

## Flood Management Working Group Meeting #3

### MEETING NOTES

October 1, 2015

#### Location:

Stanislaus County Ag Center  
3800 Cornucopia Way (Harvest Hall)  
Modesto, CA

10:00am – 12:00pm

---

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

#### 2. Update on RFMP Activities

- a. Mid SJR News
  - i. Funding opportunities, Prop 1 opportunities
- b. Charter Signatories
  - i. Many participants talked about getting charter signed or signing it themselves
- c. Preseason meeting last week at Atwater – Stanislaus OES was in attendance
- d. Flood fighting technique trainings are next week in Merced County; CalFire and CA Department of Conservation are available to assist with prep work in the event of a flood
- e. Operations and Maintenance Repair, Replacement & Rehabilitation Technical Memorandum – Chris Williams of DWR made a presentation last July, and is still looking for comments on the TM, which are due at the end of October
  - i. A new draft is expected at the end of the year
  - ii. Looking at governance and consolidation of LMAs
  - iii. DWR wants comments and feedback, especially on the per unit costs for O&M

#### 3. Project Updates

- a. Stanislaus County is looking at feasibility study to find up to 12 areas in the County that could be used for groundwater recharge that have a dual benefit of recharge and flood control;
  - i. The east side of the County is moving forward on this type of project
  - ii. County is looking for partners and want to coordinate with TID, MID, and other folks to find locations for groundwater recharge/flood control
- b. The City of Patterson also doing a recharge study in the northwest of City (outside of City but within SOI)
  - i. Looking at soil borings to determine which locations would be good for recharge and maybe there's a potential to affect flood risk
- c. Stanislaus County is looking at a new project called the Grayson Concept Project

- i. The community of Grayson is eligible for a Small Communities Flood Risk Reduction grant; this grant is designed to help small communities that are protected by SPFC but not protected by 100 year flood event; Grayson is identified as a small community and is eligible, so the County is looking at developing a project
    - ii. The community of Grayson will be involved with fleshing out the concept
  - d. Grant Proposals submitted
    - i. River Partners submitted a grant proposal for a 285 acre property in Grayson to the Department of Fish and Wildlife
    - ii. River Partners also submitted proposals for continued restoration at Dos Rios and studies for riparian brush rabbit
  - e. CVFPP Coordination Meeting
    - i. ACOE talked about RD1602 and RD2091 and how both RDs had unacceptable ratings
    - ii. RD2091's biggest issue is with encroachments and trees; the ACOE wants them removed but DWR says they cannot be removed; these trees are protected Oak trees and serve as a bird sanctuary
    - iii. ACOE is revisiting their policies on trees on levees and would not make a finding of unacceptable rating based on vegetation management

#### **4. Binder Review**

- a. Internal draft of the Binder from DWR was provided to regions for review – the Binder contains a summary of all six RFMPs
  - i. DWR wanted to make sure they understood what was in each RFMP, the needs of the region, and how the region is looking to address those needs
  - ii. The Binder is to be used for the Region to provide more info; our Region needs to provide more information on benefits, and project details
  - iii. Farmland of Statewide Significance is important and DWR is interested in this so the RFMPs need to address this
  - iv. DWR has identified a process to update the Binder – after the region gives DWR feedback, then the draft Binder will be revised
  - v. Stakeholders should look at the Binder to see how your project is characterized
- b. Mid SJR RFMP Summary in the Binder
  - i. Issues
    1. Infrastructure – loss of capacity; channels cannot simultaneously contain all objective releases from reservoirs; reoperation may be needed to meet multiple goals; multiple RDs have levee reaches that they consider to be non-functional that they recommend for removal from SPFC; E-W river crossings that function during floods are needed, given placement of critical facilities
    2. O&M – permitting of O&M is an issue; need consistent levee vegetation standards; need support for LMAs on grant applications; reduced

maintenance costs is a key concern since most landowners lack ability to adequately assess landowners

3. Residual Risk and Emergency Management – significant risk remains to lands behind SPFC levees due to modest channel capacity and high risk of levee failure; integration of emergency response entities; functional RDs that are financially sustainable and able to carry out O&M responsibilities
4. Policy Needs and Issues - Governance identified as an issue since there isn't one entity responsible for flood management
5. Funding is a major issue – our Region has a limited ability to pay for local cost share so need to increase State cost share; cost of O&M has risen significantly, and region's ability to get PL84-99 funding has declined
  - ii. Unique issues for our Region – presence of major underground pipelines (Hetch Hetchy water line, PG&E gas line); history of multiple levee breaches; existing significant erosion locations; and hydraulic interconnectedness between RD2063 and RD2091
  - iii. Proposed management actions for the region were discussed

#### **5. Grayson Project Concept Discussion**

- a. To give stakeholders an understanding of how DWR will be evaluating projects and how projects can meet their criteria, the Grayson project concept was discussed, and the group went through a DWR Assessment Worksheet together so everyone could see how projects would be evaluated by DWR.

#### **6. Mid SJR Project Additions**

- a. DWR is looking to incorporate new projects into the Binder
- b. Stakeholders can add new projects by using the link on the website
- c. We will also be contacting all project leads to see if there are changes to your project or new projects in the next 3-6 months

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

- a. The next Flood Management Working Group Meeting will be held on January 14, 2016 from 10-noon at Stanislaus County Ag Center.