

City of Woodland
Meeting Minutes – September 22, 2015
Flood Control Advisory Committee (FCAC)

1. Roll Call

Present: Kevin Cowan, David Cullen, Skip Davies, Evelia Genera, Nancy Lea, Eric Paulsen, Lynnel Pollock, Ken Trott, Robert Ullrey

Absent: Mike Adams, Eric Alfaro, Al Eby, Beth Robbins, Dean Simeroth, Mary-Ann Warmerdam

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

2. Public Comment

NONE

3. Committee and Staff Comments

David Cowen expressed his appreciation for the scoping meeting for the DWR/City Feasibility Study. Lynnel Pollock expressed concern that the notification for the scoping event was sent out late and did not have a chance to reach all the parties that it should. She also would have preferred more of a presentation. Nancy Lea expressed a concern that the scoping meeting did not include an opportunity to make comments for the record and thought the event should have been bifurcated with both a formal and informal session.

Skip Davies announced that he and staff had met with three (3) committee members on September 18 to “catch” them up on issues covered during previous meeting absences.

Tim Busch explained that there was a pre-meeting before the scoping meeting to decide on whether the event would be done as a formal presentation or an open-house forum. An open house forum was decided upon because attendees could come and leave at varying times during the event. Event notification was done through the City’s master list used to provide notification on all environmental impact reports.

4. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from August 25, 2015 were approved. Minutes from June 16, 2015 were proposed for modification. Suggested changes were provided. June 16th minutes-revised will be presented at the next meeting for approval.

5. Local Preparation for Possible El Nino and Associated Flooding

Greg Meyer, Public Works Director, explained that our preparation for flooding this year began about a year ago since we take an El Nino warning seriously. We are doing extra work on ditch lines and drop inlets around the town. We should have everything cleaned by the end of September. We have also prepared for possible flooding through increased Emergency Operations Center (EOC) training. We have had joint training with Yolo County, Winters, and other area entities to work on our emergency operations preparedness. Flooding events require a great deal of coordination between agencies. Usually in the case of anticipated flooding, we open a Department Operations Center (DOC) in advance. The storm drain system in our town cannot handle large volume flows due to the age of the system. We can get localized flooding pretty quickly, but we get crews trying to keep the system open and clean as best as we can. Once the DOC is open, we start talking to the Flood Control and Water Conservation District regarding the Rumsey Flow meter. This gives us 8 hour lead time to when we can expect flows to get to the City to determine the need to move to an EOC.

Sand bag sites are opened to the public as needed. Once an EOC opens, full emergency response is exercised at that point. The biggest difficulty with flooding is deciding if it's going to flood or not. We feel we are as prepared as we can be.

Paul Navazio noted that we are trying to get all City staff trained and ready to face any type of emergency. We are working towards having a large scale simulated training based around a Cache Creek flood event, probably in 2016. Such a simulated event would include the state, Caltrans, the flood control district, county EOC and state EOC. Additionally, Paul reviewed the Everbridge Communication System with reverse 911 systems and geocode ability. This system will help the City should full-scale public notification ever be necessary.

6. Four Flood Alternatives – 2A, 2C, 6B, 7B

South Bypass: 2A – This alternative 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. There are no structures impacted, but flowage easements would be needed. Alternative 2A looks to be the USACE NED Plan. This alternative is modeled on 100 year flood, not the a 200 year flood as required by DWR.

2C – This alternative 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. This alternative requires removal of material from the Cache Creek Settling Basin. Still

in question is whether the excavated material can be used for levee work. As of the current cost estimates, this is the most expensive alternative.

6B –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.

7B –This alternative 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 and we believe the County would object.

7. Flood Solution Funding Possibilities

A City/State/Federal Flood Project: federal government will fund 65% of the NED Project, the state will fund 70% of the remaining 35%, leaving 30% of the remaining 35%. If the City moves forward with a Locally Preferred Plan (LPP) that is not the NED, then the City will have to bear the full cost of the difference in the NED and the LPP.

City/State Flood Project (estimate only): state will fund 70% and the City will fund 30%.

Right now, all of the state Prop. 1E funding is already allocated. Unless there is new money identified, there is no more state funding available. Should a federal alternative be selected, funding will most likely take 10+ years.

Our primary goal besides finding a flood solution is to maximize federal and state funding and minimize the local share. We have contracted with Larsen-Wuzel Associates to look at a possible flood assessment district. The work is very preliminary, but even under a best case scenario, revenue would not cover the full local cost share.

Some communities have also looked to the voters for sales tax increment, voter required bond measures, and/or developer interests to fund flood solutions. A more focused discussion on financing alternatives is still ahead of us.

8. Next Meeting

October 20, 2015, 3:30-5:00 p.m. – City of Woodland Council Chambers

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:33 p.m.