City of Woodland
Meeting Minutes – August 25, 2015
**Flood Control Advisory Committee (FCAC)**

1. Roll Call

   Present: Mike Adams, Kevin Cowan, David Cullen, Skip Davies, Al Eby, Eric Paulsen, Lynnel Pollock, Dean Simeroth, Ken Trott, Mary-Ann Warmerdam

   Absent: Eric Alfaro, Evelia Genera, Nancy Lea, Beth Robbins, Robert Ullrey

   Staff Present: Tim Busch, Brent Meyer, Ken Hiatt, Lynn Johnson, Greg Meyer

2. Public Comment

   NONE

3. Committee and Staff Comments

   NONE

4. Approval of Minutes

   Minutes from June 16, 2015 were held over for the September meeting to allow for additional comments and corrections; minutes from July 28, 2015 were approved as modified.

5. Letter to the USACE regarding breadth of Alternatives

   The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Department of Water Resources (DWR), and the City are partnered together in finding a flood solution.

   The USACE looks at all of the possible alternatives, reviews the engineering, and looks at benefits and damages. They look at the costs and the benefits and then covert that to annualized costs. With that information, they pick the National Economic Development (NED) alternative that has the highest positive cost to benefit ratio. The costs that are considered include environmental, right-of-way, and construction, but not operations & maintenance. The Corps does not design the NED plan to any particular size of a storm event. Although FEMA requires a 100 year flood solution, the Corps is not obligated to that because they are a different agency. We need to try to influence the USACE to continue to look at alternative plans and to look specifically at 200 year flood solutions and SB5 requirements.

Woodland has to officially request the USACE to include a second alternative in case Woodland comes up with an alternative that we want included, even if it is not the NED Plan. By Milestone 2 we need to decide if the USACE goes on to study both alternatives even though they will only fund up to the NED Plan.

6. Army Corps Alternatives Currently Under Review

North Bypass – All alternatives in this category have been dropped from further review because of the high cost to convey water under the railroad tracks and I-5.

South Bypass – Alternatives 2A and 2B are still under consideration. Alternative 2A sends water through the Cache Creek Settling Basin to the Bypass and includes a levee at the north City boundary connecting to the Cache Creek Settling Basin west levee, a notch in that west levee allowing flood flows into the settling basin. Alternative 2A looks to be the USACE NED Plan with a cost estimate of ~$150 million. Alternative 2C includes a levee at the north City boundary with flood flows directed to the Yolo Bypass via a channel to the west and south of the Cache Creek Settling Basin. It also includes the realignment of a Cache Creek Settling Basin levee. The 2C alternative has a significantly higher cost estimate than 2A (~$400 million), primarily because of the mitigation requirements of hauling material out of settling basin on the "clipped corner". Staff has asked for more details from the Corps on both cost estimates to make sure the alternatives can be compared as "apples to apples".

Strengthen Levees or Raise Existing in Place – Alternative 6B is still under consideration. This option strengthens and raises the existing left bank Yolo levee, extends right bank levee upstream, strengthens and raises the existing right bank levee and builds I-5 and railroad cross drainage. This option keeps water out of Woodland, but transfers risk to the properties north of Cache Creek. This is not a complete solution and the State would not approve.

Setback Levees – Alternative 7B is still under consideration and would build a new levee south of the existing levee sending all water to the settling basin. This includes expanding the settling basin to the north, approximately 600 acres. The amount of land needed to expand the settling basin would drive up project costs significantly.

The Committee asked how much farmland would be taken out of production for this and wanted to make sure that the concept is consistent with Yolo County's Agricultural preservation policies. Additionally, they wanted to know how the easements would be maintained.

7. City/DWR Feasibility

The City has been given a preliminary allocation of $5 million from DWR for a City/DWR Feasibility Study (50% share). We are currently working with the State to put together a scope of work. Due to the matching requirement, it is our plan to phase the scope of work to ensure that we have our matching funds available. A logical order will be feasibility, environmental, and then preliminary design. There will be a joint scoping meeting for the EIR/EIS on September 3rd at the Community & Senior Center.

This City/DWR Feasibility will be better able to look at different alternatives that are not necessarily constrained by the NED Plan and that can better meet the State SB5 and 200-year flood requirements. We are hoping to get to at least a 65% design level with this funding.

8. West Bypass Levee

The Army Corps Feasibility Study is focused on Cache Creek flooding, not on the Bypass. We know that there is are identified problems with the West Bypass Levee. The current levee does not meet standards and so far, the State has not proposed fixing the problem. We are trying to make sure that the City/DWR Feasibility addresses the levee issues, primarily height and geotechnical.

9. Next Meeting

September 22, 2015, 1:00-2:30 p.m. – City of Woodland Council Chambers

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.