



River Corridor Working Group

Wednesday, July 17, 2013
9AM – 11AM

Meeting Notes

Location: CWSD Conference Room

Contact: Brenda Hunt, 887-9005

Attendees: Terri Pereira (Churchill Co.); Duane Petite (TNC); Robb Fellows (CCPW); Courtney Walker (CWSD); Mitch Blum (HDR); Jean Stone (NDEP); Ed James (CWSD); Brenda Hunt (CWSD); Shane Fryer (AWG); Eric Schmidt (Douglas Co. GIS); John Cobourn (UNCE); Kathi Lawrence (CWSD)

1. Welcome and Introductions – Brenda welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced newcomers Courtney Walker, CWSD's new Watershed Assistant, and Shane Fryer, Alpine Watershed Group's new Watershed Coordinator.
2. Announcements – 3 events scheduled for September 21: Kiwanis cleanup in Carson City; Markleeville Creek Day; and the Green Living Festival at The Nature Conservancy. Shane reported that water sampling has been taking place in Alpine County, in both the east and west forks.
3. Member reports /updates on suggested actions
 - a. Update on SA-14 + MAS projects including MAS 4 (Ed and Mitch) – Mitch explained that MAS 4 will be the mapping phase, using the modeling results from MAS 3. Scoping is underway to submit an application for MAS 4 for \$400,000 for mapping the results of MAS 3 and reporting. FEMA's application submittal period should be opening up in the next few weeks. Protocols and procedures will need to be established regarding how to update the model as things change. Up to 10% of the grant amount may be used for community outreach. A program will be developed to engage the community about the project and flood hazards throughout the entire watershed. Presentations will be made to planning commissions, elected

officials and communities. Also, ordinances will need to be reviewed regarding necessary changes, such as mitigation measures and defining setbacks, taking into consideration the “meandering river”. Jean discussed a plan from Vermont, noting their analysis of erosion hazards. A suggestion was made that when a building department is reviewing building plans for a property located in a designated hazard area, they could refer the property owner to the planning department to receive warnings regarding the risks. Developing a hazard map will be the first step; the map will include a 500-year floodplain. Brenda shared maps she received from Barbara Resnik, which were created by the Douglas County GIS Department (Douglas County GIS Department now serves Douglas, Storey, Lyon and Carson City). The maps identify hazards after the 1997 Carson Valley flood (such as “erosion occurred here”), as well as flood repairs which were made.

- b. Progress on SA-7 Retention of Floodplain Lands For Flood Storage (mapping acreage) (Brenda and John) – John and Steve have been working with Eric Schmidt, Douglas County GIS Department, to develop 2 maps: Map 1 will be a simple map meant for the general public, showing protected floodplains; Map 2 will be a more detailed map with more layers, to be used in the Regional Floodplain Management Plan update. John explained that the purpose of Map 1 is to show the public how much preservation work has been accomplished to protect floodplain acreage, but to also show how much more is left that needs protecting. John would like Map 1 to be ready by the end of August. There was discussion regarding which map should be developed first -- #1 to have it ready by end of August, or #2, the more complicated map, first, then scale it back for the public version? Brenda noted that there is not enough time to create Map 2 for use in the Floodplain Management Plan update, so the update will just refer to the fact that the map is a work-in-progress. Map 2 needs a consistent data scheme; various counties may have differing definitions of open space vs. public lands, and what is considered “protected forever”. Some land, such as county parks, may currently function as open space, but they are not actually deed restricted or guaranteed to remain open space

forever. Eric will “clip parcels”, showing the entire parcel but counting only the acreage which lies within the floodplain. Eric shared with the group the first draft of the map he has begun, and requested feedback. The following suggestions/comments were made: (1) Categories are not important for the public map, simply show protected vs. unprotected lands; (2) Show line of the '97 flood instead of line of official 100-year or 500-year flood; (3) Leave FEMA official lines, but add the '97 flood lines, to help the public ‘get it’; (4) For Map 1, take out Yerington area and alluvial fan areas; (5) Include a QR code on the maps for a web app, which could provide more data than the printed version of the map, such as alluvial fan areas, parcel lot lines and basic road network; (6) Tie GIS information to actual recorded documents; (7) John’s original plan was for Map 1 to be an 11”x17” document, but perhaps several separate maps would be better, so that the scale doesn’t have to be too small.

ACTION: Eric will start with database information and begin filling in the map. He has information for Douglas, Lyon, Storey and Carson City, and has contacts in Alpine and Churchill. He will assemble a list of layers and send it to Brenda, to distribute to the group for suggestions of what other layers are needed. He will make the names of the layers intuitive, and make the map-in-progress available on the web.

4. Discussion regarding floodway vs. potential river meander zones (John C./ Brenda/Jean) – Time ran out before this item could be addressed; this item will be placed on the next meeting’s agenda.
5. Floodplain Management Plan Review
 - a. Process: Brenda has emailed everyone the updates she has completed so far, and requested comments. She has received updates from some counties, but still needs Alpine, Storey and Lyon; she would also like to see updates from Dan Greytak for the Tribe. Ed commented that Mike is Storey County’s flood administrator to contact; they are considering getting more involved in FEMA’s community rating system. Brenda reviewed with the group specific sections of the plan and the group discussed: (1) On Page 5, projected change table on population – Brenda requested county population numbers from

anyone who has them; alternatively, she can try to get the data from the state demographer's office/website. (2) In Section 4.0, TDR and the Lands Bill are mentioned but not explained. Brenda could provide a general definition, then include links to individual county web sites. She could also use a glossary to define. (3) Section 4.3 include risk map information; Brenda will include in appendices the charter, discovery report and CTP. (4) Section 4.3.4, Brenda added an appendix of HDR guidelines. (5) Section 5.2, last paragraph – what can be measured to show success? Acreage protected, how many flood projects have been completed, a review of action items. (6) Section 5.3, Brenda received information from Churchill and Douglas – any other changes? Robb noted that information shown for Carson City is current. (7) Emergency contact information has been updated.

- b. Feedback on important updates from group post review of FMP
- c. Information needed: Map updates -- Eric is searching for old shape files for a map that Brenda has. The group viewed the map and noted that it looks like an old Lyon County style of map. 2 years ago Lyon County gave a lot of information to Douglas County; Eric will now look under old Lyon County information.
- d. Schedule for update: The plan update will be taken to the CWSD Board on August 21; therefore, the draft must be included in the Board packets on August 9 – Brenda would like to have the draft completed by August 1. Brenda will email the draft out to the group, without maps, in a Word document format so that changes can be made by individuals. After the CWSD Board approves the plan update, the tentative schedule is for Ed and Brenda to present it to Douglas County and Carson City boards (not Planning Commissions) on September 5, and Storey County on September 17.
- e. Other

6. Schedule Next Meeting: September 11, 2013, 9 AM to 11 AM