

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD
April 27, 2012

NOTE: THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER TIMED ITEMS AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE LISTED TIME, BUT NOT BEFORE THE TIME SPECIFIED. UNTIMED ITEMS MAY BE HEARD IN ANY ORDER. MINUTES ARE PRESENTED IN AGENDA ORDER, THOUGH ITEMS WERE NOT NECESSARILY HEARD IN THAT ORDER.

A regular meeting (Open Session) of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board was held on April 27 beginning at 8:30 a.m. in the Auditorium of the Resources Building, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California.

FRIDAY, APRIL 27

The following members of the Board were present:

Mr. Bill Edgar, President
Ms. Emma Suarez, Vice-President
Ms. Jane Dolan, Secretary
Mr. Joe Countryman
Mr. Tim Ramirez

The following members of the Board staff were present:

Mr. Jay Punia, Executive Officer
Mr. Len Marino, Chief Engineer
Mr. Eric Butler, Supervising Engineer
Ms. Mitra Emami, Senior Engineer
Mr. Michael Wright, Senior Engineer
Ms. Nancy Moricz, Staff Engineer
Ms. Amber Woertink, Staff Assistant
Ms. Deborah Smith, Legal Counsel

Department of Water Resources staff present:

Mr. Jeremy Arrich, Chief, Central Valley Flood Planning Office
Mr. Eric Koch, Chief, FloodSAFE Program Management
Mr. Noel Lerner, Chief, Flood Maintenance Office
Mr. Mike Mierzwa, Supervising Engineer
Mr. Michael Sabbaghian, Acting Chief, Flood Projects Office
Mr. Jeff Schuette, Senior Environmental Scientist
Mr. Keith Swanson, Chief, Division of Flood Management
Mr. Ward Tabor, Assistant Chief Counsel
Mr. Kent Zenobia, Chief, Project Delivery Branch

Also present:

Mr. Lewis Bair, Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District, Sacramento River Westside
Levee District, Reclamation District 108
Ms. Kelley Barker, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. John Cain, American Rivers
Mr. Ben Carter
Ms. Denise Carter, Colusa County Supervisor
Mr. Ryan Larson, United States Army Corps of Engineers
Mr. Scott Shapiro, Downey Brand
Ms. Julie Wolford, National Marine Fisheries Service

1. ROLL CALL

President Edgar greeted everyone in attendance. He noted that Board Members MacDonald and Villines would not be present for the meeting. Board Member Ramirez was not present but arrived shortly.

President Edgar reviewed the meeting order.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 24, 2012

Upon motion by Secretary Dolan, seconded by Board Member Ramirez, the Board approved the February 24, 2012 Meeting Minutes with one abstention.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Staff requested to postpone Items 9A, L, and M. President Edgar requested Noel Lerner, DWR Flood Maintenance Office Chief, to go over the maintenance area budgets with the Board rather than leaving the item on the Consent Calendar as # 9N.

Upon motion by Secretary Dolan, seconded by Board Member Countryman, the Board unanimously approved the agenda with the changes noted above.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Denise Carter, Colusa County Supervisor, thanked Mr. Lerner and Secretary Dolan for coming to Colusa County to provide information and answer questions about the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). She expressed the hope that the Board would continue this kind of outreach to the local communities during regional planning.

5. RECOGNITION OF SERVICE – BENJAMIN F. CARTER

President Edgar commenced the recognition program for Ben Carter, immediate Past President of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB).

Executive Officer Punia thanked Mr. Carter for his dedicated service to the Board and the residents of the Central Valley. His accomplishments included:

Transitioning the organization from the Reclamation Board to the CVFPB.

Co-founding the California Roundtable.

Developing the framework document to bring temporary reprieve to the levee vegetation issue.

Develop an effective working relationship with Army Corps of Engineers top brass in Washington D.C.

Challenging the staff to find a way to get every job done.

Executive Director Punia presented Mr. Carter with a symbolic gavel.

President Edgar presented Mr. Carter with a Board Resolution that recognized his leadership and dedication in presiding over the Board for almost seven years, as well as his education, experience, and volunteer work on behalf of the rural communities in the Central Valley. President Edgar added his personal thanks for the help and assistance Mr. Carter had given in the transition to the new Board.

Secretary Dolan, Board Member Countryman, Vice-President Suarez, Lewis Bair of the Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District, and Attorney Scott Shapiro expressed appreciation for Mr. Carter's knowledge, intelligence, and wisdom regarding flood issues.

Mr. Carter stated that it had been a true privilege to serve on the Board with its wonderful members, staff, and stakeholders. He was very proud of what the Board had accomplished through its transformation from the Reclamation Board to the CVFPB. He closed with a reminder that the Board's mission is to protect all who are living, working, and playing behind the levees of the Central Valley.

6. ELECTION OF THE BOARD VICE-PRESIDENT

Upon motion by Secretary Dolan, seconded by Board Member Countryman, the Board unanimously elected Board Member Emma Suarez as Vice-President.

7. REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Keith Swanson, Chief of the DWR Division of Flood Management, reported to the Board on DWR's activities.

- Mr. Swanson attributed the success and growth that DWR had seen in the CVFPB to Mr. Carter's leadership. They had enjoyed working with him. DWR had already lined up Mr. Carter to participate in the vegetation research symposium as it moves forward.
- Mark Cowin has been appointed Director of DWR's Division of Flood Management.
- Regarding hydrologic conditions, precipitation in the Northern Sierra is at 84% of average with that number decreasing moving south.
- DWR continues work on the vegetation Policy Guidance Letter (PGL). They continue to express concern to the Corps that the policy is compromising public safety and recently presented an extensive comment package. They are seeing some

Congressional interest now, and possibly a Legislative solution will come in the future.

- Recently there have been a number of newspaper articles regarding the 2006 PL 84-99 vegetation mitigation. President Edgar commented that the situation regarding the Corps variance to plant 30,000 trees is a Catch-22 for the Levee Maintaining Agencies (LMAs): they cannot maintain the trees in accordance with the Corps policy headquarters because they can't get permits from either the Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Mr. Swanson agreed and expected that the Corps would not move forward unilaterally without reaching accord with the Board and the LMAs. DWR and the Board will need to write a letter back to the Corps expressing very clearly their positions.

- Regarding the CVFPP, the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) comment period closed on April 20. DWR and the Board have participated in numerous public engagements during the last month. DWR was going to provide a briefing on regional planning at today's meeting. The briefing will concern five areas:
 1. Integrated water management
 2. Regional governance to develop a prioritized list of projects
 3. System planning/bypass expansions
 4. Improved risk management
 5. Coordinated implementation

Mr. Swanson noted that moving forward, either we cooperate or we legislate or we litigate. It's incumbent upon us to try to work together and identify the critical needs of the various groups to formulate solutions that work.

- He had participated in a tour of the joint federal project at Folsom, a very impressive undertaking. The House has passed an appropriations bill allocating \$82 million for Folsom Dam.
- Regarding the statewide flood management program, DWR is releasing an Administrative Draft Flood Futures Report on May 4. It is really a state-level companion document to the CVFPP.
- Board Member Countryman asked about one of the items in the report: a Central Valley Hydrology Study. To what extent had it been submitted to the public for review and comment? Mr. Swanson replied that as the material was extremely complex and technical, a general public review was not warranted.
- Board Member Countryman noted that the study is going in a brand new direction. Using technology, hundreds of different storm events are routed based on multiplications of historic floods. The results are resolved into what the 200-year flow might be at a particular location. It's a very critical question of how this new

hydrology is being put together and what the end result is, so the Board needs full information on it.

- Mike Mierzwa, DWR Supervising Engineer, gave an update on the hydrology study. Board Member Countryman expressed concern that the Board and the locals had not seen the entire package. People with local knowledge and local understanding of the hydrology need to see this entirely new approach.

8. REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Executive Officer Punia reviewed the activities of the CVFPP staff.

- He gave an update on the progress and various activities related to the CVFPP.
- He noted that DWR had released new program fact sheets showing the relationship of the CVFPP, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, the Delta Plan, and the Rural Agricultural Community Sustainability Plan, as well as their correlation to the San Joaquin River Restoration Program.
- Regarding the Title 23 update: based upon their Tier 1B update, staff had prepared a resolution requesting the Board's approval to delegate authority to the staff to approve projects.
- Caltrans is submitting many bridge applications.
 - After Caltrans built some projects in the Marysville area without acquiring Board permits, Board staff has been working with Caltrans staff, making them aware that they need to get permits in the future.
 - In the Stockton area, Caltrans, Board staff, and the Levee Maintaining Agency (LMA) came up with a solution to non-specification revetments Caltrans had placed under a bridge, using flexible grouting.
 - In the Fresno area, Caltrans has submitted several applications which staff is reviewing.
- Board staff is working with DWR to launch the Small Erosion Repair Program (SERP) which addresses small erosion problem sites before they become bigger.
- Board staff received 65% plan sets for the 44-mile-long Feather River West Levee Improvement Project. Staff and the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency decided to brief the Board on this subject once the CVFPP is adopted.
- The West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (WSAFCA) South Port Levee Project is making progress. Their geotechnical consultant submitted plans to begin the geotechnical exploration work soon.
- Regarding the PL 84-99 erosion repair site mitigation plantings by the Corps, staff will make sure that no trees are planted before a consensus is reached among the local reclamation districts, the Corps, DWR, and Board staff.

- Staff is receiving the reports from the Corps Periodic Inspection Program. Recently, staff met with the Corps and the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency to go over the issues pointed out by the Corps in this area. Many encroachment issues are still pending.
- Vice-President Suarez inquired about the joint press release on the levee system status. Len Marino, Staff Chief Engineer, replied that the flood control agencies are coordinating to present a joint position on the condition of the levees, the flood mapping, and all the issues that are causing confusion and concern to Stockton residents.

Vice-President Suarez requested to have the Board President review the press release before it goes out.

Executive Director Punia said that in the Stockton area, there are many local jurisdictions that are unique. Also, there is an ongoing issue with the Bear Creek encroachments removal.

- Regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, staff attended a Yolo Bypass fishery enhancement technical workgroup meeting. The focus was on proposed changes to the Fremont Weir.
- Staff conducted a tour of the Yuba County Goldfields with local representatives to understand the locals' concerns that during extremely high events, the water can outflank the levees in RD 784.
- Staff continues to meet with California High-Speed Rail regarding their potential projects. Staff also continues to meet with the San Joaquin River Restoration Program staff.
- The Sutter Bypass two-dimensional model is coming to a close. Staff is coordinating with the developer of the model to arrange training for staff, so that at least two people on staff can run the model.

Michael Wright gave a synopsis of the enforcement efforts.

- Staff met with the Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority (TRLIA) and RD 784 on April 16 to discuss a path moving forward for the 48 Notices of Violation. They discussed the proposed alignment of the new fence, as well as the drainage issues and possible solutions.

They will meet again in May when TRLIA will present a drainage plan and alternatives. Once the plan is agreed on, TRLIA will host a community meeting to discuss the plan with residents.

Regarding the San Joaquin River Restoration Plan, Board Member Countryman voiced concern about non-project levees along the San Joaquin River. Executive Officer Punia stated that staff is trying to ensure that when they impose the restoration project, it doesn't impact the flood control project negatively. Staff has conveyed its concerns to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation a number of times and will continue to do so.

Board Member Ramirez commented that this was a chance to make sure the project works for all the multiple purposes it needs to, public safety and restoration included. It can connect some areas that right now are not very well connected.

Executive Officer Punia stated that he would arrange a briefing in the upcoming months.

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Permit No. 18166-2, Sacramento Regional Transit District (Postponed)

Consider approval of Permit No. 18166-2 to construct light rail improvements as part of the South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2 adjacent to, and over Union House Creek; and relocated existing levee access road adjacent to Morrison Creek. (Sacramento County)

B. Permit No. 18536, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency

Consider approval of Permit No. 18536 to install 3,200 linear feet of new barbed wire fence; replace approximately 13,500 linear feet of barbed wire fence; and authorize 7,700 linear feet of existing barbed wire fence within the Dry Creek Designated Floodway. (Sacramento County)

C. Permit No. 18560, Slavic Missionary Church

Consider approval of Permit No. 18560 to authorize an existing dwelling, a 0.87-acre pond, an in-ground swimming pool, two entry gates, 730 feet of wrought iron fence, 350 feet of chain link fence, two garden sheds, a house pump, an agricultural well, a septic tank, and 319 trees; to remove and replace two garden sheds and a metal storage shed; to construct a metal foot bridge, a gazebo, a small waterfall, a pump house, five light poles, 420 feet of chain link fence, and 975 feet barbed wire fence within Area C of the Yuba River Designated Floodway. (Yuba County)

D. Permit No. 18570-1, City of Yuba City

Consider approval of Permit No. 18570-1 to plant an additional 26 trees and 10 shrubs to mitigate for the impacts from a new intake facility for the City of Yuba City on the right (west) bank overflow area of the Feather River. (Sutter County)

E. Permit No. 18715, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18715 to authorize the extension of the existing triple 12-foot by 7-foot culvert approximately 28.3 feet west to accommodate the new on-ramp due to the realignment of Frontage Road at the SR 99 Mariposa Road interchange (Br. No. 29-0012). The extension will have wing walls and a 4-foot cut-off wall. (San Joaquin County)

F. Permit No. 18716, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18716 to widen the existing cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge crossing Mormon Slough at South Golden Gate Avenue. (San Joaquin County)

G. Permit No. 18717, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18717 to widen the existing State Route 99 cast-in-place reinforced concrete slab bridge crossing Mormon Slough. Both the east side and west side of the bridge will be widened. (San Joaquin County)

H. Permit No. 18718, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18718 to authorize removal of the existing Duck Creek Bridge at Mariposa Road and the construction of a new approximately 106-foot wide simple span cast-in-place concrete bridge (Br. No. 29c-0451) at Mariposa Road. (San Joaquin County)

I. Permit No. 18721, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18721 to construct a new 51-foot wide cast-in-place concrete slab bridge (Br. No. 29-0335) at the intersection of Duck Creek and the new Mariposa Road Northbound off-ramp. (San Joaquin County)

J. Permit No. 18722, California Department of Transportation

Consider approval of Permit No. 18722 to construct a new cast-in-place concrete slab bridge (Br. No. 29-0334) at the intersection of the south Branch of Duck Creek and the new Mariposa Road Northbound off-ramp. (San Joaquin County)

K. Permit No. 18735, Reclamation District 1001

Consider approval of Permit No. 18735 to authorize emergency repair to the landside slope of the existing levee; including degrading and reconstruction to portions of the existing levee for approximately 330 linear feet; construction of a new stability berm along approximately 470 linear feet of the existing levee toe and construction of a new access ramp. (Sutter County)

L. Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study (*Postponed*)

Consider approval of Resolution No. 2012-13 to approve:

1. Amendment No. 2 to the Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board), and the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency authorizing the acceleration of funds to USACE in an amount not to exceed the current estimate of the non-federal sponsors' required cost share, less any funds or in kind contribution previously contributed, for immediate use by USACE.
2. Delegate to the Board President the authority to execute the amendment.

M. Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study (*Postponed*)

Consider approval of Resolution No. 2012-16 to approve:

1. Amendment No. 1 to the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board), and the City of Woodland authorizing the acceleration of funds to USACE in an amount not to exceed

the current estimate of the non-federal sponsors' required cost share, less any funds or in kind contribution previously contributed, for immediate use by USACE.

2. Delegate to the Board President the authority to execute the amendment.

N. Consider approval of Department of Water Resources proposed fiscal year 2012-2013 maintenance area budgets, pursuant to Water Code § 12878.

Upon motion by Vice-President Suarez, seconded by Secretary Dolan, the Board voted unanimously to approve Consent Items 9B – K and N.

Board Member Countryman recused himself from Items B and K.

10. CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION PLAN

Proposed Maintenance Area Budget

President Edgar stated that at the public hearings on the CVFPP, the issue of maintenance has loomed large. Maintenance area budgets are assessments that are imposed on the state; they generate funding. The Board wanted to ensure that resources are available to do the proper maintenance in those areas.

Noel Lerner, DWR Flood Maintenance Office Chief, presented the maintenance area budgets for the Board to consider and possibly approve.

- Mr. Lerner began by explaining the arrangement of funding for maintenance areas, which are formed by the Board and DWR when there isn't a local agency that performs the maintenance required for Corps projects. The work is strictly levee rather than channel.
- He described the work done at the various sites.
- He provided a summary table of the individual budgets in the past, present, and future. The proposed budget for the forthcoming fiscal year, 2012-13, is the same budget as that approved last year. He noted that increasing the maintenance area budget doesn't really address the existing problems, which involve channel maintenance.
- Maintenance activities for levees focus on four areas:
 1. Vegetation control, to improve visibility and flood fighting capabilities.
 2. Rodent control. Al Romero, a former superintendent, has been working with local maintaining agencies to develop a low-cost grouter and is teaching them how to use it.
 3. Encroachments are a serious problem.
 4. All-weather roads are important especially for rural communities to help with flood fighting, access issues, and inspection.
- With the channels, the short work windows are an issue. A number of endangered species impact the channels, and DWR is limited by the Department of Fish and

Game permits as to when they can begin mowing activities because of bird nesting habits. DWR cannot use overtime because of budget restrictions.

- Mr. Lerner summarized that the problem is not the maintenance area budgets that are impacted by budgetary constraints, it's the channel work which comes out of the General Fund. The channels are much harder to keep clear of vegetation. In the bypasses there are responsibilities on the landowners to do this, and some landowners are better than others.

Board Member Countryman noted that in Marysville, the Board had heard many comments about poor maintenance in the Cherokee Canal. Mr. Lerner commented that the gradient is flat and sediment settles. Bridges going across the canal impede flow. Also, there were periods of time when the channel wasn't maintained and vegetation subsequently grew. DWR is trying to deal with the problem, but the property owners have an obligation as well.

Upon motion by Vice-President Suarez, seconded by Board Member Countryman, the Board voted unanimously to approve the proposed maintenance area budget for 2012-13.

A. Public Comment Summary

Nancy Moricz, Staff Engineer, took the Board through a brief summary of the public comments on the CVFPP.

- The comments came in three forms: email, mail, and transcribed testimony from the public hearings and meetings. That information was processed into raw indexed comments which had been updated weekly.
- Comments came from a variety of sources: the Corps, other key flood control agencies, counties, cities, farm bureaus, reclamation districts, levee districts, Boards of Supervisors, PG&E, NMFS, Fish and Wildlife, American Rivers, and various irrigation and water districts. The National Wildlife Action Fund had over 4,300 supporters of an online campaign.
- The categorized individual comments came from the raw indexed comments. For example, one letter could have had 10 comments; they were categorized for internal use and discussion.

B. Public Process for the Adoption of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Executive Officer Punia stated that with input from various Board members, the staff had devised an overall game plan for the adoption of the CVFPP.

Eric Butler, Staff Supervising Engineer, elaborated on the public process.

- He showed what the plan adoption package might have looked like as of the April 20 workshop: a resolution, plan addendum, several exhibits including the plan itself, the documents incorporated by reference, the conservation framework, and the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).

- Mr. Butler proposed a modification to that package. In the new package the contents of the addendum document – the history, the “whereas” statements, and the “now therefore be it Resolved” statements – would be compiled into the resolution. Attached to the resolution are the exhibits, the descriptive document and the Flood Control Status Report, and Volume 1 of the attachments (Attachments 1 through 6, with Attachment 2 being the conservation framework). These were the documents that were delivered to the Board last December 31 and January 1. The PEIR is also included.
- Mr. Butler described the “whereas” statements and the “Resolved” statements.

President Edgar commented that many of the Plan appendices were going to be changing, and ought not to be adopted – they are essentially work papers that haven’t been properly vetted. Mr. Butler agreed that it was not the staff’s intention for the Board to adopt the Plan with all attachments, but that the Board would have the option of adopting a responsible agency findings on the PEIR.

Deborah Smith, Staff Legal Counsel, clarified that the Board, when it acts as a responsible agency, does make specific findings on the significant impacts and mitigation measures.

Vice-President Suarez added that the appendices and the technical analysis are necessary to support the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document, but they are not necessary to support the Board’s adoption of the plan.

President Edgar stated that the sooner we get the draft document out, the better. The public can look at it and understand that the intent really is to collaborate with the locals. Secretary Dolan suggested for the draft to be clearly labeled as such.

Ms. Smith cautioned that it would not be appropriate for staff to send interim drafts to the Board members, asking for comments off the record – that would be a violation of Bagley-Keene.

Vice-President Suarez explained the role of the CEQA document: the Board is required to demonstrate that they relied on some environmental documents in support of their decision. The findings do that. The Board needs to communicate that in making the decision, they understood the environmental impacts associated with the decision – that some of them were going to be mitigated and some cannot be mitigated. Understanding that, they went ahead and approved it.

President Edgar noted that then the exhibits would include the plan, the description document, the Flood Control System Status Report, and Volume 1 with its six attachments, but not the final PEIR.

The Board continued to discuss the package with Mr. Butler.

Ward Tabor, DWR Assistant Chief Counsel, stated that DWR’s plan is to adopt the final PEIR well in advance (a minimum of two weeks) of the Board’s decision to adopt the plan. DWR staff would be working with Board staff to help prepare draft findings for the Board as well.

At the request of Mr. Butler, President Edgar agreed that staff could begin processing comments on the adoption package rather than on the plan.

Board Member Ramirez suggested having the schedule for comments clearly posted so that people don't miss any opportunities. He added that he hoped for the adopted plan to be in a form that keeps people interested and engaged for the next five years. Some kind of schedule showing what the Board, DWR, and the local governments will be doing over the next five years would be prudent.

He continued that it should be clear to the public that the Board and DWR are going to take the role of systemwide advocates. Whatever the two agencies set in motion will be done in that context.

C. Regional Planning Process

Mike Mierzwa, DWR Supervising Engineer, gave an introduction to regional planning and how it relates to DWR's activities for Integrated Water Management (IWM).

- In 1957 the first California Water Plan was released which took a systemwide perspective. Over time the water plan has adopted an Integrated Regional Water Management approach.
- From 1957 to the present a number of Integrated Regional Water Management groups (IRWMs) have been created. They focus on multi-benefit, multi-objective water projects.
- In 2009, the California Water Plan update released the first section on flood management, so they have been incorporating some of those multi-benefits into the water plan. In 2013 the update will have an expanded section on floods. This system is the entire state of California, instead of just the Central Valley. Key to those activities has been the top-down approach of the system plans, merging with the bottom-up approaches of all the regional planning and local initiatives that are in progress throughout the state.
- The three key focus areas that drive many activities are public safety, water management, and the ecosystem. The goals are reinforcing public safety, environmental stewardship, and economic stability. As programs at the local, state, and federal levels achieve those goals, they undergo four different types of coordination activities:
 1. Integration of alignment
 2. Project implementation
 3. Technical foundational values
 4. Flood risk management activities
- Voters have continued to authorize bond legislation that specifically includes the three focus areas, with Propositions 13, 204, 50, and 84.

- The California Water Plan provides DWR's strategic vision for the state of California on what it should be doing to achieve all of the water management objectives.
- People aren't just asking what the Flood Plan is doing in their areas. They are interested in what the state is doing in their areas. The need for integration at the regional level and the system level remains.
- DWR needs to demonstrate to the public that it can use the remaining bond funds wisely to achieve all of the water management objectives, so that DWR can have a strong argument when it goes back to see an additional funding source.
- The next step of the CVFPP is to go into two parallel efforts:
 - The regional planning and prioritization process. This involves working from the bottom up to get more on-the-ground ideas for implementing new flood-specific projects, and meeting those flood-specific objectives to invest wisely in flood money.
 - The two basin feasibility studies outlined in the CVFPP. These advance the technical work necessary to find feasible solutions from the entire system perspective.
- System improvements will be incrementally realized as a series of projects at the regional level.
- Currently there are 48 IRWMs within the state. Each has slightly different goals and objectives, and were, by and large, locally formed.
- DWR proposed nine new flood-specific planning regions in the CVFPP. The differences between them are based on the water management focuses, as well as the state cost share.
- The state's role in working on many of the IRWMs has been rather small, and DWR has proposed a more robust, longer process where there can be significant state financial and technical support.

Board Member Ramirez asked about the map showing the nine new areas with the 48 IRWMs. Mr. Mierzwa responded that there is a smaller area of focus for each of the nine regional areas, but there is an overlap. DWR wanted people to be aware of the overlap, but to point out that the focus of these groups is on flood-specific planning with the goal to demonstrate that there are opportunities for additional funding coming from multi-benefit projects.

Board Member Ramirez cautioned that landowners, local agencies, and NGOs are going to wrestle with the nine new regions. We can't create another regional forum with intersection and overlap, and have people continue to participate.

President Edgar commented that this had been a common thread in the comments: how were the nine new areas devised, and why can't we just somehow use the ones we have? Mr. Mierzwa responded that DWR is open to thinking about how the areas are formulated. Just as the IRWMs were created at the regional level, the nine regional

groups should be defined by the boundaries of interest to them. The challenge lies in having an area so large that you cannot focus on the flood management objectives.

Secretary Dolan noted that people are having trouble trying to figure out which meeting to attend with Bay Delta, the CVFPP, integrated regional planning, and everything else in progress. If we add the nine groups, it is going to be more complex than helpful.

Eric Koch, FloodSAFE Program Management Office Chief, replied that it is going to be a simple thing to prioritize flood projects in the regions, but the implementation is going to be complicated. DWR is going to work with the regional partners to develop the answers by listening and possibly tweaking.

He added that the nine regions are based on shared flood facilities and inundation areas. DWR has concentrated on looking at the flood projects by considering areas that can involve water reliability or ecosystem restoration.

Mr. Koch proceeded with a presentation on the regional planning effort.

- This 18-month planning effort is one of the most critical activities for FloodSAFE in the CVFPP implementation.
- DWR needs the support of the local regional partners and the Board to guide near-term investments and funds for the next five years, as well as to generate the support to develop future funding for reaching the ultimate goals of the CVFPP.
- The purpose of the regional planning process is to build upon the existing information compiled by DWR, and then update it with local knowledge from the regional partners.
- DWR has developed an extensive and detailed project management plan, which lays out the development of the regional plan during the next 18 months. It is a model that DWR has given each of the nine regional managers.
- DWR will produce a region atlas representing all technical data: geographical information, flood risk areas, opportunities for ecosystem improvement, location of critical facilities, maintenance areas, etc.
- DWR is putting together a funding program to be released in the middle of May.
- DWR will produce a regional plan consisting of participating entities, flood risk and priorities, regional projects, criteria used to evaluate and prioritize, and residual risk management strategies.
- The financial plan is another critical piece. DWR needs an idea of project costs, local benefits and beneficiaries, and funding.
- DWR will soon produce a Project Management Plan (PMP) detailing the regional planning effort. It will include steps, expectations of local agencies, and expectations of DWR's regional managers in implementing the program.
- DWR envisions three different types of meetings:

- Meetings with the key implementing agencies.
- Meetings with the operating agencies, i.e., the LMAs and RDs.
- Workshops where all the work takes place; the lead regional agency will determine how many are necessary.

Board Member Ramirez asked about projects such as the Yolo Bypass that encompass two regions. President Edgar noted that we ought to be dealing with the existing regional agencies, expanding them to take into consideration improvements to certain facilities. For projects that span across regions, we should encourage the Joint Powers Agencies (JPAs) to develop partnerships and loose coalitions; but we shouldn't be talking about new entities.

Mr. Koch responded that in the first group of meetings that is exactly what will occur: regional agencies will work together and form coalitions. This is a *state-empowered* effort, not a state-led or state-mandated effort.

Vice-President Suarez asked about systemwide improvements such as the Yolo Bypass that don't necessarily fall into the regional planning process. Mr. Koch answered that they could actually fall into the regional planning process, but the basinwide feasibility studies are specifically looking at those areas.

Mr. Arrich added that the bypass expansions and system elements have to be more of the top-down view of the system, yet integrated with bottom-up regional planning to find the touch points.

President Edgar asked about a methodology of scoring and ranking the projects. Mr. Koch replied that the three meeting groups will come up with the criteria to use for ranking projects.

President Edgar commented that the process looks like the one used by SAFCA and TRLIA. They generate projects; then DWR looks at them and determines what are "no regrets" projects – projects that can proceed that are consistent with the systemwide approach; then DWR allows them to go. It's a bottom-up, top-down process.

Mr. Koch agreed, saying that DWR is not trying to re-invent the wheel, but to put structure around the existing wheel so they can prioritize their state investment funding.

Board Member Countryman asked about the Cherokee Canal Bypass, for example. It passes through three regions, and there's minimal support in at least the first two regions. Yet there is a systemwide benefit that the individual regions don't see. How is that addressed?

Mr. Koch responded that those types of cases will be top-down from the system perspective. The Cherokee Bypass may not be on the regions' priority list, but DWR is going to wrap the state systemwide needs around the regional projects that are going to lead to the investment arrangement of state funding.

- Mr. Koch listed the state criteria for prioritizing their investment:
 - Using a risk-based approach to multi-benefit projects.

- A systemwide integrated flood management approach.
- Levels and sources of non-state funding.
- A systemwide approach.
- Consideration of disadvantaged communities, tribal, and environmental justice concerns.
- Cost and benefits of projects.
- Mr. Koch listed DWR's overall approach to regional planning:
 1. The CVFPP identifies systemwide needs.
 2. The regional planning process begins, producing regional priorities.
 3. DWR wraps the system approach around the regional priorities from the systemwide needs and the CVFPP, resulting in state investment priorities, at both the system and the regional level.
 4. Out of that process come project feasibility studies, at both the regional and basinwide levels.
 5. Out of those studies come projects to implement and invest in.
- Mr. Koch pointed out that regional planning is an 18-month process. DWR is trying to get through the near-term funding strategies. As they continue down the process in developing the 2017 CVFPP regional planning, more and more agency integration will occur.

Board Member Countryman expressed a concern that when they met with the locals, they gave them the impression that the regional planning effort would give them a chance to weigh in on the controversial items such as the bypass expansions and new bypasses. Now he was hearing that it would be more of a system issue with regional groups not necessarily weighing in.

Mr. Koch replied that the regional planning effort is tied to the basinwide feasibility studies. The regions will be going out with DWR as part of the team when DWR meets with the local agencies. So they are going to start in a parallel fashion. At some point, the two will split, because DWR is looking at strictly the systemwide perspective. However, in the beginning, the regions are going to be working with DWR, using their own communication and engagement strategy for dealing with the systemwide projects; the discussions can certainly start at the regional level.

Secretary Dolan summarized that DWR is going to instruct the regional groups that they have 18 months to organize and make sure their priorities fit with what DWR has already decided. She felt that DWR would have 18 months of argument, and said that the Board would like to work with DWR to prevent that.

Mr. Koch responded that this was a near-term strategy. DWR has about \$2 billion it needs to spend by 2016. It has to come together with the regional groups, and identify the projects they can jointly agree on quickly. This first effort for the regional planning is

not the end of it. It will update and proceed with the 2017 plan, which will be informed by the projects developed within the regional planning process as well as the statewide process. Thus when the 2017 CVFPP comes out, it will contain more specificity.

Mr. Koch stressed that DWR will begin in parallel to start the discussions as a whole. The locals will want to talk about their likes and dislikes on the system aspects. At some point during the process, maybe systemwide will go one way, and regional priorities will go another way. They'll come back together at the end when DWR needs to decide where state funding is going to go in the near term.

President Edgar remarked that the Board was hoping that DWR did not emphasize the divergence or give the impression that these are two different systems. He felt that people are beginning to look forward to the regional process as a chance to express their views, and we should enable them to do that.

Mr. Koch agreed and reiterated that they would start off in parallel and work through the problems together, remembering that the goal is to decide how to invest state funding in the near term.

Board Member Ramirez expressed again the need for clarity in the CVFPP, so that people can understand what the next step is and the Board can be clear about its intent.

- Mr. Koch laid out the schedule leading up to the October 2013 wrap-up of this initial cut at the regional plans.
- In terms of project organization, DWR has formed a planning steering committee to oversee the regional planning process and the basinwide process. Nine regional managers – DWR office chiefs and branch chiefs – have been designated. DWR considers this effort to be one of the highest priorities in FloodSAFE.

Each team is backed by a broad-based group of employees from the Integrated Regional Water Management Division, the Statewide Water Management Division, and the FESSRO Division, as well as consultant resources.

John Cain of American Rivers shared what that organization had learned about the CVFPP through its own detailed analysis.

- The various technical analyses underlying the plan are relatively traditional approaches to flood management that do not really manage flood risk holistically. They are more about controlling the probability of floods and controlling the consequences.
- The various approaches were not really designed to meet the objectives of the legislation. There was simply some modeling analysis that was done.
- The plan does not really lay out specific measurable objectives or performance criteria for ranking the various approaches.
- The Enhanced System Capacity Approach is really the only approach designed to achieve all the legislative objectives, but it is not really a targeted or logical approach.

- Staff did a very good job of taking the data from the consultants and developing a more integrated approach in the State Systemwide Investment Approach (SSIA), including a broad portfolio of approaches in a logical coherent strategy.
- One of the problems with the SSIA is that it is not optimized against measurable objectives or performance criteria. Although it is better integrated, it falls short on a fully integrated approach.
- You can't solve the problem simply by controlling the probability of floods.
- There are some openings in the plan about agricultural conservation easements that could help reduce flood risk.

In answer to a question from Secretary Dolan, Mr. Cain stated that a few engineers and hydrologists from American Rivers had helped him review the plan. In addition, a group of 15 or more conservation organizations are still working on signing a joint comment letter referring to American Rivers' more detailed comments.

11. REQUESTED ACTIONS

A. Consider a resolution delegating authority to the Executive Officer to approve or deny permits and to issue cease and desist orders in accordance with the California Code of Regulations Title 23 Division 1 Tier 1B Revision.

Len Marino, Staff Chief Engineer, gave a brief presentation.

- He began with background information. Assembly Bill 1165, passed in 2009, contained a provision to delegate more authority to the Executive Officer. The CVFPP regulations had been updated in February 2009 and contained a provision allowing the delegation to take place.
- The main purpose of the resolution is to streamline the process for approving minor encroachment permits.
- The three main points of the permitting authority that the delegation accomplishes are:
 - Minor encroachments would no longer require a Board consent vote.
 - Each of the permits to be approved by the Executive Officer would be posted on the website for 30 days.
 - Board staff would have a mechanism for reporting to the Board on a regular basis on the permits the Executive Officer actually signed in the previous period.

The Board members discussed the resolution.

Vice-President Suarez gave a legislative background of the proposal. She suggested that Item N on Resolution 06-08 is an item that probably should be deleted from the delegation; she also suggested a wording fix to #2 of the proposed resolution. She recommended that the Board stop the delegation with the Executive Officer, as the statute didn't give the Board the power to delegate beyond that office.

Upon motion by Vice President Suarez, seconded by Board Member Countryman, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Tier 1B Revision, with the addition of language reading, "...with the authority to redelegate except with respect to C;" and under the 06-08, the removal of N and resignation of that authority.

B. Consider Board staff participation in developing Department of Water Resources proposed five-year Small Erosion Repair (SERP) Pilot Program.

Mr. Butler and Jeff Schuette, Senior Environmental Scientist with the DWR Flood Maintenance Office, presented a proposal on DWR's Small Erosion Repair Program (SERP), and a five-year pilot project to implement and determine the success of the program. The Resolution asked the Board to provide direction to staff and to inform DWR as to the Board's intention to participate in the proposed pilot program as a state partner.

- The project is confined to the geographical area of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. It represents a unique collaborative approach to erosion repairs.
- SERP is a product of the Interagency Flood Management Collaborative Program, with participants from the National Marine Fisheries Service, Fish and Wildlife, the Corps' Operations & Readiness, and the Corps' Regulatory.
- SERP started about five years ago to look at ways to better fix small erosion sites, to speed up the environmental review process, and to speed up the repair of the designs.
- The participants are developing a SERP manual to explain the various strategies.
- Repairing erosion sites is becoming more difficult. Construction windows are very tight; there is less funding; the environmental review process is very lengthy. SERP offers to build the permits up front proactively, such that the sites can be repaired more quickly.
- During the five-year timespan, a maximum of 15 erosion sites can be repaired each year.
- The program is for DWR-maintained levees only.
- Mr. Schuette gave the timeframe for acceptance of a site into SERP.
- SERP has identified seven standardized design templates used to repair all SERP sites.
- All work is done under the current regulations for Operations & Maintenance (O&M). SERP is in line with the CVFPP's levee vegetation management strategy.
- The next steps are finalizing the SERP manual and PEIR, starting the application process for the program, and implementing in 2013.

Board Member Ramirez asked about any connection to the current problem regarding the Corps' PGL with the program for maintenance of the vegetation. Mr. Schuette answered that the Code of Federal Regulations points to encouraging the planting of vegetation

waterward of the levee toe. Currently, that is the SERP regulation, so DWR feels that the program is not in conflict.

The development team had included the Corps on the regulatory side, and the Corps supports the program.

- After the five-year program has come to a close, a hoped-for outcome is that DWR will seek to make it available to all LMAs.
- Mr. Butler ran through the applicable federal statutes, state statutes, and Board regulations. He stated that the federal statutes and state statutes allow for this type of work to be done. The intent is to do it as O&M.
- Some of the Board geotechnical staff had concerns about the geotechnical designs. They had worked with DWR and succeeded in resolving the issues.
- Another concern was hydraulic impact when vegetation is planted in the floodways. The solution was that during review of the sites, reviewers will notice any very narrow channels and do hydraulic modeling.
- Mr. Butler felt that sufficient checks and balances have been built into the program. They will be stated in the SERP manual.
- The SERP manual will provide for methodology as to how to review, screen, accept, or reject proposals. The reviews need to be done in about a one-month timeframe.
- If flooding washes out any vegetation that is there for mitigation purposes, it will be replaced at a 1 to 1 ratio.
- The other resource agency partners are willing to provide a way of going about the program without requiring additional mitigation in the future.
- When DWR presents its screened list in July to the partnering agencies, site criteria will be as follows:
 - Have the sites been designed according to the SERP manual?
 - Are the geotechnical designs consistent with the templates?
 - Is there long-term vegetation maintenance in place?
 - What is the public noticing process?
- Today's decision will enable the manual to be finalized and the PEIR to be publicly noticed.
- Mr. Butler read the formal staff recommendation to adopt Resolution 2012-20 to deem that SERP is O&M.

President Edgar remarked that DWR supports a number of programs to try to expedite the O&M of the levee system, for example, the Feather River Corridor Management Plan. Mr. Schuette added that under the Interagency Flood Management Collaborative effort, DWR is always looking at ways to speed up the process of maintenance.

Vice-President Suarez asked what happens if the Board staff decides to reject a project and they are the only members of the group who do; does DWR have an opportunity to come back to the Board with an Encroachment Permit request? Mr. Schuette replied that the maintenance has to be done, so DWR would eventually have to do that.

Vice-President Suarez also pointed out missing verbiage in her version of the resolution.

Board Member Countryman asked about a scenario where there is erosion to the vegetation but not to the levee. Would there be a requirement to replace the vegetation, or only to replace it if they have to do additional levee work? Mr. Schuette responded that during the next five years, the group will look at the sites and collect data on their success, from mitigation perspectives as well as erosion control protection.

Board Member Ramirez commented that staff was really asking the Board to give them the direction to do something that in the end they won't need Board authority for. It is visible and transparent, and the sites won't need to be brought to the level of Board authority.

Julie Wolford, Flood Management Biologist with the National Marine Fisheries Service – one of the partners in SERP's development – presented that organization's statement encouraging the Board to support the program.

Kelley Barker, Staff Environmental Scientist with the California Department of Fish and Game (another partner) presented that organization's encouragement as well.

Ms. Barker also stated that from her Department's perspective, they are going to give the program itself a streambed alteration agreement. The 15 maximum projects a year will fall under that overhead agreement. It will be a kind of rubber stamp – this project fits in, that one does not. They will all fall under the umbrella agreement from Fish and Game.

Ryan Larson of the Army Corps of Engineers, Operations and Readiness Branch, stated that SERP should follow the Corps O&M manual regarding vegetation on the waterward slope. Regarding permitting, they see SERP as an O&M activity that does not require a Corps permit.

President Edgar stated that when the Board approves SERP, they want to make sure they won't be tangled up in the vegetation policy problems; according to Mr. Larson's statement, SERP will be operating under the provisions of the O&M manual.

Mr. Butler noted that going forward, the program is consistent with the vegetation management strategy in the CVFPP. Staff cannot foresee if down the road, once the plan is adopted, issues between the state and the Corps on vegetation will continue.

Upon motion by Vice President Suarez, seconded by Board Member Ramirez, the Board voted unanimously to approve the SERP Resolution with the addition of the missing words in Paragraph 7.

Board Member Ramirez requested for Executive Officer Punia to send a letter to the partner agencies, recognizing the staff that had worked hard on this much-needed new project. Board Member Ramirez stated that the Board write a letter recognizing Mr. Butler and Executive Officer Punia for their work.

12. INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

A. Briefing on the Early Implementation Program (EIP) and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) Sponsored U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Project Statuses

Kent Zenobia, Chief of the DWR Project Delivery Branch, briefed the Board on seven DWR programs that deal with environmental support:

- Corps and Board-sponsored construction projects on the ground. Most are 65% funded by the federal government and 35% between state and local. Six of the major projects are American River Common Features, the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project, Marysville Ring Levee, Mid-Valley, South Sac Streams, and West Sacramento Levee Construction.
- Early Implementation Projects (EIPs) originally developed before the plan. EIP is morphing into the Urban Flood Protection Program. It is for rehab, reconstruction, and replacement of any facility in the State Plan of Flood Control. Mr. Zenobia showed a table of major accomplishments.
- Corps and Board-sponsored studies. They evaluate basins in a feasibility study analysis that gets done over time. The portfolio includes feasibility studies (FSs), General Reevaluation Reports (GRRs), and Limited Reevaluation Reports. Accomplishments in 2010-11 were the American River Features GRR (the Natomas PACR), the Lower Cache Creek FS, and the Yuba River Basin Project GRR.
- Flood control subventions. Basically an entitlement program enacted in 1945, it is bond-funded. To date DWR has reimbursed about \$250 million. It is a state share cost with non-State Plan of Flood Control projects, i.e. Corps projects.
- Local levee assistance. Their strategies are local levees, which is a \$2 million cap. The program can fund surveys, investigations, modeling, lab testing, etc., as well as critical local levee repairs.
- Yuba Feather Program. The Yuba Feather Program is an almost \$2 billion program to finance safe drinking water, water quality, flood protection, and water reliability. It addresses serious threats along the Yuba and Feather Rivers and tributaries, a long-term problem.
- The Flood Corridor Program. It is intended to solve flood problems using non-structural solutions. It has to link flood benefits with habitat or ag land conservation. So far DWR has awarded almost \$140 million to 41 projects. They funded a dozen individual flood projects, which was almost \$50 million. They have funding guidelines in place to award an additional \$35 million this year.
- The Corps Environmental Support Branch stands ready to help with the studies and construction projects. They help with permitting support for all FPO programs. They perform activities such as planning, permitting, project monitoring, mitigation site development, and so on.

President Edgar commented on the number of feasibility reports on the books. He asked if DWR has thought of thinning them out and concentrating on the ones that are most important. Michael Sabbaghian, DWR Flood Projects Office Acting Chief, responded that they had worked with the Corps for many months to identify the studies of interest.

Mr. Sabbaghian continued that the Corps had a new 3 by 3 by 3 policy. It came from the General at Headquarters as a directive to reevaluate their studies, putting one-third of them in an inactive zone. It is scheduled to be done by June.

He noted that DWR has also requested funding in order to accelerate federal studies, in order to work with the Corps.

In answer to a question from President Edgar, Mr. Sabbaghian estimated that DWR could supply a report sometime in July or August. He said that if DWR shuts down any studies, the allocated funding would revert to the bond funds, to be available for reallocation to other studies or projects.

Board Member Ramirez asked about state money involved in the feasibility studies. Mr. Sabbaghian replied that it is 50/50 between federal and nonfederal. Then the state shares its cost with the locals at 50/50, so it is 50% federal, 25% state, and 25% local.

Board Member Ramirez requested a list of studies on the books now, to see how it changes in the next couple of months.

President Edgar asked if the money can go back and forth from a study to an EIP program. Mr. Sabbaghian replied that most of the study funding is capital outlay, earmarked for specific projects. The Budget Act does allow DWR to move funding between projects. Typically what will happen, however, is that DWR allows the money to revert, then asks for it back again for specific projects.

Board Member Countryman inquired about the Corps' 3 by 3 by 3 edict. Mr. Sabbaghian explained that reports are to take 3 years, have 3 levels of review, be less than 3" thick, cost less than \$3 million and so on. The total cost is \$3 million from the initiation of the study, but many studies are already well beyond that. The challenge is finding out what that means as far as asking for exceptions.

Some studies are at the tail-end (the Sutter and Yuba, and West Stanislaus, Orestimba, Feasibility Study. They will not be impacted. Studies that are in initial stages (the Lower San Joaquin) will be impacted, as will those that are right in between (the American River and West Sacramento).

Mr. Sabbaghian noted that another of the Corps' 3s was 1/3 of the studies. Board Member Ramirez commented that it is probably the most important part – it is a measurable objective. Mr. Sabbaghian remarked that it is easily doable in California within the district.

Mr. Zenobia played a short presentation for the Board, of time-lapsed photography of the Kaweah Delta building of the dam. It showed five-dimensional design; the engineering community will eventually head that way as part of emerging technologies. You can

have five screens in front of you and look at the plans, as well as the expenditure of money.

Mr. Zenobia explained that you can monitor the project. After studying numerous projects, you can go back in time and devise ways to improve a particular scenario with regard to construction activities, expenditure of money, managing the funds, etc.

Board Member Countryman noted that he had worked on the design of the Kaweah Delta project. It was promoted by the local entities that operate Terminus Dam. It was a long struggle to overcome agencies that were opposed, but it got done and has been tremendously successful.

CLOSED SESSION

To discuss litigation (Giudice v. State of California et. al; San Joaquin County Superior Court Case No. 39-2011-00256176-CU-OR-STK) pursuant to Govt. Code section 11126(e)(1).

Pursuant to the authority of Government Code section 11126, subdivisions (e)(1), (e)(2)(B)(i), and (e)(2)(C)(i), the Board will meet in Closed Session to consider potential litigation involving the Board.

The Board recessed into closed session at 3:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:59 p.m. President Edgar announced no reportable items.

13. BOARD COMMENTS AND TASK LEADER REPORTS

- President Edgar requested to start meetings at 9:00 a.m.
- He reported that he had sent the Board a memorandum about revising committee structures. In looking at the Board structure, President Edgar felt that it was reactive: as issues come before the Board, we appoint a person to react to that issue. He suggested considering a system of standing committees, which would mean that the Board members would probably have two other meetings per month to attend.

The committees would be essentially planning committees in certain areas:

- Executive
- Legislative and Regulations
- Intergovernmental Outside Agencies
- Planning
- Corps Coordination

The committees would meet once a month or once a quarter to examine the issues in that category and the Board's direction. The committees would come back to the full Board to recommend ad hoc representatives assigned to specific issues.

President Edgar asked the Board members to consider the suggestion.

- President Edgar asked the staff to think about the monthly report from Three Rivers. It was necessary when they were developing Plumas Lakes. That project is done, so perhaps the resolution should have the section requiring the monthly report rescinded.
- President Edgar requested for staff to consider arranging some field trips for the Board in both the San Joaquin and Sacramento areas. Ms. Smith noted that with three or more Board members in attendance, the field trips would need to be publicly noticed.

Ideas put forth were the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency, a SAFCA vegetation tour, the Oroville Thermalito complex, and the Folsom Dam modifications.

14. FUTURE AGENDA

The Board members discussed the future agenda.


15. ADJOURN

Upon motion by Vice-President Suarez, seconded by Board Member Ramirez, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn.

President Edgar adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.

Dated: June 22, 2012

The foregoing Minutes were approved:



Jane Dolan
Secretary



William H. Edgar
President