APPENDIX A - CALFED Agencies

Participating CALFED agencies include:

- California Resources Agencies: California Bay-Delta Authority, State Parks, Department of Water Resources (DWR), Department of Fish and Game (DFG), Reclamation Board, Delta Protection Commission, Department of Conservation, and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission;

- California Environmental Protection Agency: State Water Resources Control Board;

- California Department of Health Services;

- California Department of Food and Agriculture;

- U.S. Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management;

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency;

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;

- U.S. Department of Agriculture; Natural Resources Conservation Service, Forest Service, National Marine Fisheries Services; and

- U.S Western Area Power Administration.

APPENDIX B - Related Delta Studies and Reports

Numerous studies and reports related to the Delta have been prepared over the years by Federal, State, and local agencies. Major past reports and ongoing studies related to Delta levees are listed below.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, Draft Feasibility Report and Draft Environmental Impact Statement, October 1982. This report presents the USACE's feasibility study to solve flooding and related water resources problems in the Delta. The identified problems included flooding as a result of levee deterioration, salinity intrusion into the Delta, subsidence of islands, protection of fish and wildlife resources. There was a strong potential for additional recreation facilities. The selected plan includes 165 miles of levee rehabilitation surrounding 15 islands; 650 acres for fish and wildlife mitigation; 6,000 acres for fish and wildlife enhancement; and recreation facilities for boat launching, fishing, picnicking, and trail-oriented activities. With the 1982 voter's defeat of the proposed peripheral canal, the State could not proceed with the feasibility study. As a result, the draft report was not finalized because no non-Federal sponsor was identified.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, Special Study, Initial Report, March 1993. The USACE completed this report, which presents results of studies on the water resources problems and needs of the Delta, presents an array of potential solutions, outlines a long-term management strategy for effectively protecting Delta resources, and identifies cost-effective project features for later study. The Initial Report documented technical data obtained to that point, and led to two new Corps reconnaissance studies (West Delta and North Delta).

Levee System Integrity Program Plan, Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix, CALFED Bay-Delta Program, July 2000. CALFED agencies prepared this plan to outline long-term strategy to reduce the risk to land use and associated economic activities, water supply, infrastructure, and the ecosystem from catastrophic breaching of Delta levees. Topics addressed in this report include a Delta levee base level protection plan, Delta levee special improvement projects, Delta levee subsidence plan, levee emergency management and response plan, Delta risk assessment and risk management strategy, sea level rise, ecosystem restoration program/levee program coordination, permits, adaptive management, monitoring and research, cost estimates, funding, and the Suisun Marsh levee system. This report provides the basis for the CALFED Levee System Integrity Program Plan.

Lower San Joaquin River, California, 2005. The USACE completed this reconnaissance study in 2005. Federal interest in a multipurpose water resources project (flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration) was identified and the study recommended a feasibility study. The feasibility study has yet to be initiated due to lack of non-Federal sponsor.

Pinole Shoal Management Study, California, (Delta Long-Term Management Strategy). The USACE is working with CALFED partners and stakeholders to study the potential use of dredged material, related problems associated with permitting actions, and the effects on water quality, consistent with the LSIP and CALFED ROD. The Pinole Shoal Management (Delta LTMS) study will develop a sediment management plan for the Delta, including beneficial reuse of sediment for levee reconstruction as one of the main components of the larger plan. The study will also consider specific testing protocols for this work, relevant scientific studies, and the potential for a streamlined permit effort. This effort has just been initiated and is anticipated to be completed in 2011.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study. This study will coordinate and incorporate results of the State's DRMS into a Feasibility Study/EIS/EIR (to be initiated in June 2006) to collaboratively establish the type and extent of Federal interest in programmatic and site-specific long-term levee system improvements. The Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Report/EIS/EIR is currently scheduled for completion in June 2009. The purpose of the State's DRMS is to gather data; assess existing conditions and future scenarios; identify system-wide problems, risks, standards, criteria, and strategies; and set priorities for potential levee projects and program actions. The DRMS is scheduled for completion in December 2007.

APPENDIX C- Development of Project Priorities

The USACE implemented the following steps to develop requests for proposals (RFP) in response to the CALFED Act, Public Law 108-361.

Step 1. After enactment of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-103) in November and receipt of funds in December 2005, the USACE's Sacramento District initiated efforts to prepare this report on potential levee stability projects authorized under Section 103(f)(3) of the Act.

Step 2. The USACE immediately notified Federal and non-Federal members of CALFED and stakeholders of the intent to prepare the report to Congress and solicit input on the identification of potential levee improvement projects. In the first week of January 2006, an RFP was distributed to CALFED agencies, reclamation districts, and concerned stakeholders at meetings and by mail and e-mail. The RFP emphasized that proposals should be for urgent projects – those most vulnerable levees with an imminent threat to life, property, and/or water supply – to guide the evaluation process and to set priorities consistent with the authorized but limited $90 million Federal share.

The response to the RFP was impressive. Sixty-eight responses were received with potential costs of over $1 billion. Unfortunately, the proposals did not clearly establish any serious urgency due to critical risk to life, property, and/or water supply, which provided a challenge during the initial screening and evaluation process.

Step 3. A multidisciplinary team of USACE and State experts was convened to establish and review evaluation criteria and participate in assessing the proposals. Final priorities were assigned by the USACE. It is recognized that additional project-specific evaluations (for example, planning, engineering, environmental, social and economic, and public involvement), documentation, environmental compliance, and establishment of Federal interest are necessary before design and construction may proceed.

Step 4. Proposals were initially screened to exclude any submittals that were not specific proposals submitted by (or on behalf of) potential non-Federal sponsors (that is, government bodies). For example, several letters of intent were submitted without specific proposals; these were excluded from further consideration. Several proposals were received from businesses without any government sponsorship; these were also excluded from further consideration.

The proposals were also reviewed to ensure that they addressed at least one of the eight project categories listed in Sec 103(f)(3)(D) of the Act, also listed in Section 2.1 of this report. All of the 54 remaining proposals met that criterion.

Proposals that included several identified project elements were examined to determine whether it was evident that any of the elements was functionally separable. Only one proposal with a separable element was identified. That separable element was evaluated as a separate proposal.

Evaluation of Proposals

A priority ranking of High, Medium, or Low was assigned to each proposal relative to the other proposals received. A priority ranking of Medium was used as a starting point. Beneficial and adverse considerations were then identified and considered for each proposal by the review panel, as described below. The beneficial and adverse considerations were subjectively weighed against each

other to assign a final ranking. If beneficial considerations substantially outweighed the adverse considerations, a High ranking was assigned. If adverse considerations substantially outweighed the beneficial considerations, a Low ranking was assigned. Otherwise, a Medium ranking was assigned. An explicit effort was made to maintain consistency among the priority rankings so that comparable proposals would receive comparable rankings.

Beneficial Considerations. Higher priority was assigned to:

- proposals that would best address five of the objectives in Section 103(f)(3)(A) of the Act: pertaining to "flood control, ecosystem restoration, water supply, water conveyance, and water quality…" In considering the flood damage reduction benefits of each proposal, the extent to which the proposal would reduce flood risks to life, health and safety, urban and agricultural properties, and strategic infrastructure for transportation, utilities, and water supply was considered.

- proposals that would provide multiple benefits in accordance with Section 103(a)(2)(B) of the Act.

- proposals that would protect specific recognized Federal interests, such as habitat for threatened, endangered, or migratory species of wildlife; nationally significant historic sites; the Central Valley Project; and the interstate highway system.

- the eight western Delta islands that are recognized in the State's Delta Flood Protection Act of 1988 as critical to protecting water quality because they are adjacent to major channels in the area where fresh and salt water mix (Sherman Island, Twitchell Island, Webb Tract, Bradford Island, Jersey Island, Bethel Island, Hotchkiss Tract, and Holland Tract).

- proposals that would demonstrate innovative solutions to water resource problems in the Delta.

Adverse Considerations. Lower priority was assigned to:

- study-only proposals, consistent with the USACE policy regarding the application of the Section 205 authority and similar continuing authorities. The USACE would consider the study proposals in scoping the USACE studies pursuant to Section 103(f)(3)(D) of the Act, the proposed Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study, and the Pinole Shoal Management (Delta LTMS) study for dredged material in the Delta. Eligible study proponents may be able to collaborate with the USACE as a co-sponsor of a cost-shared study and thereby receive credit for in-kind work toward the non-Federal share of the overall study cost.

- proposals that would potentially result in additional substantial near-term development within floodplains protected by levees. Development within the floodplain would continue to be at risk of flood damages even after levee improvements are completed. Executive Order 11988 requires Federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse effects associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains, and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. In accomplishing this objective, "each agency shall provide leadership and shall take action to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health, and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains in carrying out its responsibilities." As a result, the USACE has determined that these proposals

should not be given high priority for fast track implementation. Potentially growth-inducing levee project should be addressed through a comprehensive evaluation of economic, environmental, and social effects, such as the proposed Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study. Comprehensive evaluation would provide the opportunity to fully evaluate any growth-inducing effects and allow local governments to identify and implement appropriate mitigation measures such as land use policies. Local land use agencies, for example, could agree to refrain from development by funding permanent easements that would allow agricultural practices to continue. In assigning a final priority to each proposal, the extent to which the proposal would protect existing developed areas was weighed against the potential for near-term growth-inducing effects.

- proposals that did not include a cost estimate because the lack of a cost estimate precluded any evaluation of cost effectiveness. Lower priority was also assigned to proposals with a maximum submitted cost of less than $500,000 because the Federal administrative costs of implementing a very low-cost project would make it inefficient. It may be possible for the USACE to implement a low-cost proposal more efficiently as part of a larger-scale project. The proposed Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study would provide the opportunity to identify a cost-effective system-wide project.

- proposals with a maximum submitted cost in excess of $50 million. Projects exceeding that amount would quickly exhaust the total funding authorized by Congress. In USACE's judgment, it is preferable to give priority to lower cost projects so that a larger number of projects can be implemented. Giving priority to lower cost proposals would also help to ensure that the scale of the projects is appropriate for fast tracking.

- proposals that would primarily provide flood damage reduction benefits to a single landowner. The USACE policy generally precludes participation in such projects. Proposals that would also provide significant environmental, water quality or water supply benefits to the general public were not considered to have a single primary beneficiary, regardless of land ownership.

Priority List Development

After a priority ranking was assigned to each proposal, the proposals were screened based on whether the submitted cost estimate was below or above the $7 million per project Federal cost limit specified by Section 205. It was assumed that a 35 percent non-Federal share would be required for each project, consistent with other projects constructed under the authority of Section 205. A project receiving $7 million in Federal funds would therefore require a non-Federal share of $3.8 million (rounded), for a total cost of $10.8 million (rounded), which was rounded to $11 million for the purposes of screening proposals.

Many proposals were submitted with wide cost ranges. In general, the high end of the submitted cost range was used in evaluating proposals to avoid overestimating the number of proposals that could be funded. However, two proposals were submitted with cost estimates that ranged over $11 million, but not over $12 million. For those proposals, an estimated cost of $11 million was applied based on the amount of uncertainty apparent in the cost estimates and the USACE's discretion to allow non-Federal funding of additional costs.

Proposals with a total cost of $11 million or less are included on List 1 as proposals within the Section 205 cost limit. List 2 A includes all proposals, regardless of the submitted cost estimates.

Lists 1 and 2 are further divided according to whether or not a Statement of Intent to cost share the proposed project with USACE was provided. In most cases, the Statement of Intent is a separate letter of intent signed by the proposed sponsor. In a few cases, a clear statement of willingness and ability to cost-share that was included within a proposal was treated as a Statement of Intent.

Lists 1 and 2 are both divided into the following priority groups of proposals as shown in Table C-1.

Table C-1 Priority Groups

Priority Group	Statement of Intent	Priority Ranking
A1	Yes	High
A2	Yes	Medium
B1	No	High
B2	No	Medium
C1	Yes	Low
C2	No	Low

Proposals in Priority Groups A1 and A2 of List 1 would be given priority by the USACE, subject to the availability of funding. Proposals in Priority Groups B1 and B2 would be given priority if a letter of intent indicating willingness and ability to cost-share each proposal is received from an eligible non-Federal sponsor, subject to the availability of funding. Proposals in Priority Groups C1 and C2 would be given low priority and are not recommended for expedited implementation because of substantial policy issues, project cost and scope, and/or the potential for encouraging additional floodplain development. Additional evaluation is required before these projects can be assigned a higher priority.

The total submitted maximum cost for the 13 projects in List 1 for Priority Groups A1 and A2 is $86.7 million. The total submitted maximum cost for the 23 proposals in Priority Groups A1, A2, B1 and B2 is $136.7 million. Assuming that a 35 percent non-Federal cost-share would be required, the amount of Federal funds needed to fund these proposals would be approximately $89 million.

Prioritization of Proposals for Delta Levees Report to Congress

List 1: Proposals with Submitted Cost Less Than Section 205 Total Cost Limit ($11 Million)

Priority Group	*Potential Sponsor*	*Description*	*Submitted Cost*	*Statement of Intent?*	*Cost <$11 Million?*	*Positive Factors*	*Negative Factors*	*Priority*	*Comments*
A1	Bethel Island Municipal Improvement District (BIMID)	Levee improvements at Horseshoe Bend	$11M	Y	Y	Western island, Existing population and development		H	
	Brannan-Andrus Levee Maintenance District	Levee improvements	$5M	Y	Y	Existing population and development (Isleton), State Highway 12		H	
	California Department of Water Resources and The Nature Conservancy	McCormack-Williamson Tract flood control and ecosystem restoration improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Innovative solution, Interstate 5, Environmental benefits		H	
	RD 830 - Jersey Island	Levee improvements	$7M	Y	Y	Western island, Utility infrastructure, Adjacent to developed islands		H	
	RD 1607 - Van Sickle Island	Levee improvements	$0.75M	Y	Y	Environmental benefits, Important habitat, Salinity gates		H	
	RD 2059 - Bradford Island	Levee improvements	$6M	Y	Y	Western island, Important habitat, Agricultural benefits		H	
	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services (flood contingency)	Flood contingency and evacuation engineering	$0.73M	Y	Y	Non-structural floodplain management alternative		H	
A2	RD 2025 - Holland Tract	Levee improvements	$2.8M	Y	Y	Western island, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2026 - Webb Tract #1&2	Levee improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Western island		M	
	RD 2028 - Bacon Island	Levee improvements	$9.5M	Y	Y	Water quality importance		M	
	South Delta Water Agency	Dredging and Stark Tract levee improvements	$7.2M	Y	Y	Water conveyance, Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2033 - Brack Tract	Levee improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Important habitat, Ecological reserve		M	
	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services (wastewater facility)	Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility flood protection	$3.7M	Y	Y	Non-structural floodproofing alternative	Would not eliminate need for levees	M	Replacement of existing headworks may be ineligible for funding
B1	RD 369 - Town of Locke	Levee improvements	$2.9M	N	Y	Historic significance, At-risk population		H	National Register historic site and National Historic Landmark
	RD 2040 - Victoria Island	Levee improvements	$6.3M	N	Y	Water Q/S importance, Infrastructure, Cost-effective		H	
	RD 2072 - Woodward Island	Levee improvements	$10.5M	N	Y	Water conveyance, EBMUD aqueduct		H	
B2	Drexler Tract	Levee improvements	$1.1M	N	Y	State Highway 4, Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 684 - Lower Roberts Island	Levee improvements	$3.1M	N	Y	Utility infrastructure, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2023 - Venice Island	Levee improvements	$5.1M	N	Y	Water Q/S importance, Infrastructure, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2038 - Lower Jones Tract	Levee improvements	$7.5M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2090 - Quimby Island	Levee improvements	$11M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2111 - Dead Horse Island	Levee improvements	$0.67M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2117 - Coney Island	Levee improvements	$1.8M	N	Y	Water conveyance, Agricultural benefits		M	
C1	RD 554 - Walnut Grove	Levee improvements	$0.1M	Y	Y	Natl Reg historic site, Existing population and development	Estimated cost is too low to be efficient as a Corps project	L	Project might be cost-effective for Corps participation if scale is increased
	RD 1608 - Lincoln Village West	Dredging for maintenance and emergency access to levee	$1.1M	Y	Y	Existing population and development	Temporary measure primarily for purposes of maintenance	L	Unlikely that project can be justified for emergency access
	RD 2026 - Webb Tract #3	Restore dredge cut	$6M	Y	Y	Environmental benefits	High cost for env. benefit, Stability benefit uncertain	L	Benefits separate from Webb Tract #1&2 (Levee improvements)
	RD 2065 - Veale Tract	Levee improvements	$4.9M	Y	Y	Agricultural benefits	Potential floodplain development	L	
	RD 2074 - Brookside Estates	Rock bank protection on existing levees	$2.6M	Y	Y	Existing population and development	Need for rock on backup levee not substantiated.	L	Unlikely that project will qualify for Corps funding. Rock on river levees appears to be maintenance.
	RD 2139 - Can Can/Greenhead	Levee improvements	$0.38M	Y	Y	Important habitat	Estimated cost is too low to be efficient as a Corps project	L	Project might be cost-effective for Corps participation if scale is increased
C2	Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)	Investigation of: flood risks to Bay Area infrastructure; use of dredged material for levee repairs; mitigation areas for levee repairs; and non-structural flood control remedies	$1.4M	N	Y		Study only	L	Topics are expected to be addressed by Delta Islands & Levees feasibility study and Delta LTMS. ABAG could participate as an additional study co-sponsor.
	RD 307 - Lisbon	Sacramento River bank protection	$2.7M	N	Y		Outer fringe of Delta	L	Appears to be part of Sacramento River Bank Protection Project
	RD 2024 - Orwood Palm Tract	Levee improvements	$7.9M	N	Y		Potential floodplain development	L	
	RD 2113 - Fay Island	Levee improvements	$0.42M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits	Single primary beneficiary/owner	L	
	RD 2119 - Wright Elmwood Tract	Levee improvements	$3.3M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits	Potential floodplain development	L	
	Shin Kee Tract	Levee improvements	$10.9M	N	Y		Single primary beneficiary/owner	L	

Prioritization of Proposals for Delta Levees Report to Congress

List 2: All Submitted Proposals (No Section 205 Cost Limit)

Priority Group	*Potential Sponsor*	*Description*	*Submitted Cost*	*Statement of Intent?*	*Cost <$11 Million?*	*Positive Factors*	*Negative Factors*	*Priority*	*Comments*
A1	Bethel Island Municipal Improvement District (BIMID)	Levee improvements at Horseshoe Bend	$11M	Y	Y	Western island, Existing population and development		H	
	Brannan-Andrus Levee Maintenance District	Levee improvements	$5M	Y	Y	Existing population and development (Isleton), State Highway 12		H	
	California Department of Water Resources and The Nature Conservancy	McCormack-Williamson Tract flood control and ecosystem restoration improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Innovative solution, Interstate 5, Environmental benefits		H	
	RD 756 - Bouldin Island	Levee improvements	$14M	Y	N	State Highway 12, Water conveyance		H	
	RD 830 - Jersey Island	Levee improvements	$7M	Y	Y	Western island, Utility infrastructure, Adjacent to developed islands		H	
	RD 1607 - Van Sickle Island	Levee improvements	$0.75M	Y	Y	Environmental benefits, Important habitat, Salinity gates		H	
	RD 2059 - Bradford Island	Levee improvements	$6M	Y	Y	Western island, Important habitat, Agricultural benefits		H	
	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services	Flood contingency and evacuation engineering	$0.73M	Y	Y	Non-structural floodplain management alternative		H	
A2	RD 2025 - Holland Tract	Levee improvements	$2.8M	Y	Y	Western island, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2026 - Webb Tract #1&2	Levee improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Western island		M	
	RD 2028 - Bacon Island	Levee improvements	$9.5M	Y	Y	Water quality importance		M	
	RD 2029 - Empire Tract	Levee improvements	$21.7M	Y	N	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2033 - Brack Tract	Levee improvements	$11M	Y	Y	Important habitat, Ecological reserve		M	
	RD 2037 - Rindge Tract	Levee improvements	$41M	Y	N	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2041 - Medford Island	Levee improvements	$19.2M	Y	N	Important habitat		M	
	RD 2044 - King Island	Levee improvements	$12.7M	Y	N	Agricultural benefits	Potential floodplain development	M	
	RD 2086 - Canal Ranch	Levee improvements	$21.7M	Y	N	Agricultural benefits		M	
	San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services	Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility flood protection	$3.7M	Y	Y	Non-structural floodproofing alternative	Would not eliminate need for levees	M	Replacement of existing headworks may be ineligible for funding
	South Delta Water Agency	Dredging and Stark Tract levee improvements	$7.2M	Y	Y	Water conveyance, Agricultural benefits		M	
B1	RD 369 - Town of Locke	Levee improvements	$2.9M	N	Y	Historic significance, At-risk population		H	National Register historic site and National Historic Landmark
	RD 548 -Terminus Tract	Levee improvements	$39.3M	N	N	Interstate 5, Existing population and development		H	
	RD 563 - Tyler Island	Levee improvements	$91M	N	N	Water conveyance, Important habitat		H	
	RD 1601 - Twitchell Island	Levee improvements	$30.4M	N	N	Western island, Important habitat		H	
	RD 2040 - Victoria Island	Levee improvements	$6.3M	N	Y	Water Q/S importance, Infrastructure, Cost-effective		H	
	RD 2072 - Woodward Island	Levee improvements	$10.5M	N	Y	Water conveyance, EBMUD aqueduct		H	

Prioritization of Proposals for Delta Levees Report to Congress

List 2: All Submitted Proposals (No Section 205 Cost Limit)

Priority Group	*Potential Sponsor*	*Description*	*Submitted Cost*	*Statement of Intent?*	*Cost <$11 Million?*	*Positive Factors*	*Negative Factors*	*Priority*	*Comments*
B2	Drexler Tract	Levee improvements	$1.1M	N	Y	State Highway 4, Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 17 - Mossdale Tract	Levee improvements	$59.5M	N	N	Existing population and development, Infrastructure	High cost vs. scope, Seismic upgrade uncertainty	M	
	RD 501 - Ryer Island	Levee improvements	$31.35M	N	N	State highway on levee	Seismic upgrade uncertainty	M	
	RD 684 - Lower Roberts Island	Levee improvements	$3.1M	N	Y	Utility infrastructure, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2023 - Venice Island	Levee improvements	$5.1M	N	Y	Water Q/S importance, Infrastructure, Cost-effective		M	
	RD 2027 - Mandeville Island	Levee improvements	$16.2M	N	N	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2038 - Lower Jones Tract	Levee improvements	$7.5M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	Appears to be part of Sacramento River Bank Protection Project
	RD 2090 - Quimby Island	Levee improvements	$11M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2111 - Dead Horse Island	Levee improvements	$0.67M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits		M	
	RD 2117 - Coney Island	Levee improvements	$1.8M	N	Y	Water conveyance, Agricultural benefits		M	
C1	RD 554 - Walnut Grove	Levee improvements	$0.1M	Y	Y	Natl Reg historic site, Existing population and development	Estimated cost is too low to be efficient as a Corps project	L	Project might be cost-effective for Corps participation if scale is increased. Possibly combine with RD 369.
	RD 1608 - Lincoln Village West	Dredging for maintenance and emergency access to levee	$1.1M	Y	Y		Temporary measure primarily for purposes of maintenance	L	Unlikely that project can be justified for emergency access
	RD 2026 - Webb Tract #3	Restore dredge cut	$6M	Y	Y	Western island, Environmental benefits	High cost for env. benefit, Stability benefit uncertain	L	Benefits separate from Webb Tract #1&2
	RD 2064 - River Junction	Replace drainage pumps, dredging to reduce flow restrictions, and levee improvements	None	Y	N/A		No cost estimate	L	
	RD 2065 - Veale Tract	Levee improvements	$4.9M	Y	Y	Agricultural benefits	Potential floodplain development	L	
	RD 2074 - Brookside Estates	Rock bank protection on existing levees	$2.6M	Y	Y	Existing population and development	Need for rock on backup levee not substantiated.	L	Unlikely that project will qualify for Corps funding. Rock on river levees appears to be maintenance.
	RD 2130 - Honker Bay	Levee improvements	None	Y	N/A	Important habitat	No cost estimate	L	
	RD 2139 - Can Can/Greenhead	Levee improvements	$0.38M	Y	Y	Important habitat	Estimated cost is too low to be efficient as a Corps project	L	Project might be cost-effective for Corps participation if scale is increased
	Suisun Resource Conservation District	Suisun Marsh levee improvements	>$65M	Y	N	Important habitat	No current cost estimate for levee improvements, Very high cost anticipated	L	Cost estimate based on 1982 USACE report
	Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department	Sacramento River levee integrity investigation	$15M	Y	N		Study only	L	Appears to be part of Sacramento River Bank Protection Project
C2	Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)	Investigation of: flood risks to Bay Area infrastructure; use of dredged material for levee repairs; mitigation areas for levee repairs; and non-structural flood control remedies	$1.4M	N	Y		Study only	L	Topics are expected to be addressed by Delta Islands & Levees feasibility study and Delta LTMS. ABAG could participate as an additional study co-sponsor.
	RD 307 - Lisbon	Sacramento River bank protection	$2.7M	N	Y		Outer fringe of Delta, Part of Sac River Bank Protection Project	L	
	RD 799 - Hotchkiss Tract	Installation of sheet pile	$50.7M	N	N	Western island, Existing population and development	Potential floodplain development, High cost	L	
	RD 800 - Byron Tract	Levee improvements	$20M	N	N	Existing population and development	Potential floodplain development	L	
	RD 2024 - Orwood Palm Tract	Levee improvements	$7.9M	N	Y		Potential floodplain development	L	
	RD 2113 - Fay Island	Levee improvements	$0.42M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits	Single primary beneficiary/owner	L	
	RD 2119 - Wright Elmwood Tract	Levee improvements	$3.3M	N	Y	Agricultural benefits	Potential floodplain development	L	
	Shin Kee Tract	Levee improvements	$10.9M	N	Y		Single primary beneficiary/owner	L	
	Solano County Dept. of Resource Management	Collinsville levee improvements	None	N	N/A	Existing population and development	No cost estimate	L	

Delta Proposal Evaluation Team

USACE gathered a team of seven experts with experience in the Delta from USACE, DWR, and DFG to evaluate the submitted proposals. Their areas of expertise and degrees are listed below:

- Senior Engineer (PE) and Project Manager, BS in Civil Engineering
- Civil Engineer (PE), BS in Environmental Engineering
- Certified Water Resource Planner, MA in Landscape Architecture, BA in Geography and Environmental Sciences
- Senior Environmental Planner, PhD in Ecology, MS in Range Management, BS in Biology
- Ecosystem Restoration Specialist and Water Resource Planner, MS in Wildland Resource Science, BS in Biology
- Senior Environmental Scientist, MS in Biology, BS in Psychology/Zoology
- Geotechnical Engineer (PE, GE), Regional Levee Specialist, MS in Geotechnical Engineering, BS in Civil Engineering

Submittals Not Included

Table C-2 summarizes the project proposals that were screened out for a number of reasons, including letters of intent without specific proposals, proposals from businesses that are not qualified non-Federal sponsors, and study proposals only.

Table C- 2 Submittals Not Included

Potential Sponsor	Description of Proposal	Reasons for Deletion
RD 341 Sherman Island	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
RD 348 New Hope Tract	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
RD 2034	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
RD 2127 Simmons-Wheeler	Letter of intent for Suisun Resource Conservation District's proposal	Redirected to Suisun Resource Conservation District's proposal
RD 2135 Sunrise Island	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
RD 2136 Grizzly West	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
RD 2138	Letter of intent only	No proposal provided
Environmental Risk Services Corp(2 submittals)	Letter of intent only	Not an eligible sponsor and no proposal provided
Dept. of Fish and Game, Grizzly Island Wildlife Area	Letter of intent for Suisun Resource Conservation District's Proposal	Redirected to Suisun Resource Conservation District's proposal
Hart Restoration, Inc.		Not an eligible sponsor
Kjeldsen, Sinnock & Neudeck, Inc.	Proposals for specific RD's are listed individually	Not an eligible sponsor
Shafer/Pintail RD 2112	Letter of intent for Suisun Resource Conservation District's Proposal	Redirected to Suisun Resource Conservation District's proposal
Port of Stockton	Letter of interest only	No proposal provided
Prof. Raymond B. Seed University of California, Berkeley	Study proposals only	No eligible sponsor identified

APPENDIX D

California Governor' Proposed Delta Budget Plan

California Governor's Proposed Budget Plan[1] on the Delta ($M)

Delta Levees	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	Subtotal	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	Total
State	16	37	46	55	56	**210**	140	140	140	140	140	**910**
Levee Maintenance & State Operations	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5		12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Available to Cost Share with Federal for Levee	3.5	24.5	33.5	42.5	43.5		127.5	127.5	127.5	127.5	127.5	
Local	3	8	9	9	10	**39**	19	19	19	19	19	**134**

Delta Levee Maintenance (Subventions) & Special

Delta Levee Maintenance (Subventions)
- -levee maintenance in Delta & Suisun Marsh
- -levee upgrades to PL84-99 standards
- -consistent w DWR, CALFED, & DRMS objectives

Special Flood Control Projects
- -levee upgrades to PL84-99 standards
- -demonstration projects to reduce seismic risks
- -projects to reduce island subsidence
- -mitigation banking (land purchase & long term
- -catastrophe mitigation actions
  - *emergency response planning
  - *pre-positioning of equipment & materials
  - *acquisition of property
- -cost sharing w Federal & local agencies

[1] From Governor's Strategic Growth Plan at the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee Hearing, January 31, 2006.