

2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Program Environmental Impact Report



PUBLIC SAFETY

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

ECONOMIC STABILITY

Final PEIR Contents

- Chapter 1.0, Introduction
- Chapter 2.0, Master Responses
- Chapter 3.0, Individual Comments and Responses
- Chapter 4.0, Errata
- Chapter 5.0, References
- Chapter 6.0, List of Preparers
- Appendix A, Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Plan
- Appendix B, Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Errata

Comments and Responses

- Federal - 5 Commenters; 284 comments
- State - 6 Commenters; 86 comments
- Local Agency - 50 Commenters; 421 comments
- Group - 60 Commenters; 696 comments
- Individual - 84 Commenters; 528 comments
- Public Hearings - 99 Commenters; 560 comments

Comments

- Letters, emails, faxes received during the DPEIR public comment period March 6-April 20, 2012
- Letters, emails, faxes received after the CVFPP was released (December 2011-May 4, 2012)
- Testimony at CVFPB hearings



Oral Comments/Testimony

- January 27, 2012, Sacramento
- February 24, 2012, Sacramento
- April 5, 2012, Sacramento
- April 6, 2012, Marysville
- April 9, 2012, Stockton
- April 11, 2012, Woodland



Additional Comments Considered

County of Yolo – email received on May 17, 2012

County of Yolo – letter received June 26, 2012

These late comments:

- have been considered
- will become part of the Administrative Record;
- are not included in the Final PEIR

CVFPP Timeline

Oct 2010	PEIR Notice of Preparation
Nov 2010	SPFC Descriptive Document
Dec 2011	Flood Control System Status Report
Dec 2011	CVFPP Public Comment Period begins
Mar 06, 2012	DPEIR Public Comment Period begins
Apr 20, 2012	DPEIR Public Comment Period ends
May 4, 2012	CVFPP Public Comment Period closes
Jun 18, 2012	Proposed Response to Public Agency Comments delivered
Jun 28, 2012	DWR Certifies the PEIR

Findings for Environmental Topic Areas

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen many significant environmental effects on the environment.
- Those changes or alterations are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.

Findings for Environmental Topic Areas (cont.)

- Specific economic, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the PEIR that would otherwise avoid or substantially lessen the identified significant environmental effects of the project.
- The SSIA results in one or more significant and unavoidable impacts after mitigation

Findings

- The PEIR provides adequate, good-faith, and reasoned responses to all comments raising significant environmental issues
- Absence of Significant New Information
 - PEIR evaluates compliance w/ETL to provide an analysis if needed for a future ETL variance process
 - Errata for changes of a minor, nonsubstantive nature
- Facts in Support of Decision Not to Adopt Alternatives to the SSIA

Findings Continued

Based on the foregoing findings and information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

- a. Most significant effects on the environment due to approval of the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
- b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the statement of overriding considerations.

Statement of Overriding Consideration

- Significant portions of the Flood Risk Reduction System need modification
- State law and policy require the Flood Risk Reduction System to meet multiple objectives where feasible (CWC 9616(a))
- Flood risk reduction is necessary
- Flood risk reduction projects can be planned to minimize impacts
- Flood events are uncontrolled, cause death, injury, and adverse impacts

Statement of Overriding Consideration

After DWR balanced the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks, DWR found that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

