

PAC TECHNICAL GROUP MEETING
March 9, 2011
Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
3:30 – 5:00 pm

Attendees:

Fran Borcalli, floodSAFE Yolo
Mark Deven, City of Woodland
Mark Cocke, City of Woodland
Donna Gentile, WRA

Stefan Lorenzato, YCFC&WCD
Max Stevenson, YCFC&WCD
Dave Pratt

1. Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study

a) Project Management Plan, Federal & Non-Federal Cost Share Agreement: Fran reported that all agreements have been signed by the City of Woodland and the CVFPB in February. They are still pending yet another legal review by DWR that could take four weeks. After DWR review the agreements will go to the USACE.

b) Federal Budget – FY 2011: A FY2011 budget is still pending final determination therefore the USACE does not have a definitive budget amount available for the feasibility study work. Once the agreements leave DWR, floodSAFE can start a discussion about whether the feasibility study can be funded by the state and locals in advance of federal funding becoming available. Fran indicated that it would be advantageous to implement the hydraulic analyses and floodplain mapping to document the impact of the Settling Basin on local flooding as early as possible. If this work could move forward, as provided for in the PMP, then the USACE may be able to establish a decision document that could open up funding opportunities to resolve Cache Creek Settling Basin issues.

c) Schedule: Based on finalizing the federal and non-federal cost share agreements, the earliest start date has been pushed back to be May 1, 2011.

d) Implementation organization and coordination: Fran asked the PAC about their expectations on implementation of the feasibility study in relation to communication during the course of the feasibility study. The City of Woodland is the lead agency and the legal entity on all the agreements. Fran wanted all the partners to communicate about moving forward. Unfortunately, Yolo County was unable to attend today's meeting and Tim O'Halloran was also absent. Mark Deven expressed that he wanted the current level of collaboration to continue among the MOU partners in the forum of the PAC. Fran wants to be sure that the integrity of floodSAFE Yolo is maintained throughout the process of implementing the feasibility study. The floodSAFE Yolo website would be the logical place for communication information, such as posting project updates, meetings, reports, etc. There would be interactive links on all MOU partner's websites. Fran agreed to draft a proposal outlining guidelines for PAC implementation organization and coordination including his participation. The draft proposal will be presented at the April PAC meeting.

Respecting that the work on the feasibility study is related to, but separate from the floodSAFE activities, Fran will be preparing a proposal at the City's request that outlines the role and activities that Fran could perform in participating with the City in implementing the feasibility study.

MEETING NOTES

March 9, 2011

e) Cache Creek hydraulic model: The PAC held a technical discussion about the hydraulic modeling being conducted in Yolo County and the Central Valley regions. They discussed the modeling needs for upper and lower Cache Creek. Modeling lower Cache Creek would assist with developing solutions for the feasibility study. They discussed the practical timing and coordination needed for current modeling efforts to assist with the Cache Creek Feasibility Study, especially if work begins in May. It is unlikely that any of the agencies involved will want to provide upfront funding for work product that may not be credited as a local match, however coordinating this effort would provide substantial financial savings for the local partners. Fran will monitor whether or not the two pieces of this puzzle will come together in a timely manner. In about a month the PAC, with feedback from DWR related to its CVFED Program, should be able to make a decision whether it makes sense from a technical and financial standpoint to move forward with this modeling effort.

2. Management of DWR LiDAR data and future CVFED products:

Max Stevenson provided a discussion on who should be the steward of the LiDAR data within the county. The YCFC&WCD (District) is one logical steward; however, they do not have GIS software in-house in order to manage the information. All GIS data for the District is currently outsourced to Charlie Thomas. Additionally the District's geographic boundaries do not include the entire county. From a regional perspective, it would be prudent to not only include Yolo County area, but also portions of Solano and Colusa counties. Parts of Colusa County were recommended to support RD 108 (and the Sacramento River West Levee District) and Colusa County Water District. Parts of Solano County would be useful to Yolo County when consideration is given to activities involving the entire Yolo Bypass. This will be particularly helpful during the development of the Westside IRWMP (under the recently awarded Prop. 84 planning grant to the Westside Regional Water Management Group). Max informed that in order to effectively manage the data, it is helpful to know who needs the data and why, as well as how this data ties into other types of data throughout the county. The University of CA Davis was suggested as an appropriate steward given that they are also a model user and have a better working knowledge with staff and software resources to manage the data. Fran reiterated that it is necessary to keep the model updated in order for it to be a useful tool.

3. WRA Technical Committee requesting recommendation regarding hydraulic models and strategies throughout Yolo County

Stefan provided background on the discussions held at the WRA Technical Committee (TC) in March that prompted this request. The TC would like to be able to send a letter to DWR with comments and a recommendation for coordination. At the TC meeting, Robin Kulakow expressed her frustration for the Yolo Bypass that they can not keep track of all the various models being done by different DWR departments (or others) for a variety of different purposes. Stefan emphasized that even DWR isn't aware of what other agencies are doing. Fran expressed his concern that many of the people involved in these agency meetings do not have the technical capacity to understand the process and how all modeling functions integrate. Also DWR is often unsure who they should be speaking with, therefore speaking with the County is the most logical. Unfortunately the participants for the County don't necessarily understand the full implications of the technical aspects of the work, nevertheless from DWR's perspective they have "communicated" with the locals. Several ideas were discussed: develop a list of available models by agency, type and function; hold a symposium to education the WRA etc. on who's doing what

MEETING NOTES

March 9, 2011

and why; hire an outside consultant under an ad hoc contract to track and monitor all the models (possibly under WRA project funds?). It was agreed that the next step is to talk with Tim O'Halloran and decide whether to involve Bill Marble and Mike McGowan in the discussion for direction. Include Bill from the standpoint of the WRA as a regional organization and Mike McGowan for his extensive involvement in the Delta County Coalition and Delta planning processes. Stefan agreed to speak with Tim O'Halloran to start the discussion.

4. **Management of storm drainage/flood management proposals review**

Fran raised the question about who is the appropriate agency to review and manage storm drainage/flood management proposals by independent developers. Although Yolo County adopted the Yolo County City/County Drainage Manual, there is no protocol that requires the review of developer's project and what they have done. Yolo County would be the logical agency. Fran wanted to bring this to the attention of the PAC for discussion. However without the full PAC management this item could not be discussed effectively.

5. **CAP-to-CAP:** This item was not discussed in the absence of Tim O'Halloran who is participating in CAP-to-CAP activities.

6. **Budget Status:** Fran distributed an updated budget through February 2011. There is approximately \$78,000 remaining of the original \$600,000 budget.

7. **Other:** No additional items were presented.

8. **Next PAC Meeting:** April 13, 2011, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Summary of Action Items:

- Fran draft proposal for Feasibility Study implementation organization and coordination
- Fran will monitor the Cache Creek hydraulic modeling processes to determine whether it is feasible to proceed based on timing and funding to benefit the feasibility study work
- Discuss the WRA TC's request for a recommendation on countywide hydraulic modeling coordination with Tim O'Halloran and possibly include Bill Marble and Mike McGowan in the discussion (Stefan initiate discussion with Tim)

Submitted by:

Fran Borcalli, Program Manager