

From: Deirdre Des Jardins <ddj@cah2oresearch.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:37 PM

To: Delta Council ISB <DeltaCouncilISB@deltacouncil.ca.gov>; Windham-Myers, Lisamarie@DeltaCouncil <lisamarie.windham-myers@deltacouncil.ca.gov>; Mullin, Erin@DeltaCouncil <Erin.Mullin@deltacouncil.ca.gov>; Madueno, Virginia@DeltaCouncil <Virginia.Madueno@deltacouncil.ca.gov>

Subject: Concerns expressed by Delta local flood agencies at August 2021 DLIS hearing

At the August 2021 hearing on DLIS, the DSC Executive Director said that the concerns expressed by the Central Valley Flood Protection Association, Central Delta Reclamation Districts, and Gil Cosio could be addressed going forward. But the presentation today by the Delta Stewardship Council staff showed that these concerns have been completely forgotten. Further, none of the local flood agency folks who expressed concerns were asked to present to the Delta Independent Science Board. This fails to give adequate information to the Delta ISB for independent oversight of the Delta Stewardship Council.

The characterization of the DLIS as prioritizing "risk reduction" is also fundamentally obfuscatory. The Council's decisionmaking documents showed that the Council did not choose the option that would have prioritized protecting lives and property. The decisionmaking instead chose the option that would prioritize protecting statewide interests -- Delta export water supply and ecosystem restoration. You can see this in the categorization of restoration of Grizzly Island and Hasting Tracts as "very high" priority, above that of most levees protecting Delta legacy communities.

<https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/pdf/dlis/2024-01-02-closeup-extent-1.pdf>

<https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/pdf/dlis/2024-01-02-closeup-extent-2.pdf>

<https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/pdf/dlis/2024-01-02-closeup-extent-3.pdf>

This is my blog post on the August 2021 hearing (with a transcript of my concerns about protecting lives and property in Delta legacy communities.)

[Revised Delta Levees Investment Strategy approved over objections by Delta stakeholders](#)

The DLIS maps continue to fail to even show the location of Delta Legacy Communities.

Transcript of comments by Melinda Terry of the Central Valley Flood Protection Association, Dante Nomellini Sr. representing Central Delta Reclamation Districts, and Gil Cosio, the levee engineer for North Delta Reclamation Districts.

[Comments of Delta stakeholders on revised Delta Levees Investment Strategy](#)

The table below (updated from our 2019 brief) shows actual conditions of the levees protecting Delta legacy communities.

[Hazard Level definitions are from the Lower Sacramento River/Delta North Regional Flood Management Plan, July 2014.](https://www.yolocounty.org/home/showdocument?id=28753) Available at <https://www.yolocounty.org/home/showdocument?id=28753>

When water reaches the Levee Assessment Tool assessed Water Surface Elevation:

- Hazard Level A –low likelihood of either levee failure or the need to flood-fight to prevent levee failure.
- Hazard Level B – moderate likelihood of either levee failure or the need to flood-fight to prevent levee failure.
- Hazard Level C – high likelihood of either levee failure or the need to flood-fight to prevent levee failure.
- Lacking Sufficient Data (LD) – There is currently insufficient data about past performance or hazard indicators to assign a hazard level, or there is poor correlation between past performance and hazard indicator scores.

	DLIS Island /Tract or portion	SPFC	RD	Hazard Level	Standards	2010 population (whole island / tract)	Probability of Flooding (Hydrologic 2012 Baseline)	Priority
Freeport	Maintenance Area 9 North	Y	744			38*	1.4%	Very High
Clarksburg	Netherlands	Y	999	All B		917	1.2%	High
Clarksburg area	Lisbon	Y	307	C		163	1.0%	Other
Clarksburg area	Merritt Island	Y	150	A or B, B, C		173	1.2%	Other
Hood	Maintenance Area 9 South	Y	746	C		1,495	6.6%	Very High
Courtland	Pearson District	Y	551	B, LD		696	1.7%	High
Locke	Libby McNeil	Y	369	A		108	0.9%	Other
Walnut Grove – East Bank	Walnut Grove (Has its own RD)	Y	554	A		502	1.5%	High
Walnut Grove – West Bank	Grand Island	Y	3	B, C		1,388	2.2%	High
Ryde	Grand Island	Y	3			1,388	2.2%	Very High

Isleton	Brannan-Andrus Island	Y	407	B and C		1,586	1.9%	Very High
Rio Vista	DLIS-22				2.4 m of waterfront need upgrades	158 (within flood area)	0.1%	High
Bethel Island	Bethel Island				11.5 m at HMP	2,137	1.0%	Very High
Knightsen	DLIS-07 (Adjacent to Hotchkiss Tract)					216	0.0%	High
Knightsen	Veale Tract				4.2 m at HMP (100%)	55	1.0%	High

Other sources:

[Report 1607, Delta Levees in Contra Costa County: How well do we protect this vital safety system, Contra Costa Grand Jury, 2015-16.](http://www.cc-courts.org/civil/docs/grandjury/1607_ReportSigned.pdf) Available at http://www.cc-courts.org/civil/docs/grandjury/1607_ReportSigned.pdf.

From the Yolo Bypass Draft EIS-EIR Chapter 4:

The Rio Vista waterfront is vulnerable to flooding along a 2.4-mile reach that extends along the waterfront from downtown near California Street to the Mellin Levee and northward along the Mellin Levee to high ground (Figure 5-18) (Solano County Water Agency, 2015). Rio Vista has proposed a combination of floodwalls, closure structures, and levee improvements to protect the city from 200-year flooding and higher sea level rise due to climate change. In the event that changes in the Yolo Bypass contribute to stage increases in the vicinity of Rio Vista, the State could potentially participate in the implementation of the local 200-year flood protection project as mitigation for such effects.

Deirdre Des Jardins

California Water Research

Climate change, adaptation & western water from nonlinear dynamics & complex systems perspective

Former researcher, Santa Fe Institute, Center for Nonlinear Studies at Los Alamos National Lab, NASA Ames