



Meeting Summary

Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group Meeting #3

November 9, 2010, 1:00pm – 5:00pm

**Location: West Sacramento City Hall
1110 West Capitol Ave
West Sacramento, CA 95691**

WORK GROUP ATTENDANCE:

Name	Organization	Status
Francis Borcalli	FloodSAFE Yolo; Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Bill Busath	City of Sacramento	Member
Bill Center	American River Recreation Association, Planning & Conservation League, CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba) IRWMP	Member
Andrea Clark	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	Member
Scott Clemons	Riparian Floodplain Joint Venture	Member
Jim Cornelius	Sutter County RCD	Alternate
William Edgar	Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency	Member
Dan Fua	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Member
Miki Fujitsubo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Member
Eric Ginney	PWA, Ltd., Environmental Hydrology & Geomorphology	Member
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Member
Gena Lasko	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Stefan Lorenzato	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Member
Steve Rothert	American Rivers	Member
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento	Member
Ronald Stork	Friends of the River	Member
Susan Tatayon	The Nature Conservancy	Member
Tim Washburn	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Jeremy Arrich	CA Department of Water Resources	CVFPO** Chief
Noel Lerner	CA Department of Water Resources	DWR Executive Sponsor
Ray McDowell	DWR, FESSRO*	Team
Michelle Ng	CA Department of Water Resources	Team
Vanessa Nishikawa	MWH Americas Inc.	Team
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH Americas Inc.	Team
Craig Wallace	MWH Americas Inc.	Team

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

Name	Organization	Status
Mike Harty	Kearns & West	Facilitator
Briana Moseley	Kearns & West	Facilitation Support / Note Taker
Evan Paul	Kearns & West	Observer

ABSENT:

Paula Britton	Upper Lake Rancheria	Former member
Regina Cherovsky	Conaway Preservation Group LLC, Reclamation District 2035, Water Resources Association of Yolo County	Member
Chuck Dudley	Yolo County Farm Bureau	Member
Mike Hardesty	RD 2068, RD 2098, California Central Valley Flood Control Association	Member
Tom Smythe	Lake County	Member
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	Member
Jeffrey Twitchell	District One of Sutter County; urban and rural interests of Yuba City-Sutter Basin	Member
Warren Westrup	Yolo County Department of Parks and Resources	Former member

*FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office

**Central Valley Flood Planning Office

ACTION ITEMS

- The project team will provide printed copies of large documents for work group member review upon request to address printing cost concerns.
- The project team will provide a small copy of the large benefit areas map displayed at the meeting.
- Open question: "Does the CVFPP planning effort include flood-prone areas that aren't behind levees but are protected by a Section 7 reservoir?"
- The project team will locate communities on a map in order support development of regional objectives and public understanding.

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)
 The Lower Sacramento Regional Management Actions Work Group (Work Group) of the Central Valley Flood Management Program (CVFMP) continued its work on November 9, 2010 with the following activities:

- Work group update on and discussion of the Management Actions Report
- Briefing and discussion on the elements of the 2012 CVFPP
- Work group member edits to the regional objectives developed by the subcommittee
- Briefing on the next steps in Phase 3, including the process for sub-regional and regional solution set development
- Work group member completion of Phase 2 Assessment Surveys

MEETING GOALS

1. Discuss feedback on the Management Actions Report and Interim Progress Summary #2
2. Outline what the 2012 CVFPP will include
3. Develop list of proposed regional objectives building on subcommittee initial draft

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

4. Describe Phase 3 process and opportunities for involvement

SUMMARY

Welcome, Greetings, Agenda Review

Mike Harty, meeting facilitator, welcomed work group members and reviewed the meeting purpose, objectives, and agenda.

CVFPO Chief Jeremy Arrich explained DWR's decision to adjust the schedule for developing the 2012 CVFPP, although specific details are still under discussion. The timeline for plan development is likely to be extended due to a variety of factors, including resource constraints.

Opening Remarks

Noel Lerner, executive sponsor, provided a progress update. DWR is currently developing the CVFPP Progress Report to the Legislature which will outline the anticipated content of the 2012 Plan and 2017 Plan Update.

The draft Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published in October. There will be three public scoping meetings in November for the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). Phase 2 of the CVFPP process officially concludes at the Valleywide Forum on December 9.

Document Update

Michelle Ng, DWR, provided an update on CVFPP document development and review:

- State Plan of Flood Control [SPFC] Descriptive Document: Final version issued Nov. 5, 2010
- Flood Control System Status Report: Public draft will be available early 2011
- History Document: Public draft will be available early 2011
- 2012 CVFPP Progress Report: Final version will be issued Dec. 31, 2010
- Phase 2 Documents: Managements Action Report & Interim Progress Summary # 2: Public drafts will be released Dec. 1, 2010
- Program Environmental Impact Report: Notice of Preparation: Public draft was released Oct. 29, 2010
- Program Environmental Impact Report: Scoping Meetings: Nov. 15-16-18, 2010

Draft Management Actions Report, Draft IPS2 Discussion/Comment Session

Michelle Ng reviewed the management actions development process and the Management Actions Report (MAR, distributed November 1 for review), the Integrated Progress Summary 2 (IPS2) report, and related appendices. Michelle explained how management actions will be further developed, refined, and applied during Phases 3 and 4 of work group activities. Michelle provided an overview of the Management Actions Report and advised that the deadline for comments on the MAR is November 12th.

Michelle's presentation generated questions and comments on several topics, including:

- How to describe the relationship between the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) and CVFPP;
- Whether the CVFPP will alter the SPFC and thereby the State's responsibility and potential liability;
- Whether these questions will be addressed in the CVFPP; and
- Whether the state has a responsibility to set a standard for flood protection, and who will be responsible if standards set forth in the CVFPP are not achieved.

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

In general terms, DWR advised that the SFPC defines the State's flood control facilities and that the CVFPP will clarify who is responsible for which facilities. Responsibility for setting flood protection standards and achieving them is the subject of ongoing discussions within DWR.

Overview Of 2012 CVFPP: What Is It, How Will We Get There, And Where Do We Go From Here?

Jeremy Arrich provided an overview of the FloodSAFE program and its accomplishments. FloodSAFE is funded through bond funds from Prop 1E and Prop 84 and has core management programs including an emergency response program, operations and maintenance, floodplain management, and environmental stewardship. Thus far, the bonds have funded some initial levee evaluations, road repairs, and special projects to local agencies.

The 2012 CVFPP is a core part of FloodSAFE and is expected to provide the roadmap for effective flood management throughout the Central Valley. It will not propose site-specific projects in most cases but rather a vision for flood management, an implementation framework for future flood system improvements, and a series of specific recommendations for actions to be taken between 2012 and 2017 (including possible feasibility studies, early implementation projects, and legislative, policy, or institutional changes). Between 2012 and 2017 there will be a shift from conducting major planning activities to implementing recommendations. The 2012 plan will define a framework and contain initial recommendations that will be refined as more is learned about the system, projects are constructed, and feasibility studies are completed. The 2012 CVFPP will not focus on a single preferred alternative but will pull from a certain solution set for a certain area. It is intended to be a system-wide look.

The presentation was followed by an extended period of questions, responses, and discussions; key points are presented below:

- The term "sustainable" in the context of a systemwide approach for flood management refers to an approach that is more strategic and economically viable.
- Repairs are operations-based maintenance and are localized. Improvements are larger in scale and go beyond the original design.
- Q: How do you distinguish a repair from an environmentally required improvement? Will there be repairs conducted specifically for environmental restoration purposes?
- A: Repairs will be considered under the umbrella of broader system improvements within the plan. At this point DWR has not yet defined whether or which repairs would be done solely for environmental purposes. The program team can consider this idea when further defining the repair program.
- Comment: The CVFPP must incorporate environmental restoration as one of its key purposes.
- A: The CVFPP program is focused on flood risk management and will be coordinated with other efforts that are specifically focused on environmental restoration. Within the CVFPP structure, the program team will be working to identify areas where restoration can be incorporated.
- Will the state be committing to achieving the design standard for SFPC facilities? One view in the meeting is that the legislature did not impose a requirement on the state that all facilities encompassed by the CVFPP will achieve design standards and DWR should have a clear policy about this.
- What is the potential for use of the state's authority to impose obligations to meet design standards, including the creation of maintenance areas that impose burdens on property owners? There is an important difference between the state's minimum responsibility and its "aspiration" that may not be a responsibility, and this difference should be made clear.
- It is important to state clearly how responsibility is allocated between communities in their planning and the state: if a community chooses to grow and meets the definition of an urban area requiring 200-year flood protection who is obligated to provide that protection?

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

- Note: DWR advised that it is aware of these concerns and that roles and responsibilities will be addressed in the 2012 CVFPP
- The plan should use different solution sets that include different responsibilities (e.g. state, federal, local, and fiscal responsibilities) as a package. The plan should illustrate the tradeoffs and highlight them so that a state policy can be established.
- A concern was raised about ambiguity in the definitions in the MAR (and associated documentation including the glossary). The definitions should be clear, including “design standards.”
- There should be clarity about whether DWR plans to incorporate the CVFPP into the Bulletin series, like the State Water Plan process in Bulletin 160, and recognize that flood management is part of the statewide plan.
- The system is defined by the geographic scope. The system is the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Flood Management System.
- The plan should highlight the importance of integrating with other processes that also are underway and should avoid a narrow focus, i.e., stovepipe, that could take over as deadlines approach. In designing a system to address flooding issues it is important to integrate, coordinate, and not pre-empt other important interests.
 - DWR: There is an explicit focus on coordination at this time of all major programs in the Delta. Integrated Regional Water Management is another example of a program where DWR is addressing the need for a broader, coordinated approach.
- The purpose of this plan is to make places safer. It does not have other purposes; if this purpose can be met as well as other purposes, that is fine.

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

Vanessa Nishikawa gave an overview of Phase 3 and regional solution sets. The key point is that these are not alternatives but rather different approaches to flood management intended to reveal the trade-offs between different solutions. The four basic approaches are:

1. Restore design capacity – restore to original design condition. Repairing existing flood management system in place.
2. Only address high-risk areas. Develop minimum 200-year protection for urban communities.
3. Manage consequences of large floods. No significant structural improvements, but rather use easements, flood insurance, and other non-structural solutions.
4. Multi-benefit approach. Modify corridors and maximize important opportunities for ecosystem restoration and water supply. This includes significant changes to infrastructure.

Questions:

Q: It is not clear what is going to be in a programmatic EIR without alternatives. If we are going into scoping for that EIR, then how does this work?

A: The EIR is focusing on the adoption of the plan and establishing the potential impacts from implementing the plan. We are looking at watersheds impacted by the CVFPP (see the NOP). There may be impacts to the MSP and SWCP. This is not your typical Programmatic EIR. There has been an effort to have the planning process and EIR in lock step.

Q: On solution sets, we have these four approaches. Are these stand-alone approaches? Do these cross-over?

A: In order to identify these trade-offs, we need to see the trade-offs and look at these individually.

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

Q: The original design capacity has a certain geometry (e.g., specific freeboard). Is that what you are talking about to restore design capacity? Are you talking about what would be required to achieve a theoretical condition?

A: Yes, or designed capacity. We are looking at freeboard with a certain levee geometry. If that condition is not met we would look at what needs to be achieved to meet that specific design flow.

Q: That approach does not maximize flood protection, so why is it included? It is not a solution for anything.

A: The management actions would be put together into a solution set to address that approach for flood management. It is not that this would be something that we would decide to do; it defines a baseline for comparison. It is a way to look at the legislation and what is required.

The CVFPP will set policy and, as we go on to plan how to manage flood-risk, identify the trade-offs. The solution sets help us identify the costs, risks, and consequences of the different approaches; they are decision-making tools. The final alternatives are going to be combinations of all four approaches.

C: Restore SPFC design capacity could be appropriate for non-urban areas. It makes sense to have a solution set that gets back to that context.

Q: I think the alternatives and preferred alternatives are going to be a mish-mash of these approaches. DWR has to figure out the costs and nature of the system capacity as perceived by the courts. DWR and the public will have an interest in doing something different than the original design. What does it mean that we have a plan with a different aspiration? It does make sense to have a solution set based upon the SPFC Design Capacity. We are not at this currently.

A: Each one of these is not a straightforward answer. These can define specific approaches.

Q: I thought the phrase Solution Set was going to be changed to Themes.

A: It was decided that solution sets is the term to be used. They are sets of management actions. The outcome of this design formulation tool is alternatives. Use the term "solution sets" loosely.

Phase 3 planning process

Vanessa explained the solution set planning approach as it applies to particular sub-regions.

Q: How is sub-region defined? Is the map (large-scale map in meeting room) intended to be a head start?

A: We will define the specific sub-regions starting with the USACE benefit areas and then amend them based upon additional analysis. That map might be grouped a little differently.

Q: The way you have the solution sets, it implies there may well be regions with the same characteristics that are not distinct and contiguous. Would you consider those as a commonality or lump together specific areas?

A: We have looked at place-based actions for these areas. Applying management approaches to similar areas (e.g., ag lands) that are not in the same sub-region may be useful. We will continue to think about community based management actions. We could take those (common characteristics) into account as we talk about various sub-regions.

Q: I took a look at the map. It seems to try and correspond to some of the areas protected by levees associated with USACE projects. There are flood-prone lands relevant to the operation of Section 7 reservoirs, federal and non-federal that are not on the map. Does this planning effort include flood-prone areas that aren't behind levees, but are protected by a Section 7 reservoir?

A: We will get an answer to that question.

A: Phase 3 will engage stakeholders in discussing specific sub-regions in order to understand potential place-based actions and how they apply in the different sub-regions. The CVFPP needs

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

to characterize the flood issues in those sub-regions (e.g. property and infrastructure at risk, etc.) and then provide a reconnaissance-level evaluation of what you can do in certain regions.

The reason why they are called benefit areas is that they will help better identify the costs to the areas they benefit, which then informs the “beneficiary pays” concept. This is an important concept as the CVFPP moves forward with financial requirements.

C: These approaches are designed as planning tools, but they have the potential to leave out important features. It would be useful in looking at the step at which solution sets are designed to achieve an approach; you should look at how well that solution set achieves the goals and objectives of the plan. We need to tie this stuff back to the goals and objectives. We may be missing important pieces.

A: The regional objectives are going to help us get back to these regional solutions. As we develop solution sets for sub-regions and regions, we need to be looking back at how we are achieving the goals and objectives.

We will take into consideration the information provided by the SPFC evaluations on the geometric design of the system. Criteria are being developed. If you set the bar too high then there is no way to get to that reliability level.

Develop Regional Objectives

Vanessa described the regional objectives process in Phase 3. The regional objectives being defined in Phase 2 focus on the primary goal of flood system improvements; objectives to achieve the supporting goals will be the focus of Phase 3. The regional objectives developed by the Lower Sacramento RMAWG subcommittee will be helpful in comparing how well the regional solution sets achieve the CVFPP goals.

Subcommittee Report

Fran Borcalli, work group member, provided a report on the subcommittee's activities. The subcommittee discussed the need for a map that identifies the communities under discussion (e.g. rural, small community, urban) to allow for greater understanding of how those communities relate to the objectives. This map will be an important tool for the public. The subcommittee effort was focused on the primary goal (flood protection) and not the supporting goals.

Work group members provided the following edits and additions to the draft regional objectives:

Draft Regional Objective #1: “Minimize the frequency of flooding to achieve the following levels of protection...”

- Add “...for existing communities” to the end of objective 1 first sentence.
- Add “to control the extent of community expansion through local general plans and development review” in example actions. Also add, “To implement the Community Rating System”.

Draft Regional Objective #2: “Minimize loss of life when flooding occurs”

- Leave as-is

Draft Regional Objective #3: “Reduce private property and equipment damages when flooding occurs.”

- Discussion identified support for a new objective around design for recovery.

Draft Regional Objective #4: “Reduce damage to critical and community facilities when flooding occurs.”

- Leave as-is.

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

Draft Regional Objective #5: “Minimize water quality contamination when flooding occurs.”

- Add “industrial, agriculture, and domestic sources of pollutants” as an additional bullet to example actions.

Draft Regional Objective #6: “Improve overall system performance and reduce flood stages in the Sacramento River system”

- Change to “improve overall hydraulic system performance by reducing flood stages in the Sacramento River system”

Draft Regional Objective #7: “Minimize flooding in lower Cache Creek area”

- Change to “Enhance the management of sediment and mercury from the Cache Creek system”

Draft Regional Objective #8: “Increase flood protection system resiliency to minimize catastrophic flooding.”

- Leave as-is.

Draft Regional Objective #9: “Increase flood conveyance capacity through the Yolo Bypass system without increasing water stages.”

- Provide additional examples here.
- Transitory storage.
- Reduce obstructions to flow in the bypass (e.g. the railroad).

Draft Regional Objective #10: “Minimize unforeseen facility failures by implementing a sustainable flood management system O&M program.”

- Leave as-is.

There was discussion at the end of the meeting on the need to better incorporate green infrastructure and address environmental goals in the process. The project team noted that these issues should be dealt with in Phase 3.

Overview of the Phase 2 Assessment Process

Mike Harty asked members to fill out the Phase 2 Assessment Survey.

Action Items and Next Steps

The project team reviewed key upcoming dates for document review and work group comments (see page 3, above).

Adjourn