

City of Woodland
Meeting Minutes – July 18, 2016
Flood Control Advisory Committee (FCAC)

1. Roll Call

Present: Kevin Cowan, David Cullen, Skip Davies, Al Eby, Evelia Genera, Nancy Lea, Eric Paulsen, Lynnel Pollock, Ken Trott, Mary-Ann Warmerdam

Absent: Mike Adams, Eric Alfaro, Dean Simeroth, Beth Robbins, Robert Ullrey

Staff Present: Tim Busch, Lynn Johnson, Greg Meyer

2. Public Comment

NONE

3. Committee and Staff Comments

NONE

4. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from December 8, 2015 were approved as revised.

5. Army Corps Cost Review of Alternatives 2A and 2B

Alternative 2A: USACE has presented an alternative that did not provide 200 year flood protection and created uncertainty with impact of flooding depths. The State wanted to know the impact to the settling basin with Alternative 2A. The City “paused” the USACE work to allow time to review the alternatives more in depth. Additionally, the City and State wanted to review the cost detail of Alternative 2B in greater detail to see if the cost could be reduced. We also wanted to look at the USACE cost analysis for earthwork to see if we could use adjacent fill material for a parallel trench to create the needed levee and reduce the cost of the earthwork.

A modified 2A alternative was developed as an option to 2A. The estimated cost of the modified 2A alternative is \$127-\$129 million with a \$14-\$17 million cityshare.

Alternative 2B has an estimated cost of \$236 million with a cityshare of \$46-\$123 million. If Alternative 2A is the NED, the USACE will cost share on 2A and should the City select 2B, we would have to pay the cost share as if it was 2A plus the cost difference between the two alternatives.

Nancy Lea expressed some concern about the financial impact to agricultural land to the north and whether the land would be “stigmatized” for future agricultural lending.

Clarifying Information:

- There will be flowage easements needed
- Water will flow east with modified 2A alternative
- Both 2B and modified 2A provide 200 year flood protection
- There are five (5) structures impacted in both 2B and modified 2A
- The USACE Operations & Maintenance Manual would provide any information about vegetation management in the Cache Creek Settling Basin. After review, it was determined that the manual only requires vegetation removal on the levees and does not identify a need to manage vegetation in the CCSB.
- Both alternatives are SB5 compliant
- Federal funding for a project is most likely at least 10 years out and state funding is still up in the air on timing
- Neither of these alternatives take care of the Yolo Bypass West Levee. It is being considered as part of the Basin Wide Feasibility Study.

6. Cache Creek Settling Basin Mercury Issues, Sediment Transport & Impacts on Alternatives

UC Davis is completing a sediment transport model to see what happens with modified 2A on the basin since that is a concern to the State. The Regional Board is concerned with the Yolo Bypass – Modified 2A sends everything to the CCSB and 2B sends everything to the Bypass – they are just different problems. The Regional Board likes Modified 2A better. It looks like DWR will likely support the UC Davis Study and could support modified 2A.

7. Timeline and Next Steps on Alternatives

We would like to go to the City Council on August 23rd with a recommended locally preferred alternative and lift the pause with the Army Corp. We need to do this prior to the end of the federal fiscal year (September 30th) so that we are not at risk of losing funding for the study.

A meeting with the Farm Bureau was suggested whereby impacted property owners could be invited and informed. The Committee asked to be notified of the Farm Bureau meeting.

8. Next Meeting

August 15, 2016, 3:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.