

## Project Summary Sheet

**Project Name:** Scilacci Farm Flood and Conservation Project

**Tracking No:** 200784102

**Location:** North and West of Lincoln in Placer County.

**County:** Placer

**Project Sponsor:** Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

**Point of Contact:** Brian Keating (530) 745-7592

**Co-applicant(s):** None

**Assembly District:** # 4 Ted Gaines

**Senate District:** # 1 Dave Cox

**Project Summary:** Grant funding would support the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) and its co-sponsors efforts to acquire flood and conservation easements to improve the floodplain and wetland habitat resources on Scilacci Farms, a 456-acre property north and west of Lincoln along Coon Creek in western Placer County (see Figure 1, Project Location Map). The project co-sponsors include Ducks Unlimited, Placer County Planning Department, and Placer County Redevelopment Agency. The District's purchase of 330 acres of flood and conservation easements on this rice production land will compliment efforts on agricultural lands immediately to the east including a Department of Water Resources (DWR) protected site that also provides improved floodplain and riparian protection. These adjacent properties include the 138-acre Lakeview Farms Conservation project which was awarded a grant through the same Flood Corridor Protection Program several years earlier, as well as the Lakeview Farms NCRS easements that are part of a larger restoration effort. Wetlands habitat will be reconstructed to the primary benefit of the numerous waterfowl and migratory birds that are found in the area.

Acquisition of flood and conservation easements on Scilacci Farms will:

- Conserve 330 acres of agricultural land adjacent to Coon Creek in an area of increasing development pressure
- Quickly and efficiently provide approximately 500 acre-feet of increased volumetric storage (retention) within the existing floodplain during a 100-year flood event (Phase I). Provide approximately 800 acre-feet of increased retention during a 100-year flood event over the long term (Phase II).
- Preserve and maintain surrogate wetlands
- Preserve open space, providing linkages with surrounding preserve areas
- Benefit migratory birds and wildlife

- Maintain habitat and connectivity for state and federal species of concern (Central Valley Steelhead, Chinook Salmon, Swainson's Hawk, Northern Harrier, California Sandhill Crane, White-tailed Kite, Western Pond Turtle, and potentially Giant Garter Snake)
- Helps secure balance of property -- 119 acres of riparian woodlands and adjacent wheat field -- for future habitat restoration
- Provide flood control benefits quickly and at relatively low cost per acre-foot of storage (a proposed project schedule is included in Section VI, Part E)

**Flood Benefits:** The proposed project provides 500 acre-feet of on site transitory storage of floodwater on the rice fields. There are no structures that are directly protected by the project, but adding the ability to retain floodwater onsite until peak flows in the Natomas Cross Canal and Sacramento River have passed would incrementally help protect the Natomas Area.

**Agricultural Benefits:** Per application, the sponsor is not currently working with a local ag conservancy or land trust. But, they have an established working relationship with Placer Land Trust. If this project is selected for funding, an appropriate entity will be identified to monitor the agricultural conservation easement for maintaining agricultural production on site rather than allowing development of the property. The main development threat is subdivision for ranchettes.

**Agricultural Land Conserved:** 330 acres

**Wildlife Benefits:** n/a

**Wildlife Habitat Conserved:** n/a

**Total area conserved:** 330 acres

**Other Benefits:**

**Total Cost:** \$3,492,000

**FPCP Cost:** \$2,842,000

**Funding Partners and Share of Cost:** Local Funds contributed is \$650,000.

1. Is there a full hydrologic report with the application, or is there simply an engineer's opinion? Either way, what is the conclusion as to the anticipated flood benefits of the project?

There are older hydrologic reports from the 1990's. The District would update the existing reports to include the Lakeview Farms and Scilacci Farms improvements before

implementation. Application signed by District Engineer sites 500 acre feet of transitory flood storage gained with first phase of project and additional 300 acre feet from phase two. District report from 1993 sited and a County report prepared by CH2MHill in 1994 is sited.

2. What exactly will the FPCP funds pay for?

FPCP funds will pay for flood easement on agricultural lands and modifications to that property to allow additional flood storage capacity.

- a. If the project applicant indicated they could accept less – then what (if anything) would be cut from the project? (What is lost by providing less FPCP grant money?)

Reduced funding of \$1,082,000 could fund the purchase of the flood easement and operational modifications to allow for up to 500 acre feet of additional flood water storage.

Full funding would allow for completion of second phase, raising and improving berms surrounding rice fields. Estimated total storage capacity after these improvements amount to 800 acre feet of storage.

- b. Does the applicant have access to alternate funding to replace the amount deducted from their request so that they can still spend the total amount they requested? If so, what would be the alternate funding source(s) and is the alternate funding already allocated, promised or committed?

No alternative funding sources have been identified.

- c. When giving a project score credit for matching funds, how much of the funding is matched? What is the source of the matching funds and are the matching funds already committed?

There is \$650,000 of “matched” local funding already allocated – sources are listed as Placer County Redevelopment Agency; Placer County Planning Department; Ducks Unlimited.

3. If there is funding for acquisition of property, what is the type of ownership? Easement? Fee title? Or Both?
  - a. Who will own the easement or fee title? DWR? Project applicant? Other?

Title to the property will remain in the Scilacci family name, however, a flood and conservation easement will be issued to the Placer County Flood Control and Water

Conservation District. A second party encumbrance with a local trustee agency, if required under this program, will be pursued as necessary.

4. Does any portion of the project site have mitigation bank potential for DWR to gain mitigation credits for its maintenance program? (Note: Mitigation property would need to be within 40 miles of the disturbance area that needs to be mitigated)

This site is not a likely source for DWR mitigation unless perhaps for loss of agricultural land or enhancement of adjacent riparian habitat not included in this application.

5. Is the project USACE authorized under the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA)? If so, is there USACE funding for the project pursuant to WRDA? Should the USACE be fully funding the project?

The project has not officially been authorized by the USACE. There is no USACE funding identified for this project.

6. Can the management of transitory water storage on the site be optimized for flood benefit? (look to the hydrology report for info on this). Is the applicant willing to work with DWR on water management during extreme flood events?

Yes, this project is designed around flooding agricultural property as needed for water storage.

The project would be operated using the Verona gage on the Sacramento River.