

**Table ES-1. Summary Comparison Between the No-Action, the LCCFB, and the MWSL Plans**

	<b>No Action</b>	<b>LCCFB Plan (NED)</b>	<b>MWSL Plan</b>
<b>1. PLAN DESCRIPTION</b>			
Annual Performance (chance of being exceeded in any year)	1 in 10	1 in 500	1 in 500
Conditional Annual Percent Chance of not Flooding for 100-year event		97.3%	89.3%
<b>2. IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>			
<b>A. Economic</b>			
(1) First Costs	\$0	\$40,973,000	\$152,594,000
(2) Total Investment Cost	\$0	\$43,761,000	\$162,975,000
(3) Annual Cost	\$0	\$2,923,000	\$10,936,000
(4) Total Annual Benefits	\$0	\$11,541,000	\$12,550,000
(5) Annual Net Benefits	\$0	\$8,618,000	\$1,614,000
(6) Benefit-to-Cost Ratio	NA	3.9	1.1
<b>B. Environmental Quality (EQ)</b>			
(1) Air/Noise	Normal air quality and noise levels created by traffic, business, and industrial activities.	Temporary increased air quality pollutant and noise levels during 2-year construction period.	Temporary increased air quality pollutant and noise levels during 3-year construction period.
(2) Vegetation & Wildlife	Existing vegetation typical for streams in northern California. Good habitat for woodland songbirds and urban wildlife.	Permanent loss of 137 acres to project features.	Permanent loss of 199 acres to project features.
(3) Land Use	No effect	Converts 104 acres of agricultural lands to flood control uses; loss of 100 acres of prime farmland.	Converts 216 acres of agricultural lands to flood control uses; loss of 158 acres of prime farmland and indirect effects to farm operations on 1,254 acres of prime farmland between the setback levees.
(4) Special Status Species	Loss of habitat associated with rehabilitation and maintenance of existing levee system (2,100 linear feet of riprap and 6 miles of new levee construction).	Loss of habitat (160 acres and 100 trees) affecting Swainson's hawk, giant garder snake, northwestern pond turtle, steelhead, and Chinook salmon.	Loss of habitat (199 acres and 1,176 trees) affecting: valley elderberry longhorn beetle (100 stems direct, 200 stems indirect), Swainson's hawk, giant garder snake, northwestern pond turtle, steelhead and chinook salmon.

**Table ES-1. Summary Comparison Between the No-Action, the LCCFB, and the MWSL Plans**

	<b>No Action</b>	<b>LCCFB Plan (NED)</b>	<b>MWSL Plan</b>
(5) Settling Basin	No effect	Possible effect on the distribution of sediments within basin. No decrease in project life of basin. Removal of 1 mile of training levee.	Possible effect on the distribution of sediments within basin. Substantial increase in peak floodflows into the settling basin. No decrease in project life of basin. Removal of 2 miles training levee.
(6) Cultural Resources & Historic Properties	Cultural resources and historic properties subject to flood damages from events greater than 1 in 20 chance.	Protects cultural resources and historic properties in Woodland (south of the LCCFB). Resources and historic properties between Cache Creek and the LCCFB would remain subject to flood damages.	Archeological and historic sites could be affected by levee construction, degradation of the present levee, and accelerated erosion. Once levee construction is complete, all archeological and historic sites on the landside of the MWSL would be protected.
<b>C. Other Social Effects</b>			
(1) Life, Health, and Safety	Significant flood threat to one-third of Woodland.	Reduces flood threat to Woodland.	Reduces flood threat to city of Woodland and to residents “behind” the setback levees.
(2) Community Cohesion (displacement of people & businesses)	Increased insurance costs to owners within the FEMA floodplain. Additional costs to develop properties within the FEMA floodplain.	Some displacement of residents north of flood barrier levee. Flood depths and durations increased in some areas north of flood barrier levee requiring the acquisition of occasional flowage easements (1,816 acres), the acquisition and relocation of one resident and structural measures to mitigate for induced flooding at six residential properties.	Increased displacement of residents and agricultural operations to residents between the new levees. Requires the acquisition of permanent flowage easements (1,679 acres) and the acquisition and relocation of 32 residential and business structures.
<b>3. PLAN EVALUATION</b>			
<b>A. Contribution to Planning Objectives</b>			
(1) Efficiently reduces flood damages to maximum practical extent	Average Annual Flood Damages (AAD) is \$12,429,000. Does not meet objective	Residual AAD = \$888,000 for a 93% reduction in AAD. Meets objective.	Residual AAD = \$794,000 for a 94% reduction in AAD. Meets objective.

**Table ES-1. Summary Comparison Between the No-Action, the LCCFB, and the MWSL Plans**

	<b>No Action</b>	<b>LCCFB Plan (NED)</b>	<b>MWSL Plan</b>
(2) Provide optimum level of flood protection	Damage outputs starting at the 20-year flood level. Does not meet objective	1 in 500 chance for Woodland, NED plan. Meets objectives.	1 in 500 chance for Woodland and most of the floodplain. Meets objectives
(3) Minimize environmental impacts	Existing vegetation typical for streams in northern California. Excellent habitat for woodland birds and urban wildlife. Meets objective.	Permanent loss of 104 acres to project features. Temporary disturbed areas to be restored. Meets objective.	Permanent loss of 216 acres to project features. Potential loss of 2,135 acres between the levees. Temporary disturbed areas to be restored. Meets objective.
<b>B. Response to Planning Constraints</b>			
(1) Financial capability of local partners to cost-share project construction	N/A	Local cost share of \$16,092,000 is within local capabilities.	Local cost share of \$127,702,000 is not within local capabilities.
(2) Institutional acceptability	Ongoing high level of flood damages not acceptable to local partners. Does not meet constraint.	1 in 500 chance protection acceptable to local partners and meets Federal criteria. Meets constraint.	1 in 500 chance protection acceptable to local partners and meets Federal criteria. Meets constraint.
(3) Public acceptability	Not acceptable. Does not meet constraint.	Not fully acceptable. Partially meets constraint.	Not fully acceptable. Partially meets constraint.
<b>C. Response to Evaluation Criteria</b>			
(1) Completeness	Does not meet objective.	Meets objective.	Meets objective.
(2) Effectiveness	Does not meet objective.	Meets objective.	Meets objective.
(3) Efficiency	Does not meet objective.	Meets objective.	Meets objective.
(4) Acceptability	Does not meet objective.	Meets objective. Public opposition to increased flood depths and durations north of flood barrier levee.	Meets objective. No public support for conversion of agricultural land to flood control uses.