

DRAFT MINUTES
October 21, 2010
Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan
Work Group Meeting
Member Attendance

Name	Affiliation	Telephone #
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
Debra Bishop	AECOM	916-414-5818
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
Gary Hobgood (<i>Conf Call</i>)	Department of Fish & Game	916-983-6920
Andrea Mauro	Central Valley Flood Protection Board staff	916-574-0332
Ray McDowell	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-651-7192
Scott Rice	Department of Water Resources	916-837-6415
Alicia Seesholtz	DES Department of Water Resources	916-376--9848
Gary Sprague	Nat. Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.	916-930-3615
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	530-894-5401 x227
Jeffrey E. Twitchell	Levee District 1 & Yuba City Basin	916-631-4555
Matt Wacker (<i>Conf Call</i>)	AECOM	916-266-4907
Kent Zenobia	FPO - Department of Water Resources	916-574-2639

Agenda development review

- Earl Nelson - announced the request for application submissions for the DWR's Flood Protection Corridor Program (FPCP). The FPCP is established to fund primarily nonstructural flood management solutions through direct expenditures and grants to local public agencies and nonprofit organizations. Funding under this Program is intended to be used for acquisition, restoration, enhancement and protection of real property while preserving sustainable agriculture and enhancing wildlife habitat in and near flood corridors throughout the state. The DWR will implement this Program to avoid future flood damage and correct existing problems by restoring natural fluvial and related biological processes in flood corridors by acquiring, through easement or fee title, rights to real property that is subject to periodic damaging flood flows.

Task order timeline

- Tony Danna discussed the process for the Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) development and where we are at in that process.

Task Order I

- Debra Bishop and Matt Wacker discussed the current status on Task Order I Deliverables:

1. Gather & Review Background Info
 - a. Data collection & review technical memo
2. Biological Resources Reconnaissance Surveys
 - a. Technical memo
3. Prepare Maps
 - a. Regional project base & restoration maps
4. Stakeholder Outreach Support
 - a. Stakeholder meetings
 - b. Conceptual permitting strategy tech memo
5. Project Work plan, Permitting Strategy & Tech Memo for Phases 2, & 3

Task Order II

- Debra Bishop and Matt Wacker discussed the development of Task Order II Deliverables:

- A. The Corridor Management Plan
- B. Permit identification and requirements
 - Clean Water Act Section 404; Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10; Clean Water Act Section 401&402; Federal Endanger Species Act, Sections 7&10; Migratory Bird Treaty Act; National Historic Preservation Act; Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; Federal Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management; Streambed Alteration; California State Lands Commission; Central Valley Flood Protection Board; California Endangered Species Act
- C. CEQA Requirements
- D. NEPA Requirements (due to USFWS and US Army Corps of Engineer federal nexus)
- E. Hydraulic Modeling
- F. Geomorphic Analysis of Channel Dynamics Modeling

CMP Outline Review

- Group Discussion on the Corridor Management Plan document including the outline contents:
 - Executive Summary
 - Introduction
 - Factors Affecting Corridor Plan Development
 - Existing Corridor Conditions & Management Needs
 - Corridor Opportunities & Constraints
 - Corridor Actions & Implementation Plan
 - Permitting Strategy
 - Ongoing Monitoring & Implementation
 - References
 - Appendices
- The Work Group discussed the CMP data needs and the borrowing of information from other studies and documents already completed in the region.

- Ray McDowell – Felt the document should be forward looking and adaptable to changing situations. He expressed concern with the level of analysis and whether the data was intended to use future situation analysis.
- Paul Brunner – Consider using all comments from the TRLIA project, with the addition of additional stakeholders concerns addressing the Lower Feather River CMP.
- Debra Bishop – Cautioned against getting too tied into individual feelings and address the larger consensus view of the larger interest groups.
- Ray McDowell– Perhaps these issues are too complex for the majority of stakeholders to address. Will there be an education opportunity to bring the stakeholders up to speed.
- Earl Nelson – We have worked on developing a full list of stakeholders in the region and will use briefings prior to the release of the document to education the stakeholders.

Mapping Boundary

Corridor Parcel Maps

- **Discussion on LFRCMP Project Boundary - What are the Mapping Boundaries?**

Yuba River and upper reach of the Feather River

- Ray McDowell – Management activity outside levee should be discussed.
- Gary Hobgood – The northern study area boundary should be from the State Cut and Hwy 70 overpass on the Yuba River and Hwy 20 (*Colusa Ave*) Bridge on the Feather River.
- This would add approximately .9 miles to the Feather River and an additional .9 miles of the Yuba River to the confluence of the two rivers. A total of 1.8 miles to the northern boundary of the CMP Study Area.
 - **No disagreement expressed!**

Bear River

- Gary Hobgood – On the Bear River the Hwy 70 crossing would be good physical boundary that is easily identifiable.
- Debra Bishop – The boundary location does not have to be the same for modeling and the project boundary. There are different rationales for these boundaries.

- Earl Nelson – The boundary on the Bear River will extend from the point where the Hwy 70 Bridge crosses the Bear River downstream (approx. 3 miles) to the confluence of the Bear and the Feather River.
- **No disagreement expressed!**

Feather River confluence with the Sutter Bypass – Southern Study Area Boundary

Discussion on this lower boundary of the study area ended with no change to the current boundary for the CMP. It was discussed and decided that the modeling extension into the Sutter bypass would only be addressed for hydraulic modeling purposes.

- **No disagreement expressed!**
- Jim Cornelius – Sutter County Parks is developing a park and mitigation project on the right bank of the Feather River near the northern upstream boundary.
- Earl Nelson – Discussed the Setback levee issues and the width of the study area. Discussion on the potential for future setback levees was discussed. A proposal for the use of the 50 foot from toe on the land side of the levee was discussed.
- Debra Bishop – The Plan may want to address issues related to historic or potential flood management purposes. Also, future ecological improvement projects or processes should be a part of this CMP.
- Terri Gaines – If the intent is to increase the project acres for flood risk reduction in the future, then this would be a beneficial study process. The Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) is currently looking into the future flood risk areas outside the levees and the Lower Feather River CMP could be at the cutting edge of future option development.
- Ray McDowell – Buffer areas are needed in the Central Valley region and could enhance future flexibility.
- Terri Gaines – Permitting of maintenance projects on the Feather River flood plain would reduce flood risks issues and enhance habitat improvement areas.
- Earl Nelson – Improving maintenance projects for both habitat areas and public safety would reduce flood risk while being cost effective. Multiple benefit projects will be more likely gain approval and funding in the future.
- Earl Nelson – The US Army Corps of Engineers' vegetative variance issues will still need to be addressed before programmatic maintenance can be addressed.
- Paul Brunner – Back to this discussion on expansion of the study area for potential levee setbacks. It would be unwise to expand our boundaries in this CMP to address all potential flood hazard areas.

Expansion of setback levees should only be addressed with the political will of the community. Someday the expansion of setback levees may be a point of discussion for future consideration. But not now! No new setback levees should be encouraged on private acres or included in this plan. Issues beyond the 200-year protection study plan and what the adjacent land holders viewpoints should be addressed by local community demand.

- Earl Nelson – The lessons learned from Sacramento and San Joaquin Comprehensive Plan was that the plan failed because they tried to address all the potential setbacks levees in the region too early.
- Paul Brunner – The plan should include the analyst and engineering needed for future options. But those options should not develop beyond the potential regional discussion.
- Debra Bishop – Potential setbacks should be defined in this plan because we have the right people in this Work Group to make the intelligent decisions needed on this study area. What the Work Group says should carry some weight on what is studied.
- Scott Rice – There are two options we could go – First to stay within the boundary of the levee that is the described DWR maintenance area or second to stay within the crowns, while only “studying” outside those defined boundaries.
- Debra Bishop – One of the Work Groups Objectives was to address potential setback levee.
- Scott Rice - The boundary should be limited to a narrow expansion of the levee to improve flood flow for public safety purposes. Any potential proposals should be a result of hydraulic modeling. There is also the scheduling concern to address all future potential issues with setback levees. This CMP will not be able to get specific enough to discuss all potential issues in the time frame we have set.
- Terri Gaines – We need to stay consistent with the CVFPP. The data collection for an “appropriate” boundary is what needs to be addressed today.
- Earl Nelson – Please keep in mind the “Suicide” concern for the CMP. The 200-year and the 500-year flood plain boundary are very different concerns between the Lower Feather CMP and the CVFPP Study Area.
- Terri Gaines- The two plans should address the future “Fix” of the flood system. The Lower Feather CMP is a strategy. The Lower Feather CMP should do nothing to prohibit or restrict future efforts to benefit flood management.
- Jennifer Hobbs - What is the wider CVFPP study area? Discussion followed on this boundary. The CVFPP will describe a sustainable, integrated flood management plan that reflects a system-wide approach for protecting areas of the Central Valley currently receiving protection from flooding by existing facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control. This area includes the flood plains of the Sacramento / San Joaquin Rivers and major tributaries.

- Ray McDowell – More hydraulic modeling studies are needed to accurately determine what hydraulics impacts are occurring. In addition, potential vegetation habitat restoration/ improvement protect placements can be identified to reduce erosion, while benefitting flood flow. This plan should address what are the desired corridor river conditions and what analysis is needed to determine the best management practices to achieve those desired conditions.
- Debra Bishop – The hydraulic modeling and the impacts of the flood stage on the existing levees should be a preventive process.
- James Cornelius – Interest in this process and the impact of the CVFPP on the Feather River upstream from this study area (Yuba City to Orville Dam) needs to be addressed by the local stakeholders.
- Terri Gaines – Back to the boundary discussion, are we in agreement to use the “Crown to Crown” or to go beyond the levee structure to the 50 ft. from the landside toe?
- Paul Brunner – If we just stay within the legal levee easement on each side of the levee will be the most defensible position.

Width of the Lower Feather River CMP Study area

- Earl Nelson – That appears to be the most practical decision. Are we all in agreement on using the legal easement on the landside of levee as the exterior of the study area?
 - **No disagreement expressed!**

Subcommittee Reports

Operations and Maintenance

- Paul Brunner – The O&M funding discussion went to the lawyers - Nancy Finch and Andrea P. Clark, TRLIA lawyer, had that discussion and followed up with a letter to Brunner. He will share with the Work Group later. The summary is that there is No process available yet to provide for long term maintenance funding. There is payment for mitigation cost for long term projects. Any onsite mitigation work will not be funded by state funds. There appears to be some silence on issue, thus it is not a final no way. There just does not appear to be current guidance on how this could be achieved.

- Debra Bishop – Advance mitigation effort occurs with CalTrans, DWR and other agencies. There appears to be a Law Group involved and this effort is getting a lot of momentum behind it. This new process would place advance mitigation in place over a 5 – 10 years term and be available for anticipated projects in the future. It would be a long term management mitigation bank. The permitting would be streamline to expedite the projects. The process would be managed by third party or perhaps the state.
- Paul Brunner – The funding method would have to be with the state, since the local governments are unable to accomplish the funding.
- Earl Nelson – The existing Prop 13 & 84 have language to purchase or acquire land and run mitigation sites. It can also be a cost sharing arrangement with other governmental agencies. Prop 1E has no language to allow for flood corridor projects.

Hydraulic Modeling

- Jeff Twitchell- discussed the a hydraulic modeling that is included in the CMP Outline. He had a handout which he discussed. Yuba River upstream to the TRLIA / RD784 boundary model is available from MBK data.
- Ray McDowell– Discussion on the boundary occurred. Setbacks need to be built into this model.
- Jeff Twitchell – The low flow Sutter bypass information is available but costly.
- Ray McDowell– There is cost savings with CVFED data, available in about 3 months.
- Jeff Twitchell – I don't feel CVFED is good option for our effort. This data realistically will be available in about 9 months.
- Earl Nelson – 1D model will not do give sufficient information to resolve the issues we know we have in the Lower Feather River corridor.
- Jeff Twitchell – Agreed on the lack of information on the 1D model.
- Jeff Twitchell – He will meet with MBK consultants to discuss the particulars.
- Action Items: Tony will notify Kelly Briggs of the discussion and the meeting with MBK. Earl and Jeff Twitchell will talk to Joseph Chan, DWR and Marjorie Caisley, DFG.
- Helen Swagerty – The options for modeling projects and how the low flow drainage modeling was done at the O'Connor Lakes restoration effort were discussed.

- Jeff Twitchell – Mentioned that Safe Harbor (*like*) mitigation agreement was wanted by CVFPB for restoration work, but not for vegetation plan. The Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Agreement (OMRR&R) for Star Bend Setback with a long term vegetation management plan with DFG & DWR was desirable to the Board. A draft vegetation management plan was sent around to USFWS to review. The discussion that followed was on LD1 continuing to do doing maintenance work on the restoration for the next 7/8 years under contract. The cost will be covered by LD1 but they may want to get some of the FPCP.
- Helen Swagerty – Contractor do the maintenance work on the restoration project but how about the corridor flood way?
- Jeff Twitchell – The only real issue is the elderberry issue. The DWR will continue to do the actual river corridor management and maintenance operations as they have in the past.

Delphi Exercise III

Earl Nelson gave an overview of the Delphi Exercise and a request for the Work Group to complete an eight page survey for Exercise III. The Work Group was thanked for their past participation and their continued support of the Goals for the Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan. The Work Group was asked to rate the 156 scenarios' into the following three categories:

“Should this scenario be included within the Corridor Management Plan?”

1. Yes - it should be discussed or
2. Yes - it should be analyzed and a solution presented or
3. No - no need to address within the CMP.