

ATTENDING AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

1. City of Sausalito
2. Flood Mitigation Leave of RV
3. Marin County Flood Control
4. U.S. Corps of Engineers
5. Zone 7, Alameda County of Flood Control
6. Marin County Sherriff’s Office of Emergency Services
7. Flood Zone 4, Tiburon
8. Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District
9. Flood Zone 7 Advisory Board
10. Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
11. Sonoma County Fire & Emergency Services
12. City of Belvedere
13. GHD
14. City of Mill Valley
15. Marin County Department of Public Works
16. Sonoma County Water Agency
17. Flood Advisor Board 4, Marin County

SUMMARY

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) invited area agency and stakeholder contacts to attend a briefing that highlighted the findings of the public review draft of *California’s Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing the State’s Flood Risk*. The team worked with the Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies Association to distribute the meeting information and arrange logistics.

DWR’s Terri Wegener and USACE’s Craig Conner lead the approximately 50-minute San Rafael presentation. A deeper discussion of each *California’s Flood Future* recommendation followed.

Key meeting questions/suggestions Included:

- Does the report account for or include data related to climate change
- Local funding efforts have been successful when they are very tangible, single-focused projects, but integrated water management efforts weren’t as successful- Bond measures have to show link between economics and impacts (results)
- Coordination between local, state, and federal emergency management activities needs to be improved
- Funds should be directed toward public education efforts
- Local elected should be offered report presentations (remote or live)
- More emphasis should be created on statewide impacts, many residents don’t understand direct impact if they don’t live in a floodplain
- Need graphic representation of impacts of flooding that makes it real to residents so that risk is fully understood

RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

(Italics indicate ideas or phrases from meeting presenters)

Recommendation 1

Conduct regional flood risk assessments to better understand statewide flood risk.

- Were you able to identify what events cause flooding? For example, most floods statewide have been associated with an atmospheric river. Is that a common theme, are they associated with climate change? Were you able to look at that?
 - *We looked at it in a more macro way – as info changes, we are able to look at a more quantitative way. We wanted to start the conversation with common types of flooding.*
- In our town, there is a lot of artificial fill – and now we are getting tidal flooding because it's settled four feet. Potentially look at those areas based on artificial fill.
- When you say regionally – what does that mean?
 - *Word region is scalable – maybe IRWM regions, maybe geo localities, especially watersheds – not talking about small – talking about systems.*
- If a city wanted to undertake a flood assessment – are there federal or state programs or funds that can help with that?
 - *Yes, you can ask USACE and they can assess whether it can be done under existing programs.*

Recommendation 2

Increase public and policymaker awareness about flood risks to facilitate informed decisions.

- How much interaction was there with local elected officials in information gathering process? How much of this recommendation is feedback from them versus report?
- It would be good to contact local elected officials – offer internet/webinars for local people.
- FEMA requires flood elevation certificates for each building in floodplain – we were able to conduct an interesting watershed assessment model but only two people saw that because there isn't a way to transmit information.
- Maybe establish protocols for information sharing. Defining in contract a useable deliverable, rather than just model run.
- Advertising/PSAs would get information to the public who need it most – not sure a brochure would reach people who need to hear it.

Recommendation 3

Increase support for flood emergency preparedness, response, and recovery programs to reduce flood impacts.

- *Have any of you participated in the golden guardian program?*
 - The issue is either it's statewide or region 1 – and locals get buried, or state doesn't live up to billing. It's been a frustration for locals with that exercise specifically. State has

lost credibility with it. Almost always cheaper for locals to develop their own that is more tailored.

Recommendation 4

Encourage land use planning practices that reduce the consequences of flooding.

- A general plan must consider all things– missing issue is standards for helping community determine what its land-use planning policy needs to be.
 - *For reference, there's an executive order that outlines floodplain management suggestions.*
- If the general plan doesn't call our standards and doesn't call out next steps – communities get in bind and it's an amendment to the plan and needs CEQA and millions of dollars.

Recommendation 5

Implement flood management from regional, systemwide, and statewide perspectives to provide multiple benefits.

(No comments)

Recommendation 6

Increase collaboration among public agencies to improve flood management planning, policies and investments.

- Regarding permitting, is this where DWR can help? In some cases you may have a couple of agencies collaborating, but that doesn't have impact across the state. Is part of this recommendation having DWR take the lead on this?

Recommendation 7

Establish sufficient and stable funding mechanisms to reduce flood risk.

- Also manage storm water program, talking about creating utility service for public service – no enabling legislation at state has been a 20 year discussion. Don't understand there are impacts from nature and that we can manage better.
- We've done polling – flood protection doesn't sell, can't get to a 2/3 voting threshold. Projects related to water supply, environmental protection, water management do, but flood on its own won't hold. The farther you get from the flood, the farther the vote discrepancy gets. Even during a large flood, 80 percent of people generally don't flood – so it's hard to relate need for flood protection.
 - *If 2/3 was reduced to 50 percent voter approval, would ballot items have a shot?*
 - Yes, at 50, they would have a conversation.
- Over the last 10 years in Marin County, we've had three initiatives on the ballot. Early 2000s – very focused on flood control for a project affecting 700 people. Other successful projects relate to a small area or specific project that shows tangible results. We deviated and included a multi-benefit program the same area, but the proposal failed because people thought it was going to studies, not projects. Any organized opposition and the measure won't make it. We did a measure, only required 50 percent – prevailed over five years in court – polling showed more than 2/3 support.

- People also don't realize economic impact for a flood – not just self-interest. Other impacts even if your home isn't impacted.
- We have separate flood, water, sanitation agencies, and there's little incentive to partner and roll dice on grants.
- Informational outreach seems backwards – too much money being thrown at bureaucratic process. Consider conducting a simulation in key areas prone to confluence of events and measure damage and impacts. We need someone drumming up interest. Cut study budget and put it toward public education.

###