



## TRUCKEE RIVER FLOOD PROJECT WORKING GROUP

October 28, 2009, 3:00 P.M.

### FINAL MINUTES

#### Present:

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Noel Laughlin	HDR	Greg Salter	DA's Office
Burnham Moffat	FPCC	Heath Hildebrandt	Kimley-Horn
Dave Hollecker	OCTA - Trails West	Vicki Healey	UNR
Heidi Frantz	Michael Baker, Jr.	Christine Kirick	NCE
Roger Jewett	HV Resident	Garth Oksol	RTC
Dody Gustafson	HOA	Tom Greco	RTC
Glen Krogman	HDR	Marge Frandsen	Citizen
Todd Welty	Tahoe Reno Airport Authority	Pat Martinez	
Candace Siwarga	KJC		

**Staff Present:** Naomi Duerr, Susie Kapahee, Danielle Henderson, Paul Urban, Jay Aldean, Greg Salter

#### 1. Introductions

A meeting of the Working Group was held on Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at the Truckee River Flood Project Office Conference Room, 9390 Gateway, Suite 230, Reno, Nevada. Susie Kapahee welcomed the group and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

Naomi Duerr explained that the Working Group is informal with no set membership. She added that minutes of the meeting are provided as an informational item only. She encouraged attendees to participate in discussion.

#### 2. Approval of the Working Group Minutes of September 30, 2009

The minutes of the September 30, 2009 Working Group meeting were submitted for approval. Danielle Henderson clarified some of her comments on page 2 of 5. In relation to motorized vehicles on the trails, she reworded the sentence to read, "No *recreational (i.e. ATV)* motorized vehicles will be allowed." Ms. Henderson revised a sentence in the next paragraph to read, "Preserving a building to turn into something else *might* be considered beneficial *to the local community but would probably not meet the eligibility requirements.*" She explained that reuse of the facility would not be included in the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) plan due to the cost to benefit ratio.

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the minutes pending the requested revisions. Mr. Moffett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**3. Amendment to Locally Preferred Plan (LPP) to include Fish Passage, Floodplain Acquisition, Flood Proofing / Home Elevation, Bank Stabilization and Bridge Elements**

Paul Urban reviewed a Power Point presentation and explained the reason it is being presented to the Working Group is that the components need to be officially adopted into the LPP. He explained that the hope is for adoption by the Flood Project Coordinating Committee (FPCC) at the November meeting.

Mr. Urban reported that the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (PLPT) met with the Assistant Secretary of the Corps in Washington, DC to argue that the Corps needs to take responsibility for fish passage as part of the flood project. He named the locations for proposed fish passage, the uppermost of which is Fleisch at the California state line. Ms. Duerr clarified that based on the inclusion of Fleisch, it could be said that the Flood Project begins at the state line and Mr. Urban agreed. .

Mr. Greco asked if there would be any constraints for the project to stay within state boundaries. Mr. Urban stated it did not seem to be an issue with the Corps because it deals with endangered species.

Mr. Martinez asked if the eight locations were chosen based on being the most in need. Mr. Urban stated yes but it was also based on locations that could be improved based on federal interest. Ms. Duerr asked if the eight passage improvements would allow fish to travel from Pyramid Lake to the Fleisch area. Mr. Urban stated there would still be problem areas, of which some are being addressed by other agencies, for instance the Pioneer Dam Diversion (City of Sparks) or the Glendale Diversion (Truckee Meadows Water Authority). Mr. Urban reported that some projects would be included in restoration projects, such as modification of the Peri Ranch Diversion.

Ms. Duerr requested that Mr. Urban and Ms. Henderson develop a schematic showing what agencies are involved on which program to show that the burden of fish passage would be shared with other agencies.

Mr. Urban gave a brief overview of the Floodplain Acquisition element. He explained that some downstream properties that did not previously flood would flood due to the Flood Project. The Corps and staff are analyzing such areas to determine the increased impacts of: 1) flood depth, 2) velocities, 3) duration, and 4) frequency. He added that the Corps has criteria for the analysis, which is dependent on land use, soil type, etc.

Mr. Urban showed pictures of past flooding in Hidden Valley and Rosewood Lakes. He stated that rather than building floodwalls (which would cost approximately \$50 to \$60 million); approximately 55 Hidden Valley homeowners would be offered assistance in elevating their home to prevent flooding (which is estimated at \$10 million). He reported that staff has been working with the Corps' non-structural alternative staff to enable inclusion of home elevation into the LPP. He added that the Corps would change its National Economic Development (NED) plan to include home elevation in the Hidden Valley area, as well as Eastside Subdivision. Mr. Martinez asked if the program total is \$10 million and whether it would be voluntary. Mr. Urban clarified that it would cost approximately \$10 million for Hidden Valley. Ms. Duerr stated that the

Eastside Subdivision would probably cost \$10 million as well. Mr. Urban stated that floodproofing of buildings in the downtown reach is estimated at approximately \$5 million. Mr. Aldean clarified that the home elevation program would be voluntary.

Mr. Greco asked what floodproofing elements might be used. Mr. Urban stated that some alternatives include closing off openings that are below the first floor (basements), glass panes strong enough to sustain floodwater, planter-box type levees around buildings, etc. Ms. Duerr added that there are options for paints, coatings, elevated utilities, barrier doors, and others.

Mr. Urban next referred to Bank Stabilization, which includes bridges that might require rip-rap, revetment or other measures. He added that bio-technically designed materials would be explored other than rock stabilization. He referred to a map that shows the areas being considered for bank stabilization in the LPP.

Ms. Duerr stated that if the FPCC Board approves the amendment to the LPP, the plan is also to amend the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 377B plan for spending the 1/8 percent sales tax to make it consistent.

Mr. Laughlin asked Mr. Urban what the proposed elements would add to the cost of the Flood Project. Mr. Urban stated that Bank Stabilization could cost as much as \$200 million additional. He explained that it would be included in the project in an effort to receive as much funding as possible from Congress. He reported that the costs include:

- Fish Passage \$40 million additional
- Floodproofing / Home Elevation \$50 million savings
- Floodplain Acquisition Unknown at this time
- Bridge Improvements Already included in the cost

Mr. Aldean stated that there is a possibility of buying properties downstream as they become available.

Ms. Duerr requested that staff develop a cost estimate for each element prior to presenting the amendment proposal to the FPCC Board. She added that by excluding Huffaker improvements, approximately \$300 million will be saved; approximately \$200 million will be added for the elements discussed under this item; and an additional \$50 million will be added for the recently-approved Recreation Plan. She summarized that the cost change is approximately \$50 million to the good in relation to the \$1.6 billion project.

Mr. Urban stated that it is unknown at this time how many downstream parcels may be needed as easements. Mr. Aldean added that probably 95% of the properties are farm land or other land with no structures. Ms. Duerr suggested including a slide in the Power Point presentation to the FPCC Board that refers to the cost revisions.

#### **4. TRAction Projects – Hidden Valley Home Elevation Update**

Jay Aldean reported that recently staff visited Tehama, California, where a home elevation program was implemented.

Ms. Duerr reported that staff hopes to present to the FPCC Board in December a proposed program on the basic principles of how home elevation might be implemented. She reported that the Tehama program included elevation of 38 homes. Mr. Aldean agreed that the program

was very successful. He mentioned that in Northern Nevada, four homes were elevated in the Gardnerville Ranchos under Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grants. Ms. Duerr stated that of 20 qualified homeowners in Gardnerville, 4 chose to participate. Mr. Aldean compared that number to Tehama, where 40 of 100 qualified homeowners chose to participate.

Mr. Aldean referred to a list of “fast facts” on the Tehama project and asked for comments or questions. He explained how the projects were funded based on federal assistance. He reported that he developed a draft home elevation program proposal, which he provided to Greg Salter for legal review prior to distribution.

Mr. Aldean explained some of the insurance benefits available to participants in the program. He reported that Tehama provided a list of pre-approved contractors. Ms. Duerr stated that in speaking with some in the construction industry, it was suggested to consider hiring a construction management firm to oversee the program. Mr. Aldean stated he planned to include that issue in his proposal based on the liability issues. He added that the plan would be for homeowners to choose a contractor. Ms. Siwarga asked if the local plan is to have a pre-approved contractor list, to which Mr. Aldean stated yes. Ms. Duerr stated that another consideration is to include mandatory training by contractors who have successfully completed elevation projects.

Mr. Aldean referred to a Tehama requirement that no living quarters be permitted on the ground floor. Mr. Greco suggested changing “ground floor”, which Mr. Aldean offered to explore.

Ms. Duerr reported that in Tehama, homeowners were allowed to stay in their home with their belongings, except on the day the elevation was performed. Homeowners expressed satisfaction with the elevation results. She stated that the home elevation program in the LPP would require homeowners to apply for the program within ten years in order to be included at any time in the future (subsequent homeowners would fall under the requirement as well).

Attendees discussed the National Flood Insurance Program and the base flood elevation (BFE) requirements and associated cost reductions. Ms. Frantz mentioned the issue of pre-Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and post-FIRM, which she stated is based on elevation versus BFE. She suggested determining whether the homes are pre or post-FIRM and how they would be rated insurance-wise to minimize the minimum elevation requirement. Mr. Aldean agreed that was a good idea. Mr. Urban added that the information was provided by insurance agents. Ms. Duerr stated that staff would confirm the information. She also requested that staff develop a table of examples. Ms. Frantz suggested compiling a list or database of when the homes were built, which Mr. Aldean agreed to examine.

Mr. Oksol asked if the LPP is based on the 100-year or 117-year flood protection. Mr. Aldean reported that currently per the Corps, it would be the higher of the two or that which provides the best result to citizens. He stated that non-structural staff from the Corps encouraged higher elevations of homes in order to decrease risk to government by future flooding. He added that by increasing the home elevation, it increases the property value. Ms. Frantz stated that it might also make homeowners eligible for a preferred risk policy to save money.

Ms. Duerr summarized that the Flood Project would be funded by the 1/8 percent sales tax plus funds from the rate charge to homeowners and businesses. She stated that a fee structure for the flood rate will be developed based on whether or not it is located in the floodplain. She added that the cost for one who does benefit directly might go as high as \$200 per year,

whereas one who does not flood might pay \$15 per year. She reiterated that the decreased flood insurance costs could result in a net savings.

Mr. Jewett asked if the 117-year flood level is the same as the 2001 grade level for homes. He stated that his neighbor, whose home had to be built 2 feet above the BFE, pays no flood insurance; however, he pays \$1,770 per year based on his elevation. Mr. Aldean explained that flood insurance requirements are set by mortgage companies.

Mr. Urban stated that the target is that upon completion of the Flood Project, the Rosewood Lakes / Hidden Valley area water levels should drop 1 to 1.5 feet. Ms. Frandsen asked for clarification that the homes in Rosewood Lakes along Steamboat Creek would be protected. Mr. Urban stated that the goal is to bring the actual water levels down to those previously estimated by FEMA. He referred to eight homes in Hidden Meadows along Parkway Drive. Ms. Gustafson cautioned Mr. Urban against referring to the “houses along Parkway Drive” as part of Hidden Meadows (which is a newer subdivision). She stated that such incorrect comments have caused many problems at homeowners meetings.

Mr. Aldean explained that some of the alternatives for floodproofing downtown buildings include a levee to encircle the building with gates to handle the floodwater, paint or coating, and others.

## **5. Corps Project Schedule**

Mr. Aldean stated there were no changes to the Corps’ schedule and offered copies. Mr. Greco referred to the construction schedule, which is set to begin in January 2012 and asked when it is scheduled for completion. Ms. Duerr stated that the schedule is based on 15 years to complete, although it is dependent on the level of annual funding received from the government.

Ms. Duerr reported that the Flood Funding Study is continuing. She stated that the hope is to have a new draft agreement ready for presentation at a joint meeting in January or February for ratification.

Mr. Moffett asked Ms. Duerr about her recent trip to Washington, DC. Ms. Duerr reported that she, FPCC Chair Bob Larkin and Vice-Chair Ron Smith recently took a very successful trip to Washington, DC. She reported that they met with the entire Nevada delegation, which included Ensign, Heller, and staff from Reid, Titus and Berkley’s offices. She stated they also met with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to discuss inclusion of the Flood Project in the President’s Budget. She reported that the group also met with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), which has to “bless” the project environmentally.

Ms. Duerr reported that recently an article was printed in USA Today about the Mustang Ranch restoration project, which the group shared with Washington, DC representatives. She stated that they also met with the Corps to discuss the Sacramento office, which is again rethinking the Flood Project. She stated that the group also updated the representative for the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee on the Flood Project. She summarized that \$10 million is being requested for next year’s budget. She added that recently \$6.75 million had been approved for planning by the Corps. She summarized that overall it was a good trip with good meetings. She added that a commitment was also received from the Nevada delegation to put some pressure on the Sacramento Corps office (in the form of a jointly signed letter) to stop redirecting the resources responsible for the Flood Project.

## **6. Future Meeting Schedule and Location**

Ms. Kapahee stated that the next two regularly scheduled Working Group meetings would occur during holiday weeks. She stated that currently there are no hot topics scheduled for those meetings and asked for input on the next meeting date. Ms. Duerr suggested possibly having one meeting in early December. Ms. Gustafson cautioned against meeting “just to meet”, with which staff agreed. Members discussed the options and agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled in January unless a reason to meet arises. In that case, Ms. Kapahee offered to provide a week’s notice of the meeting.

## **7. Other Topics**

Mr. Moffett mentioned that the Air Civil Patrol has not heard the final word on moving, although a call for volunteers was made. Ms. Duerr stated that the move was approved. Mr. Salter stated that he was not sure the necessary insurance certificate had been received. Ms. Duerr stated that prior to the move, the insurance certificate must be received. Mr. Aldean agreed to follow up on the issue.

Ms. Kapahee thanked everyone for attending. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Niki Linn, Recording Secretary