

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study

Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
1	1*	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Are maintenance and life-cycle cost included in the cost estimates?	Addressed	Maintenance costs are important, and need to be added when we refine the selected scenario. None of the scenario costs currently reflect O&M costs.
2	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Did you consider a more aggressive BMP implementation requiring BMPs for permitted development, etc.?	Addressed	Yes – considered several options (see the BMP option discussion beginning on page 22 of the workshop handout package). More aggressive BMP implementation can certainly work within any of the scenarios and should be encouraged – perhaps on a voluntary basis.
3	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	There could be some way to incentivize the implementation of BMP option 2 or 3 (permitted or retrofit BMPs). Consider tax breaks, or other approach to identify flow reduction per acre, for example.	District Input	
4	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	In cities, District doesn't have jurisdiction, so oversight of BMP implementation and maintenance could be problematic.	District Input	
5	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Requirement for BMPs to manage 100-year return-period flow could kill development.	District Input	
6	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	BMPs approach (project by project) is more of an "urban" approach as opposed to a watershed or subshed approach. By focusing on BMPs could be shooting ourselves in the foot re: spending money on something more effective or cost-effective	Addressed	A combination of regional and local implementation will be best. Some locations might be not be suitable for one of the other. City of Camarillo, for example, would be better suited to a regional solution – it's a matter of available land.
7	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Consider redevelopment fees rather than require 100-year flow detention on individual sites.	District Input	
8	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Are dollars in current amounts? What is planning horizon?	Addressed	Yes – dollars are current (2008). Planning horizon is 20 years. CIP period is 5 years. Long range plan feeds the implementation plan.
9	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Where does ¼ mile buffer extend from?	Addressed	Buffer extends from centerline of channel.
10	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Do any of the projects include replacing the existing channel bottom with concrete?	Addressed	No – concrete channelization is off the table.
11	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	Would regional basins be like Hansen Dam or Sepulveda Basin but on a smaller scale?	Addressed	Yes – recreation and habitat can be maximized if the basin is more than just a "dirt bowl". This does add to the maintenance cost, but the benefits are (in my opinion) worth it. Would/could improve habitat, water recharge, water quality, and others.
12	1	Stakeholder	Q&A	Jan-13-2009	What do you see in terms of water quality improvement with the basins?	Addressed	Sediment reduction (TMDL emphasis); basins also add retention for smaller storms to reduce sediment and other loadings.
13	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Concerns from land owner: proposed basin 8 location is private property; also sediment and high-groundwater concerns. Consider Camarillo Park as an alternative location for Basin 8.	District Input	
14	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	WWTP flows and high groundwater might limit infiltration ability within basins.	District Input	
15	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Why Q100 and not Q200 or Q250? Consider going to higher protection.	District Input	
16	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	¼ mile buffer from centerline may not be as good as ¼ mile from edge of channel for Land Management approach. Consider making buffer consistent along all reaches.	District Input	
17	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Land Management buffer concept is not likely to be acceptable to some land owners.	District Input	

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
18	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Be aware of supplemental EIR from CSU Channel Islands – review proposed works.	District Input	
19	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Food safety concerns due to contact by public with food crops. Also public safety concern with potential contact with chemicals/pesticides if recreational use overlaps or is adjacent to farmlands.	District Input	
20	1	Table Session	Reaches 1, 2	Jan-13-2009	Implement more aggressive BMPs watershed-wide. Find ways to incentivize.	District Input	
21	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Strong emphasis on bike trails: joint-venture with County and City Parks agencies; mimic Ventura River trail - Ojai to ocean; cost sharing needed; consider shared liability; bike train master plan; Class 1 bikeway; Involve Rec/Habitat commission; educational opportunities.	District Input	
22	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Arroyo Conejo confluence with Santa Rosa: wetland? Regional basin? Improve habitat.	District Input	
23	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Watershed BMPs should reference the latest MS4 permit draft (Feb 09).	District Input	
24	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	In past, focus has been on health of Mugu Lagoon. It needs to be incorporated in the planning process. Consider effects of scenarios on Mugu Lagoon.	District Input	
25	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	A few regional basins is better than many smaller basins.	District Input	
26	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Flood wall along Conejo Creek and other projects were proposed in HDR report – consider recommendations of that report.	District Input	
27	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Consider works that are to be constructed between the 101 and Pleasant Valley Road	District Input	
28	1	Table Session	Reaches 3, 6	Jan-13-2009	Basin at confluence of Camarillo Hills Drain and Revolon Slough: most water would need to come from Revolon Slough, not from Camarillo Hills Drain.	District Input	
29	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Acceptability of proposed approaches: how would we go back to property owners to get buy-in. Partnerships required to get buy-in; how would we work together to achieve these solutions given different jurisdictions and property boundaries?	District Input	
30	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	How will plan updates be addressed? Would this cause a tax increase? How would property assessments and NPDES requirements be affected?	District Input	
31	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Has the original plan calling for 3 basins in Simi Valley been considered/included?	Pending	
32	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	There is potential to control recharge downstream; want water in basins to infiltrate and not evaporate.	District Input	
33	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	MS4 requirements are not the same across Ventura County.	District Input	
34	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Land owned by City and County downstream of Hill Canyon Treatment Plant that could be used for regional basin: potential flood, habitat, wetland/restoration benefits	District Input	
35	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Need to be flexible in solutions: change number of BMPs; change number/location of basins. Will agricultural BMPs be required to limit flows?	Addressed	Flexibility will be required, and it is expected that the best solution will vary by reach based on the priorities and desires of affected stakeholders, and on what has been selected upstream. Agricultural BMPs would be expected to limit flow, although targets have not been established at this stage.

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
36	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Current draft permit language considers Q2 flows; what would be required to address Q100 flows in the same manner?	Addressed	The 100-year return-period flows (Q100) are significantly larger than the Q2 flows. To accommodate the much larger flows, BMPs would need to be considerably larger than for Q2 flow mitigation. Q100 mitigation requirements might be very restrictive. Even at a 3-year level it can be prohibitive. Is it practical to have impervious pavement or other measures to reduce runoff. Suggest target reduction goals instead of flow detention objectives.
37	1	Table Session	Reaches 4, 5	Jan-13-2009	Land Management – land credits, minimized densities near stream, negotiate with communities and land-owners.	District Input	
38	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Remove the levee that separates Revolon Slough and Calleguas Creek. PCH bridge would then have adequate capacity.	District Input	
39	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Single regional basin 10: function as a basin, but remain in ag use (as currently used).	District Input	
40	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Near Camarillo airport – potential bird hazard risk for Camarillo airport.	District Input	
41	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Need to consider a full menu of BMPs: both options 2 and 3 plus very strong educational program to expand BMP impacts as much as possible. New scenario: “watershed approach”: aggressive education, BMP implementation; wouldn't protect farmers; no channel improvements or basins.	District Input	
42	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Flooding of agricultural land is a problem: Changes soil structure; Flooding of green leafy veg. act could lose 1 to 3 years of crop growth; Farmers afraid of lawsuits from bacterial contamination of food crops.	District Input	
43	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Farmers not in support of ¼ mile buffer: land partitioning; opposition of landowners; requirement for use of condemnation. Flat farmland is becoming scarce in California – hard to give it up. Issues of capital gains tax on selling land to County – not much benefit to landowners to sell to District. Ag land is already protected in County of Ventura because of slow-growth initiative.	District Input	
44	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Preferred scenarios: farmers prefer 1 or 3 (no protection level), regulatory agencies prefer 2 because of reduced levee work	District Input	
45	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Have we considered 1/4 –mile setback levees?	Pending	
46	1	Table Session	Reaches 7, 8	Jan-13-2009	Look into California Coastal Conservancy program for assisting farmers.	District Input	
47	2	Letter, Yugal Lall, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	The City cannot support establishing a 1/4 mile buffer on either side of the Arroyo Simi to prevent development.	District Input	It is intended that there will be flexibility in how the final solution alternatives will be implemented. The City would be able to reject the buffer concept within their jurisdiction.
48	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	The City cannot support returning developed land within the 1/4 mile buffer back to undeveloped land.	District Input	It is intended that there will be flexibility in how the final solution alternatives will be implemented. The City would be able to reject the concept of returning land to undeveloped state.
49	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	The District's consultant should have had direct conversations with the municipalities to discuss their concerns in detail earlier in the study, rather than rely on large stakeholder meetings that prevented detailed discussion.	Comment Noted	The District and CH2M HILL presented the workshop materials to the City on February 2, 2009, and discussed the issues of concern with Mr. Lall and staff.
50	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	How did the District/Consultant develop the \$734 million of potential flood damages if a 100-year flood occurred in the Calleguas Creek Watershed? On November 24, 2008, FEMA released its preliminary DFIRM for the City of Moorpark, after the City appealed the September 2003 map.	District Input	

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study

Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
51	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	The requirement for BMP installation should reflect municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.	District Input	It is intended that there will be flexibility in how the final solution alternatives will be implemented. The City would be able to reject standards that go beyond the NPDES requirements.
52	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	Given the current economic conditions of both the state and federal government, is it realistic to assume that funding is going to be available to cover the cost of any of the proposed scenarios provided so far in the study?	District Input	
53	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	Is there certainty that grant funds spent on this program will produce the greatest benefits compared to other potential projects?	District Input	Alternative solutions and input have been, and will continue to be, requested from all stakeholders. Although the focus of the current study is flood management, benefits can include flood protection, water quality enhancement, recreational improvements/access, increased tax base, and others as defined by the different stakeholders. The flexibility of implementation of the final alternative solutions will allow different jurisdictions to emphasize their priorities, and achieve the greatest benefits possible.
54	2	Letter, City of Moorpark	Reach 5	Feb-06-2009	The District's consultant did not address the drainage guidelines for municipalities wherein new development is designed with no net increase in the storm flow.	District Input	The draft NPDES permit addresses flows that are considerably less than the 100-year return period storm. Control of the 100-year storm (or greater) has been suggested by stakeholders. It is understood that the City of Moorpark limits the post-construction discharge for the 10- to 100-year storm to the corresponding pre-development discharge flows.
55	3	Letter, Allan Paul, CSUCI	Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	After careful study, I believe that your option number one which emphasizes regional basins and channel improvements would clearly be the preferred scheme for the water quality and flood control of our area.	Comment Noted	
56	3	Letter, CSUCI	Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	The suggested ¼ mile buffer zone proposed on either side of Calleguas Creek south of University Drive would impinge on CSU property. The university campus is located between the steep, unbuildable Santa Monica Mountains and the "flood plain" of Calleguas Creek. A major portion of the campus lies within ¼ mile of the creek. A move toward blanket restriction or enforcement of the suggested buffer would severely limit the future growth potential of the University to meet the enrollment goals at its current location and would not be acceptable. To the contrary, the university needs increased protection from Calleguas Creek and Long Grade Creek flooding, so that its growth can continue within the existing site area.	District Input	It is intended that there will be flexibility in how the final solution alternatives will be implemented. The University would be able to reject the buffer concept within their jurisdiction.

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study

Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
57	3		Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	The "Protection Level" approach, in which the Calleguas below Pleasant Valley Road would be allowed to flood in 25 year storms with the provision of payment for crop damage, is of little value to the university or the citizens of Oxnard and Port Hueneme who depend upon Hueneme, Lewis, Las Posas, Potrero, and Pleasant Valley Roads to get to school or work on the potentially flooded roadways (The Santa Clara River is also known to flood many of the remaining roads and bridges serving the area). Farm workers, and other local employees, likewise would not benefit from these payments, but would suffer the damages. Effective flood control and water quality measures will benefit the area's farms, business, and institutions far more than an "assumed value of damage" payment.	District Input	The Flood Protection approach would provide the historically-committed level of flood protection in the lower valley, but would not reduce the flood protection. It is understood that flooding at or below the 100-year flood could have serious consequences for those in the affected areas. The study team is open to alternative approaches to compensation, or to elimination of the Protection Level approach if it is deemed unworkable.
58	3		Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	The report seems to imply that a lack of flood control in the lower reaches will help the county advance the SOAR initiative and limit growth. While the preservation of agricultural land and the control of development in the Oxnard Plain may be admirable goals, the use of flood control measures (or the lack thereof) to enforce these goals, would seem to be a misdirection of the watershed agencies.	District Input	Some stakeholders have indicated that a lack of flood protection may reduce the pressure to develop. This would be a potential consequence of a lack of additional flood protection, but is not intended to be an intentional objective of any solution.
59	3		Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	None of the schemes in the study seem to address drainage and flooding from storm water in the Santa Monica Mountains flowing to the Oxnard Plain between 101 and PCH, or from rain falling directly on the Plain. The levees and siltation of Calleguas Creek form an impediment to drainage of the land. For example, Long Grade Creek a former tributary of Calleguas Creek, which serves as drainage for over 2500 acres from CSU Channel Islands to Newbury Park, now has no natural outlet to Calleguas Creek or to the ocean because of the Calleguas Creek levee system. Instead, it forms a lake on the CSU north campus which floods the site during a 2 to 3 year storm. This floodwater remains on the campus and agricultural fields for weeks after the storm for lack of gravity drainage. Note, also, that percolation is ineffective in the area due to high ground water levels. There are, most likely, other similar situations along the north foothills of the mountains.	District Input	This is a valid point that will be discussed.
60	3		Reach 2	Feb-02-2009	Because of the limited channel of the major creeks, water quality issues, and water shortages, it seems imperative to employ strong incentives to the Best Management Practices in all of the developed areas, including the university. This approach places some of the burden of these issues on their sources. The use of the BMPs will, of course, need to be appropriate to the project, site, and soil conditions.	District Input	This is the central tenet of the BMP alternative.
61	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	Noelle Burkey mentions an excellent point. When cities actually experience a Q100 watershed response, what is the actual (predicted) impact upon our wastewater conveyance systems? Has anyone actually considered where we would expect the worst spills emanating from wastewater mains, and the actual bacteria levels that may result from such catastrophic failures? If we can't reasonably protect downstream farmland from Q100 inundation, should actual flood-protecting levees be located along wider swaths of land with knowledge we may face a need for land acquisition when/if contaminated stormwater enters the downstream farms?	Pending	

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study

Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
62	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	Relative to storm frequency selection, particularly downstream: how will this project select the appropriate frequency for confined flows between levees? That is, will Q100 be thrown out due to land costs, and will that necessarily trigger more detention basins upstream?	Pending	
63	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	I encourage stronger consideration of detention basins to keep peak discharges from major watersheds minimized; perhaps determine ways that cities can place detention facilities within their larges channels to shave off the peaks?	Pending	
64	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	Is there a way to determine the actual value of farmland that is subject to flooding now versus after the strategic plan is decided? Is farmland less valuable when the risk of flooding is 4% versus 1%?	Pending	
65	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	Has anyone ever considered what the frequency and value of the actual runoff peaks reaching the main channels is? Since most city infrastructure may be designed for a Q10 (perhaps with some freeboard), won't the time of concentration lengthen to the point of actually lowering the peak discharges; i.e., inducing detention within each city by causing collateral street flooding?	Pending	
66	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	One can anticipate a large amount of vegetation becoming dislodged in the upstream natural drainage courses during larger flood events with bulking effects that will enlarge runoff volumes, loosen sediments and deposit large amounts of debris in the low-lying flatlands of the Mugu Plain. If this is the natural characteristic of watersheds and delta formations, to what degree of flood protection must the levees be designed and maintained?	Pending	
67	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	Can the design team consider the sales value of the topsoil when/if basin alternatives are considered? The precious nature of the topsoil is legendary around the world, and there must be a market for such a great commodity.	Pending	
68	3	Jim Taylor, City of Thousand Oaks		Apr-29-2009	It seems there must be a way to conserve levee construction dollars by "stepping" the overall design of the floodway and flood fringe to accommodate a certain "primary" frequency between the first pair of levees, then the full Q100 in a more-distant (wider channel) pair of levees. It is vital to know what the true Q100 discharge is in the main channels and avoid the supposition that city systems collect and convey full Q100 without inducing a time-of-concentration delay due to street flooding and ponding.	Pending	
69							
70							
71							
72							
73							
74							
75							
76							
77							
78							
79							
80							
81							
82							
83							

Calleguas Creek IWPP Phase II Management Strategy Study Stakeholder Presentation No. 3 Comment Tracking



Workshop Held January 13, 2009, Calleguas Municipal Water District Offices

No.	Comment Set	Comment Source	Source Reference	Comment Received	Issue	Status	Resolution Description
84							
85							
86							
87							
88							
89							

*Comment Set Key

- 1 - Minutes from January 13, 2009 - Workshop No. 3
- 2 - Letter to Sergio Vargas, from Mr. Yugal Lall, City Engineer/Public Works Director, City of Moorpark 805.517.6255
- 3 - Letter to Sergio Vargas from Mr. Alan Paul, Associate Architect, CSUCI 805.437.3372