

MEETING NOTES

Project Name: Meeting Subject: Location: Notes by:		LSJ/DS RFMP Benefit Area 19 Small Group Mtg. (RD 2064, 2075, 2094, 2096) SJAFCA Loren Bottorff			Project No.: Page:	7/23/14 10:00-noon
						1 of 2
						Attendees:
	Mary Hildebrand		Steve Schoenberg Eric		Tsai	Roger Churchwell
	Petrea Marchand		Darren Suen Chr		is Unkel	Albert Boyce
	Stacy C	cody.	Randy Barker			

Purpose:

The purpose the meeting is to arrive at a list of the most important projects for use in the draft Financial Plan and draft RFMP. The second round of small group meetings build on the first round meetings by focusing on potential projects, timelines, and funding assumptions.

Presentation:

Introductions followed by a brief presentation on the overview of the agenda by Loren Bottorff (PBI).

Review Project Descriptions and Level of Protection:

Attendees were provided a "snapshot" of material currently in the draft RFMP for RD 2064, RD 2075, RD 2094, and RD 2096 and asked to provide comments by for use in refinements to the Draft RFMP. Explained that potential projects are being placed into three tiers to show when each project is likely to be implemented. Tier 1 would be for projects with likely implementation in the next 5 years. Tier 2 would be projects with implementation in the 6 to 12 year period. Tier 3 projects would be implemented beyond 12 years. RFMP is a 25 year plan.

RD 2094 Discussion:

- Proposed extension of wing levee at the north side of RD 2094 as part of RD 17 improvements to
 protect Manteca from flow outflanking existing levee. Chris N. mentioned that part of Manteca
 sphere of influence south of that wing levee would need protection if that area develops in the
 future. In this case, a new wing levee would be built to the south of the existing wing levee.
- Levees along RD 2094 are generally wider than PL 84-99 standards
- Dryland levee improvement are low priority (tier 3)
- Geometry improvements are tier 3
- Seepage and slope stability repairs are tier 3
- Draft RFMP has a project to restore the design capacity of the San Joaquin River. Sedimentation.
 - Even if a project, it is more than a single RD would attempt to accomplish make a regional project.
 - Unless other RDs provide more information, consider removing as a physical project and making it a study to determine the extent of needed dredging.
 - Mary H. mentioned prior report prepared by her father. Want included as a regional project



MEETING NOTES

RD 2096 Discussion:

- Smallest RD in the state, formed in 1962. Maintain pump station and about 0.7 mile of levee
- RD 17 levee on north side. Due to the existing houses, the area should have been included within the RD 17 levees rather than be excluded as currently. Highly developed with 60 ± houses. With houses and trailers, may be 750 to 1000 people.
- Flooded in 1997. Received about \$1 million for cleanup.
- Very concerned about flooding from upstream districts and flow in Walthall Slough
- Never have known where they can do a relief cut if needed
- Would like dredging of Walthall Slough due to sediment buildup, tier 2. Need original capacity returned. Boat traffic.
- Need pump station electrical upgrade, tier 2
- Would like existing houses and utilities flood proofed by raising above flood level. If flooding, houses would be inundated 5 to 13 feet deep. Trailer houses have axels and can be moved out under threat of flooding

RD 2064 Discussion:

- Noted that the location is along the east bank, not west bank of the San Joaquin River.
- The existing draft RFMP said that levees would be raised 6 inches above PL 84-99. Jim G. noted that that may be OK standard within the Delta further to the north, but not along the San Joaquin River where flood stages vary more with flow than in the tidal Delta. Can't raise these levees above PL 84-99 due to the impact on the opposite side of the river.
- An expansion of Paradise Cut is one way to lower stages along for the RDs upstream from Mossdale. RDs generally supported the expansion as a future regional project.
- Concern that the bridge repairs at Airport Way may be restricting flow and causing problems with water stage increases. [note, subsequent checking with San Joaquin County indicated that a hydraulic study of this potential shows minimal (0.01 foot) impact to stages.
- Have already reconstructed some levees to 25-foot crown width and seepage berms
- PL 84-99 improvements tier 1
- Erosion protection on map doesn't square with the cost shown in the draft RFMP; should be shown along entire length of levee, but tier 3
- Seepage repairs tier 3
- All-weather road tier 1
- Discussed possibility of setback levees district doesn't plan these.

RD 2075 Discussion:

- Same discussion as with RD 2064 that levees should be PL 84-99, not 6-inches above.
- Geometry improvements, erosion protection, seepage repairs, and restore capacity of San Joaquin River all should be tier 3
- Discussed possibility of setback levees district doesn't plan these.

Asked about what RDs thought about potential consolidation of RDs. Don't see a reason. Set up originally as separate benefit areas and it works.

---end---