1. Administrative Details

Proposal Name: Lower San Joaquin River Feasibility Study
by Agency: Sacramento District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Locations: CA

POC Name:
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Date Submitted: 09/24/2015

Confirmation Number: 217b4847-58d4-43d6-a7c1-b76a4815d5e4
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<td>09/24/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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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 SJAFCA, are active participants in the Study. CVFPB and SJAFCA view the improvements identified in the Study as critical components of the flood damage reduction system and are fully supportive of its implementation. CVFPB and SJAFCA have the ability to provide for the required cost share of the recommended plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency</td>
<td>The non-Federal sponsors, CVFPB and SJAFCA, are active participants in the Study. CVFPB and SJAFCA view the improvements identified in the Study as critical components of the flood damage reduction system and are fully supportive of its implementation. CVFPB and SJAFCA have the ability to provide for the required cost share of the recommended plan.</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 recommends a plan for further improving levee performance and further reducing the risk of levee failure along the San Joaquin River and their tributaries in the cities of Stockton, Lathrop, and Manteca. USACE is preparing the Study Report to recommend improvements to reduce the risk of flooding in the cities of Stockton, Lathrop, Manteca and surrounding urbanizing areas. The general authority for flood control investigations in the San Joaquin River Basin is in Section 2 and 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 (Pub. L. 74-738) and amended by the Flood Control Act of 1938 (Pub. L. 75-761). Currently the feasibility report excludes Reclamation District 17 (RD-17) improvements from the recommended plan due to USACE Executive Order 11988 (EO 11988) policy compliance issues. The State is currently working with local jurisdictions in RD-17 basin; City of Lathrop, City of Manteca, City of Stockton, County of San Joaquin, and RD-17, to develop a plan that would protect over 43,000 people currently residing there with consideration of wise-use of floodplain and identifying multi-benefit alternatives. Once State and locals have completed their alternative analysis, the final alternative, which would be different than the existing proposed USACE alternatives and should be EO 11988 compliant, would be brought back to USACE for consideration. Depending on the status of the existing Study, we would request to either include the RD-17 back into the Study or consider a follow-up study to supplement the Study’s final recommendation. The non-Federal sponsors look forward to resolution of this issue and are seeking full federal cost share of the RD-17 improvements as part of the NED. The USACE has concluded that specific authorization from Congress is required. As such, USACE will be preparing a Chief’s Report, currently scheduled to be completed by June 2016.
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>$4,382,500</td>
<td>$4,247,500</td>
<td>$8,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$523,347,000</td>
<td>$280,402,000</td>
<td>$803,749,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation (if necessary)

The Draft Feasibility Report was released for public review in February 2015. The cost estimate presented above came from the Draft Feasibility Report.
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 existing levee system within the area protects over 71,000 acres of mixed use land with a current population estimated at 264,000 residents and an estimated $21 billion in damageable property. The recommended project; subject of the Study, 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 recommended in the 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 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)
September 23, 2015

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

Subject: Proposal 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 by the State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) for inclusion of a Section 7001 proposal for construction authorization of the project recommended in the Lower San Joaquin Feasibility Study (Study) Report. CVFPB requests the Study recommendation 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 report 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.wrrda7001propsals.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 Study Report to recommend improvements to reduce the risk of flooding in the cities of Stockton, Lathrop, Manteca and surrounding urbanizing areas. The general authority for flood control investigations in the San Joaquin River Basin is in Section 2 and 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 (Pub. L. 74-738) and amended by the Flood Control Act of 1938 (Pub. L. 75-761).

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

USACE completed and certified a section 905(b) analysis and concluded the project requires specific authorization from Congress. As such, USACE will be preparing a Chief’s Report for the Study.
(iii) *have not been congressionally authorized;*

The improvements proposed in the Study have not been previously 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.*

USACE has the authority and capability to execute the project upon authorization by Congress with full support of the non-federal sponsors.

The cost estimate for the recommended plan as presented in the draft Report is $803.75 million with an estimated Federal cost of $523.35 million and an estimated non-Federal cost of $280.4 million.

Currently the feasibility report excludes Reclamation District 17 (RD-17) improvements from the recommended plan due to USACE Executive Order 11988 (EO 11988) policy compliance issues. The State is currently working with local jurisdictions in RD-17 basin; City of Lathrop, City of Manteca, City of Stockton, County of San Joaquin, and RD-17, to develop a plan that would protect over 43,000 people currently residing there with consideration of wise-use of floodplain and identifying multi-benefit alternatives. Once State and locals have completed their alternative analysis, the final alternative, which would be different than the existing proposed USACE alternatives and should be EO 11988 compliant, would be brought back to USACE for consideration. Depending on the status of the existing Study, we would request to either include the RD-17 back into the Study or consider a follow-up study to supplement the Study’s final recommendation. The non-Federal sponsors look forward to resolution of this issue and are seeking full federal cost share of the RD-17 improvements as part of the NED.

The existing levee system within the area protects over 71,000 acres of mixed use land with a current population estimated at 264,000 residents and an estimated $21 billion in damageable property. 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.

The recommended plan includes:

- 20 miles of cut-off wall seepage remediation to existing levees along Mosher Slough, Fourteen-Mile Slough, Ten Mile Slough, the lower Calaveras River, San Joaquin River and French Camp Slough.
- Closure structure on Fourteen-Mile Slough
- Closure structure on Smith Canal
• 3 miles of seismic remediation
• 6.1 miles of Levee reshaping and strengthening along Fourteen-Mile Slough
• 5 miles of erosion protection along Fourteen-Mile Slough

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. SJAFCA and CVFPB have been the non-Federal sponsors for the Study and intend to provide the non-Federal cost sharing for the authorized project.

Central Valley Flood Protection Board

[Signature]

Leslie Gallagher,
Central Valley Flood Protection Board
Executive Officer

cc: (see attached page)