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) fishermen.
- The Group observed shotgun shells from bird hunters at several stops.

## **Task Order**

- Earl Nelson – Discussed the AECOM deliverables from the Task Order (Phase 1).
  - Phase 1- identify what we need to know/collect some of it: Phase 2- follow up on the collection; Phase 3- how can the recommended actions be implemented?
    - How do agreements / MOUs combine to meet the objectives of Phase I. Data collection, technical memorandum discussing the biological resources, maps, as needed stakeholder supporting materials, need for plan to develop permitting, etc.
    - \*Desire update on the phases
    - Modeling needs to be done sooner rather than later.
  - This is the work plan for phases 2 and 3.
    - Phase 2 is taking the info from phase 1 and making into a plan.
    - Phase 3- will focus into getting all the MOUs and permits in place for all potential actions on the Lower Feather River Corridor.
  - As discussed last time: We want to move forward immediately with ongoing individual projects within the study area. Finish the projects and integrate it into the flood management plan.

## **Goals and Objectives Review**

### **Purpose Statement**

- Earl Nelson has added the CMP location to the purpose statement.

### **Goals and Objectives**

The Goals and Objectives have been reworked by Earl Nelson and Tony Danna to make them more cohesive. They wanted to make the objectives measurable but unable to do so. The Work Group discussed the specific wording of the objectives.

- Concerning Objective (1.c.), there will be hydraulic modeling work done and the Work Group input into pick which modeling method will reflect the technique best suited to the issues in the lower Feather River. A problem was identified with the goals being interdependent of one another and the uncertainty of the interagency coordination relationships on permit granting (perhaps developing permit protocols prior to the plan). However, permits are given based on specific plans (Matt Wacker and Gary Hobgood discussion).

### **Goal 2-**

- With these objectives, may want to broaden goal 2. Will this Goal be restricted to flood control projects? Do you want to facilitate the permitting of flood control only? The phrasing of Goal 2 is altered to reflect this thought process. The (CVFPB) Board wants to review each restoration action individually and each flood improvement action. This Goal should include both flood control and maintenance facilities. Since maintenance facilities will be included in the plan, then permitting process should be easier, now that the goal phrase has been changed.

- Earl Nelson- it is clear that the board should review all projects, but if there are credits to be used, then the restoration project can move ahead (advanced mitigation and restoration). Reworded phrasing for Goal 2. Earl Nelson reworded the Goal objectives to mirror the phrasing of the Goal.

### **Goal 3-**

- **Action Item** - Reword Goal #3 to be similar to the FLOODSAFE goals.
- Objective a- Public Safety should be listed higher on the list. This objective only includes ecosystems and habitats so public safety is not included .So, there should be another goal to included public safety. Instead, objective a) included the ideas of public safety. Public safety needs to be included in the vision statement, even if it may be implied, it needs to be stated. So, Earl Nelson included it into the purpose statement.
- Paul Brunner- (There needs to be some integrator of public safety into the goals. Would public safety or environmental conservation win out? Is it clear whether the restoration area or public safety wins out?) Public safety would be a top priority. The hope of creating the plan is so that there shouldn't be a problem with choosing between safety and restoration.
- Earl Nelson- (what is the standard of public safety? Need to figure out how to define that public safety is important for the system. People who live around the levees want to see as much safety as they can get. This could be discussed in a future meeting.
- Paul Brunner- made a change to the purpose statement to include public safety.

### **Goal 4-**

- Earl Nelson- The group has no authority to implement economic and recreational activities. Based on this fact, Goal #4 phrasing was changed to ensure the goal is within the authority limitations of the Work Group.
- Earl Nelson- Agriculture contributes to the habitats of the riparian region. Will people from the outside read into Goal 4 and fear for their property? The Goal was rephrased again to include the constraints. In the objectives, the phrases were changed to show the Work Group authority.

**\*\* (See Final Goals and Objective Statement with all changes incorporated Attached)**

## **Break**

### **Funding Source and Sustainability Sub-committee Report**

- Paul Brunner – (See Sub-Committee Meeting Notes Attached) Purpose of the Sub-committee meeting was to review the maintenance funding aspects of the flood control channel, to remove sources of funds, and to address expenditures requirements. Additional options were explored including long term funding opportunities, such as endowments, bond funding, and multiple agency funding.
- What are the criteria when dealing with flood channel maintenance? Karen Hull, Sutter Maintenance Yard Manager, discussed at the meeting the key points from DWR point of view.
- Discussion on the misconception that DFG funds channel maintenance. DFG has no more responsibility over channel maintenance than any other land owner. DFG may be doing more management, but it is not the DWR channel maintenance responsibility.
- Another key factor is the criteria for maintaining the channel is to pass the design flow test. Flow modeling is critical to addressing this issue. Karen Hull discussion at the Sub-committee meeting addressed DWR maintenance responsibility, the mileage of levee and channels, and the cycle of maintenance.
- In addition, funding was discussed. DWR has expressed they believe they receive adequate funding for proper channel maintenance.

- However, many Work Group members believe that the DWR needs to spend more money on channel maintenance, while DWR appears to spend more money on the levee maintenance. Work Group members expressed concern that they perceive that some work or the cycle of work is leaving the desired level of channel maintenance wanting.
- Work Group members discussed outside areas as examples of more susceptible areas like Sutter Bypass with more money. There is lots of property out there and potentially, the subcommittee will be more of perspective rather than an active participant. The regulatory role is important to look at fish and game separate.
- The question of the group was where is there money being spent? It seems the money is sent to the least maintained areas. There are farmers and folks working in the floodway in which the cost is not being identified and put into the state budget. Perhaps the group should take an effort to look at those costs. It is important that the work of the group gets exposed to the board. Someone should update the board on the progress of the committee. The board seems concerned with the floodway especially that dealing with the vegetation on the floodway so informing them on the committee happenings would be good.
- Questions- Highlight the second bullet of the areas identified by group- the board is realizing there are not funds to maintain the improvements available through the current bonds and somehow they are looking for other funds. Or change the guidelines to allow others to help. The group should identify the constraint, how to modify that constraint, and figure out the qualifier to be able to use the bond.
- John Carlon- The planning process is much more complicated than it appears. Who owns the properties along the Lower Feather and how do these properties get managed? Who has the maintenance responsibilities and who makes the management decisions are not always the same agencies or individuals. We need improved communications among all the various agencies, with the various responsibilities dealing with the same piece of property. There is a need to reduce the management complications. The Sutter Maintenance Yard is responsive to outside pressure to modify maintenance priorities and the areas maintained.
- Group discussion followed on how a levee setback is acquired and how the state obtains property ownership. The San Joaquin/ Sacramento Water Drainage District has acquired state owned property and then turned the management of that property over to DFG. The acquirer of the property does not get direction from the CVFPB on how to manage the property. This results in large acreages which have no one specifically responsible for maintenance. Often the people within the agency are not aware of where the property ownership is held, who has management responsibilities and to all appearance no one is actively managing these properties. We need to suggest MOU's that go with the properties that would define all the maintenance requirements and who has the management responsibilities. The DWR does retain all the flood channel maintenance responsibilities no matter who owns the properties.

### **Working Group members in CMP region**

- Jeff Twitchell - • LD1 – Star Bend Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, & Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) Agreement with CVFPB (Board). LD1 will enter into an agreement to amend the OMRR&R agreement; which also includes 17 miles of levee. The Board informed LD1 that it would not sign this agreement because:
  1. They were not aware the permit authorized the restoration work.
  2. They want to look at long term management plan and the goal to have the 20 acres that LD1 has done and annex it into the program.
  3. Board wants to know how LD1 was addressing the issue of maintenance of flood control and mitigation.
- Paul Brunner-There is a site plan and a BO where the Board is asking us to stand down to not use areas because an encroachment permit is needed. Plans need to be met so problems like this do not

occur. Public safety is ignored due to this management and regulations. This is another reason why the plan needs to expedite actions.

- Jennifer Hobbs - Safe harbor agreements with some of these discussions are tenuous. The challenge seems to be how you organize all the obligations from differing agencies to make a more effective plan. We need to come away with a process to resolve these issues for the long term.
- Paul Brunner – **Action Item** - Suggested a subgroup should discuss and resolve this issue. Volunteers were asked to be on a Sub-committee. A Sub-committee will have a meeting to recommend a course of action. Representatives from:
  1. CDFG- Gary Hobgood would find representative.
  2. USFWS – Jennifer Hobbs
  3. LD1 - Jeff Twitchell and will chair
  4. TRLIA – Paul Brunner
  5. RD784 – Steve Fordice
  6. CVFPB – Andrea MauroIn addition, 4 members added to the Sub-Committee to negotiate the outcome:
  7. John Carlon, River Partners
  8. Matt Wacker, AECOM
  9. Earl Nelson, DWR
  10. Tony Danna, DWR
- The expectation of why this group was formed was to blend a safe harbor approach to what happens.

**Next meeting - August 19<sup>th</sup>** is the next scheduled meeting.

- Discussion topics for the next meeting:
  - A Working Group Exercise – Corridor design issues and possible projects for the future.
  - Grassland high-flow channel
  - Vegetation restorations - Star Bend Pinch Point
  - Silt removal – Nelson Slough
  - Recreation enhancement – Recreation Trails - Maintenance

# Purpose Statement:

*The purpose of the Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is to develop a integrated strategy and long-term vision for managing the river corridor between the Yuba River and the Sutter Bypass in a way that facilitates and promotes public safety with economic sustainability and compatibility in future land uses, flood protection system management, maintenance of flood control facilities, and the restoration and enhancement of ecosystem functions and habitats.*

## Goals and Objectives

### Goal

- 1) Central Valley Flood Protection Board adoption of a long-term Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) by June 2011.

#### Objectives:

- a) Establish and facilitate a diverse working group consisting of industry experts and stakeholders, and a policy team to assist in formulating applicable policies. The Working Group will work together through coordination, collaboration and cooperative working relationships with all stakeholders and interested parties to develop a CMP.
- b) Assess the existing corridor and channel habitat, geomorphology (sediment transport and river meander), ownership, and associated land uses to identify how the channel and related flood plain can be better managed. Evaluation will include a three-prong opportunity and constraint analysis addressing flood operations and flood maintenance, ecosystem enhancement, and other multi-objective land use considerations.
- c) Review existing hydraulic and habitat function models and decision support systems to formulate and compare alternative management actions to improve public safety, habitat, and river channel conveyance.
- d) By March 2011 integrate the best management action alternatives into a cohesive set of management actions and policies to guide maintenance, flood protection system improvements, and land use decisions for adoption by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

### Goal

- 2) Facilitate the necessary permitting for maintenance and new actions within the Study Area without compromising design flow capacity and levee integrity.

#### Objectives

- a) By December 2011, identify ways to make the environmental clearance and permitting processes more efficient while meeting state and federal safety standards and following state and federal environmental protection procedures.
- b) Take advantage of opportunities to use advance mitigation projects, mitigation banks with deductible credits, and programmatic permits as part of the planned strategy for simplifying permitting for flood maintenance and new actions.

### Goal

- 3) Promote environmental stewardship and ecosystem functionality within the project area including actions to recover and restore physical processes, self-sustaining ecological functions, native habitats, and species.

**Objectives**

- a) Establish ecosystem restoration projects in conjunction with flood facility maintenance activities such that adverse effects to public safety and existing ecosystem functions are fully avoided and minimized, and habitat conditions for listed species are improved and contribute toward species recovery. Increasing habitat quality substantially above previous baseline conditions is expected to result in ecosystem functionality which will allow flood facility maintenance to occur with minimal adverse effects to habitat.
- b) Develop flood facility maintenance Best Management Practices (BMPs) that fulfill flood system operation and maintenance obligations in a manner that preserves public safety while preserving ecosystem vitality and diversity.

**Goal**

- 4) Identify economic and recreational opportunities and constraints in the Study Area consistent with CMP goals and objectives.

**Objectives**

- a) Identify opportunities and constraints related to agricultural activities within the study area. Define conditions under which agriculture may be compatible with other study area land uses.
- b) Identify opportunities and constraints related to recreational activities within the project area. Define conditions under which recreation may be compatible with other study area land.