1. Administrative Details

Proposal Name: Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study

by Agency: Sacramento District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Locations: CA

POC Name:

POC Phone:

POC Email:

Date Submitted: 09/24/2015

Confirmation Number: 91228825-9d36-40ea-bfad-cd3e8010f78e

Supporting Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Date Uploaded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cache Creek FS Section 7001.pdf</td>
<td>09/24/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Provide the name of the primary sponsor and all non-Federal interests that have contributed or are expected to contribute toward the non-Federal share of the proposed feasibility study or modification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Letter of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Primary)</td>
<td>The non-Federal sponsors, CVFPB and Woodland, are active participants in the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study. CVFPB and Woodland view the modifications identified in the Feasibility Report as critical components of the flood risk reduction for the City of Woodland. The non-Federal sponsors have the ability to provide for the required cost share of the plan resulting from the GRR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Woodland</td>
<td>The non-Federal sponsors, CVFPB and Woodland, are active participants in the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study. CVFPB and Woodland view the modifications identified in the Feasibility Report as critical components of the flood risk reduction for the City of Woodland. The non-Federal sponsors have the ability to provide for the required cost share of the plan resulting from the GRR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. State if this proposal is for a feasibility study, a modification to an authorized USACE feasibility study or a modification to an authorized USACE project. If it is a proposal for a modification, provide the authorized water resources development feasibility study or project name.

[x] Feasibility Study
4. Clearly articulate the specific project purpose(s) of the proposed study or modification. Demonstrate that the proposal is related to USACE mission and authorities and specifically address why additional or new authorization is needed.

The Study will recommend a plan for improving levee performance and increasing flood risk reduction along the Lower Cache Creek, providing the City of Woodland with increased flood protection. The basic authority for USACE to study water resource related issues in the Lower Cache Creek and Sacramento River is found in Section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Pub. L. No. 87-875, § 209, 76 Stat. 1180, 1196-98 (1962)), which authorizes studies for flood control in northern California. The current report is being prepared as a feasibility study of the Lower Cache Creek, which was authorized by Section 101(a) (1) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) 1996.
5. To the extent practicable, provide an estimate of the total cost, and the Federal and non-Federal share of those costs, of the proposed study and, separately, an estimate of the cost of construction or modification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation (if necessary)

Due to the 3x3x3 rescoping completed by USACE the total project cost may be adjusted in the future.
6. To the extent practicable, describe the anticipated monetary and nonmonetary benefits of the proposal including benefits to the protection of human life and property; improvement to transportation; the national economy; the environment; or the national security interests of the United States.

The recommended project, subject of the Feasibility Report, is intended to reduce the risk to human life and property. The non-Federal sponsors are eager to move forward with a project that is in accordance with State Laws and regulations to achieve a minimum 200-year risk reduction for urban areas. SB 5 defines urban areas as having 10,000 residents or greater.
7. Does local support exist? If ‘Yes’, describe the local support for the proposal.

[x] Yes

Local Support Description

This letter documents the non-Federal support for inclusion of a proposal for construction authorization of the project resulting from the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study. Include the recommended project in the Annual Report to Congress directed in Section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014. We recognize that the feasibility report must be approved by USACE in a Chief of Engineers Report before the project can be authorized for construction.

8. Does the primary sponsor named in (2.) above have the financial ability to provide for the required cost share?

[x] Yes
Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)
Lower Cache Creek FS Section 7001.pdf
September 23, 2015

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Attn: CECW-CE (Lisa Kiefel)
441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20314-1000

Subject: Proposals from Non-Federal Interests to be Included in the February 2016 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development

Dear Ms. Kiefel:

This letter documents the non-Federal support of the State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) for the inclusion of a section 7001 proposal for the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study. CVFPB requests the proposed modification be included in the Annual Report to Congress directed in Section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014. We recognize that the feasibility study must be approved by the USACE in a Chief of Engineers Report before the project can be authorized for construction.

This proposal has been submitted online as required at http://www.wrrda7001proposals.us/ and meets all the criteria for inclusion in the Annual Report appendix. The five criteria set forth in Section 7001 of Public law 113-121 are met as follows:

(A) CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report only those feasibility reports, proposed feasibility studies, and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies that—

(i) are related to the missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers;

USACE is preparing the Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study to recommend improvements to reduce the risk of flooding to the City of Woodland. The general authority for the feasibility study is in Section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874).

(ii) require specific congressional authorization, including by an Act of Congress;

USACE determined that a feasibility study would result in a recommended plan that would increase flood protection for the City of Woodland. Because the study has not determined a recommendation there has been no specific congressional authorization for construction.
(iii) have not been congressionally authorized;

The study's proposed alternatives are still being evaluated and have not been congressionally authorized.

(iv) have not been included in any previous annual report; and

This proposal was not included in the 2014 Annual Report.

(v) if authorized, could be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

After a recommendation is made from the study, construction could be carried out by USACE.

The cost estimate for the Study is $5.2 million developed by USACE with an estimated federal cost of $2.6 million and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2.6 million.

This feasibility study will be developed in accordance with USACE guidance document EC 1165-2-214, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC/QA), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-214) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

USACE leadership to complete this study is appreciated and we look forward to the Chief’s Report and eventual Congressional authorization of a project for this urban area. The City of Woodland and CVFPB have been the non-Federal sponsors for the feasibility study and intend to continue to provide the non-Federal cost share for the feasibility study.

Central Valley Flood Protection Board

[Signature]

Leslie Gallagher,
Central Valley Flood Protection Board
Executive Officer

cc: (see attached page)