



**Integrated Flood Management
Workshop No. 2**

**December 4, 2012 ○ 1:30 pm - 4:00 pm
San Diego County Water Authority
Board Room**

Draft Notes

Action items in italics

Attendees:

Linda Flournoy, PLE 4 Sustain	Dennis Bowling, Rick Engineering
Don Schumacher, San Diego Country Estates	Sara Agahi, County of San Diego Flood Control
Tory Walker, Tory R. Walker Engineering	Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Michelle Mattson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego	Roberto Solorzano, City of Chula Vista
Deena Raver, County of San Diego	Bruce Phillips, PACE
Kris McFadden, City of San Diego	Scott Lynch, RMC Water and Environment

1. Welcome and Introductions

Bruce Phillips welcomed the group, who did self-introductions. Mr. Phillips then presented the Workshop Objectives:

- Develop general concepts for Integrated Flood Management (IFM) Strategies
- Locations of flood risk and exposures
- IFM watershed planning tools
- Characterize flood problems/sources in watershed and Cities

2. IFM Overview

Mr. Phillips provided the Workgroup with a brief overview of Integrated Flood Management (IFM). IFM provides a holistic approach for dealing with flood risk and integrates multiple water resource benefits. IFM focuses on the entire watershed and hydrologic cycle, integrates land and water management, and includes flexible strategies.

3. Community Flood Damage Loss

Mr. Phillips presented Community Flood Damage Loss to the workshop, describing the direct and induced physical and direct and induced economic and social losses that can be attributed to flooding.

4. Statewide Floodplain Management Planning

Mr. Phillips provided an overview of the Statewide Floodplain Management Planning Study and information gathering findings. Some of the IFM projects implemented statewide included:

- Ecosystem restoration
- Water supply
- Habitat restoration/fish passage
- Groundwater recharge
- Recreation
- Water quality
- Erosion/sediment control

He outlined the factors for success and obstacles/barriers. Success factors included integrated funding multiple sources, plan in-place, support of stakeholders, and leveraging partnerships with agencies, while obstacles included limited funding, increased permitting/regulatory requirements, and additional costs for project maintenance.

5. San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation

Mr. Phillips reviewed the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation effort, which utilizes HAZUS MH and evaluated hazards at a regional level. Through this, flood risk and flood exposure could be estimated. Cross-referencing to potential dollar damages, Mr. Phillips presented the cost risks of flood exposure for different communities in the Region.

6. Flood Hazards Locations and Problems

Mr. Phillips presented flood hazard and land use maps for each of the 11 watersheds in the Region. Open Space and Recreation land use had the greatest area exposed to flood risks, approximately 30,000 acres. Commercial and Services land use was at greatest flood damage risk (approximately \$5 billion), and San Diego and Carlsbad watersheds were at greatest risk for total flood damage.

7. IFM in the Region

Mr. Phillips explained how IFM strategies change with scale and location within the watershed. He presented examples of Regional IFM, using the San Diego Creek/Newport Bay Watershed. He then explained how IFM Watershed Opportunity Planning was conducted. IFM planning uses permeable hydrologic soil type, flood hazard types and locations, conservation areas, vegetation types, groundwater basins, wetland vegetation, and high erosion/sediment production data to develop an IFM opportunity planning tool (presented in map form). Mr. Phillips presented the IFM opportunity planning tool

produced for each watershed in the Region, which uses an IFM opportunity ranking of 1 to 5 to identify areas of greatest opportunity for IFM projects.

Mr. Phillips then solicited input from workshop attendees on what was presented, chronic flood and deficiency locations, common flood problems, and flood problem sources.

Questions/Comments

- It was noted by several participants that a useable tool would be nice to have at the end of this study that organizations could utilize. However it was noted that an agency would need to take on the role of caretaker of the tool so that new data could be uploaded, etc. There was no discussion about who would do that
- Sara Agahi/County of San Diego expressed concerns about:
 - Lack of projects with flood management being selected for the Proposition 84 grant funds
 - Lack of flood management person being on the selection committee for Proposition 84 grant funds
 - Flood management not getting attention in general in the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) process and grant opportunities
- It was agreed that water quality improvement needs be added to the list of opportunities that Bruce has developed. Such water quality needs include the current Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)
- Questions came about the ability to add riparian or vegetation layers to the GIS model. Bruce replied that those could be added and would be of value, but a data source needs to be identified.

8. Next Steps

Action items identified during the workshop were:

- *Bruce to develop request for information on specific problem areas that organizations will need to identify. Some sort of map or PDF that can be zoomed in will be needed so organizations can locate the specific areas accurately.*
- *County has a list of all floodplain managers. We should request that we get this list if they are not already on our stakeholder list.*
- *Presentation should be emailed or posted to website for attendees or others who missed it can see it. Bruce should forward link to FTP to RMC to download and put in the IRWM sharesite.*