Welcome: Tom Zuckerman, Regent, University of the Pacific; Ravi Jain, Dean, School of Engineering and Computer Science and Executive Director, Natural Resources Institute; Margit Aramburu, Director, Natural Resources Institute; and Calvin Chen, Assistant Professor, School of Engineering and Computer Science.

Self-Introductions of Attendees.

Presentation Regarding the State Flood Plan by Ricardo Pineda, Department of Water Resources (Mr. Pineda used and brought copies of flood profiles, maps of the Central Valley Project, and a document entitled “2005 Inspection and Integrity Report of the Flood Control Project Maintenance and Repair”, published February 2006):

- The State has not had a formal plan; the “State Plan of Flood Control” was identified in recent legal proceedings.
- The flood control system includes levees, weirs, diversions, pumping facilities and reservoirs and work to mitigate flooding.
- The 1907 and 1909 floods on Sacramento River were the basis for the Corps early flood control projects.
- The 1957/1955 design profiles have become the de facto criteria for flood control capacity.
- Propositions 1E and 84 call for the development of a new State Plan of Flood Control.
- The profiles are being digitally scanned to be more user friendly and will available on the web soon. The data will be in Excel spreadsheet to be more useable.
- The State Plan of Flood Control, as defined in recent legislation, includes the project levees where the State Reclamation Board has signed agreements with the Corps be non-federal partner, and does not include levees in other parts of California.
- There are flood control levees in other areas; Proposition 1E includes funding to address State funding that is in arrears.

Discussion of State Flood Plan:

- There is not currently a comprehensive plan to address design flood events.
- Each area and/or city has its own design elevations and heights and flows.
- There are deficiencies, partly because the system is not static. There are erosion and other problems, and as a result most of the current levees don’t meet the 100-year standard.
- The Plan is not a level of protection; it is flows and water surface elevations.
- One of our next steps is to determine if they still meet these criteria. Next, we would need to see if they can meet the demands of the next 100 years.
- Recent flood events have exceeded current design flows.
- The current designs have protected urban areas, and, when the levees break, waters flow into non-urban areas as designed.
- While the flow data is outdated; the hydrology and hydraulics are current being updated.
- The “building blocks” to a State Plan are already under way.
• There is an existing flood simulation model; the COE is updating the model. It is a “U-Model”, updated post ‘97, and is always being updated. It is a series of linked models. This model can be used to go to the next step.

• Mr. Minton suggested there is no real time model; the State needs a new state plan, and that from a Southern California prospective, a state plan must be statewide.

• Mr. Guillen suggested there is no real state plan; the models are just models and do not tell you what will happen under real conditions.

• Assemblymember Wolk commenting on the memo summarizing the Drafting Committee discussion, said the Legislature will address standards—both realistic and flexible; a timeline—also realistic and flexible; funding to each; and long term

• Mr. Harder said the bypasses are key to addressing system deficiencies and suggested that the five billion dollars of bond funds in Propositions 1E and 84 are about half of what is needed.

• Mr. Zuckerman suggested developing a strategic plan prior to allocating the bond funds, with a strong maintenance-funding component.

• Mr. Nomellini suggested land use decision are impacting flood plains and that responsibility for planning authority to protect the flood plains must be assigned by the Legislature. Regarding standards, we suggested the State should focus on meeting the existing standards before increasing the standards.

• Mr. Pulver suggested a statewide flood plan should define and address watersheds.

Discussion of Memo Summarizing Discussion of Drafting Committee, as Prepared by Natural Resources Institute Staff:

Mr. Washburn made the following comments:

• The term “no harm” must be defined because when urban areas raise and strengthen levees there may be an increment of additional flow.

• SAFCA has adopted the position that “no project should cause encroachment into design freeboard”.

• A State Flood Plan should include: increased reservoir storage; a state-initiated maintenance district for common elements; state tax credits for flood insurance payments; urban areas acquire easements from willing sellers on ag lands to retire development rights.

Mr. Nomellini suggested the State define urban areas (versus agricultural areas); Mr. Washburn suggested using the Department of Water Resources’ maps of urban levees; Ms Hunter suggested using the FEMA definition; Mr. Washburn suggested using the SACOG Blueprint for those areas.

Mr. Hardesty made the following comments:

• more specificity, watershed approach versus statewide
• the state needs a plan and a system.

Mr. Flinn made the following comments:

• the State needs to address the flood control system as a whole including “non-project” facilities
• dam capacity and operations should be addressed
• Emphasize emergency response
• Plan first, then allocated funding for both construction and maintenance
Mr. Minton made the following comments:

- Name should reflect management of flood waters, not control
- Bond funding must include short term repairs and long term improvements
- Define risk for various uses and overlay physical realities of flood flow and volume in flood plain, etc.
- Include funding for construction and maintenance, set priorities, and time schedules.

Ms Coglianese raised the issue of new growth and local land use control; Ms Hunter suggested local governments need better data to incorporate into general plans.

Mr. O’Connor suggested the State Plan needs an assessment of current performance; delineation of additions and deletions from current system; and creation of a long term funding stream for flood control/management.

Ms Treabess suggested the plan be a Flood Protection Plan, and that the State veer away from standards instead address local needs including identification of areas for local development. The State Plan should interface with local general plans, and local general plans should better address flood issues.

Mr. Neudeck suggested system wide improvements not just a system wide evaluation.

Mr. Harder noted that the traditional cost share with the federal government (65/25/10) may be more difficult to obtain in the future.

Mr. Troppmann suggested that local land use decision processes are in place, and that funding of pre-development flood improvements is a challenge; large developments can fund, smaller projects cannot.

Mr. Cammarota commented that the BIA originally opposed the 200 year level of protection, but has softened on that issue; there should not be liability shifting to local government (from the State); State agencies should not intrude into local land use decisions; growth in some areas can help provide increased flood protection for developed areas with need for better protection (Plumas Lakes).

Mr. La Mar suggested that the role of flood control districts and local government be clarified regarding who is responsible for which decision.

Mr. Bahler suggested that existing deficiencies in the flood control system are not the responsibility of new development.

Mr. Nomellini commented that 200-year protection is not defined; that existing infrastructure to provide 100-year protection needs maintenance and upgrading; State needs to clarify for local government the issues of certification of structures and liability.

Mr. Minton suggested the path to consensus is to address funding and financing. He suggested the State’s plan outline where, when, and the cost of needed work. He described the difficulties of determining areas for growth and areas for no-growth (flood plain, agriculture, habitat, open space, etc).
Mr. Troppmann asked if the bypass system could be expanded, and if flood easements, habitat, and agriculture could be in the same areas, and suggested that upstream flood easements would be a good investment. Ms Treabess noted that there is a ramping up of the flood corridor program.

Mr. O’Connor and Mr. Troppmann agreed on developing guidelines for developing, developed and rural agricultural communities.

Mr. Hardesty noted that rural areas do not have the funds to maintain levees, and suggested that a region wide baseline level of protection (1957 standard) be adopted and funded broadly, with higher level of reliability adopted by urban areas that can afford the fees to maintain a higher standard.

Mr. Pineda shared recent actions by the State to assist in flood fight and new flood protection construction in Firebaugh, Hamilton City and Meridian.

Next Actions:

- Ms Aramburu will revise the comments about the State Flood Plan and embed in a draft comment letter from the Natural Resources Institute.
- The Dialog Group will meet again on Monday December 11, 2006 to discuss funding issues, and if time allows issues of liability and governance.

Link to SAFCA’s Environmental Document:
www.safca.org; Select yellow box on lower right entitled “New Assessment District Formation”

Link to Maps of Designated Floodways:
http://recbd.ca.gov/ [Note these are very detailed maps of designated floodways]