

Regional CRMP Meeting (West Placer, Tri County, etc.)

Rocklin Corp Yard

6/6/06

3:00-5:00

Attending: Christian Carleton (Foothill Consulting), Katie Maloney (RCD), Rich Gresham (RCD), Steve Seville (Jones and Stokes), Harvey Oslick (RBF), Lydia Sizelove (City of Rocklin), Marilyn Jasper (Sierra Club), Brian Keating (Placer County Flood Control District), Joe Navari (Ducks Unlimited)

Rich - Regional CRMP should implement existing watershed plans – mainly restoration projects and outreach.

Gregg – our funding is running out.

Rich - Katie is funded by Placer County for one meeting per month.

Projects should be described as implementing objectives of the management plans. EG, the lower Coon Creek project, dry Creek Sesbania eradication. That will aid in securing future grant proposals.

Placer County might let Ed Sullivan facilitate the regional CRMP after the DC Coordinator contract ends until funding is found.

Water quality monitoring could be a regional fee for services project.

Steve – developers are working on less profitable areas and need more environmental mitigation. They may be motivated to work with CRMP to mutual benefit.

Christian – ACE is proposing a watershed approach to vernal pool conservation that may make more mitigation necessary.

Rich – DCWC has no legal standing and can't make agreements but DCC can.

Steve – Will developers fund identified projects in return for positive publicity?

Can DCWC meet with developers and develop a proposal, including a list of projects, to ACE?

Brian – Vista Oaks is an example of lack of coordination between city, PCFCD, and ACE. PCFCD has an identified project and interests but city and ACE won't impose conditions on the project regarding the PCFCD project.

Steve – CRMP needs a list of projects to propose to developers and agencies.

It could be taken to planning commissions (Rich), agencies, and developers.

Harvey – much of the new mitigation requirements such as hydromodification mitigation at the site level is very complex and expensive. CRMP should approach the regional water quality board to get agreement to a watershed management proposal that spreads flood control, water quality, and habitat mitigation over the watershed.

Rich – we might take a step with a developer and agency on one project.

Steve – the larger regional group may be able to get attention of developers and agencies because the concept will apply to more projects.

Harvey – for some projects the on-site stormwater requirements don't help much. It would be better to put the money into watershed restoration that will mitigate stormwater impact.

Brian – new developments are using Reason Farms instead of on-site measures. Cities are going their own ways instead of looking at a watershed approach.

Harvey – on-site measures have two purposes: to preserve water quality during frequent, small events, and to provide flood control for less frequent, large events. They don't do both well.

A watershed approach could:

- Look at subwatersheds and identify potential development.
- Identify what projects could provide the most benefit to the watershed with on-site measures.
- Put mitigation money from the remaining projects into watershed wide restoration to mitigate impacts.

We need an updated flood control plan.

Brian – An update is on the PCFCD agenda but they fell a little short of projected funding of \$300 to \$400,000.

Harvey – Do only selected parts.

Brian – watershed approach is required.

Harvey – Do a different level of effort for different subsheds. The update should integrate DC CRMP concepts and projects.

Rich - we should meet with the Regional board.

Consensus of group:

- Have a meeting including developers and agencies and propose the update for the flood control plan integrating habitat from the DC CRMP and including LID.
- Ask developers to contribute a portion of funding
- Ask RWQCB to cooperate and work with group to come up with a plan that they agree would address their concerns for projects.
- It could include LID but it is difficult to know to what extent it could be used because eventual densities are unknown. The benefits of “start at the source” type BMP's are hard to quantify.
- Consultants should work with clients and DCWC to develop the meeting. We should stress that a cooperative approach will benefit all. It can solve problems both for development projects, water quality, flood control and restoration. It could provide money for restoration when grants are drying up, require LID where appropriate, and facilitate approvals for developer's projects.