

**Coalition of Watershed Towns Meeting Minute
May 21, 2012**

Present: Bill Layton, Pete Bracci and Bruce Dolph (Delaware County); Dennis Lucas and Stephen Walker (Greene County); Bruce Lamonda (Ulster County); Tony VanGlad (Schoharie County), Ric Coombe (Sullivan County). Jeff Baker – CWT Counsel

Meeting started at 6:08 PM

1. Catskill Flood Work Group, results of Long-Term Flood Hazard Mitigation proposals, May 19 meeting in Kingston

- Jeff Baker reviewed progress is being made bringing stakeholders' interests closer together. The CWT and DEP proposals, emailed to the CWT executive committee, are similar in structure and intent with respect to additional supports to watershed communities for flood hazard mitigation (FHM) planning and funding.
- Both intend to continue funding the stream management program through the SWCDs, as well as expand funding for FHM projects and planning. Distinctions in mechanisms for doing that remain. CWC will play a role in administering new monies through a FHM implementation program.
- Preparing local flood hazard mitigation (LFHM) analyses will determine future FHM projects, such as relocation and acquisition of floodplain structures, upsizing culverts, stream management projects above and beyond normal funding levels; they will also include preventive measures at the local level, such as ensuring the local floodplain law is enforced, or preserving floodplain capacity during site plan reviews.
- Implementation funds would come from the Stream Management Implementation Program (SMIP), SWCDs contracts for stream restoration projects, the new CWC FHM Implementation program, and other state, federal and private sources
- Prattsville's LFHM analysis was highlighted at the May 19 meeting as an example of what a LFHM study entails, the range of recommendations to support reduced flood risk, and the need for community buy in.
- Once LFHM analyses are conducted, communities need planning assistance to implement prioritized recommendations. DEP is not willing to fund additional staff at SWCDs for planning assistance, they feel the counties need to contribute as well. The program to be created at CWC could fund planning assistance but would be through a grant cycle. Relying on towns to apply may not be as effective as a county agency given time constraints and limited capacity.
- Dean F. noted that planning assistance needs to account for the cultural and socio-economic factors as part of acquisition and relocation projects in addition to the technical assistance of interpreting the flood study results.
- As LFHM analyses are conducted, communities need a project manager/planner to facilitate, administer and ensure critical coordination is happening to implement recommendations. Michelle cited Prattsville as an example, they have a LFHM study with a series of recommendations but do not have a core planner or manager to assist with the follow through and coordinate projects across

multiple agencies and residents.

- As a business owner in a floodplain, Bruce D. commented he could use assistance knowing what options exist for him to relocate. In developing the FHM Implementation Program, to be administered by CWC, the intent would be to expedite the process as quickly as possible and advance buyout funds to business owners, or homeowners found eligible.
 - CWT has offered legal services to SWCDs as they re-negotiate their next five-year contracts in light of these discussions to ensure the new contracts reflect SWCDs needs with respect to FHM moving forward.
 - It is unclear where the additional City funds will come from. The environmental agency signatories to the MOA are not in agreement on reallocating some of the LAP funds to FHM programming.
 - The next meeting in Kingston is June 21 and specific funding requests will be discussed to know what the City is willing to cover above and beyond base funding for SWCDs and for the new CWC flood hazard implementation program. The funding period will be five years (current DEP contract cycle).
2. **Bills** – Motion to pay warrants totaling \$ 13,216.86 by Dennis L, seconded by Bruce Dolph, with all present in favor. Bills were for March and April legal services from Young & Sommer and WAP first quarter administrative assistance.
 3. **April meeting minutes** – motion to accept April minutes made by Dennis Lucas, seconded by Bruce LaMonda with all present in favor
 4. **Gilboa Cemetery Association** – Tony V. shared a long standing agreement the Association had with DEP to maintain the Gilboa Cemetery, which had to move ~ 60% of the bodies when the dam was being constructed, is in jeopardy. DEP was paying the Association to maintain the Cemetery and has indicated to the board they can no longer do that. On a motion by Dennis L., seconded by Bruce L., with all in favor, the Gilboa Cemetery Association has CWT support to take action to attempt to reinstate the funding.

Meeting adjourned at 7: 40 PM on motion by Tony VanGlad, seconded by Rick Coombe with all present in favor.