



**Mid San Joaquin River
Regional Flood Management Plan
Public Workshop #8
July 24, 2014
Draft Meeting Summary**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Pam Jones, Kearns & West, welcomed stakeholders to the 8th Mid San Joaquin River Regional Flood Management Plan (RFMP) Workshop. She reviewed the agenda and asked for introductions. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a final review of draft elements of the plan including the draft prioritization of projects and the financial plan. This meeting was the final meeting in the series of eight RFMP workshops. Pam reviewed the agenda from the first meeting to show the group how far they had come over the year.

2. Review Changes to Project Evaluations and Ranking

Betty Andrews, ESA, reviewed changes that had been made to the project evaluations and ranking document since the last meeting in June. Betty noted that they had created 10 ranking criteria including:

1. Implementation feasibility
2. Financial Feasibility
3. Life Risk Reduction
4. Flood Damages
5. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) and repair
6. Enhancing Ecosystem Function
7. Institutional Support
8. Other related benefits
9. Low potential for dis-benefits (negative impacts)

Betty asked that project leads to look at how their projects were evaluated to make sure they agreed with it. She noted that, for the cost estimates, if a cost had not been provided, ESA and Peterson-Brustad created one for it. She encouraged leads to submit actual costs, where available.

There were some projects that suggested a large amount of money for a local cost share would be needed to complete them, even if grant funding was available. For those projects, they looked at how well locals have brought money to the project so

far. Projects with a large costs share would have low financial feasibility unless they had proven the ability to bring in money.

All of the projects had been broken into three different tiers: Highest, High and Medium priority. If a project had scored well in flood risk reduction or life safety, it was in the Highest tier. She asked the group to consider whether all of the projects in each tier should have an equal ~~scoring value~~ level of priority.

If a project did not ~~prove to be~~ show evidence of being multi-benefit, it was given an “N/A” score. Betty noted that project leads should determine if their projects could be amended to become multi-benefit, which could help them to achieve a higher score.

Betty noted that at the June workshop, Joe Bartlett, DWR, had asked whether they had considered doing a sensitivity analysis. When the flood benefit scores rankings were doubled, there was only one project that moved a spot lower, and it was still within the same tier. Thus, the project team determined that according affording greater weight to the flood scores alone would not significantly alter the ranking order that the applied ranking method used.

Questions and Comments

Comment: There had been a prior discussion about separating implementable projects from studies.

Answer (A): Moving studies into a separate category made it appear that they were less important than the projects. They decided that it would be better to make a note that studies ~~were not implementable~~ did not account for full implementation outcomes and therefore ~~could not be ranked fairly against~~ would rank lower than other projects, though they may ultimately provide that value.

Comment: It is important to be able to inform the state what studies need to be done. The planning document should reflect how much funding would be required to conduct a study as well as the desired outcomes. Part of the problem is that the state knows that there are issues in certain places but they don't know the scale of them.

Comment: It would be good to know, for the Regional Vision and the Basinwide Feasibility Study (BWFS) what studies need to be done.

- Brian Smith suggested asking the flood planning office to comment on how studies should be classified.
- Paul Romero noted that they don't want to put studies into a lower category and then not provide grant funding to them.
 - Betty will email DWR with an articulated question about how studies ~~should~~ would be prioritized for funding by the Flood Planning Office.

Q: Is the BWFS going to influence funding?

A: The output of the BWFS will heavily influence the State's interest in certain projects.

In total, there are 37 projects. In addition, there was a category for project concepts. These are projects that might ~~fall out of~~ extend beyond the scope of the RFMP, but will be included in a list within the plan. They include:

- An expedited permitting process, which is a statewide need.
- Divert flood flows to Agricultural lands.
- Ecosystem restoration on waterways adjacent to the rivers which is beneficial to habitat, flood management, and provides opportunities to people who are farming a marginal piece of land.
- Emergency response improvement.
- Improve upstream reservoir reoperations.
- ~~Increase storage in tributary reservoirs.~~
- An LMA support program.
- Basinwide sediment status and dynamic study for the San Joaquin.
- Proposed expansion of the ~~national San Joaquin River~~ National Wildlife Refuge.

Questions and Comments:

Q: Are you not addressing water supply and storage in terms of a larger context? I am thinking of the Water Action Plan and the Water Bond.

A: There are opportunities for groundwater to enhance recharge and potentially reoperation of reservoirs. We haven't specifically focused on storage or water supply.

3. Review Changes to the Financial Plan

Harriet Ross, ESA, presented changes that had been made to the Financial Plan since the June workshop. All of the comments that had been received since June had been incorporated. Major changes included more detail regarding funding sources including USACE funding on facilities and Prop 218 funding; project costs for RD resiliency concepts including the SWIF processes; and more information about Gomes Lake, Harding Lake and the Little ~~Solano Salado~~ Creek project.

The financial plan estimates about \$216 million for all projects within the Mid SJR Region. Federal cost share ~~would be about 60%~~ was estimated at \$132M and State cost share ~~would be about 20-30%~~ at \$42-70M, with the local cost share at \$13-42M.

Betty noted that the estimate of \$216 million was for areas within the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) boundaries. The entire planning area would be more.

Questions and Comments

Q: How do we compare to other regions?

- A: Our number is likely smaller than ~~the cost of that for~~ other regions, ~~though few have developed their financial plans yet~~. The Upper San Joaquin ~~is projects total~~ about 1.6 billion. However, a fair number of the Upper San Joaquin ~~project~~'s are structural whereas the Mid San Joaquin's are more studies.

Q: Will you be including anything about the cost of inaction?

A: The existing CVFPP would shed light on that. The BWFS is looking at flood risk reduction in terms of dollars.

- Comment: This should identify the cost of human life, the cost of inaction or delayed action.

Comment: NMFS put out a recovery document, which includes substantial data surrounding recovery costs. Is anyone considering existing costs versus the cost of recovery?

A: There is a lot of good information out there but it might ~~be out of beyond~~ the scope of the RFMP.

4. Discuss Scope of DWR Contract Extension

Julie Renter, River Partners, provided an update about the future of the RFMP effort. Because of the success of the RFMP process and stakeholder engagement, DWR has decided to continue to fund future regional work through 2017, when the CVFPP is finalized. Any work after 2017 is uncertain. DWR will be creating a scope of work that is similar for each of the regions and the regions will be creating annual work plans. This plan, in its final form, is still due at the end of September, however. Julie asked the stakeholders to provide feedback about the kinds of activities that they would like to see funded through the contract extension. Comments are due by August 15. A list of ideas have are currently being considered by DWR and include:

1. Legacy Encroachment Issues; have consultants work with the Flood Board to determine where the encroachments are and how to deal with them,
2. Coordination with DWR studies (BWFS, CVFPP, Conservation Strategy; arrange and host opportunities for DWR to interact and come to meetings and lobby DWR to make sure that regional needs are integrated.
3. IRWM; work with DWR to determine what needs to be done to integrate with IRWM work.
4. Governance; set up quarterly meetings with the 9 RD's in the region.
5. Communication and Engagement; continue regular workshops, periodic briefings, meeting with neighboring regions, website maintenance, and meetings and site visits.
6. Institutional Barriers
7. O&M Solutions
8. Emergency Response

Questions and Comments:

Comment: It would be helpful for DWR to help stakeholders understand what will happen over time for projects that are outside of the SPFC. It is a puzzle of cost sharing opportunities that could use some clarity.

Comment: The ~~Madera-DWR Flood Preparedness staff Group is~~ ~~are~~ ~~is~~ setting up a pre-~~season~~ meeting to coordinate the different RD’s and ~~regions~~~~organizations~~ ~~involved in flood response~~. We will also be discussing grants ~~and inspections~~. ~~Meetings are being held across the Central Valley~~. The meeting ~~for this area will be~~ ~~is~~ on October 2nd in Stanislaus County.

- o It was suggested that the ~~regions~~~~emergency response organizations~~ begin to share emergency action plans.

7. Next Steps

On August 22, a final review draft of the RFMP will be distributed. Comments are due back by September 10, and the Final draft will be due to DWR on September 30. The project team thanked everyone for their hard work.

10. Attendees:

Chester Anderson	ESRCD/WSRCD
Betty Andrews	ESA
Joel Andrews	City of Patterson
Miguel Alvarez	City of Modesto
Jim Alves	Modesto
Sue Baldwin	RD 2063
Chuck Carlson	Cal Trans
Katie Cox	Kearns & West
John Carlon	River Partners
Sonia Delgado	City of Patterson
Jerry Dion	River Partners
Maria Encinas	City of Patterson
Greg Farley	DWR
Cindy Fosi	City of Modesto
Kim Forrest	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Monica Gutierrez	NMFS
James Herota	CVFPB
Charles Hillard	PBI
Pam Jones	Kearns & West
Koosun Kim	City of Newman
Patrick Koeple	TRT
David Leamon	Stanislaus County
Abimael Leon	CDFW- Region 4

Bill Loudermilk	WSID/PWD
Loren Murray	URS
Greg Nunes	RD <u>2091</u>
Bob Ott	Farmer/Public
Tim Payne	Turlock Irrigation District
Tim Pelican	Stanislaus County Ag. Dept
Martin Reyes	RD 20 <u>131</u> and 2092
Julie Rentner	River Partners, RD 2092
Paul Romero	DWR
Harriet Ross	ESA
Joe Sallaberry	RD 2063
Brian Smith	DWR-CVFPO
Deb Thrasher	OES
Rob Tull	CH2MHILL
Eric Tsai	DWR
Doug Weinrich	USFWS