

# Flood Management Working Group Meeting #1

## MEETING NOTES

March 19, 2015

### Location:

County Basement Training Meeting Room (Room #B300)  
1010 10th Street  
Modesto, CA 95354

8:30am - 10:30am

---

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

## 2. Project Updates

### RFMP Update

- a. An update on the Mid San Joaquin River Regional Flood Management Plan (RFMP) was given. The RFMP was completed in the fall of 2014 and the document went before the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors in December 2014. The final RFMP was sent to DWR shortly after that. The project website has been restructured and is live.
- b. A Pre-season Flood Coordination Meeting occurred in Modesto on October 2, 2014.
- c. Incident command training is being planned with an emphasis on reclamation districts (RDs) and continuing on current efforts. The training would occur in October/November 2015 at RD 2031. The training would include exercise/drills, deploy a DWR team, and show RDs how to set up a command post and work with a unified command. This gives all a chance to figure out how to set things up and effectively fight floods, share resources, and deploy resources. The invite for the training will go out to all stakeholders; everyone is welcome to attend.

### Project Updates

Updates on a few of the projects identified in the RFMP were given, as follows.

- d. Tuolumne River Trust (TRT) was successful in getting a grant from CA Fish and Wildlife for design of the removal of Dennett Dam. TRT received a \$119,000 grant from Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP).
  - e. Stanislaus County Office of Emergency Services (OES) applied for an Emergency Response (ER) grant, and received good support from DWR. The ER grant is to prepare a flood plan. It was noted that not a lot of grant money was given for this region in the past.
  - f. The Three Amigos project is to get existing levees out of the Federal and State system so they can be modified. There was a multi-agency meeting in September 2014 to come up with a timeline/schedule to get moving. The US Army Corps of Engineers is actively participating, and thinking about how to modify the O&M Manual so that improvements
-

can be made. The paperwork needed to modify levees will be done by the end of 2015 so levees can be modified in 2016. There are other projects in the region that are interested in removing their levees from the State Plan of Flood Control.

- g. City of Modesto's Sutter Wastewater Treatment Plant is located along the Tuolumne River, has experienced flooding, and is an aging facility. It is also surrounded by residential uses. A feasibility study was performed to determine the feasibility of remaining in its current location. It will likely be moved to largely consolidate facilities at Jennings Ave. along the San Joaquin River; levees there would need to be improved as well.
- h. Cities of Patterson and Newman are working on complying with SB5 regulations with the preparation of a technical bulletin but no 200-year flood mapping.

### **3. Vision for the Next Phase of Effort**

- a. DWR had an interest to continue funding work for Phase 2 of the RFMP. DWR awarded funding to the regions until June 2017, in part out of recognition that the update to CVFPP due in July 2017 will link to the Regions and the RFMP.
- b. DWR is interested in funding efforts related to regional governance and institutional barriers.
- c. Regional governance involves solving challenges that keep good flood projects from happening related to governance. For example, an RD without an active Board cannot receive grant funding to implement needed projects.
- d. Institutional barriers include getting things done like environmental permitting.
  - i. Some barriers are at the agency level and solutions include developing pathways to get things approved, and finding those people in agencies that support the work.
  - ii. We need to work regionally and inter-regionally, and work on coordinating with surrounding regions.
- e. Operations and Maintenance is another arena in which we will work on both governance and institutional barriers.
- f. Coordination and communication is the thrust of this phase.

### **4. Draft Charter**

- a. A Draft Charter was prepared and presented at the meeting for stakeholder consideration. The Draft Charter outlines what we will do in order to move ahead, and outlines who we are and what we are doing.
  - b. The Charter is intended to remain in effect while DWR is funding the effort but can go beyond the timeframe if this effort is being funded. Our interest is to develop a group that will continue meeting after this project is over.
  - c. The Draft Charter will be sent out to all participants. Questions for stakeholders to consider – is this the right charge? Should there be a different focus? Are the roles
-

correct? How formal do we want to make this charter- have everyone sign and make a commitment to the charter if you think it is necessary?

- d. Comments on the draft Charter are due on April 3 to Harriet Ross ([hross@esassoc.com](mailto:hross@esassoc.com)).
- e. Stakeholders were asked if quarterly meetings were the right frequency and if they wanted to continue on these meetings. A few people indicated that meeting quarterly is good and spoke to the usefulness of the meetings. It was noted that smaller groups could meet more frequently as appropriate.
- f. A stakeholder mentioned that the charge of the Draft Charter could acknowledge a commonality between flood and drought – e.g., using floodplains to store flood water and thereby reduce the flood stage may enhance groundwater recharge, making such projects beneficial to water supply, too.
- g. Stakeholders were asked about how they feel about signing the charter, given that having signatories may give the group more weight, though acquiring signatures will take some effort.
  - i. Department of Fish and Wildlife could sign the Charter.
  - ii. Stanislaus County would like it if people signed it so you can see others supporting the effort.
  - iii. Representatives from the City of Ceres, East Stanislaus Resource Conservation District (ESRCD), RD 1602 indicated a willingness to support making the charter a signed document.
- h. Stakeholders want to add the following to the charge: the Working Group is a forum to help facilitate the activities of smaller groups.
- i. The Regional Planning Group should keep DWR apprised of their activities so they know what the region would like to see funded.

## **5. Funding Opportunities Moving Forward**

- a. Potential funding opportunities for projects identified in the region in the RFMP was discussed.
    - i. Water bond of \$7.5 billion was passed in November 2014, but it included little for flood management. DWR has \$325 million to spend on flood. Remaining funds in Prop 1E funds for Flood System Repair Projects; about \$150 million left to be awarded in the near term but requires a 15% cost share.
    - ii. Small Communities Program has some amount of funding left but only the community of Grayson is eligible.
    - iii. Food Protection Corridor Program funding can be used for flood management projects that support environmental enhancement and agricultural conservation. Solicitation is expected in 2015, awards in 2016.
    - iv. FloodSAFE has 14 programs but only 4 work for our Region: Emergency Response (future grants may or may not be available); Flood Corridor Grant Program, Small Communities Program, and the Flood System Repair Program.
    - v. Other Prop 1 grant programs that may be relevant:
      - 1. \$520M in funds to improve water quality, with an emphasis on Disadvantaged Communities.
-

2. \$1.495 billion is available for multi-benefit projects for watersheds and ecosystems restoration and enhancement; some is geographically-targeted.
  3. \$810M for IRWMP efforts (statewide).
  4. >\$2.5 billion of funding is available for water storage projects, though this is not that relevant in our region.
  5. \$725M is available for water recycling, water treatment projects.
  6. \$900 million is available for the clean-up of groundwater for the drinking water supply.
- vi. Prop. 84 Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation grants are out; to get a grant, projects must be included in the local IRWMP.
  - vii. Contact Jim Alves of the City of Modesto if you want to add a project to IRWMP.
  - viii. It's important to review and comment on grant program guidelines to make sure your project idea can fit within the adopted guidelines. We'll post the publication of grant program guidelines on the Mid SJR website.

#### **6. RFMP Project Addition Process\***

- a. The RFMP contains a dynamic project list and projects are evolving so may need to augment list.
- b. If you have a project that has significantly changed, you can add it to project list. Just use the same name or let us know that it will replace the prior version of the project.
- c. The link will be open and you can propose projects for addition until the end of September 2015.
- d. We will decide in October 2015 exactly what process we will use to review the new projects.
- e. The boundary restriction for these projects will be the same as that used to define the RFMP boundaries.

#### **7. Next Steps**

The next meeting has not yet been scheduled, but is expected to occur in June or July.

*\* The RFMP team will accept additional project descriptions until September 30, 2015. The team has very limited resources to review and rank new project concepts. Pending completion of the project addition period, the RFMP team will work with DWR to evaluate the appropriate level of effort to use for project review and prioritization. The hyperlink to access the form for Proposed Project Additions is available on our website at <http://www.midsjrfloodplan.org/>. Alternatively, you can access it directly by entering this address into your browser: <http://tinyurl.com/midsjr-proj>.*

---