

City of Woodland  
Meeting Minutes – August 13, 2019  
**Flood Control Advisory Committee (FCAC)**

1. Roll Call

Present: Skip Davies, Bruce Jacks, Nancy Lea, Lynnel Pollock, Dean Simeroth, Ken Trott, Mary-Ann Warmerdam, Beth Robbins

Absent: Mike Adams, Eric Alfaro, Kevin Cowan, Al Eby, Evelia Genera

Staff Present: Tim Busch, Lynn Johnson, Craig Locke, Paul Navazio

Invited Consultants: Rick Reinhardt, MBK; Charles Austin, Corps; Peter Blodgett, Corps; Sara Martin, ICF

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Committee and Staff Comments

None.

4. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from August 14, 2018 approved as presented.

5. Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study – Status Update

- a. The Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study was put back into active status in November 2018.
- b. The Tentatively Selected Plan was approved by the USACE in February 2019.
- c. The Waiver request has been submitted to the USACE for a schedule and budget change and we are waiting for the waiver to be signed.
- d. Work is progressing on tasks that are not covered by the USACE that are part of the DWR – Urban Flood Risk Reduction Grant.
- e. Staff is working with the consultant team on the next milestone – Agency Decision Milestone. This Milestone is primarily environmental work. The draft EIR is expected in early November 2019. The committee asked if there has been any interaction with the property owners north of the City, potentially impacted by the project. Tim explained that the City has gone door to door, sent letters to property owners, and done small group meetings to try and interact with the owners of the twenty-two structures identified in the study. Nancy Lea asked if

the City is spending City funds on this project and was answered affirmatively. Nancy asked if it is possible for the City to provide a graphic comparison between the 2004 project and the modified Alternative 2A since the two projects look very similar. Tim explained that a graphic comparison was done two years ago and could be provided. The current project is much more of a water conveyance project that decreases the duration and depth of water during a flood event. Nancy shared her concern that the project devalues land value. Ric explained that an appraiser has determined that there is no adverse impact on land value north of the City as a result of the project. The City agreed to forward the appraiser's report to the Committee members. Mary-Ann Warmerdam asked if the flood flows could be considered a resource now under SGMA. Lynnell Pollock asked how this project fits in with the small communities flood risk reduction program. Ric explained that the Woodland project is not linked with the small communities risk reduction program and has no impact on the small communities north of the City.

6. Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study – Tech. Memo on Alternatives considered
  - a. CEQA – Sara Martin, ICF – Ms. Martin explained that the CEQA Document will look at project impacts on water, air, traffic, etc. A public scoping meeting for the CEQA document will be held on September 11 in the City Council Chambers. A separate NEPA document will also be done.
  - b. USACE Process – Charles Austin, III – USACE Senior Project Manager – Mr. Austin explained that over 30 alternatives were reviewed before the Tentatively Selected Plan was chosen. The next major milestone will be the release of the draft Feasibility Study and draft Supplemental EIS. This is expected mid-November 2019. There will be a 45-day comment period. The final Report is planned for Fall of 2020 where the comments will be addressed both verbally and in writing. The Agency Decision Milestone is expected in winter 2020. The Chief's Report is the last step where "headquarters" signs off on the report and the project moves on to the design stage. Construction would be at least 3-4 years after that. If there is Congressional support for the project, funding for design and construction is secure.
7. Next Steps – Public and Committee Comments
  - a. The Technical Memo from Wood Rogers includes all 30 alternatives that have been reviewed over the years. Most did not meet the project goals of reducing flooding or were too expensive and did not meet NED.
  - b. Nancy asked if the City has done a legal analysis and engineering opinion of why the current project is not in violation of Measure S. Skip Davies said that this work has been done and that a copy would be provided to the Committee members.
8. Next Meeting

TBD

9. The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.