

LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, CA  
CITY OF WOODLAND AND VICINITY

DRAFT FEASIBILITY REPORT  
FOR POTENTIAL FLOOD DAMAGE  
REDUCTION PROJECT

---

## **APPENDIX F**

### **Real Estate Plan**

#### **Real Estate Exhibit A: Relocations**

#### **Real Estate Exhibit B: Plates of Alternatives**

**Real Estate Plate 1. Flood Barrier Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 2. Narrow Setback Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 3. Narrow Setback Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 4. Set Back Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 5. Wide Set Back Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 6. Modified Wide Set Back Alternative for Cache Creek**

**Real Estate Plate 7. Relocations Site**

## REAL ESTATE PLAN

### Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Woodland Area

**1. Introduction.** This Real Estate Plan is prepared in accordance with ER 405-1-12, 12-16, Real Estate Plan, and presents the Real Estate requirements for the Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Woodland Area Draft Feasibility Report.

The general authority for this investigation is provided by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874). In the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1993 (Public Law 102-377), Congress directed the Corps of Engineers to conduct a "reconnaissance study of flooding problems in the westside tributaries, Putah and Cache Creeks, of Yolo Bypass". The reconnaissance study was initiated in April 1993 at the request of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors. Federal interest in proceeding with a feasibility level investigation of flood reduction along Lower Cache Creek was found to exist.

New draft Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued by FEMA in September 1998 show a significant increase in the areas of Yolo County and the City of Woodland that are subject to 100-year floods.

A feasibility cost share agreement between the Corps and the State of California Reclamation Board, and a local feasibility cost share agreement between the Reclamation Board and the City of Woodland were signed in January 2000.

The study is for the purpose of evaluating alternatives for the reduction of flood damage in the City of Woodland in Yolo County, California, and vicinity. The study began with an analysis and comparison of five alternatives of which three were eliminated and two selected for further study. In actuality four alternatives were analyzed, three of which were different variations of a setback levee. The alternatives studied were: a flood barrier north of the City of Woodland and south of Lower Cache Creek in a primarily agricultural area; a narrow setback levee plan along the Creek; a wider setback levee plan, and a modified wide setback levee plan.

Setback Levee Alternatives Eliminated . Three preliminary setback levee alternative plans were evaluated during the development of the modified wide setback levee plan. The narrow setback levee alternative was an attempt to minimize the effect of the levee on agricultural lands and residences by having most levee construction performed near or immediately adjacent to the creek. This alternative required significant alteration of the stream channel, including the placement of rock within the channel to provide bank protection from high stream-flow velocities. Environmental impacts would require replacement of habitat lost due to work in the channel. Insufficient areas of land are available within or near the project area to meet the extensive environmental mitigation requirements, making this alternative extremely difficult to implement.

The wide setback levee alternative would involve moving the flood protection levees away from the creek to a distance that would reduce stream channel impacts, but it would also involve taking of more agricultural lands and buildings than the narrow setback alternative. The impact of armoring the creek near the bridges, coupled with the number of structures and land that would be affected by the wide setback levees, lead to further refinements and development of the modified wide setback levee alternative.

The narrow and wide setback levee alternatives are included in this real estate plan to demonstrate the effort and analysis involved in the development of an optimal and feasible setback levee alternative.

## **2. General Description of the Real Estate Requirements.**

The entire project is in Yolo County, California. The study area lies east of the Teichert Gravel mining operation in the vicinity of Cache Creek as it flows northeast to I-5 and on to the Cache Creek Settling Basin. The project would impact lands that are in agricultural or rural residential land uses in an unincorporated area of Yolo County located immediately north of the City of Woodland. The majority of the lands located within the study area are zoned A-1, an agricultural zone. A minimum of 20 acres is required for a home site. Many of the parcels have land conservation contracts with the county (Williamson Act) that preserve an agricultural use for a minimum period of ten years.

Estates required for each alternative and ownerships affected are as follows:

### **Flood barrier.**

Flood Protection Levee Easement  
Permanent Easement for Occasional Flowage  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Easement for Occasional Flowage  
(overlapping estates)  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement

ownerships - 28

### **Narrow setback levee.**

Channel Improvement Easement  
Flood Protection Levee Easement  
Flood Protection Levee Easement and Road Easement (overlapping estates)  
Permanent Flowage Easement  
Road Easement  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement

ownerships - 86

**Wide setback levee.**

Channel Improvement Easement  
Flood Protection Levee Easement  
Permanent Flowage Easement  
Drainage Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
Borrow Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
Borrow Easement  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)

ownerships - 106

**Modified wide setback levee.**

Channel Improvement Easement  
Flood Protection Levee Easement  
Permanent Flowage Easement  
Borrow Easement  
Borrow Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
Drainages Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement (overlapping estates)  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement and Flood Protection Levee Easement (overlapping estates)  
2 year Temporary Work Area Easement  
Fee for mitigation

ownerships - 95

**NOTE:** Mitigation area(s) would be required for all alternatives. Mitigation for the flood barrier alternative is proposed to be acquired in the form of mitigation land bank credits from Wildlands, Inc. in the Pope Ranch Conservation Bank area in Yolo County. The mitigation lands required for the modified wide setback levee are within the project footprint.

**3. Federal Lands.**

No federal lands are located within the project boundary. There are no lands subject to the application of navigational servitude.

**4. Sponsored Owned Lands.**

Overflow barrier: The non-Federal sponsor has existing rights in levees associated with the Cache Creek Settling Basin project which provide sufficient rights for the Lower Cache Creek

project. The lands are suitable and available for use for this project. Borrow material from Settling Basin levees immediately east of the overflow barrier would be used for construction of the overflow barrier. These lands, from which borrow material would be taken, have been previously provided as an item of local cooperation in a Federal project.

Setback levees: The non-Federal sponsor holds a real estate interest in approximately 472 acres of land required for all of the setback levee alternatives. The lands are suitable and available for this project. These lands have been previously provided as an item of local cooperation in a Federal project.

#### **5. Attorney's Preliminary Takings Analysis.**

The land in the study area between Cache Creek and the City of Woodland is presently in a floodplain and subject to pre-project flooding during the estimated 50-year and 100-year flood events. The land is zoned as agriculture with some scattered residences and out buildings. The agricultural uses are dry land and wet land farming of row crops and in some areas orchards.

The placement of the proposed flood barrier and weir will cause little change to what is the pre-project depth and duration of flooding of the land, except in the far eastern portion of the study area. For the 50 and 100-year flood events, the post-project changes in the flooding on the large majority of the land will be from 2/10s of a foot to 3 feet in additional peak flow, and from 1 to 10 hours increase in duration of flooding. For the majority of the land, the effects generated by the proposed flood barrier are minor and do not amount to any substantial, material, or continual additional interference with the present beneficial use of the land as agricultural, residential, or commercial.

A portion of the lands in the eastern area receives an additional inundation time of up to 4 weeks due to ponding behind the weir. The depth of peak flows on the eastern acres will also increase from 5 to 7 feet. Both of these post-project changes on those acres could materially affect the use of the land by changing the amount or type of crops grown. Subject to verification by additional detailed studies and appraisal analysis, it is likely the post-project affects will create the need for just compensation in the form of the purchase of an occasional flowage easement on the eastern acres that are materially affected by the changes in depth or duration of flooding.

In the event that some actual, unforeseen, or previously unexamined locations receive an increase in flooding that causes a diminution of value or use that is attributable solely to the proposed project, the increase may result in the requirement to pay just compensation for a "taking".

**6. Public Law 91-646-Relocations.** Public Law 91-646 relocations associated with each alternative are as follows:

Flood barrier  
1 residence

Narrow setback levee

10 residences

Wide setback levee

56 residences

2 businesses

Modified wide setback levee

31 residences

1 business

**7. Facility/Utility Relocations and Removals.**

Information on relocations of facilities and utilities is attached as Exhibit A. An attorney's Opinion of Compensability will be completed for the selected alternative.

ANY CONCLUSION OR CATEGORIZATION CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT THAT AN ITEM IS A UTILITY OR FACILITY RELOCATION TO BE PERFORMED BY THE NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR AS PART OF ITS LERRD RESPONSIBILITIES IS PRELIMINARY ONLY. THE GOVERNMENT WILL MAKE A FINAL DETERMINATION OF THE RELOCATIONS NECESSARY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, OR MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT AFTER FURTHER ANALYSIS AND COMPLETION AND APPROVAL OF FINAL ATTORNEY'S OPINIONS OF COMPENSABILITY FOR EACH OF THE IMPACTED UTILITIES AND FACILITIES.

**8. Sponsors Ability to Acquire.** The non-Federal sponsor is the State of California Reclamation Board with the City of Woodland participating as the local sponsor. The Reclamation Board, through the Department of Water Resources (DWR), has the ability to acquire the necessary rights in real estate for this flood control project. DWR has the power of eminent domain pursuant to Water Code Section 8590, et seq., and Code of Civil Procedures Section 1230.010, et seq. The sponsor has been advised of P.L. 91-646 requirements and the requirements for documenting expenses for credit purposes.

**9. Maps.** See Exhibit B for real estate maps. All real estate maps depict the approximate areas of estates required for each alternative.

**10. Minerals.** No analyses of mineral interests associated with the alternatives under study have been conducted.

**11. Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW).**

An Environmental Site Assessment performed by the Corps in May 2000, did not confirm any known contamination due to HTRW. However, there is one area of potential concern along the

alignment of the Lower Cache Creek levee at LM 0.75 where a chemical mixing area was observed. No field or records evidence was found to indicate that this potential source has caused any contamination, but the physical presence of this source indicates further investigation is warranted. Also, the possible presence of contamination from pesticides and herbicides used during normal agricultural operations over the years cannot be ruled out. HTRW issues are addressed in Appendix E.

## **12. Attitude of Landowners and Community.**

**Flood barrier.** Many agricultural landowners north of the proposed flood barrier have a negative view of the alternative. The agricultural land north of the flood barrier would be permanently separated from the City and remain in the flood plain. These owners fear that the barrier would slow the transition of agricultural land to urban development land, thus reducing the value of the properties. Some landowners north of the flood barrier have joined together to threaten litigation should the flood barrier alternative be selected.

**The narrow setback levee,** in many cases, could cause agricultural lands along the Creek to be severed from the larger portions of owners' parcels. Some landowners along the Creek are not happy with this potential situation. The potential for litigation exists.

Under **the wide setback levee plan,** many rural residences and outbuildings would need to be relocated and agricultural uses would be affected. The potential for litigation exists.

**The modified wide setback levee plan** has similar characteristics to those of the other two levee plans.

On the March 5, 2002 election, three measures were included on the ballot relating to the financing of the City share of the Lower Cache Creek Flood Damage Reduction Project. One was a local sales tax extension and the remaining two were advisory measures related to the sunseting of the sales tax measure if the setback levee were the selected plan, or if the flood barrier were the selected plan. The funding measure was put on the ballot in advance of release of the Feasibility Study in order to facilitate seeking federal funding support in 2000.

All three were voted down, indicating a lack of community support for the project.

Release and public review of the Feasibility Study and EIS/EIR are expected to clarify misconceptions raised during the March 2002 election process. Community support can be more accurately evaluated after the study is released, the public has a chance to formally review the study, comments are received and responded to, and environmental review process is completed.

**13. Baseline Cost Estimate.** The following tables show the components of the baseline cost estimate. The difference between State and Federal appraisal rules have been considered and are not expected to have any appreciable impact on the estimated real estate cost. All lands needed for the project have been appraised at fair market value utilizing mass appraisal techniques.

Lands in which the non-Federal sponsor has a real estate interest as the result of the previous local cooperation Federal project for the existing levee system are not included in the cost estimate that follows. Contingencies that have been added to the fair market value take into account unknown property splits, undetected improvements, minor project design changes and any additional costs involved in the application of PL 91-646.

While the real estate requirements reflect a 12-foot levee crown/patrol road width, the crown may vary in width up to 20 feet for ease and safety of maintenance operations. Increases in the crown width from 12 to 20 feet can be accommodated by a corresponding reduction in the size of the Temporary Work Area Easement that parallels the base of the levee, without a change in the width of the project footprint. The value of the lands required for the Flood Protection Levee Easement will be applied to the additional lands that will be required for the widening of the levee crown. The value of the Flood Protection Levee Easement is greater than the value of the Temporary Work Area Easement, thus increasing the real estate cost of all alternatives. Crown widths will be refined for the selected alternative, and related real estate requirements will be described in the final Feasibility Report. Potential real estate costs associated with the wider crown width are not reflected in the tables that follow in this report, but are provided immediately below:

Modified Wide Setback Levee Alternative:

Potential real estate cost increase due to increase in levee crown = \$163,000

Overflow Barrier Alternative:

Potential real estate cost increase due to increase in levee crown = \$76,000

Additional borrow material will be required to construct the wider levee under this alternative. Real estate cost for a 14 acre borrow easement = \$92,000

Total = \$168,000

A gross level appraisal was completed for all alternatives in March 2002. For the feasibility study, no detailed and site specific appraisal or parcel-by-parcel valuation is performed. The gross appraisal provides a broad estimate of the value of real estate to be included in the alternatives under study.

## FLOOD BARRIER

<b>ESTATES and Other TAKES</b>	<b>ACRES or UNITS</b>	<b>LERRDS COST</b>
Flood Protection Levee Easement	103.68	\$807,337
Permanent Easement for Occasional Flowage	1,774.36	\$2,240,563
Temp. Work Area Easement	49.06	\$54,646
Permanent Easement for Occasional Flowage and Temp. Work Area Easement	41.6	\$24,075
Roads	12	\$12,000
Structures	1	\$50,000
Severance	10% of above	\$318,862
Relocations	1	\$22,500

Total Ownerships - 28

Total LERRDS \$ - \$3,529,983

### NOTES:

A drainage ditch along the northern toe of the flood barrier is included in the flood protection levee easement estate above.

An encroachment permit from CALTRANS to the non-Federal sponsor would provide for placement of drainage pipes under I-5. No drainage ditch easement would be required.

**NARROW SETBACK LEVEE**

<b>ESTATES</b>	<b>ACRES</b>	<b>LERRDS COST</b>
Flood Protection Levee Easement	145.66	\$1,208,985
Channel Improvement Easement	21.34	\$190,854
Permanent Flowage Easement	856.67	\$8,373,571
Temp. Work Area Easement	69.57	\$112,814
Road Easement	1.23	\$10,595
Borrow Easement	135.43	\$677,134
Flood Protection Levee Easement and Road Easement	1.54	\$10,110
Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	55.99	\$570,434
Roads	9	\$9,000
Structures	10	\$741,956
Severance	10% of above	\$1,190,545
Relocations	10	\$225,000

Total Ownerships - 86

Total LERRDS \$ - \$13,320,998

**WIDE SETBACK LEVEE**

<b>ESTATES</b>	<b>ACRES</b>	<b>LERRDS COST</b>
Flood Protection Levee Easement	221.29	\$1,631,560
Channel Improvement Easement	10.88	\$62,146
Permanent Flowage Easement	1919.33	\$20,737,647
Temp. Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	87.69	\$711,953
Drainage Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	9.59	\$55,737
Borrow Easement	135.34	\$676,687
Permanent Flowage Easement and Borrow Easement	84.22	\$600,652
Roads	13	\$13,000
Structures	58	\$8,343,628
Severance	10% of above	\$3,283,211
Relocations	58	\$1,300,000

Total Ownerships - 106

Total LERRDS \$ - \$37,415,321

**MODIFIED WIDE SETBACK LEVEE**

<b>ESTATES</b>	<b>ACRES</b>	<b>LERRDS COST</b>
Flood Protection Levee Easement	209	\$1,788,825
Channel Improvement Easement	.06	\$559
Permanent Flowage Easement and Fee	1587	\$18,139,323
Drainage Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	7.82	\$45,163
Borrow Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	96.12	\$567,262
Temporary Work Area Easement and Permanent Flowage Easement	91.58	\$695,088
Temp. Work Area Easement	70	\$534,262
Temporary Work Area Easement and Flood Protection Levee Easement	3.13	\$19,374
Borrow Easement	135.51	\$677,216
Roads	9	\$9,000
Structures	32	\$5,444,658
Severance	10% of above	\$2,792,073
Relocations	32	\$717,500

Total Ownerships - 95

Total LERRDS \$ - \$ 31,430,303

## COST SUMMARY BY ALTERNATIVE

Fair Market Value of the project real estate requirements, potential relocations, severance, and contingencies are included in Acquisition Costs that follow. Non-Federal and Federal Administrative Costs to acquire real estate requirements and perform relocations are also shown below.

### Flood Barrier

ACQUISITION COSTS	NON-FEDERAL ADM. COSTS	FEDERAL ADM. REVIEW COSTS	TOTAL
\$5,284,000	\$2,764,920	\$528,500	\$8,577,420

### Narrow Setback Levee

ACQUISITION COSTS	NON-FEDERAL ADM. COSTS	FEDERAL ADM. REVIEW COSTS	TOTAL
\$16,595,000	\$7,513,150	\$1,376,900	\$25,485,050

### Wide Setback Levee

ACQUISITION COSTS	NON-FEDERAL ADM. COSTS	FEDERAL ADM. REVIEW COSTS	TOTAL
\$46,444,000	\$9,502,550	\$1,666,300	\$57,612,850

### Modified Wide Setback Levee

ACQUISITION COSTS	NON-FEDERAL ADM. COSTS	FEDERAL ADM. REVIEW COSTS	TOTAL
\$38,410,000	\$8,713,400	\$1,523,900	\$48,647,300

**14. Acquisition Schedule.** A detailed acquisition task list is shown on the following table. No schedule for this project has been developed to date. The non-Federal sponsor will be directed to begin real property acquisitions for the project only after the PCA is fully executed. The non-Federal sponsor is aware of the risks of initiating the acquisition process in advance of the PCA being signed.

<b>TASK</b>	<b>COE START</b>	<b>COE FINISH</b>	<b>NFS START</b>	<b>NFS FINISH</b>
Receipt of final drawings from Engineering	Sep2003	May2005		
Execution of PCA	Jan2004	Jan2005	Jan2004	Jan2005
Formal transmittal of final ROW drawings and instruction to acquire LERRDS	Jun2005			
Conduct landowner meetings	TBD		TBD	
Prepare/review mapping and legal descriptions	TBD		TBD	
Obtain/review title evidence	TBD		TBD	
Obtain/review tract appraisals	TBD		TBD	
Conduct negotiations	TBD		TBD	
Perform closing	TBD		TBD	
Prepare/review condemnations	TBD		TBD	
Obtain possession	TBD		TBD	
Complete/review PL 91-646 benefit assistance	TBD		TBD	
Conduct/review facility and utility relocations	TBD		TBD	
Certify all necessary LERRDS are available for construction	TBD		TBD	
Prepare and submit credit requests	TBD		TBD	
Review/approve or deny credit requests	TBD		TBD	
Establish value for creditable LERRDS in F&A cost accounting system	TBD		TBD	

NFS: Non-Federal Sponsor COE: Corps of Engineers

\* TBD=To be determined when an alternative is selected for cost sharing.

**15. Assessment of Non-Federal Sponsor’s Real Estate Capacity**

Non-Federal Sponsor: The non-Federal sponsor is the State of California Reclamation Board with the City of Woodland participating as the local sponsor.

I. Legal Authority:

- a. Does the sponsor have legal authority to acquire and hold title to real property for project purposes? **YES**
- b. Does the sponsor have the power of eminent domain for this project? **YES**
- c. Does the sponsor have “quick-take” authority for this project? **YES**

- d. Are any of the lands/interests inland required for the project located outside the sponsor's political boundary? **No**
- e. Are any of the lands/interests in land required for the project owned by an entity whose property the sponsor cannot condemn? **No**

II. Human Resource Requirements:

- a. Will the sponsor's in-house staff require training to become familiar with the real estate requirements of Federal projects, including P.L. 91-646, as amended? **No**
- b. If the answer to II.a. is "yes," has a reasonable plan been developed to provide such training?
- c. Does the sponsor's in-house staff have sufficient real estate acquisition experience to meet its responsibilities for the project? **Yes**
- d. Is the sponsor's in-house staffing level sufficient considering its other workload, if any, and the project schedule? **N/A**
- e. Can the sponsor obtain contractor support, if required, in timely fashion? **Yes**
- f. Will the sponsor likely request USACE assistance in acquiring real estate? **No**

III. Other Project Variables:

- a. Will the sponsor's staff office be located within reasonable proximity to the project site? **YES**
- b. Has the sponsor approved the project real estate schedule/milestones? **N/A**

IV. Overall Assessment:

- a. Has the sponsor performed satisfactorily on other USACE projects? **YES**
- b. With regard to this project, the sponsor is anticipated to be: California State Department of Water Resources

V. Coordination:

- a. Has this assessment been coordinated with the sponsor? **YES**
- b. Does the Sponsor concur with this assessment? **YES**

**16. National Economic Plan and Locally Preferred Plan**

**The Flood Barrier Plan** is the National Economic Plan.

As of the date of this submission the non-Federal sponsors have not selected a Locally Preferred Plan.

**EXHIBIT A**

Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study				
ROAD & BRIDGE RELOCATIONS				
ROAD & BRIDGE RELOCATIONS		Length	ROW 1/	Modification
<b>Flood Barrier Plan</b>				
0	County Road 19B	300'	Probably	Raise roadway
1	County Road 97A	1200'	Yes	Raise roadway
2	State Hwg 16	2880'	No	Raise roadway
3	County Road 99	3450	No	Raise roadway
4	Dubach Field Road	1200'	No	Raise roadway
5	County Road 101	5400'	No	Raise roadway
6	County Road 102	5700'	No	Raise roadway
<b>Narrow Setback Levee Plan</b>				
Bridges 4/				
7	CR 102	400'	No	Design floods > 200-yr
8	State Hwg 113	300'	No	Design floods > 200-yr
9	I-5 & CR 99W	300'	No	Design floods > 500-yr
10	Railroad	300'	No	Design floods > 400-yr
Roads				
11	CR 17B	800'	Yes	
12	CR 97B	1150'	Yes	
13	CR 97A	700'	Yes	
<b>Wide Setback Levee Plan</b>				
Roads				
11	CR 17B	TBD	Yes	
12	CR 97B	3600'	Yes	
13	CR 97A	4100'	Yes	
Bridges 5/				
<b>Modified Wide Setback Levee Plan</b>				
Roads				
11	CR 17	TBD	Yes	
12	CR 18 & 18A	3600'	Yes	
13	CR 97A	4100'	Yes	
9	I-5 Ramps AC & AB	TBD	No	
Bridges				
7	CR 102	400'	No	
8	Highway 13	300'	No	
9	CR 99W	300'	No	
9	I-5 NB & SB	300'	No	
10	Railroad	300'	No	
1/ Additional ROW needed for relocated facility				
2/ Bridge lengths do not include approaches, only approx length of the structure				
3/ Facilities located within road ROW				
4/ Relocations are not anticipated for design floods < 500-year				
5/ No bridges have been identified as needing relocation for this alternative (work in progress)				

Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study						
Road & Utility Relocations						
			Underground 1/			
UTILITY RELOCATIONS			Overhead	Public	Private	Other
<b>Barrier Levee Alt</b>						
0		CR 19B at FBL	OHE, P			2/
1		CR 97A at FBL	OHE, P, C			
2		State Hwg 16 at FBL	OHE			
3		CR 99 at FBL	OHE, P, C	W	G	
4		Dubach Field Rd / RR	OHE, P, C			3/
5		CR 101at FBL	OHE, P, C, T/L	W	G	
6		CR 102 at FBL	OHE, P, C		FO	
<b>Setback Levee Alternative (Min RE, Lot of rock)</b>						
7		CR 102 at CC	OHE, P, C			
8		Hwg 113 at CC	OHE,P, C	W	G	
9		I-5 at CC	None			
9		Hwg 16 at CC	OHE			
10		Railroad	OHE, P			
11		CR 17B at SB levee	OHE			
12		CR 97B at SB levee	OHE, P			
13		CR 97A at SB levee	OHE		G	?
<b>Setback Levee Alternative (Minimum rock)</b>						
7		CR 102 at CC	OHE,P, C			
8		Hwg 113 at CC	OHE,P, C	W	G	
9		I-5 at CC	None			
9		Hwg 16 at CC	OHE			
10		Railroad	OHE, P, C			
11		CR 17B at SB levee	OHE			
12		CR 97B at SB levee	OHE, P, C			
13		CR 97A at SB levee	OHE		G	
<b>Legend</b>						
OHE	Overhead Electric					
P	Phone					
C	Cable					
W	Water					
SS	Sewer					
FO	Fiber Optic					
FBL	Flood Barrier Levee					
SB	Setback Levee					
T/L	Transmission Line					
<b>Notes</b>						
1/	Underground facilities identified by drive by inspection of site (not a records search)					
2/	Unkown vault					
3/	Cased UG utility					

Relocations for RE

