

# 2022 Flood System Status Report Update

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
1	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Report - Overall	The main body of FSSR does not discuss remedial actions taken since the last update.	Highlight successes and improvements to the system.	We have indicated improvements to the system through completed construction projects done through various programs (EIP, UFRR, USACE, etc....). These are identified on ULE/NULE figures as improved linework. Further descriptions of remedial actions completed are included in the CVFPP Chapter 2.	No.
2	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Report - Overall	The FSSR does not provide specific recommendations on how the def. identified, can be remediated.	Highlight specific implementation actions & schedule.	The existing conditions for the SPFC system have not significantly changed since ULE/NULE was completed, and there is no intended plan to conduct new evaluations. The scope of this report is to identify the existing conditions of the SPFC and present the physical status. The CVFPP identifies the specific investment strategy and cost associated with determining implementation actions for the future.	No.
3	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Report - Overall	The FSSR does not provide any cost data on what's been spent since the last update, and what is needed going forward.	Provide cost data	The existing conditions for the SPFC system have not significantly changed since ULE/NULE was completed, and there is no intended plan to conduct new evaluations. The scope of this report is to identify the existing conditions of the SPFC and present the physical status. The CVFPP identifies the specific investment strategy and cost associated with determining implementation actions for the future.	No.
4	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Report - Overall	The FSSR main body does not fully reflect DWR's significant investment through successful programs that have helped/continue to help local levee maintaining agencies maintain SPFC facilities (DMP, FSRP, FMAP, SDDR, Small Communities Flood Risk Reduction Project, etc.). It also doesn't reflect successfully completed projects that were funded through other federal programs such as FEMA's HMGP or though USACE's PL84-99 program. These are significant improvements made throughout the system and their success is worth highlighting.	Incorporate meaningful discussion, provide X sites, X dollars, etc. for successful projects. I think it's important to highlight how these programs have helped LMAs, and ultimately the CVFPB, meet conditions outlined in their Assurance Agreements, meet eligibility criteria for PL84-99, etc. Once the DWR's investment, recently completed projects/improvements are accurately represented, revise Chapters 7 and 8 to provide an approach and set of recommendations to continue to expand these successful programs.	The existing conditions for the SPFC system have not significantly changed since ULE/NULE was completed, and there is no intended plan to conduct new evaluations. The scope of this report is to identify the existing conditions of the SPFC and present the physical status. The CVFPP identifies the specific investment strategy and cost associated with determining implementation actions for the future.	No.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
5	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Report - Overall	We didn't see a discussion of the SWIF program and how it's being used to regain PL84-99 eligibility.	None.	We will add this into the report and tie it into USACE tables in the appendix.	Yes.
6	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Executive Summary	The Exec Summary misses the opportunity to highlight the progress made and work yet to be done. For example, there is no mention of the great work DWR did in responding to the 2017 storm damage or in developing the DMP program and the highly successful FMAP program. We would like to see some financial information included: dollars spent since the last update; estimates of dollars needed etc. We think the ES audience are policy makers, and the ES should be written with that audience in mind. It's important to keep in mind that the executive summary should be something the legislature could pick up and use to help inform/justify requests and efforts made to secure additional funding. As written, this executive summary does not fully communicate the status and needs of the SPFC system to policy makers.	None.	We will expand 2017 and 2019 storm damage discussion.  The existing conditions for the SPFC system have not significantly changed since ULE/NULE was completed, and there is no intended plan to conduct new evaluations. The scope of this report is to identify the existing conditions of the SPFC and present the physical status. The CVFPP identifies the specific investment strategy and cost associated with determining implementation actions for the future.	No.
7	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page vi	It should also rely upon 408 decisions and USACE data from authorized projects.	None.	Revised description.	Yes.
8	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page vi	While we understand that this is the baseline from which to start, the data needs to be updated with information regarding projects constructed since that time or newer information that may have been collected.	None.	There have been no additional evaluations conducted to categorize the status of existing or remediated projects.	No.
9	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table ES-1	It's unclear whether the percentages based on levee miles, levee segments, levee systems, or other?	A note or clarification within the table should be provided.	A clarification will be provided.	Yes.
10	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table ES-1	The characterization of nonurban levees should be consistent with how urban levees are portrayed. For urban settings, levees are characterized by not meeting criteria but not the potential for failure. It is the opposite for nonurban. This should be done consistently.	None.	This report utilizes the direct results from ULE and NULE analysis and all results have been finalized. Urban and non-urban levees were analyzed differently in those foundational analyses; as described in the ULE and NULE documents.	No.
11	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table ES-1	Descriptions and percentages for "Seepage" and "Levee Stability" listed in this table seem low. Please confirm or revise values.	None.	Values have been confirmed.	No.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
12	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table ES-1	<p>Erosion: Clarify whether it is "High potential" or are "currently deficient?" This distinction is important. If this table does in fact intend to capture "high potential" then percentage seems low. The last bullet is out of place, recommend removing.</p> <p>Settlement and Levee Vegetation: Is there a reason this is not expressed as a percentage like the rest of the factors? Best to be consistent.</p> <p>Penetrations: Couldn't the UCIP and DMP data be used to not just capture number of penetrations but relative risk?</p> <p>Rodent Damage: This is a very broad statement. Is there more information that should be conveyed?</p> <p>Inadequate Conveyance Capacity: Out of place in this table. This table is intended to summarize changes/findings since 2017. While this statement may be true, it doesn't offer insight into the changes since 2017.</p>	Review values, confirm or revise.	<p>Erosion: There is no mention of "currently deficient" for erosion. High potential is what is used. Revised formatting for last bullet.</p> <p>Settlement: Only four settlement locations were documented, so percentages would not be useful. However, vegetation has more locations documented, so that was changed to a percentage.</p> <p>Penetrations: Added percentage of penetrations that are in urgent need of repair.</p> <p>Rodent Damage: More information is conveyed in Section 4.9.</p> <p>Conveyance Capacity: While this table does indicate changes, many of the items do remain the same and they are reflected as such.</p>	Yes.
13	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page xi	The improved levees should not be considered deficient for the type of repair. For example, if a stretch of levee fixed seepage but not erosion, the values should reflect that. The projects were all reviewed by the CVFPB and USACE as meeting criteria. No additional analysis should be necessary.	None.	Revised improvement projects to reflect types of repairs.	Yes.
14	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page xi	Is there a reason freeboard and underseepage are the only deficiencies that are mentioned?? The Non-urban levees were evaluated for more than just these two items. This section should reflect that.	None.	Expanded descriptions.	Yes.
15	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 1-3	This paragraph does not offer information regarding new issues since the last 2017 version.	None.	This is a general description of the FSSR document.	No.
16	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 2-7	This section should be reviewed or written with the USACE. The process as described in this section is not correct. This section should also describe the importance of SWIFs in PL84-99 eligibility.	None.	Added a SWIF description in the document.	Yes.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
17	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 2-7	This statement is inaccurate. The most recent inspection, regardless of whether it's periodic or continuing eligibility, takes precedence for 84-99 eligibility.	None.	This has been revised.	Yes.
18	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 2-9 and 4-48	FSSR states that "The goals of ULE and NULE were to determine whether levees met defined geotechnical criteria and, where needed, to identify repair and improvement measures, including cost estimates, to meet desired geotechnical criteria."  But DWR asked MUSR to revise the Project Portfolio, and not use NULE/ULE data as part of "needs" identified in the Project Portfolio because the NULE/ULE overstated the system needs. Sections 2.2.1.1 and 4.5.1.1 state that NULE/ULE data is adequate to use for planning and cost-estimating purposes, which contradicts the instructions the Region received during project portfolio development.	DWR needs to provide clarity on how it intends stakeholders to use and interpret NULE/ULE data.	Clarity on use and interpretation of the NULE and ULE data is being developed.	No.
19	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 2-13	Flood System Repair Program (FSRP) should be Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP).	None.	This was revised.	Yes.
20	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 2-13	Delete "...Partnership with LMAs under the FSRP."	None.	This was revised.	Yes.
21	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 3-11	We would respectfully suggest that is not good practice and doesn't provide an accurate "Status Report". Updated hazard classifications should be developed based on the constructed project as it was approved both by CVFPB and USACE. Communicating progress to the legislature will be extremely difficult if these improvements are not captured.	None.	Revised improvement projects to reflect types of repairs.	Yes.
22	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table 3-2	These numbers do not appear to sum correctly. Please revise numbers.	None.	The numbers were revised.	Yes.
23	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table 3-3	This table should include the Missouri Bend project funded as part of FSRP - seepage berm and 0561-35 seepage berm constructed as part of PL 84-99. In addition, 3 additional sites have been improved under PL 84-99 in 2021 as well as a pipe removal and pipe lining under the DMP. Why are erosion repairs not included?	None.	Those projects were completed as repairs, not levee improvement projects.	No.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
24	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 3-18	Why were penetrations and burrowing animal damage data not included as part of this update?	None.	Those categories were not evaluated under the ULE/NULE investigation and are not included in this section. However, we did include an updated burrowing animal persistence study analysis under Section 4.9 and included updated penetration data in Section 4.7.	No.
25	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 3-18	Why were geometry comparison to the levee design prism not part of this update?	None.	This paragraph is referring to the NULE hazard classification process. Specifically, geometry was not a part of the original evaluation to assign a NULE rating.	No.
26	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table 3-4A	Since this data has not been updated, and therefore doesn't reflect the deficiency status of the SPFC system.	Update table.	This table identifies miles of NULE-evaluated SPFC levees that were improved since 2017.	No.
27	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 4-65	Why aren't the evaluation performed through the DMP program included?	Update table.	This section is referring to the process the UCIP goes through to evaluate penetrations.	No.
28	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Chapter 4	In general, this chapter does not provide a clear update/new information regarding the current status of the SPFC system.  Cost information should be included.  Regarding erosion, the Sac Bank program should be discussed.	None.	The scope of this document is not to provide cost information. That is provided in the CVFPP update (primarily Chapters 1 and 4). The Sac Bank program is mentioned in Section 2.1.3 and the combined results of that program and others are included in this chapter.	No.
29	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Chapter 5	This section doesn't mention the sediment and Arundo removal efforts that have been completed by DWR in Elder Creek (Tehama County), or the planned (or in progress) work for Cherokee Canal.  There is no discussion as to whether DWR plans to take remedial action(s) to restore/achieve system channel capacities.  Cost information should be included	None.	The scope of this document is not to provide cost information. That is provided in the CVFPP update (primarily Chapters 1 and 4). The Sac Bank program is mentioned in Section 2.1.3 and the combined results of that program and others are included in this chapter.	No.
30	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Chapter 6	M&T overflow has been degraded during overflow events and no longer operates at the prescribed elevation. Please discuss.  No mention of remedial actions at Tisdale Weir or BSOG.  Cost information should be included.	None.	The scope of this document is not to provide cost information. That is provided in the CVFPP update (primarily Chapters 1 and 4). The Sac Bank program is mentioned in Section 2.1.3 and the combined results of that program and others are included in this chapter.	No.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
31	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Chapter 8	Chapter 8 lists a number of state-maintained levees in the "High Concerns" table, but when MUSR was compiling its projects portfolio for the 2022 CVFPP update, DWR communicated that they had no project needs and did not include projects in the MUSR portfolio which is being used by DWR for planning assessing financial needs. This FSSR would appear to contradict that position. Please clarify.  How will DWR address the High Concerns levees, given the restriction on MA funding?	None.	This table represents the status of levees characterized by the ULE/NULE programs that either have not been remediated, or the completed improvement projects have not been officially turned over.	No.
32	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Page 8-14	The recommendations are too general and not specific enough.  Include recommendation for funding programs needed to address system def. identified in the FSSR.  Discuss recommendations for programmatic actions needed, such as SERP, to facilitate system repair and rehab  Include cost data  Include a schedule for implementation of recommendations.  Identify parties responsible for carrying out recommendation.  Provide a prioritization of the def. identified in the FSSR	None.	Those recommendations are covered more in-depth in the CVFPP update, including policy recommendations in Chapter 3 and investment recommendations in Chapter 4. Further detail on some recommendations is included in the CVFPP, Appendix C.	No.
33	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Table A-2	The table states, "Middle valley Levee Reconstruction" but does is mean to reference the "Mid Valley" project? If so, please update the project title. The construction is not complete. Recommend changing to Partially Complete, or identify which phases are complete and which phases are still in need of funding.	None.	Project title and status were revised.	Yes.
34	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Figure A-6	What were these levee raise and widening projects along the Sacramento River north of the Fremont Weir? I am not familiar with this amount of work in our region since 2017.	None.	These are different raises and repairs that have occurred throughout the history of the levee system. Some of these projects date back to the 1940s. There are a variety of sources for this information.	No.
35	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Figure A-12	There are missing Seepage Repair sites on this map.	None.	The repair sites have been confirmed by the CVFPB.	No.



ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
36	Barry O'Regan	MUSR RFMP	Figure A-12	Priority erosion and seepage projects for the LMAs within the MUSR RFMP have been identified but are now shown on this map. Please add those sites.	None.	The repair sites have been confirmed by the CVFPB.	No.
37	Chris Fritz	Feather River RFMP	Overall Report	In general, the February Draft FSSR does not accurately convey a true representation of current conditions for SPFC facilities. The FSSR does not incorporate any discussion of the damages which occurred during recent high-water events, including 2017 and 2019. The Draft FSSR also does not reflect some of the recent investments which the State has made via programs such as UFRR, DMP, FSRP, etc.	Revise accordingly.	Expanded on 2017 and 2019 storm damage repairs and on State programs where necessary.	Yes.
38	Chris Fritz	Feather River RFMP	Figures ES-1 and Figure ES-2	Figures ES-1 and ES-2 are very difficult to interpret. For example, you cannot see the status of the levees protecting the City of Marysville.	Revise or create additional figures to show in better detail.	These figures have been revised.	Yes.
39	Chris Fritz	Feather River RFMP	Figure ES-1	The Cherokee Canal levee should not be listed as a 'Low Concern' levee since this levee system protects the small community of Richvale.	Review and revise.	Cherokee Canal is not a "low concern" levee. It is characterized as a "lower concern" levee in relation to all the other evaluated levees in NULE.	No.
40	Chris Fritz	Feather River RFMP	Table ES-2 and Figure ES-2	Table ES-2 and Figure ES-2 are not correct for parts of the Feather River Region. For example, they do not reflect TRLIA's UFRR improvements.	Review and revise.	Those projects and the status for TRLIA and UFRR are reflected in Table A-1 in the appendix. Many sections of the Feather River Region listed have been remediated, but have not been officially turned over yet.	No.
41	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Plumas Lake - Feather River - Reclamation District 784 - RD 784 Unit 2B - 11.1–11.6 – Why is this listed?	This levee meets both FEMA and ULDC criteria and should be removed from the list.	Table A-1 on page A-11 in the appendix identifies that construction is complete for this levee improvement project. It is still listed because the project has not been officially turned over from USACE to the State (updated O&M, assurances, etc....). We revised the table and figure to show that an improvement project is underway.	Yes.
42	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Plumas Lake Interceptor Canal Reclamation District 784 RD0784 Unit 4 • 0.1–0.8 • 2.2–2.3 • 2.7–3.1 • 3.8–4.1 • 5.6–6.3 - Why is this listed?	This levee meets both FEMA and ULDC criteria and should be removed from the list.	Revised as completed improvement project in 2020.	Yes.
43	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Sacramento Arcade Creek American River Flood Control District NA0001 Unit 1 • 0.0–2.1 – Why is this listed?	This levee has been improved as part of a DWR UFRR grant	Revised.	Yes.
44	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Sacramento Arcade Creek American River Flood Control District NA0001 Unit 7 • 0.0–1.9 – Why is this listed?	This levee has been improved as part of a DWR UFRR grant	Revised.	Yes.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
45	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page xvi	This section states: “Perform ULE and NULE style reassessment of the improved levees to confirm that these improved levees now meet ULE and NULE design criteria.”	Why is reanalysis necessary? All of these projects have CVFPB permits and 408 permission and most were done under DWR grants. Why can't they just be removed from the list of deficient sites once construction is completed?	Need formal confirmation from USACE/CVFPB that these levees meet specific design criteria to remove from list. At this point in time, ULE/NULE criteria is the most relevant characterization of SPFC levee status.	No.
46	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table 2-1	This says channels are inspected annually. This is not accurate, a sub-set of the channels are inspected annually, but most are not inspected annually.	Modify to identify which channels are inspected annually and which ones are not inspected at all, or less frequently.	Added clarification.	Yes.
47	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Section 2.2.2	Missing projects.	Add Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study. For the South Sac Streams project, it is completed, however project close out and turn over has never occurred.	Added Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study to list of studies.	Yes.
48	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table 3-1	Missing projects.	Add Marysville and TRLIA	These projects have not yet been turned over from USACE to the State.	No.
49	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Section 3.3.1.2	Text says “However, a new ULE analysis of these improvements has not been conducted. Therefore, no hazard classifications are updated in this 2022 FSSR based on the improvements.”	The risk has been lowered by construction and that should be reflected. These projects were permitted and reviewed by the CVFPB, USACE and DWR (when conducted under DWR grants). Why is additional review necessary?	Table A-1 on page A-11 in the appendix identifies that construction is complete for this levee improvement project. It is still listed because the project has not been officially turned over from USACE to the State (updated O&M, assurances, etc....). We revised the table and figure to show that an improvement project is underway.	Yes.
50	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Figure 4-5	Cache Creek levees do not meet Freeboard criteria and has been evaluated by FMO, AR north and south levees upstream of H street have freeboard deficiencies.	Make these changes on the figure.	The Cache Creek regions that do not meet freeboard criteria were not assessed during ULE and are not shown in this figure. American River portions have been confirmed.	No.
51	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Figure 5-3 and Figure 5-4	The information is hard to read at this scale.	Can tabular format be added with this information?	This is included in appendix table B-1.	No.
52	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Figure 6-2	The control structure for Little John Creek is not shown (I believe it's the headgate for south little john).	Add the structure.	This is not listed as a SPFC structure.	No.
53	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page 8-6	RD 827 and RD 785 have been dissolved and their area annexed by RD 537.	Change to RD 537.	We are still awaiting closeout documents (O&M updates, as-builts, assurances, etc....). Added description in the document to clarify.	Yes.
54	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page 8-7	RD 827 and RD 785 have been dissolved and their area annexed by RD 537.	Change to RD 537.	We are still awaiting closeout documents (O&M updates, as-builts, assurances, etc....). Added description in the document to clarify.	Yes.



ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
55	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page 8-15	Perform ULE and NULE style reassessment of the improved levees to confirm that these improved levees now meet urban and nonurban levee design criteria.	Why is reanalysis necessary? All of these projects have CVFPB permits and 408 permission and most were done under DWR grants. Why can't they just be removed from the list of deficient sites once construction is completed?	Revised recommendations.	Yes.
56	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page 3-11	RD 2062 has constructed an internal levee system that protects the developed area. This levee has been certified as meeting FEMA 100-year requirements and the RD is in the process of making a ULDC finding.	While the improved levee system is not the SPFC levee system, it should be acknowledged that the non-project levee reduces flood risk and protects the population at risk.	This is the levee improvement project we list for River Islands.	No.
57	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Page 3-17	River Islands is listed as a non-urban system. While there are deficiencies with the project levees, an interior levee system has been constructed that has been certified as meeting FEMA criteria and the district is in the process of making a ULDC finding.	The RI levee system is within the City of Lathrop and should be classified as an urban levee and a discussion added acknowledging the non-project levee that protects the urban development.	River Islands were evaluated under the NULE program, and that is what is represented in this table.	No.
58	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Chapter 4	River Islands is listed as a non-urban system.	Change to an urban levee system.	River Islands were evaluated under the NULE program, and that is what is represented in this table.	No.
59	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Marysville, NA0004 Unit 2, 0.3-1.3. Why is this listed?	This levee has been improved as part of the USACE Marysville Ring Levee Project, Phase2A.	Table A-1 on page A-11 in the appendix identifies that construction is complete for this levee improvement project. It is still listed because the project has not been officially turned over from USACE to the State (updated O&M, assurances, etc....). We revised the table and figure to show that an improvement project is underway.	Yes.
60	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Marysville, NA0004 Unit 1, 0.3-0.5, 0.8-1.4, 1.7-2.6. Why is this listed?	<p>1.7-2.6 - this levee was improved by USACE as part of the Marysville Ring Levee Project Phase 1.</p> <p>0.3-0.5 - This levee was improved as part of the USACE System Evaluation Project and was determined by the USACE MRL Project to meet criteria for the 200-year plus 2-feet DWSE</p> <p>0.8-1.4 - A portion of this levee was improved as part of the MRL Project Phase 4A and the remainder is either in design or has been determined by USACE to meet criteria for the 200-year plus 2-feet DWSE</p>	Table A-1 on page A-11 in the appendix identifies that construction is complete for this levee improvement project. It is still listed because the project has not been officially turned over from USACE to the State (updated O&M, assurances, etc....). We revised the table and figure to show that an improvement project is underway.	Yes.

ID	Commenter	Affiliation	Location in Public Draft	Comment: Issue	Comment: Proposed Solution	DWR Response	Change in Document
61	Ric Reinhardt	Flood Control Association	Table ES-2	Marysville, NA0004 Unit 3, 0.3-1.3. Why is this listed?	This Project is being improved as part of the MRL Phases 2C, 2B and 3 projects.	Table A-1 on page A-11 in the appendix identifies that construction is complete for this levee improvement project. It is still listed because the project has not been officially turned over from USACE to the State (updated O&M, assurances, etc....). We revised the table and figure to show that an improvement project is underway.	Yes.

Notes:  
AR = American River  
CVFPB = Central Valley Flood Protection Board  
CVFPP = Central Valley Flood Protection Plan  
DMP = Deferred Maintenance Program  
EIP = Early Implementation Program  
FMO = Flood Management Office  
FSRP = Flood System Repair Project  
FSSR = Flood System Status Report  
LMA = local maintaining agency  
NULE = Non-Urban Levee Evaluation  
O&M = operations and maintenance  
PL = Public Law  
RD = Reclamation District  
SPFC = State Plan for Flood Control  
SWIF = State Water Infrastructure Fund  
UCIP = Utility Crossing Inventory Program  
UFFR = urban flood risk reduction  
ULE = Urban Levee Evaluation  
USACE = U.S. Army Corps of Engineers