



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary FINAL

Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #5

Time: October 29, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm
Location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau
 3290 N. Ad Art Rd.
 Stockton, CA 95215

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Name	Organization	Status
Roger Churchwell	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency (SJAFCA)	Member
Susan Dell'Osso	Reclamation District 2062	Member
Kevin Kauffman	Stockton East Water District	Member
Jesse Roseman	Tuolumne River Trust	Member
Joe Bartlett	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO)	CVFPO Representative
Gary Hester	DWR	CVFPP Program Manager
Carolyn Lott	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)	Facilitator
Sam Magill	Center For Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support
Mark Nordberg	DWR	DWR Lead
Keith Wallace	MWH	Technical Lead

Absent:

Deedee Antypas	RD 2074	Member
Jim Giottonini	City of Stockton, SJAFCA	Member
Koosun Kim	City of Manteca	Member
Tony Refuerzo	Stanislaus County Planning Department	Member
David Zezulak	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Wes Fujitani	City of Lodi	Member
Alex Hildebrand	South Delta Water Agency	Alternate
Mary Hildebrand	San Joaquin Farm Bureau, South Delta Water Agency, California Central Valley Flood Association	Member
James Nelson	Stormwater Consulting	Member
Dave Peterson	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency	Member

Julie Retner	River Partners	Member
Steve Winkler	San Joaquin County	Member
Scott Woodland	DWR	Regional Coordinator

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK

1. Jesse Roseman will provide alternative wording for the levee vegetation section in Chapter 3 of the Regional Conditions Summary (RCS) and Regional Conditions Report (RCR).
2. Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) members will provide additional objectives for Worksheet #9 before meeting #6.
3. Keith Wallace will contact Work Group members for more information on the objectives developed during meeting #5 as needed.
4. Mr. Wallace will send the Central Valley Flood Management Program (CVFMP) local briefing presentation to Work Group members for review.
5. DWR will provide a bond expenditure report to Work Group members for review as soon as it becomes available.

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Work Group continued its work on October 29, 2009 with the following actions:

- Continued review of problems and opportunities. Reviewed draft problems and opportunities for Chapter 3 of the RCSR.
- Reviewed the draft goals, objectives, and principles for the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and began developing objectives to match each of the 5 CVFPP goals.

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCSR, a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCS and RCR will identify resources, conditions within the Central Valley, flood management and related problems and opportunities, and goals and objectives for use in preparing the CVFPP. The Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

1. Respond to Questions Raised in Meeting #4
2. Discuss Refinement of Problem and Opportunity Statements (Chapter 3)
3. Continue Development of Goals and Objectives (Chapter 4)

SUMMARY:

****ALL PRESENTATIONS AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT
www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp****

Welcome and Greetings

Carolyn Lott opened the meeting and noted that the DWR Executive Sponsor would attend later in the afternoon. The discussion of questions and information requests was delayed until later in the day when Gary Hester arrived to walk through the document entitled “Responses to Questions from Meeting #4.” This document is available online and discussed in greater detail below.

Opening Remarks

Joe Bartlett thanked participants for attending and reviewed the CVFMP process schedule known as the “swim lane”. This document is available online at the web link above. He noted that the Work Group is nearing the end of its process, and expressed his thanks for everyone’s contributions to the CVFPP. He then asked participants for additional help in the next phase of the CVFMP; defining management actions.

Review of Previous Meeting Action Items

Mark Nordberg reviewed action items from Work Group meeting #4. He then asked if all Work Group participants received passwords for the CVFMP SharePoint site – they had.

Roadmap and Overview of Topic Work Group

Keith Wallace delivered a presentation on the Work Group process and changes to the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR). This presentation is available online. As noted during meeting #4, DWR determined that the original schedule was too aggressive and therefore adjusted it so as to incorporate all participant comments in the RCSR in a meaningful way.

As comments are received, they have been incorporated into the RCSR. Mr. Wallace noted that this document is beginning to become very large. As a result, the RCSR will be separated into two documents: a shorter, 20 page summary entitled the *Regional Conditions Summary* (RCS) and the more extensive *Regional Conditions Report* (RCR). All Work Group members will be given the opportunity to comment on both documents.

He then explained that parallel to the RCS/RCR process, there are three companion documents under development: the *State Plan of Flood Control History*, the *State Plan of Flood Control Description*, and the *Flood Control Systems Status Report*. All of these documents, along with the RCS/RCR will be included in the CVFPP.

Finally, Mr. Wallace discussed the topic work group process. In addition to the various regional conditions work groups, there are a number of topic specific work groups. Each of these groups has completed its work with the exception of the Agricultural Stewardship Committee. Upon completion, all topic work group input will be included in both the RCS and RCR. With the exception of the Agricultural Stewardship Committee and Environmental Conditions Work Group, topic work groups did not add any additional goals or principles to the RCR.

Chapter 3 Problems and Opportunities

Mr. Wallace provided a review of planning definitions including the definitions of problems, opportunities, goals, objectives, and principles for the RCS/RCR. He explained that one focus of the day's meeting would be to roll out a summary of Chapter 3 of the RCR and the comments received. To date, staff has received 200 comments, most of which focus on refining existing text. Other comments stress the importance of climate change as a major driver for almost all problems, the public perception of flood risk, liability issues, and emergency preparedness.

He then explained that Chapter 3 has been substantially reorganized since the last Work Group meeting. Initially, there were 20 separate problem statements. These statements have been summarized into 5 overarching problems with subcategories or "contributing factors". As written, the revised statements capture everything discussed to date, but in a more concise manner.

Ms. Lott asked meeting participants to refer to the chart entitled "Problems and Opportunities (Chapter 3)- Contributing Factors and their Regional Differences" and discuss how important each issue is to the Lower San Joaquin Region. Mr. Wallace noted that issue 4(b) under Flood Risk includes all six sub-bullets. The following discussion was recorded:

Discussion:

- A participant asked what was assumed as the baseline condition for each problem (i.e., current conditions, projected likely conditions, etc). Mr. Wallace responded that the problems in Chapter 3 either are current problems or near-term problems (those that are likely to be problems in the next 7-8 years). If a problem is expected to impact the Lower San Joaquin Region before the 2017 CVFPP update, it should be included on the list.
- Another participant asked when the 40 year planning timeframe will be used. Mr. Wallace noted that it is difficult to state what problems will be encountered in that length of time, given the inherent uncertainties in the flood system.
- A Work Group member noted that problem 2 under Flood Risk should include earthquake danger. Mr. Wallace commented that contributing factors were intended to be issues that man could have some degree of control over however, if climate change will be referred to as an overarching problem, maybe earthquake risk should also. Mr. Wallace agreed to bring the suggestion back to the planning team.
- A participant commented that many of the problem statements are characterized as facts, but do not explain the basis for the conclusions. Staff explained that the chart is only meant to be a graphical representation of the problems and opportunities. The full text of the RCR and RCS will provide additional supporting information. The participant added that subjective statements such as "...provide the level of protection desired..." should be reworded to speak directly to requirements of the CVFPP. The same applies to terms like "frequent" and "severe." Such terms should be defined in the full RCR to avoid any confusion.
- Work Group members noted that subsidence under 1(c) and 2(d) should be a half circle for the Lower San Joaquin region.
- A meeting participant raised a concern that the rating system used for the chart should be based on sound science instead of subjective Work Group input. In other words, what is important for the Lower San Joaquin Region from one member's perspective may be less important to another member. The participant suggested that all rankings be based on hydrologic/hydraulic modeling. Staff responded that the ranking system was only designed to give an overview of what each regional conditions work group thought were the major challenges facing each region. DWR and staff technical teams will focus on the engineering and scientific aspects of each problem.
- One member raised the concern that the public and agencies may look at the ranking system and base management action decisions on those rankings. He noted that the things that all of the work group members may agree on are totally uncontroversial and could overshadow more important (and more difficult) actions. Staff responded that management actions will be discussed during 2010, and that the intent of the work group process was only to identify problems and opportunities in each region, but not specify specific actions.

- A participant commented that number 19 under Flood Risk is too strongly worded, and suggests that local emergency management agencies are not doing their jobs. They are constrained by funding and do the best they can with limited resources.
- One member noted that numbers 16 and 17 under Flood Risk should be moved into the Ecosystem section. Staff agreed to take the suggestion back to the planning team.

After the initial discussion of ranking, Ms. Lott asked meeting participants to focus on the problem statements themselves. The following discussion was recorded. Comments are grouped by individual problem statements:

Problem Statement 1: The Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley has been subject to frequent and severe flooding...

- Participants noted that the first problem statement on flood risk suggests that land use changes in and of themselves increase flood risk. Although increased development could increase the damages caused by floods, it does not increase the frequency of flooding.
- A member requested that problem statement number one be revised to include a statement that flood severity is likely to increase due to land use changes and other issues *besides* climate change.
- Staff reiterated that the text of the RCS and RCR will discuss each problem statement in greater depth than is presented in the chart.
- One person noted that all levees in the State Plan of Flood Control actually have performed up to the standards to which they were designed. Major flood events in California occur when floods have exceeded the standards to which levees were built.
- Ms. Lott summarized discussion of problem statement 1 as follows
 - Land use in and of itself doesn't cause flooding.
 - Flood risk is likely to increase due to a variety of factors, not just climate change.
 - Uncoordinated reservoir releases are a major problem.
 - Terms such as "frequent and severe" need to be clearly defined.
 - There is a common desire to raise the overall level of protection.

Problem statement 2: Operation, Maintenance, and Repair of Flood Management Systems...

- A participant noted that repair should be separated from operation and maintenance. Operations and maintenance are ongoing; repair only applies to post-flood events.
- A participant asked why the original design of the State Plan of Flood Control is characterized as a problem. Mr. Bartlett responded that the system was originally designed to move mining debris, but has resulted in increased flow velocities that scour channels. The participant asked that this information be included in the left hand side of the chart and the RCS/RCR.
- One member noted that in the sample narrative accompanying the chart, the US Army Corps of Engineers is the only agency cited for levee vegetation information, even though it refers to "differing perspectives" on the issue. Mr. Bartlett responded that there are a number of studies underway on the levee vegetation issue, and that will be reflected in the revised document. Jesse Roseman offered to develop an alternative perspective for the narrative (**see Action Item #1**).

Problem Statement #3: The development, operation, and maintenance of the flood management system has contributed to the degradation of native habitats...

- A participant noted that "operations and maintenance" should be removed to address the issue more broadly.
- One member remarked that problem statement #3 could include a statement that current efforts to improve the flood system may also improve the environment.

Problem Statement #4: Lack of common understanding and coordination of flood management agency roles...

- Work Group members suggested adding "conflicting agency requirements" to problem statement #4.

- A participant asked what “incomplete consideration of flood risk in land use planning” means. Mr. Wallace responded that this idea speaks to areas that do not always take flood risk into account when planning land use changes.

Problem Statement #5: Conventional, single purpose flood management actions...

- No comments received.

Review Revised CVFPP Goals

Mr. Wallace provided a review of CVFPP goals and objectives. Ms. Lott directed participants’ attention to the chart entitled “Relationship of CVFPP Problems and Opportunities, Goals, and Objectives.” The following discussion was recorded:

Discussion:

- A participant asked that “sustainability” be included in Goal #1.
- Staff remarked that the bullet points under Goal #1 are there to reiterate that it applies to the entire planning area. This does not mean that DWR is proposing to expand the State Plan of Flood Control, but rather that actions in the CVFPP must acknowledge that levees and tributaries outside of the State Plan affect areas within the existing flood management system. The Delta is a prime example: although it does not contain many “project” levees, it has a definite effect on areas within the State Plan.
- A participant suggest that one objective for Goal #1 could be to remove portions of the State Plan to provide overland flood storage and habitat opportunities.
- Work Group members suggested that Goal #2 be revised to include the statement, “...and adjust, coordinate, and streamline.”
- A member asked that “permitting requirements” be included in Goal #2.
- No comments were received on Goal #3.
- A participant suggested that “permitting” be included in Goal #4.
- Another Work Group member suggested that Goal #4 include a statement saying, “identify acceptable levels of risk that balance habitat, economic, and public safety needs...”
- One person commented that the concept of prioritizing projects for funding could be included in Goal #4.
- No comments were received on Goal #5.

Discuss Development of CVFPP Objectives

Mr. Wallace delivered a presentation on CVFPP objectives, and asked that Work Group members think about what should be included in objectives, and what additional objectives should be added. He then provided a walkthrough of Worksheet #9, entitled “Develop Draft CVFPP Objectives.” The sample objectives differ from specific management actions in that they are not as specific as actions would be, and do not identify a responsible party for carrying out that action.

Ms. Lott then asked members to select one goal and take 15 minutes to design an objective based on the criteria discussed in the presentation and on the worksheet. One objective was designed for each of the five goals by filling in the table provided in Worksheet #9. The encouraged the members to answer the question: Is the objective: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and does it include a timeframe for completion? The following conversation was recorded for each objective:

Goal #1: Improve Flood Risk Management

- Objective: Construct systems to provide a level of protection that maintains that level of protection, even if a storm event exceeds specified flows (i.e., a 100 year levee does not

breach in a 200 year event, but merely overtops). Utilize systems upstream to build redundancy into the system to eliminate flood damages above the frequency of design.

- Specific: This would be for urban areas. Technical work on the design for this type of levee still needs to be done.
- Measurable: Yes. The public will know it is achieved when new physical structures are completed.
- Achievable: These are structural improvements (bypasses, reinforced levees, upstream storage) that can be built. A policy change may be required to make this a priority, and stable funding from state, local, and private partnerships is necessary to achieve it.
- Relevant: This objective addresses goals 1, 2 (as O&M applies to repair), 3 (through bypasses and overflow areas), 4 and, 5
- Time: 2025

Goal #2: Simplify Operations

- Objective: Establish an interagency permitting office/clearinghouse to streamline the permitting process by January 1, 2015.
 - Specific: One office for the entire state would be used to provide permitting for flood-related operations, maintenance, repair, and construction.
 - Measurable: This objective would be complete upon the establishment of a functional office. "Functional" will be defined as a clear reduction in the timeliness of permits (down to months from years or decades)
 - Achievable: Similar offices exist in other states, but funding would have to be established. Proponents would also need to convince local, state, and federal permitting offices that this is easier to use than the current system.
 - Relevant: This objective addresses goals 1,2,4, and 5.
 - Time-based: January 1, 2015

Goal 3: Restore Ecosystem Functions

- Objective: Carry out a study by 2012 to identify sufficient specific areas that are currently unavailable due to topography or other restraints that could accommodate 200 year peak flood flows without additional structural developments downstream.
 - Specific: The study would examine areas upstream of major urban areas.
 - Measureable: The objective is complete when the study is finished
 - Achievable: Yes, but new funding is required, and the study would have to solve considerable modeling challenges. One option for funding could be a CALFED science grant.
 - Relevant: Goals 1, 3, and 5 could be addressed by this objective. (if you could be more certain of the capacity of a floodplain than the strength of a levee).
 - Time-based: The study would be complete by 2012.

Goal 4: Institutional Support

The objective designed for Goal #4 was very similar to the permitting clearinghouse in Goal #2. The major difference would be to change the timeframe from 2015 to 2012. The purpose of such an office is to streamline the permitting process and reduce conflicting regulations between agencies. Gary Hester noted that the 2006 emergency levee repairs show that this type of coordination can be done, but requires funding and dedicated staff to address permitting challenges in real time.

Goal 5: Multi-Benefit

- Objective: Skim or divert a significant percentage of flood flows to groundwater banking facilities.
 - Specific: This objective applies to areas upstream from a flood benefit site (defined as a location that will benefit from recharge).

- Measureable: The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requires groundwater metering. We will know how much we are diverting and how much is going in (groundwater monitoring wells) on a regular basis. Success is defined as the per cent reduction in flood flows (TBD) and per cent recovery of groundwater levels (TBD) with an increasing yield for water supply. This objective would have the added benefit of stopping or slowing subsidence in many areas.
- Achievable: Yes. Funding would have to be specifically identified, but would likely be through federal, state, and local partnerships.
- Relevant: This objective applies to all goals. The weakest link is to goal #4: improved institutional support.
- Time-based: 2012 to begin, but this would be an ongoing objective similar to the Farmington Groundwater Recharge Program (www.farmingtonprogram.org).

After a review of Work Group developed objectives, Ms. Lott instructed Work Group members to develop additional objectives and submit them to Mr. Wallace as soon as possible (**see Action Item #2**). The five objectives discussed above will be refined by staff. Mr. Wallace will contact the members that developed them as needed for clarification (**see Action Item #3**).

Response to Questions from Meeting #4

Mr. Hester provided an overview of the document entitled "Response to Questions from Meeting #4." The following is a summary of questions raised by all of the regional conditions work groups in meeting #4.

1. Oroville relicensing. This will be dealt with by the US Army Corps of Engineers.
2. Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District maps and the CVFPP Planning Area. This response goes into some discuss about the district boundaries. Both districts exclude some of the areas within the CVFPP Planning Area. Although urban areas within district boundaries must consult with the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), the CVFPB does not hold any veto power over the legislatively mandated requirements in the CVFPP.
3. Kings River flood flows. The CVFPP management actions will evaluate actions outside of the CVFPP Planning Area that may affect areas within the Planning Area, including flood flows from the Kings River.
4. Local jurisdictional briefings. Briefings on the CVFPP to local jurisdictions are underway. County boards of supervisors from Colusa and Solano Counties and the Merced County Public Works Department have already been briefed; additional meetings are scheduled. Staff from MWH will send the PowerPoint developed for these briefings to the Work Group for review (**see Action Item #4**).
5. Expenditures of bond funds. DWR will provide a bond expenditure report to the Work Group as soon as it is available (**see Action Item #5**).
6. Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) coordination with FloodSAFE. Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman developed a memo on coordination activities, and Jerry Johns, DWR, is attending the Delta Regional Conditions Work Group. This action is a direct response to regional conditions work group requests.

Discussion:

- A participant asked what the local reaction has been to the CVFPP requirement for a building moratorium if the 200 year level of protection can't be met. Mr. Hester responded that it has been very negative. Unless adequate progress towards the 200 year mandate is recorded by 2015, a moratorium will be imposed. In this case, a California Environmental Quality Act challenge could effectively halt any major development.
- One Work Group member noted that the San Joaquin Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) would be a good oversight body for the Work Group. Mr. Hester responded that

the TAC has already been contacted as an interest-based group that could provide important input to the CVFMP and CVFPP.

SharePoint Tutorial

Mr. Wallace provided a brief tutorial on how to access the CVFMP SharePoint site. This website provides the most current versions of the RCS/RCR to Work Group members for review. Passwords and user names were sent to individual Work Group members in advance of meeting #5. Mr. Wallace asked Work Group members to contact Rachel Arendt with any questions about accessing the site at Rachel.r.arendt@mwhglobal.com.

Valley-Wide Forum

Mr. Nordberg announced that the Valley-wide forum discussed at meeting #4 is scheduled for February 3, 2010 at the San Joaquin Delta College. Additional information will be provided when available.

Adjourn