

SAFARI Meeting Minutes
July 16, 2014
AWSMP Office
10:00am-12:00pm

In attendance:

Rob Stanley, Town of Shandaken
Eric Hofmeister, Town of Shandaken
Aaron Bennett, UC DoE
Candace Balmer, RCAP Solutions
Mark Carabetta, Milone & MacBroom
Beth Reichheld, NYC DEP
Danyelle Davis, NYC DEP
Leslie Zucker, CCEUC
Brent Gotsch, CCEUC
Heather Eckardt, CCEUC

Brief introductions were made.

There were no issues with the previous meeting minutes.

Town Supervisor Update

Rob Stanley stated that the Town Attorney is reviewing the Milone & MacBroom contract. There are no issues with the LFA scope of work items. Work planned for task orders include LFA, Phoenicia water pump, Pine Hill Trail Network (SMIP grant), and bridge engineering.

Beth Reichheld updated on status of the NYC Watershed Flood Buyout (FBO) program. Said that the City is working with CWC and the counties to set up delivery of the program.

Rob said local assumptions about FBO seem to originate in Delaware County, even though DEP does a lot of work there. Rob said that Mike Triolo of Delaware County wrote an opposition letter that Todd Pascarella of Fleischmanns backed up. Rob does not believe that this is as much about DEP's buyout program as it is a political issue.

The purpose of the buyouts is to improve the flood impacted areas. It is not about eminent domain. Benefits people who don't qualify for FEMA. FEMA buyout decisions take time and must meet FEMA requirements.

Aaron Bennett said that there was a press release about the FBO program that went out when the FAD was announced. Ulster County has been less involved in FBO development than Delaware and Greene.

Beth said DEP is meeting to discuss Catskill Watershed Corporation (CWC) public outreach and advocacy strategy in support of FBO. DEP will have more of a technical assistance role.

Rob asked if fact sheets on FBO be available. Beth said yes, DEP will provide.

Aaron asked who can apply for a City-funded buyout.

Beth responded that individuals and organizations could apply. Criteria for buyouts would fall under three categories: stream project facilitation, threat of erosion, or inundation. Inundation is the lowest priority, but could be the highest demand. For stream project facilitation, a house does not necessarily have to be damaged, but project goals have to be met.

Mark Carabetta asked about qualifying cost/benefit ratios in Local Flood Analysis.

Beth said cost/benefit over 1.0 is not necessary for DEP. Some projects recommended by LFA may have high cost-benefit ratio; some may not. CWC does require cost/benefit over 1.0, but the CWC board can waive on a case-by-case basis. Water quality benefit will also be considered.

Aaron asked Rob if he is comfortable with the Coalition of Watershed Towns (CWT) representing the town's interest in FBO. (A CWT position paper is being developed).

Rob said he has faith that the CWT will do what they should. Town Boards make final decisions.

LFA Scope of Services Review

Need to review and finalize outreach strategy and finalize study site boundaries for the LFA scope of services.

Rob said the first LFA public meeting should be a televised preliminary meeting with the Town Board. At this meeting announce when the individual community meetings will take place. At the community meetings in Phoenicia and Mt. Tremper, they will gather and vet options with the public. Modeling results will be presented to the communities at the second set of meetings. A final meeting will present options to the Town Board.

Rob said flood maps and depth grids should be shown at first meetings. Rob asked Mark whether Phoenicia or Mt. Tremper should start first, or could run at the same time?

Mark said it does not have to be determined right away. There is flexibility. They will explain the capabilities of the modeling and show conceptually how it works. They can try out different scenarios and show them to people.

Rob suggested showing similar situations (such as in Vermont) where modeling was done, and show the end results. Mark, Dave, or Jim from MMI could present VT slides.

Beth said that engineering analysis is done to identify the most beneficial projects. Danyelle Davis said that engineering analysis led to the work done at Stony Clove.

Eric Hofmeister suggested sending out a direct mailing to landowners after meetings to collect their individual ideas. Perhaps listed items next to check boxes, and then space for them to write in their thoughts.

Leslie Zucker asked Mark how MMI dealt with mitigation ideas that were to fix eroding stream banks. Mark said we are not looking to put things back exactly as they were, but looking to improve them.

Danyelle made the point that some projects would benefit entire communities. The models can show these benefits.

Beth said that focusing on the 100-year flood is sometimes not as beneficial as focusing on 50- or 25-year floods.

Mark asked about availability of first floor elevations. Rob said the Town does not have many (if any) elevation certificates. It is not a law to file one with the Town, but surveyors have been asked to share them with the Town for record keeping.

Rob said it is particularly difficult to get people to understand water table rises. There are a lot of basements in Phoenicia, but many buildings in the town are step-ups.

Leslie asked about specific strategies to reach key community members. Rob said word of mouth; individual invites. He said the outreach meeting sites will be Parish Hall in Phoenicia, Emerson for Mt. Tremper. The Mt. Tremper meeting may have to be held on a weekend, between August and October, to try to reach second homeowners.

Danyelle mentioned that FEMA buyouts are only for primary homeowners. Asked if second homeowners are eligible for DEP buyouts. Beth said yes.

Study sites I and II (Phoenicia and Mt. Tremper, respectively) were viewed. Safe margins are based on population centers.

Objective is to lower inundation levels in population centers. As long as relocation need originates in LFA, relocation can be to anywhere within town.

There was some question about whether CWC needed to review the population centers and boundaries. After looking over the rules, Beth determined that the boundaries were okay without CWC review.

No major changes to the LFA Scope of Services.

Mark and Beth said that if 2-D modeling is done, it may cut into funds to do other things.

Shandaken Flood Mitigation Plan Maintenance Strategy

Brent Gotsch reviewed the Plan maintenance strategy. A progress report will be due annually, with a detailed report due every five years. Rob will begin drafting the annual progress report. Next meeting, SAFARI will assist with developing the draft progress report. See the attached action steps for report completion.

Deadline for annual progress report completion is September 22, 2014, to be submitted no later than October 1, 2014.

Rob was tasked with drafting sections on the report purpose, changes, and review of listed mitigation actions. SAFARI and AWSMP will contribute to mitigation success stories. SAFARI will contribute changes that may impact the implementation of the plan, and recommend changes/ enhancements.

Rob and Mark will have reviewed the LFA Scope of Work by next meeting.

Next Meeting: August 14, 2014 at 10:00am.

Town of Shandaken Flood Mitigation Plan Maintenance, July 16, 2014

Task	Person(s) Responsible
<p><i>Summary Overview of the Plan's Progress</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date plan became effective (??) • Date when update will occur • Estimated % complete the plan is • # of initiatives complete • # of initiatives ongoing/in-progress • #of initiatives where no action taken 	
<p><i>Purpose</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background on purpose of this report (see template for model) 	Rob Stanley
<p><i>Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of when progress report was approved (September 2014?) • Updated list of membership including names, titles, and jurisdiction/agency affiliation 	AWSMP
<p><i>Flood Events within Planning Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of flood events since last progress report and their impact (brief) 	Rob Stanley
<p><i>Changes in Risk Exposure in the Planning Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of any flood event in the planning area that changed the probability of occurrence of flooding as presented in the flood hazard mitigation plan 	Rob Stanley
<p><i>Mitigation Success Stories</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of mitigation accomplishments during the reporting period 	SAFARI/AWSMP contribute (stream projects, roadwork, elevation grants, buy-outs, elevation certificates, etc.)
<p><i>Review of Action Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table 2 in model for template • Report status of each initiative outlined in plan • Was any element of the initiative carried out during the reporting period? • If no action was completed, why? • Is the timeline for implementation for the initiative still appropriate? • If the initiative was completed, does it need to be changed or removed from the action plan? 	Rob Stanley
<p><i>Changes That May Impact Implementation of Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of any significant changes in the planning area that would have a profound impact on the implementation of the plan. Specify any changes in technical, regulatory and financial capabilities identified during the plan's development 	SAFARI (NY Rising, LFA, Public Outreach)
<p><i>Recommendations for Changes or Enhancements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report any recommendations for changes that should be made for future updates/revisions of the plan 	SAFARI

Deadline for Completion: September 22, 2014

Deadline for Submission: October 1, 2014