

ATTENDING AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

1. California Department of Fish & Wildlife
2. Tuolumne County
3. DWR South Central Region Office
4. County of Fresno
5. Fresno Irrigation District
6. Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
7. Southern Sierra IRWMP
8. City of Visalia
9. Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
10. Mariposa/Yosemite Regional Water Advisory Council
11. District 10 Congressional Candidate

SUMMARY

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) invited area agency and stakeholder contacts to attend a briefing that highlighted the findings of the public review draft of *California’s Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing the State’s Flood Risk*. The team again worked with DWR’s South Central Region Office and CSAC to distribute the meeting information and arrange logistics.

DWR’s Terri Wegener and USACE’s Hunter Merritt lead the approximately 60-minute Fresno presentation. A deeper discussion of each *California’s Flood Future* recommendation followed.

Key meeting questions/suggestions Included:

- Establishing a process that provides for an even playing field for determining risk and receiving funding would be helpful. Flood planning looks very different in parts of the state, and it’s hard to compare without common criteria.
- Creating a common understanding of what’s needed from each agency for a flood assessment would also be helpful – how large of a process is it?
- We should communicate flood risk to the public in probabilities so they understand the cost of repairs versus cost of planning measures. Communities also need to agree on the level of risk they’re willing to accept (25, 50 or 100-year)
- Workshops/table top exercises have proven helpful in understanding past scenarios and developing better emergency management plans.
- Often agencies can’t afford to move forward with a project because of the high permitting costs and the process is crippling. Establishing more reasonable process would allow agencies to seek out funding and implement projects that would aid flood management projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

(Italics indicate ideas or phrases from meeting presenters)

Recommendation 1

Conduct regional flood risk assessments to better understand statewide flood risk.

- Consider identifying methods for defining flood risk. What we know that Kaweah versus Sacramento is different and we need to communicate on broader scale, then thinking about Sacramento, looks a lot different.
- What does that mean for each entity in each area – how big of a process is that – but it's worth it if we address problems identified.
 - *What's a good method, can we identify gaps? Having that conversation part of this process.*

Recommendation 2

Increase public and policymaker awareness about flood risks to facilitate informed decisions.

- As a state coordinator, I deal with this on a daily basis. Big thing is flood insurance – I give them options on how they can reduce flood risk. For public to buy in on projects – we have enough data – we know probability, but we don't talk about community risk for 100-year flood. Identify types of floods they've had – recommend changes that show costs of improvements and going to 100-year protection. Public buy-in on how much they need to prepare for (25, 50 or 100-year)
 - *Create common understanding of acceptable flood risk.*
- If someone is purchasing property – they are using a loan, banker is going to look at flood risk. If you run a 30-year mortgage against a 100-year flood, you'll have 26 percent chance of flood.
- Here we are in a dry year, and it's hard for public to understand. We have a short-term memory when it comes to flood. This is a huge issue, a misconception of what we're up against.
- Do you have software online that shows what happened during flood events in past? Surely insurance companies are running scenarios, graphically represented online – then adding what if scenarios.

Recommendation 3

Increase support for flood emergency preparedness, response, and recovery programs to reduce flood impacts.

- *Golden guardian program offers interagency scenarios - 2014 will be flood focused.*
- On local table top exercises – in 2010-11, local law enforcement received information late and we were able to modify procedures and have water agencies inform law enforcement of triggers. Use past scenarios to help improve emergency response plans.

Recommendation 4

Encourage land use planning practices that reduce the consequences of flooding.

No comments

Recommendation 5

Implement flood management from regional, systemwide, and statewide perspectives to provide multiple benefits.

- Part of IWM in Mariposa County – how would different IRWMs use DWR/USACE contributions that would benefit regional groups.
 - *We are working on more actively incorporating flood into IRWM process.*

Recommendation 6

Increase collaboration among public agencies to improve flood management planning, policies and investments.

- On the regulatory side, does USACE encourage flood control components? Seems like there should be a USACE program that tries to better train people in regulatory program – take funds from biology projects from flood. Sometimes can't do project because of process hold ups. Internal knowledge sharing.
 - Early in project cross training.
- Flood O&M requirements need to be discussed in a forum to help reduce risk and meet permit needs- locals need help from State to lead this effort.

Recommendation 7

Establish sufficient and stable funding mechanisms to reduce flood risk.

- The State's application process is a resource constraint – can't afford to fill out the form – IRWM grant promised, spent a year getting a contract. Funding is one thing – process is crippling – is it even worth it? Trouble getting shovels in the ground – process, in addition to funding, needs to be addressed. IRWM program great – need to continue to refine process.

###