

# 2022 State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document Update

| ID | Commenter     | Affiliation                                 | Location in Public Draft | Comment: Issue  | Comment: Proposed Solution  | DWR Response  | Change in Document |
|----|---------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 1  | Ric Reinhardt | CA Central Valley Flood Control Association | Page 2-15                | The TRLIA improvements are not listed for the RD 784 system.  | Add a section on this levee improvement program.  | These are listed in EIP section 7.7.  | No.                |
| 2  | Ric Reinhardt | CA Central Valley Flood Control Association | Page 2-19                | Lower Cache Creek Feasibility Study is not included.  | Add study.  | Revised.  | Yes.               |
| 3  | Ric Reinhardt | CA Central Valley Flood Control Association | Report – Overall         | The report does not list the WRDA 2016 legislation to deauthorize Segment 6 of the RD 784 WPIC levee.   | Add discussion on features added or deleted from the SPFC.  | The WPIC levee improvements are captured in Table 3-1 of the FSSR. Please refer to table A-1 in the FSSR appendix for all RD 784 projects completed under EIP/UFRR. | No.                |
| 4  | Ric Reinhardt | CA Central Valley Flood Control Association | Report – Overall         | The report does not list the WRDA 2020 legislation to authorize extending to RD 784 Yuba River levee upstream to include the newly constructed levee that TRLIA built.  | None.   | Please refer to table A-1 in the FSSR appendix for all RD 784 projects completed under EIP/UFRR.  | No.                |
| 5  | Andrew Remus  | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District  | Figure 3-12A             | The draft document has a mapping error in Figure 3-12A. At the far upper right side of the figure, a section of Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control's Big Dry Creek Reservoir embankment and our Little Dry Creek Diversion Channel are shown as SPFC levee. None of our facilities are part of the SPFC (see draft document page 44). This appears to be merely a mapping error which could mislead readers into thinking that some part of the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control system is part of the State Plan of Flood Control. | Removal of the SPFC Levee designation in Figure 3-12A solves the problem. This is the only place in the draft document where this error occurs. | This has been fixed.  | Yes.               |
| 6  | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP                                   | Report – Overall         | See global comments provided in the FSSR. There is a large gap in providing new information that is critical to justify the need for additional funding. Similarly, it does not describe the successful programs that have been in place, completed projects, etc. This makes it difficult to recommend existing programs continue and grow.  | None.   | The scope of this document is not to provide cost information. That is provided in the CVFPP update (primarily Chapters 1 and 4).                                   | No.                |

| ID | Commenter     | Affiliation | Location in Public Draft | Comment: Issue   | Comment: Proposed Solution  | DWR Response   | Change in Document |
|----|---------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------|
| 7  | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Page 3-37                | This section attributes maintenance of the Wadsworth Canal and the East and West Interceptor Canals to Maintenance Area 3. But Wadsworth Canal is designated ST0010, and the East-West Interceptor Canals are ST0020.  | Maintenance to MA3, ST10, and ST20 is provided through DWR's Sutter Maintenance Yard, but it's important to distinguish the LMA.                                  | Revised to clarify.  | Yes.               |
| 8  | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Page 3-38                | Similar to Comment 7, the left bank of the Sutter Bypass is not maintained by Maintenance Area 3. This is maintained through ST0002. The left bank of the Sacramento River described in this section is not maintained by MA3, it is maintained by ST3.  | Maintenance to ST0002 and ST0003 is provided through DWR's Sutter Maintenance Yard, but it's important to distinguish the LMA.                                    | Revised to clarify.  | Yes.               |
| 9  | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Page 3-41                | The southern-most portion of the left bank of the Colusa Drain is also maintained by Reclamation District 787.   | Please include RD787 in this description.   | Revised.   | Yes.               |
| 10 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Page 3-58                | Doesn't describe the issue with the new USACE approach to evaluate the economic benefits by sub-basin. This means many sub-basins with the system will not be eligible for repair, and responsibility for repair will fall to non-fed sponsor.   | Discuss how new USACE approach means many sub-basins with the system will not be eligible for repair, and responsibility for repair will fall to non-fed sponsor. | This section is meant to provide a general description of the SRBPP, and not broader policy issues such as the one in the comment. Please refer to Chapter 3 of the CVFPP. | No.                |
| 11 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Chapters 3 and 4         | I understand that this document should describe facilities as listed in their respective O&M Manuals. However, this is of little value if the system is not further described in relation to its current performance. For example, it is well documented that "design channel capacities" have been significantly reduced due to sediment build up, invasive species, etc. Even if described qualitatively, I think this is very important because it highlights a really important need of the SPFC system. | None.   | Physical conditions (and changes to physical conditions) are included in the FSSR, where data are available.   | No.                |
| 12 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Pages 8-3 to 8-5         | It would be helpful to expand this section to discuss the programs in more detail, including information on funds spent and available in each program. UFFR has an expanded section, we suggest the other programs have similar level of detail.   | Add detail on funds programmed and expended.  | Will consider expansion of information for other programs in future updates.   | No.                |
| 13 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP   | Page 8-3                 | Is "Levee Penetrations Rehabilitation Program" supposed to be Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP)?  | None.   | Yes, that is correct. Revised.   | Yes.               |

| ID | Commenter     | Affiliation        | Location in Public Draft | Comment: Issue  | Comment: Proposed Solution                             | DWR Response  | Change in Document |
|----|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------|
| 14 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP          | Page 8-5                 | <p>This section makes no mention of the completed Small Community Feasibility studies, the tremendous value of the new data and information gathered through these studies, or the alternatives that were further vetted. It also doesn't describe the communities that have progressed into Phase II. This section should also highlight the need for additional funding to implement remaining remediation alternatives identified. These small communities should be a top priority.</p> <p>It makes it difficult to advocate the continuance or expansion (like implementing preferred alternatives identified in feasibility studies) of existing programs if there is not track record to show success.</p> | None.  | The purpose of this section is to provide a general description of the program. Additional descriptions of completed feasibility studies and priorities for small communities moving forward are included in the CVFPP. | No.                |
| 15 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP          | Page 8-5                 | See comments 12-14 above. This program is one of the most successful, helpful programs for LMAs. Not only does it help LMAs be eligible for PL84-99 assistance, but also help ensure that assurances to the federal government are maintained.  | None.  | Noted.  | No.                |
| 16 | Barry O'Regan | MUSR RFMP          | Page 3-60                | The figures show area described as "Sacramento River Watershed". The Sac River watershed is much, much larger than shown. Do you mean the "area protected by levees"?   | Clarify the definition of "Sacramento River Watershed" | Yes, it is the area protected by levees. Revised description.   | No.                |
| 17 | Chris Fritz   | Feather River RFMP | Page 3-37                | The Wadsworth Canal levees are not part of MA3.   | Revise Accordingly.                                    | Revised.  | Yes.               |
| 18 | Chris Fritz   | Feather River RMP  | Page 3-38                | The Sutter Bypass East Levee is not part of MA3.  | Revise accordingly.                                    | Revised.  | Yes.               |

Notes:  
Board = Central Valley Flood Protection Board  
CFR = California Code of Regulations  
CWC = California Water Code  
DMP = Deferred Maintenance Plan  
DWR = California Department of Water Resources  
EIP = Early Implementation Plan  
FCA = Flood Control Act  
FSRP = Flood System Repair Program  
HD = house document  
LMA = local maintaining agency  
MA = maintenance area

O&M = operations and maintenance  
OMRR&R = Operation and Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation  
PL = Public Law  
RD = Reclamation District  
SDDER = Storm Damage DWR Emergency Rehabilitation  
SPFC = State Plan for Flood Control  
SRBPP = Sacramento River Bank Protection Project  
TRLIA = Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority  
UFFR = urban flood risk reduction  
USACE = U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
WRDA = Water Resource Development Act