



Meeting Summary

TAC Meeting #4

1/9/2018

Client: City of Chico
 Project: SWRP
 Subject: SWRP Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4
 Meeting Date/Time: 1/4/2018, at 1:30-3:30 pm
 Location: City Council Chambers, 421 Main Street Chico, CA

ATTENDEES:

Name	Representing
Erick Burre	Water Board, TAC
Thomas Fossum (on the phone)	Butte County, Department of Public Works, TAC
Erik Gustafson	City, TAC
Skyler Lipski	City, TAC
Rich Burgi	City, TAC
Matt Thompson	City, TAC
Robin McCollum	Stream Team, Public
Les Heringer	M & T Ranch, Public
Dick Cory	Teichert Ponds, Public
Angela Spain	City, Public
Kelly Allen	City, Public
Natalie Muradian	Consultant
Doug Moore	Consultant

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

Note: The discussion provided below represents summaries of comments provided at the meeting, and are not direct quotes.

Goal of TAC Meeting #4:

- Present response to comments from public review period extending from November 10, 2017 to December 13, 2017.
- The TAC needs to select one of four Initial Project Screening options:
 - Option 1 - Adopt the Initial Project Screening described in Response to Comments on Initial Project Screening, dated November 9, 2017.
 - Option 2 - Adopt the Initial Project Screening described in Response to Comments on Initial Project Screening, dated November 9, 2017, but with the minor modifications identified in the Response to Comments (RTC) table.

- Option 3 - Adopt the Initial Project Screening described in Response to Comments on Initial Project Screening, dated November 9, 2017, but with the other/additional modifications identified during TAC meeting 4.
- Option 4 - Direct the SWRP Project Team to revise the Initial Project Screening based on other groupings and/or screening criteria. In this case, an additional TAC meeting will be needed to adopt the Initial Project Screening. Also, it will be difficult to have project applications ready for the next Proposition 1 Grant cycle.

TAC Question and Answer Session:

- What does 30% design mean?
 - 30% design represent a preliminary design. 100% design presents a set of documents a contractor could take and build. We are only doing a 30% design to be ready for a grant application. A 100% design will be completed if grant funding is received.
- Erick Burres didn't agree with the process that was used to facilitate the groupings of projects. The project proponent was not consulted during the grouping, and therefore, opportunities for collaboration with other projects and increasing project benefits could have been missed.
 - Doug Moore: The groupings were done to move as many projects forward as possible. Many projects as initially submitted, did not have sponsors, and therefore, would not have been considered at all. This way, many of the projects could move forward in the SWRP development.
 - Erick Burres: That's fine, but the project proponent should have been contacted if their projects were grouped.
- The project information provided was not sufficient for the TAC to effectively evaluate the projects. For example, the affordability ratings that were provided in the screening need backup.
 - Doug Moore: Affordability for each project was estimated relative to other projects.
 - Erick Burres: This is not acceptable because some projects may have a huge benefit for a small cost, while other projects may have a huge cost, but not much benefit.
 - Doug Moore: That's true. This phase was only the screening, and a more detailed cost analysis will be done in a future phase of the SWRP development. Regardless, most of the projects were grouped and are included in a grouped SWRP project.

Public Question and Answer Session:

- Robin McCollum: Public was not prepared for the level of specificity required for the SWRP.
 - Erick Burres: How can public be involved in future project evaluations?
 - Doug Moore: SWRP project team will decide when to contact project proponents based on the project and information needed.
 - Erick Burres: Recommends that each project proponent be contacted.
 - Matt Thompson: A conference call could potentially be set up per project to include proponents of grouped projects.
- Les Heringer, who farms on M& T Ranch, had several concerns, listed below:

- The adequacy of the existing stormwater facilities and the hydrologic assumptions on which the facilities were designed is not being reviewed or updated as part of the SWRP.
- The City's SWRP, grant funded, is intended to produce a list of projects that meet certain goals as outlined in the SWRP guidelines. The SWRP will not in the short term alleviate immediate downstream concerns of existing flood risk.
- The amount of flood risk that exists now due to existing and planned development is not addressed by the SWRP.
- Scoring criteria for projects does not alleviate any obligation to manage existing downstream flood risk.
- The city should immediately update its policies and regulations to address flood risk from existing and proposed development. The SWRP it would appear is being used by the city to avoid updating its Storm Water Master Plan.
- Flood risk is immediate, the SWRP is multi-year and doesn't address concerns in real time and may never result in addressing downstream flood risk.
- Comanche Creek has a small channel and may not be able to handle all the high flood flow events the future holds with present and potential development in the SE Chico Corridor. FEMA map shows Comanche Creek staying within its banks until just east of Dayton Road and from there spreading out and covering a very large area west of Chico.
- It has been 30 years plus since a storm water master plan for the city has been evaluated. A new one needs to be undertaken or at the very least fact check the original one's assumptions against today's conditions to ensure it is still relevant.
 - Doug Moore: We responded to the comment about extending the flood study downstream as far as applicable to evaluate downstream impacts in the Response to Comments Table, this update is reflected in Project O.
 - Matt Thompson: The City is trying to use the SWRP process to update the City's storm drainage master plan in the future, see Project P. This is an update to the City's storm water management plans and policies.
- Les Heringer: Previously spoken with the City about helping get gauges installed to monitor the system's behavior for large flood events. Is the City interested in helping with the gauges?
 - Doug Moore: Project O includes evaluating the flood control system, and installing gauges in Project O is recommended as part of the RTC log.
 - Erick Burres: Check out Project O and provide feedback on if you think what's included in the project will meet your expectations.
 - Les Heringer: I will check out project O.
- Erick Burres: As an aside, I have heard about some projects that have used trail cams to help document flood water rise – it's a relatively low-cost way to provide monitoring. It could be an option for this project.
- Les Heringer: Who's sponsoring Project O and Project P?
 - Doug Moore: The City is sponsoring both projects.
- Dick Corey: What's currently happening to Teichert Ponds is detrimental to the ponds. The original plan for the ponds was to build a bypass around the wetland to the stormwater

pond, but now stormwater is discharged into the wetlands, not the stormwater pond. As a result, nutrients are discharged into the ponds, and silting is a big problem. Teichert Ponds is supposed to be used for nature, recreation, and detention, but because of the nutrient and sediment issues, only seems to be providing the benefit of detention. A project designed in 2008 proposed separating two of the ponds. These design documents already exist, and could act as a 30% design. Improving Teichert Ponds would be an asset to the surrounding neighborhoods, and would draw attention to illegal encampments, which is a good thing because it would bring the issue into the public spotlight. Teichert Ponds could also be used for education and outreach as it would be a great place for school field trips. Teichert Ponds also provides habitat, a benefit for the environment.

- Doug Moore: multiple submittals were received on Teichert Ponds (it was the project that received the second most public comments and submittals) and this project is moving forward into the next phase of the evaluation.
- Dick: Can the engineers provide an update to the cost estimate?
- Robin McCollum: Head cutting occurs in Sycamore channel, which deposits sediment in Sycamore Creek at Cohasset Road. Is this a project which can be included in the SWRP?
 - Doug Moore: we have several projects that address this area, including the Big Chico Creek 21st Century Management Plan and the 5 Mile and Lindo Channel Diversion Study and Improvements.
 - Robin McCollum: What is the Big Chico Creek 21st Century Management Plan?
 - Doug Moore: This is a comprehensive plan for how to manage Big Chico Creek, including gravel/sediment deposition, habitat enhancement, and flood control.
 - Matt Thompson: this plan came from having many years of experience with requests for fixing small problems, and realizing these problems are all intertwined – therefore wanting to have a plan to address the issues in a holistic manner.
 - Erick Burres: Leveraging County Service Area 24 funds is listed as a part of the Big Chico Creek 21st Century Management project. What are County Service Area 24 funds?
 - Matt Thompson: County Service Area (CSA) 24 was created to maintain infrastructure built by the Army Corps.
 - Les Heringer: What does “multi-faceted holistic program” mean in Project O?
 - Doug Moore: The holistic approach is to address the many intertwined issues that occur in watersheds, including gravel and sediment deposition, erosion, habitat, water quality, flood management, etc.
- Doug Moore: To clarify, the type of projects that received the most public support were trash control projects. Teichert Ponds received the second-most project submissions and comments.
- Erick Burres: What is the City going to do considering the new MS4 unfunded mandates that came out two weeks ago?
 - Matt Thompson: The City is going to wait and see what happens with Senate Bill 231 before making any decisions.
 - Erick Burres: How is the SWRP going to help the City meet its MS4 requirements?
 - Erik Gustafson: Project G covers the MS4 requirements

- Doug Moore: Project I covers the Trash Amendment requirements
- Erick Burre: Rapid Trash Assessments not only help identify trash, but also help increase education and outreach regarding trash.

Voting

- Doug Moore: Are there any proposed tweakings to the projects?
 - Response: No response
- Vote on Options for Projects
 - Motion by Erik Gustafson to select Option 2: Adopt the initial project screening described in *Response to Comments on Initial Project Screening*, dated November 9, 2017, but with the minor modifications identified in the RTC table.
 - Second to the motion, by Matt Thompson
 - Unanimous vote for Option 2, Option 2 is selected
- Vote on Options for Response to Comments
 - Motion by Matt Thompson to select Option 1: Adopt the Response to Comments As is
 - Second to the Motion, by Skyler Lipski
 - Five votes in support, one vote opposed – Option 1 is selected

DECISION LOG:

DECISION LOG						
No.	Subject	Decision	Date	Party	Cost	Notes
1	Vote on Projects	Adopt the initial project screening described in <i>Response to Comments on Initial Project Screening</i> , dated November 9, 2017, but with the minor modifications identified in the RTC table	1/4/2018	TAC	N/A	
2	Vote on RTC Log	Adopt the Response to Comments As is	1/4/2018	TAC	N/A	

ACTION ITEM LOG:

ACTION ITEM LOG					
No.	Subject	Action	Party	Date	Status