

**Coalition of Watershed Towns Meeting Minute**  
**July 16, 2012**

Present: Carl Stuendel and Bruce Dolph (Delaware County); Dennis Lucas and Stephen Walker (Greene County); Tony VanGlad (Schoharie County); Bruce LaMonda (Ulster County). Jeff Baker – Counsel.

6:10 PM start

1. **June meeting minutes** – motion to accept June minutes made by Carl Stuendel, seconded by Bruce Dolph with all present in favor.

2. **Privilege of the Floor**

---

- Resident Jay Braman inquired if the CWT would consider supporting enhanced funding for the Phoenicia Hamlet WWTP project under the next FAD review (the community is trying to get DEP to increase funding allocated for the project to include a wider area). Chairman Lucas and Counsel Baker responded requests for assistance usually come from the elected officials of member communities, and no request has been made by the Town of Shandaken for CWT assistance in this matter. Braman inquired whether a request from a group of citizens would be recognized as the current and previous local government administrations have been divided over the issue. Bruce LaMonda responded town officials need to be on board as it ultimately lies with the local government how a project such as this moves forward. The normal protocol is the local government asks for assistance from the CWT and the executive committee decides whether to get involved or not.

3. **Catskill Flood Mitigation Work Group update**

---

- The recent stakeholders' meeting (7/12/12) at the DEP offices in Kingston resulted in further progress according to J. Baker, Aaron Bennett and Dean Frazer – agreement has been reached on parameters for the Flood Hazard Mitigation Program (FHMP), including enhanced money through the SWCDs for Local Flood Mitigation (LFHM) Analyses, which will outline flood mitigation options in areas that experience repetitive flood damage (e.g., low lying villages, hamlets next to streams). Communities will go through a LFHM analysis, prioritize recommendations, develop budgets for implementation and apply for funding through the new FHMP administered by the CWC.
- The new program will be for larger projects beyond the scope of typical SWCD projects and may include selective buyout projects. The State DOH will reflect this program in the new FAD (the draft should be out in the next month).
- It is uncertain how much LFHM projects will cost or how much demand there will be until the analyses are conducted and communities endorse what is recommended.
- Timing of funding will depend when projects are ready to be implemented, with normal stream restoration projects being handled through the SWCD contracts and larger FHM projects (e.g., relocating homes and businesses) being handled through the new CWC program.
- It is up to each County SWCD to negotiate their future contract needs with DEP. There may be a gap before the new contracts are registered (2014)
- Jeff Baker requested a breakout of what SWCDs are proposing for the next contract

period which he will forward to DOH to include in the Draft FAD.

- Community buy-in is critical for implementing recommendations in the LFHM analyses; that will drive the FHMP projects and what gets approved
- CWC will determine what gets approved with program rules being flexible enough to cover a wide variety of projects. There will be some kind of Benefit Cost Analysis to show cost effectiveness of flood mitigation recommendations.
- Michelle Y. pointed out GCSWCD is proposing an additional full time equivalent to work with communities on stormwater and flood mitigation projects in the next contract and questioned if that does not get approved by DEP would the CWC program be available to support that technical assistance in order to work with communities on implementing recommendations identified in LFHM plans. Jeff B. indicated that it would providing it is correlated to project-specific needs, the grant could be used to support planning and engineer assistance.
- Aaron B. inquired whether any of the funds could be used to work with communities downstream from reservoirs knowing they are impacted by flooding as well. Funding resources will be used only in the watershed, which theoretically should free up county resources to work with those not directly receiving DEP funds.
- **EWP projects** – DEP identified projects they are willing to provide the 25% cost share and some they are not. The CWT has argued DEP should cover the cost share for other projects approved for NRCS funding, such as County Rte. 17 in Jewett, because of the federal dollars they can leverage. As these projects are decided they will be included in the FAD.
- The 220 day turnaround time to implement EWP projects is an obstacle. The Working Group agreed a letter should be written to the agency to request a one year extension on EWP-funded projects (current deadline is November – 2012).

4. **Bills and Warrant** – motion to pay the April 2012 Young and Sommer bill was made by Bruce Dolph, seconded by Carl Stuendel and carried unanimously. Bruce Dolph reviewed the June **Treasurer's Report**: there is \$ 99,100.07 in Savings and \$1,000.60 in Checking.

#### 5. **Correspondence**

- Letter to DEP ref: closing three rainfall gages in Delaware County – Dean will call Paul Rush, Assistant Commissioner

7:02 PM meeting adjourned on motion by Bruce Dolph, seconded by Bruce LaMonda with all present in favor.