Members Present: Sara Agahi, Danielle Borish (for San Bernardino County Supervisor Paul Biane), Dale Casey, Mike Fox, Steven Hernandez (for Riverside Supervisor Marion Ashley), Rick Iger, Kern County Supervisor Jon McQuiston, Paul Novak (for Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich), Eric Shamp, Norman Meek, Brian Moore, Ali Sahabi, Stephanie Pincetl, Mark Pisano, Paul Quill, Chris Stone, Marty Teal, Ralph Wagner, Duane Young

State and Federal Representatives Present: Brian Walker, Steve Cowdin, Ray Lenaburg, Stephan Lorenzato, Maria Lorenzo-Lee, Allan Oto, Ricardo Pineda, Mark Stuart, Pete Sorenson, Rene Vermeeren


Members Absent: Los Angeles County Supervisor Michael Antonovich, Riverside Supervisor Marion Ashley, San Bernardino County Supervisor Paul Biane, Georgia Celehar, Tom Davis, Scott Dawson, San Diego County Supervisor Bill Horn, Mark Grey, John McCarthy, Dave Mlynarski, Vana Olson, Tom O’Keefe, Lee Reader, Tom Scott, Scott Steinmetz, Joan Taylor, Marty Teal, Ray Torres, Sergio Vargas, Kathleen Webb, Dusty Williams.

State and Federal Representatives Absent: Mike Anderson, Chris Adams, Dave Gutierrez, Greg Krzys, Robert Mead, Ed Bortugno

Others Present: Bart Brizzee, Jason Thomas, Tina Cydzik, Mekbib Degaga, David Garcia, Chuck Lackey, Stuart McKibbin, Terry Rogers

Meeting called to order: at 9:30 a.m. by AFTF Facilitator, Susan Carpenter.
Welcome:
- Meeting Host, Supervisor Jon McQuiston, Kern County
- Mark Stuart, AFTF chair, announced that the next meeting will be in Bakersfield, at the Petroleum Club.

AFTF Business: Minutes of the AFTF Plenary Meeting 5, April 11, were reviewed and approved by AFTF Task Force members, with changes.

The AFTF Coordinator presented the discussion goals for the meeting—to find agreements in principle, explained how members could provide editing comments at the meeting or afterward and said that the tools category had increased from four to six.

A lengthy discussion of the document ensued. The highlights of the comments follow:

Re: Executive Summary

- 2003 event is post-fire debris flow, not alluvial fan flooding.
- 45-day public review and presentations scheduled, instead of 30
- Need an outreach plan with names and locations
- Need photos of fans/destruction for inclusion in executive report: 300 dpi or better
- Focus on model ordinance
  - Should include CFR 65.13 (Develop. On Alluvial Fans) and then have the tools show how to get there.
  - Tools are advisory not regulation
- Step 2a and 2b: Identify hazard issues and resources values

Re: TOOL KIT

- Would like benefits maps, including groundwater maps, recharge maps.
- Input from USGS needed, and will be helpful to locals
- Task Force members should be involved in outreach.
- One page fact sheet needed before formal outreach begins
- What incentives are there for developers to look at these tools?
- Need description of benefits and consequences at each level of the model ordinance.
- Final report needs greater discussion of the aesthetic values of Alluvial Fans
- Discuss the costs/benefits—who do they actually benefit?
- Web site should have a list of funding sites.
- Ability to realistically build has to be taken into account. (Rick 32)
- Global Climate change may recalibrate the 100-year debate (Pete)
- Effect of fire in water shed is not included
- Recommend talking about contributing area/ rain amount
“Man-mades” could make the area “wet” – such as Caliente Creek (Rick 17)
Need elevation even though it may not be in active part of land.
In Model Ordinance, 1% flood is based on hydrology data. Counties need to go beyond the data
Put “100-year flood” in quotations and explain why it is not used, in favor of “base flood”
Landscape value not reflected in document and minutes
Useful to have a distinction between active and inactive alluvial fan.
Orange County Case study should include these guidelines, if possible
One sustainable plan would be easier to communicate
Map recharge areas. Insert value of providing groundwater quality
If we require all developers to map/set aside all potential groundwater recharge areas, we will over reserve land needed for water supply. Need analysis to compute the land are needed.
Who is doing the assessments? Developer? Whose responsibility is long term maintenance? Evacuation shelters? Need clarification of responsibility
Need to know how far to go down the steps. Have recommended “markers” to help “flow” or designation of where responsibility would begin/end. (brian)
Educational materials that you could hand to the developer would be helpful
Weight the numbers in the D+C “Practices” chart to assess county-wide cumulative impacts, or use a relative weighting from 0-8
Highlight the assets of what we’re doing in the report (ex: fairness and equity)
Demonstrate water requirement by developers
Education needs to begin sooner rather than later, perhaps start with Supervisors’ offices
In re the sustainable development tool, the task force should incorporate value for developability so “avoidance” is not always a default.

In wrapping up the discussion, Susan Carpenter told the group that the document was still in draft stage and Susan Longville asked for members to continue sending editing comments. She said that the document would be vetted by legal counsel.

Mark Stuart reminded the group that the report represents its collective work and that there needs to be buy-in by AFTF members.

Meeting Adjourned: 3 p.m.
Next Meeting:
Friday, Sept. 19, 2008
Hosted by DWR
Location Riverside Flood Control District, 1995 Market St., Riverside

Minutes respectfully submitted to the AFTF members by Gigi Hanna, AFTF Administrative Coordinator. Please contact ghanna@csusb.edu if corrections are necessary.