



The outlined area on the map above illustrates the area that flooded during the 1997 flood. This area, and possibly a larger area, would likely flood again in the future if no action is taken.

Alternative 1

“No Action” Alternative

The Corps of Engineers always studies what would happen if the Corps did not put a flood protection plan in place at all. This gives the community an understanding of the “baseline” existing conditions. Some highlights of the “no action” alternative include:

- There is a 1 in 26 chance of flooding in the downtown area in any given year. And as much as a 1 in 15 chance of flooding in the area near Vista. Flood damages now cost us about \$31 million a year, averaged over all years. Of course, flooding doesn’t happen every year, but all at once. For example, the 1997 flood caused between \$500 and \$600 million in damages.
- No project also means that the existing floodwalls and levees would not be repaired leaving us vulnerable to even less than 100-year floods.
- No project means the community would have to find other ways to restore sections of the river and to improve recreation and access to the river.

Alternative 2

Floodwalls and Setback Levees Alternative

The basic elements of the original Corps of Engineers 1986 plan are included in this alternative. The floodwalls and levees have been moved as far away from the river as possible to allow for as much restoration and recreation as possible. Key features of this alternative include:

- Repair or build walls and levees (2 – 11 feet high) with walls in the residential areas.
- The walls and levees contain the floodwaters, which would raise the water surface above the 1997 levels.
- Containment may also increase downstream flows by as much as 4,000 cubic feet per second at the peak of a flood.
- Internal drainage (how to get rid of the water that accumulates behind the walls and levees) still needs to be considered.

This alternative is estimated (preliminary estimate only) at \$230 – \$250 million; the local government share would be in the \$115 million range; the Corps of Engineers would pay for the remainder.



The highlighted areas on the map above show where Alternative 2 would locate floodwalls and setback levees.

Alternative 3

Floodwalls and Setback Levees with Detention Basin Alternative

This alternative is designed to control floodwaters in the Truckee Meadows without sending additional waters downstream at the peak of the flood. Key features include:

- Repair or build walls and levees (2 – 11 feet high) with walls in the residential areas.
- A detention basin on UNR Farms would store increased peak flows that are created by containing the floodwaters within walls and levees. The concept of diverting water into the basin and later releasing it must be addressed.
- Internal drainage (how to get rid of the water that accumulates behind the walls and levees) still needs to be considered.

This alternative is estimated (preliminary estimate only) at \$230 – \$250 million; the local government share would be in the \$115 million range; the Corps of Engineers would pay for the remainder.

Alternative 4

The Community Coalition Plan Alternative

This Plan emphasizes restoring the Truckee River to a more natural state. (Refer to pages 4 and 5 for a detailed map.) Key features (as highlighted in this newsletter) include:

- Structural elements including natural-looking terraces that incorporate set-back levees within landscaped parkways.
- Remove, replace or modify dams, diversions and bottlenecks.
- Enable the river to naturally handle flooding by recreating the floodplain and restoring natural river meanders.
- Mitigate construction impacts and any increased downstream flooding.
- Protect the investment in flood management.

This alternative is estimated (preliminary estimate only) at \$230 – \$250 million; the local government share would be in the \$97 million range; the Corps of Engineers would pay for the remainder.

Costs and Financial Feasibility

The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that these flood management alternatives would each cost between \$230 and \$250 million. Of this, the federal government will pay between 50 and 75 percent, depending on the types of solutions proposed. To obtain federal funds, the community must provide the remainder of the funding. That means the total local investment is only about 15 percent of the damages suffered in the 1997 flood alone. Here is how the flood management plan could be funded:

- The majority of the cost, at least \$115 – \$125 million, will be paid by the federal government.
- Local governments can get “credit” for lands they currently own – parks, for example.
- The 1/8-penny sales tax, which was enacted in 1999, can only be used for public safety and flood prevention. It can help fund a community-approved flood management plan. A Washoe County resident has been paying only about 50 cents a month through the 1/8-penny sales tax.
- A benefit-based assessment can be levied on properties that directly benefit from the flood project or that especially contribute to flooding.



The white lines in this alternative show approximate locations of floodwalls and set-back levees. The red line defines the general area where a detention basin would be formed by surrounding floodwalls and setback levees.