

REPORT TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR
AND CITY COUNCIL

DATE: September 16, 2008

SUBJECT: Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes for April 2008

Report in Brief

Attached are the April 28, 2008 Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes. These minutes were approved at the July 1, 2008 meeting.

Background

The Water Resources Association meets bi-monthly and submits meeting minutes to all jurisdictions attending the meeting. Meeting Minutes are then shared with Council.

Recommendation for Action

No action required. For information only.

Prepared by: Johanna Currie
Management Analyst

Reviewed by: Gregor G. Meyer
Public Works Director

Mark G. Deven
City Manager

Attachments: April 28, 2008 Water Resources Association Meeting Minutes

**MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 2008 OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, William Marble.

Board members present: William Marble – City of Woodland, WRA Chair
Sid England – University of CA Davis, WRA Vice-chair
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County
David Scheuring -Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Regina Cherovsky – Reclamation District 2035

Alternate members present: Kurt Balasek – City of Winters, WRA Treasurer
Jacques DeBra – City of Davis, Technical Committee Chair
Helen Thomson – Yolo County
Tim O’Halloran - Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Doug Baxter – City of Woodland
Dan Mount – City of West Sacramento
William Kristoff – City of West Sacramento

Board Members absent: Donita Hendrix –Dunnigan Water District

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the agenda as presented.

3. PUBLIC FORUM – There were no comments from the public.

4. CONSENT ITEMS: The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the consent items.

- a. Approve Minutes: January 28, 2008 Board meeting
- b. Financial Reports: January - March 2008
- c. Letter of Support for RD 2035 Sacramento River Div. & Conveyance Project

5. RESOLUTION FOR OUTGOING WRA CHAIR – The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the resolution commending the contributions of outgoing Board chair, David Scheuring.

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT AND INFORMATION

- a. *Executive Committee Report:* Nothing additional to report
- b. *Administrative Coordinator Report:* Nothing additional to report
- c. Employee Review Update: Executive Committee will be conducting a performance evaluation and will present information at the next Board meeting.
- d. *Flood Control Collaborative Efforts/Opportunities:* Bill Marble reported on his networking activities at the recent CAP-to-CAP gathering held in Washington, DC. In particular, conversations with representatives from SAFCA discussing flood problems faced by Woodland and how to improve collaborations with the Sacramento efforts.
- e. *WRA Meeting Evaluation Form:* Requested that the evaluation form included with the agenda be filled out and returned to the WRA to improve the effectiveness of Board meetings.
- f. *Discuss quarterly meeting rotation hosted by member agencies:* The WRA Board agreed to continue rotating the meeting locations among member agencies.

7. INFORMATIONAL ITEM: GardenSoft Project Proposal

Jacques DeBra, City of Davis, was initially approached by GardenSoft to develop a water-wise gardening project with a focus on urban conservation. Jacques presented the information to the WRA Board to determine interest in member agencies to support this as a regional project for the WRA. The Board asked several questions regarding the proposal. If any agency is interested they should contact Jacques. The City of Davis may send out a proposal to the urban agencies inquiring about their interest in the project. The WRA could utilize this program as web-linked information, but no decision was made to move forward on this item as a WRA funded project. The UC Davis Extension program may have similar information available through their Master Gardeners' program. Staff will inquire about what kind of information is available to the public.

8. 2008-09 PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WRA PROJECT FUNDS BUDGET

Jacques DeBra, Technical Committee Chair, presented the Technical Committee recommendations for 2008-09 project funds allocations. Fundamentally these are regional efforts that are addressing issues in the IRWMP. The Technical Committee considered all funding requests and project summary information was included with the Technical Committee's recommendations report. The total budget, including funds carried over from the previous fiscal year, is \$152,000. A total of six projects were allocated a portion of the \$152,000.

The Yolo County IRWMP needs to be amended to be competitive for potential future funding under the Proposition 84 grant. A streamlined approach has been recommended. It is likely that local agency matches will be needed to complete this project in addition to the WRA funded allocation. Agency match contributions will need to be discussed further. The goal is to have the update completed by the first quarter of 2009.

The YCFCWCD has provided leadership and has been the lead funding agency for the groundwater monitoring program. Max Stevenson gave an overview of the project's history, activities and funding sources since 2004. The goal is to develop a permanent outside funding source for this foundational and valuable database. The TC recommendation allocates \$15,000 of the requested \$31,000 from FY 08-09 WRA project funds for the groundwater monitoring program. Long-term funding for this project is pending further discussion, which will need the support of local agencies outside of the WRA budget process.

Projects Submitted For Funding Consideration	WRA Request	Other Funding	Total Funding	TC Action
1. RD2035 Water Intake Design	\$ 35,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 35,000
2. Correll Rodgers Wetlands	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 35,000
3. Yolo Bypass IRWMP Process	\$ 15,000	\$ 4,200	\$ 19,200	\$ 15,000
4. Cache Creek Library	\$ 13,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 13,000
5. Groundwater Monitoring	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 15,000
6. Yolo County IRWMP Update	\$ 50,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 39,000
7. WRA Carbon Footprint	\$ 15,000	0	\$ 15,000	0
8. Willow Slough Assessment	\$ 25,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 45,000	0
TOTAL	\$ 219,000	\$ 160,200	\$379,200	\$152,000

9. PROPOSED WRA OPERATING BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008-09

A proposed FY 2008-09 budget was included with the April agenda for Board discussion. Bill Marble highlighted changes to the budget as detailed in the Executive Committee report. The final budget will be adopted at the next WRA Board meeting in July.

The Board was asked to provide feedback to the Technical Committee on structuring priorities and criteria for selecting projects for funding. This is the first year that there were more projects requesting funding than funding available. Direction from the Board is appreciated.

10. PRESENTATION: CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO FLOOD PROGRAM UPDATE

Dan Mount introduced Bill Panos, Capital Facilities Improvement Program Manager. Bill also works on the City of West Sacramento's flood protection efforts through developing financing, strategic program direction and legislative and agency relationships. Bill's presentation focused on several points: the context for development of a flood program in West Sacramento, the program's current and future capacities, the components of the flood program and upcoming issues anticipated for the program.

The flood control protection program is one of the largest infrastructure projects undertaken by the City, approximately \$400 million. West Sacramento City Council has identified this as a high priority, being that the City is at the confluence of the Sacramento and American River systems and most at-risk to be impacted by flooding.

A program organization chart illustrated that the flood protection program provides services to a JPA, the West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. The project Steering Committee meets weekly and provides program guidance and compliance to City Council priorities. William Chow is the Flood Program Manager, who also oversees the consultants, task force and city staff coordinating various elements of the program. (See organizational chart at end of minutes.) The project management by the JPA was structured to be a mirror image of the consultant's project organization. For example, the consultant's (MBK) program management mirrors the City's program manager structure with William Chow in the lead; and consultant's federal and state lobbyists (Holland & Knight, Gonsalves) are mirrored by the City's lobbyist (Bill Panos). Establishing this kind of mirrored structure is a great assistance when managing such a complex project.

Funding for the flood protection program is comprised of federal, non-federal (state) and local partners. West Sacramento has a 10% cost share for the project. The City is expecting to fund their \$80 million cost share with a voter approved local assessment (citizens approved by 82%) and an in-lieu construction fee. Although with the decline in the economy and related construction income, the City is beginning to explore alternative funding mechanisms. The complexity of the funding scenario necessitates that flood program and agency staff meets weekly, because the economy is constantly changing.

About a year ago, the flood program changed its strategic direction by focusing on strengthening Federal agency relationships, such as, the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), FEMA, and the Federal Appropriations chair. This has proven to be an important and very helpful in the success of the West Sacramento flood protection program. The program also has similar State relationships that are critical at not only the staff/middle management level, but also the senior, elected and committee levels. These State and Federal relationships allow the program to work more effectively. For example, funds have been dedicated (by the State) in California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) capital supplemental budget for the West Sacramento project. These funds will be available when the budgets are approved –\$65 million in 2008-09 and \$130 million in 2009-10.

The program has several engineering components including flood protection improvements and modeling. One project is designing a set-back levee which has garnered interest from State agencies. The State is willing to contribute triple the amount of money to that project and extend the project because it is a set-back levee (this is land that the City already owns). The primary problem with West Sacramento levees is underseepage, not overtopping, therefore there are also slurry wall designs planned. The flood protection program is in the process determining, with DWR and USACE, what the City should do, why, in what sequence and how will it be funded. Public safety is the key priority.

Following are some of the questions answered by Bill Panos:

- *What agencies are in the West Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency?* RD 900, RD 537, City of West Sacramento and formerly RD 811.
- *How does WSAFCA interface with SAFCA?* Have only recently begun to meet monthly.
- *Who do you collect the in-lieu construction fee from and for what?* From developers, people who apply for building permits in-lieu of them paying an assessment cost on new develop, calculated by the project magnitude. It is also in-lieu of them having to provide 200-year protection to the project, therefore the agreement is that they contribute to the JPA which will provide the 200-year protection moving forward.
- *What are the regional benefits of WSAFCA?* Regionalizing the projects and packaging them so that Federal agencies (in Washington, DC) can recognize the needs of the Delta. Out of state Federal agencies need a much broader perspective and understanding of our region, especially when we are competing with other communities around the country for scarce federal funding. For example, we can keep visibility of our needs high by expressing to the Federal government that next to the Mississippi Delta area, the Sacramento Delta has the second highest flood risk in the country.
- *Do any of the projects include options for increasing capacity into the Yolo Bypass?* A variety of different solution sets will be investigated for the City and for the system as a whole. All options will be looked at before anything is approved, because it is really not known what the best options are.
- *How long did it take to organize the Flood Protection Program and what were some of the key milestones along the way?* The focus of the first 5 years is local and state funding. The big hurdles were securing the local assessment/funding, which took a couple of years. Although they have been working on issues regarding the levees and the port long before they officially became a City. The next 5 years focuses on federal funding. Engineering milestones hinge on getting another federally authorized project. Feasibility studies will be done in parallel with the federal funding process. The goal is to engage the USACE to do a feasibility study of the entire system. It is anticipated that construction projects would not be completed until at least 2020. FEMA mapping overlay will be a driving force to keep the process moving forward. The City should be mapping base flood elevations in the next year (including DWR's LiDAR data) and would then have more exact information for various areas of the community. There are two sides to protecting public safety: flood insurance (FEMA) and flood protection improvement projects (USACE). Local government perceives a "disconnect" at the federal level as to how the insurance program connects to the construction flood protection/improvements projects. The City is concerned about the unintended consequence of flood insurance slowing their public safety improvements, because if citizens are paying \$1,200/yr for insurance then those are funds will not be available for assessments for improvement projects. Bill discussed the concept of incentive funding to put federal money back into the community for flood protection either directly or through a grant that would help the City continue flood protection efforts.
- *Is the Flood Protection Projects part of the IRWMP? How can the WRA be of assistance to West Sacramento with their efforts?* Yes, parts of the project are in the IRWMP. Continuing discussions with the WRA, Yolo County, the cities and elected leadership, etc. will build stronger regional relationships on flood protection issues as we all interface with other groups like SAFCA. Moving toward building a Northern California coalition will assist in discussions flood issues with DWR and in Washington, DC.

11. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Yolo County was asked to provide an update on the water policies presented at their April 22nd meeting. Supervisor Duane Chamberlain read the recommended action from the 4/22 agenda which was to receive for discussion proposed changes to the Yolo County Code pertaining to management of groundwater, give direction to staff for preparation of ordinance and fee resolution for future Board of Supervisors' consideration, and discussion of future county water governance. The Board of Supervisors voted 3-2 in favor moving forward with direction given to staff to create a process and engage as many people/agencies as possible and report back to the Board on July 22nd. Supervisor Mike McGowan also provided an update on the meeting's discussions. There are several components to the draft proposals: updating the old, ineffective groundwater ordinance and including a water transfer ordinance and fee mechanism to create a legally defensible process. The Board of Supervisors directed that a host of parties should be engaged in the process to provide input on the draft

proposals. The goal is to produce a viable piece of legislation to protect Yolo County water resources for agricultural and urban use. The new ordinances will also focus on the potential impacts of water transfers to local interests. As far as creating a county water agency, it still needs to be determined what the structure and fundamental role would be of that agency. Supervisor McGowan is on the Delta Vision and Delta Protection Committee. He shared his views on how changes to management of Delta resources might impact Yolo County. This is another reason why Yolo County needs to be prepared to protect the future of its water resources.

Bill Marble reiterated that it is important for the WRA to know what its role might be in this process and that the WRA be kept informed of the County's discussions and activities. Bill also asked what the interface is between the County's proposed new ordinances and the IRWMP adopted by all the WRA member agencies last year. Yolo County staff responded to this inquiry that there are amendments that will need to be incorporated into the IRWMP for additional actions that were developed by several agencies after the IRWMP's adoption. Such amendments will be incorporated into the IRWMP when it is next updated. An IRWMP update is one of the WRA Technical Committee's recommended 2008-09 projects. Collaborative organizations and ongoing programs (such as the WRA and the IRWMP Implementation Partners) should continue their current efforts.

YCFCWCD, RD 2035, Winters, Woodland and West Sacramento gave brief reports on current activities for their agencies.

Suggested presentation for the next Board meeting: an update from the *floodSAFE Yolo* Pilot Program.

12. NEXT MEETING DATE: July 14, 2008, 3-5 pm. Location to be determined.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna L. Gentile

Donna L. Gentile

WRA Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator