

ST51 DFG

Response to comment ST51-1

Comment noted.



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
1416 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.dfg.ca.gov

EDMUND G. BROWN, Jr., Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



February 6,
January 27, 2012

Joe Grindstaff
Executive Officer
Delta Stewardship Council
980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Submission of Comments on the Draft Delta Plan Program Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Grindstaff:

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Delta Stewardship Council's Draft Delta Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

DFG recognizes the profound challenges associated with managing the Delta to achieve the co-equal goals of ecosystem protection and water supply reliability as mandated by the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009. DFG appreciates the tremendous commitment of resources you and your staff have put into developing this important plan and the associated environmental document. We look forward to being a vital partner throughout this important and challenging process.

Our comments are included in the attached table. If you have any questions or require clarification, please contact Dr. David S. Zezulak at (916) 445-3960, or email him at dzezulak@dfg.ca.gov. Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Charlton H. Bonham
Director

Enclosure

cc: Department of Fish and Game

Sandra Morey, Deputy Director
Ecosystem Conservation Division
1416 Ninth Street, Ste. 1208
Sacramento, CA 95814
smorey@dfg.ca.gov

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870

Feb 6
Joe Grindstaff, Executive Officer
Delta Stewardship Council
January 27, 2012
Page 2

Scott Cantrell, Acting Chief
David S. Zazulak, Ph.D.
Ecosystem Restoration Program Manager
Water Branch
830 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
scantrel@dfg.ca.gov
dzezulak@dfg.ca.gov

No comments

- n/a -

Section	Page	Line(s)	Comment	
general			An general comment made by the Department staff and other agencies (DFG/USFWS Letter to DSC, 9-29-2011) is the need to clarify the process for making consistency determinations on covered actions when it involves authorized and permitted HCPs/NCCPs with the consistency determinations and definition of "covered action" called for in the Delta Plan. The process to integrate existing local, state, and federal programs into the Delta Plan is an important issue to be resolved.	ST51-2
general			The analysis of alternatives is necessarily a programmatic level qualitative analysis; however, we recommend that you try to quantify the magnitude of differences between Alternatives and the Proposed Project.	ST51-3
general			Section 5 discusses Emergency Planning. There is extensive discussion that addresses all the required mandates for each of the responsible entities however; it is not clear how this strategy would be implemented.	ST51-4
general			Double-check all references for most recent citations. Include more recent pertinent documents, such as the Hill Slough EIR.	ST51-5
general			We recommend you incorporate recent information that is being developed for the San Francisco Estuary Institute Historical Ecology Study for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (www.sfei.org/he). This information would be useful for Section 4 and Appendix F	ST51-6
2A	25	13	CDFG Stage Two Actions for Invasive Species is part of the Draft ERP Conservation Strategy and is incorporated as ER-R6 of the Delta Plan.	ST51-7
2A	34	2-5	From the ERP-CS re: Cache Slough restoration. "Restore a mosaic of deep open water, shallow subtidal, tidal marsh, riparian, perennial grasslands, and vernal pool habitats." Add: "deep open water, shallow subtidal, perennial grasslands, and vernal pool habitats" to text.	ST51-8
2A	34	19-22	The ERP-CS recommends creating a mosaic of seasonal floodplain, riparian, shallow subtidal, and tidal marsh areas at the Consummes-Mokelumne Confluence. Add: "shallow subtidal" to text.	ST51-9
2A	34	42-45	The ERP-CS re: Lower San Joaquin restoration. "Create a mosaic of seasonal floodplain, riparian, shallow subtidal, and tidal marsh areas." Add: "seasonal floodplain and shallow subtidal areas" to text.	ST51-10

Response to comment ST51-2

This is a comment on the project, not on the EIR.

Response to comment ST51-3

Please refer to Master Response 3.

Response to comment ST51-4

As described in the response to comment ST51-3, the Delta Stewardship Council seeks to influence the actions, activities, and/or projects of other agencies – the details of which are under the jurisdiction and authority of the individual agencies that will propose them in the future. The Delta Plan’s degree of influence on future undefined projects is unclear. Accordingly, a detailed discussion for how other agencies will implement emergency plans in the future is inappropriately speculative at this time.

Response to comment ST51-5

The references represent the documents used during preparation of the Draft Program EIR. In some instances a final version of an environmental document has since been completed, but the final version only adds documentation of errata. Therefore, the draft documents cited were reviewed to understand the details of their environmental analysis and were included in the reference lists.

Response to comment ST51-6

Comment noted. However, the preparers of the Draft Program EIR believe that the documents used during preparation of the Draft Program EIR provide an adequate description of historical conditions for this programmatic document. Therefore, no change has been made to the EIR.

Response to comment ST51-7

Comment noted. The projects listed in the paragraph on page 2A-25, lines 7 through 14, are included in the Proposed Project (Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan).

Response to comment ST51-8

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-9

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-10

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

2A	35	12-16	The ERP-CS does not include a discussion of Suisun Marsh. A better reference is the Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan Final EIS/EIR, which concentrates on tidal marsh and managed marsh. DFG finalized and certified the Suisun Marsh EIR in December 2011.	ST51-11
2A	35	36-39	The ERP-CS re: Yolo Bypass restoration. "Restore a mosaic of seasonal floodplain, riparian, perennial grasslands, and vernal pool habitats." Add: "riparian, perennial grasslands, and vernal pool habitats" to the text.	ST51-12
2A	39	35	Regarding the language, "change limit", use one word or the other, not both.	ST51-13
3	6	19	The term "conjunctive management" is first referred to in this sentence but it is not defined until page 3-35. Move the definition and discussion of this concept up in the document to define it first before using it again.	ST51-14
3	18	15	The term "runoff" is used in a very general sense throughout this section. The type of runoff makes a difference in the development of resource management strategies.	ST51-15
3	24	16	Correct typographical error: the name of the Irrigation District is Modesto, not Madera.	ST51-16
3	25	21	The geographic scope of the Surface Water Quality section (3.3.4.2.2) differs from the preceding Surface Water Hydrology section (3.3.4.2.1). The water quality section leaves out the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers. The US EPA added the lower portions of these three rivers to the list of impaired water bodies that will require a TMDL for temperature under the CWA 303(d) list as of November 2011. Add at least a brief mention of these three tributaries and their temperature issues in the water quality section.	ST51-17
3	36	1	This section should mention the Old Tulare Basin restoration efforts currently in progress (Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners/Tulare Basin Regional Conservation Plan).	ST51-18
3	77	11,26	It is unclear why this impact is described as limited to water supply availability to water users OUTSIDE the Delta watershed. Later in the document, the analysis addresses potential impacts to water supply for Users within and outside the Delta (Sections 3.4.3.2.3, page 3-84). We recommend more inclusive wording for this impact. It is also unclear why	ST51-19

Response to comment ST51-11

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-12

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-13

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-14

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-15

It is recognized that water quality associated with runoff from different types of land uses is different. However, for the purposes of this programmatic EIR, the impact analysis does not address specific differences in runoff quality. That level of detail would be inappropriately speculative at this time, prior to the availability of project-specific data and conduct of project-specific analyses.

Response to comment ST51-16

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-17

The description of water quality in this portion of Section 3 on page 3-25, line 21, is presented in more detail in Appendix E of the Draft Program EIR.

Response to comment ST51-18

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-19

The threshold of significance related to water supplies for areas located outside of the Delta that use Delta water is important because Proposed Project and the alternatives could affect availability and reliability of SWP and CVP water supplies that are conveyed through the Delta. Please refer to Master Response 1. Reliable water supply facilities encouraged by the Proposed Project and alternatives could include reservoirs with hydroelectric generation facilities. Because the Draft Program EIR was prepared with a conservative approach that includes many actions that could be encouraged by the Delta Plan, it evaluates potential construction and operation impacts associated with facilities that generate hydropower as part of its analysis of facilities that could improve water supply.

			hydroelectric facilities are included in a list of projects that could improve water supply reliability. It is the three features listed in line 25 that could improve reliability of water supply. Hydroelectric power is definitely a beneficial use and is non-consumptive. It does not "hurt" the water supply but neither does it "help" water supply reliability, unless the consideration here is that the generated power could be used to move water through conveyance facilities?	ST51-19
3	79	20-28	Adequate mitigation for "temporary" changes in flow and water quality constituents in the Delta tributaries will need to include a timing component. The end of the paragraph notes water transfers will achieve mitigation during "drier" periods (line 28). We recommend adding "warmer periods as well, and perhaps "vulnerable life history stages for aquatic resources." As background, migration of adult salmon as well as subsequent egg viability can be affected if adults returning to spawn in tributaries are exposed to excessive water temperatures, meaning even a temporary increase in temperature could be a significant impact if it occurs during a critical life history stage. If the water transfer occurs at the wrong time (e.g. too late), this does not equal "mitigation." There is a temporal component to the impact for which the mitigation may not be linked in time	ST51-20
3	86	3	Note on page 86, line 3, conveyance facilities—pipelines and pumping plants. We recommend either clarify the conveyance role of hydroelectric power or drop it from the list of examples.	ST51-21
3	88	15-29	This comment also applies to Section 5. Preservation, restoration of wetlands (including maintaining functionality) should be included as a Flood Risk Reduction Measure. Also, it must be acknowledged that dredging spoils placed along the Delta act as sources and spread for nonnative and sometimes noxious plants. Weed-management of spoil piles in the Delta should be included as a mitigation measure for dredging and maintenance.	ST51-22
3	101	28	We recommend adding the following reference: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2011. Transmittal of Final List of Water Bodies Added by the EPA to California's 2009-2010 List of Water Quality Limited Segments Pursuant to Clean Water Act 303(d). Region 9 Water Division, San Francisco, CA 35 pp. Also see the following link to the State Water	ST51-23

Response to comment ST51-20

The sentence referred to in this comment on page 3-79, line 28, of the Draft Program EIR is based upon information presented in the Lower Yuba River Accord EIR. Therefore, the sentence was not modified.

Response to comment ST51-21

The line referred to in this comment on page 3-86, line 3, of the Draft Program EIR, includes facilities that could be encouraged to be constructed and operated to improve water quality in the Delta and does not include hydroelectric facilities.

Response to comment ST51-22

The term "floodplain expansion" on page 3-88, line 23, of the Draft Program EIR, includes expansion and restoration of wetlands as described on page 2A-50, lines 18-23, of the Draft Program EIR. Actions encouraged by the Delta Plan include operation and maintenance activities.

Response to comment ST51-23

The references identified in this comment have been added to page 3-111, line 25, and page 3-112, line 1, of the Draft Program EIR.

			Resources Control Board's website pertaining to the 2010 Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List / 305(b) Report). http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010.shtml	ST51-23
4	7	9-15	The list/impacts of nonnative, invasive, exotic, and noxious plants in the Delta are far more extensive than what is discussed in this section.	ST51-24
4	10	19-32	Newer papers on sea level rise in the SF Bay Delta should be examined and cited: Stralberg, D., M. Brennan, J.C. Callaway, J.K. Wood, L.M. Schile, D. Jongsomjit, M. Kelly, V.T. Parker, and S. Crooks. 2011. Prospects for tidal marsh sustainability in San Francisco Bay. Spatial habitat scenarios and sensitivity analysis. PLoS ONE 6 (11): e27388.	ST51-25
4	10	33	"In addition, modeling scenarios predict an increase in California's air. Correct or delete this sentence.	ST51-26
4	16	12-13	Regarding the statement, "fish that spawn and rear in fresh water": this is an incorrect definition for anadromous fish. We suggest you use the description from: Murphy, B. R., and D. W. Willis, editors. 1996. Fisheries techniques, 2nd edition, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland. Glossary, page 688 Anadromous fishes: Fishes that migrate between marine habitats, where they do most of their growing, and freshwater habitats, where they breed.	ST51-27
4	16	13	Add a closing parenthesis after the word "water" in definition of anadromous.	ST51-28
4	17	13-14	Revise the text as: Chinook salmon pass through the Delta as juveniles emigrating to the ocean from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and tributaries where they were born, and again as adults on their return migration to their natal streams to spawn. Juvenile salmon use the Delta, Suisun Marsh, and the Yolo Bypass (when flooded) for rearing to varying degrees, depending on their life stage, size, river flows, and time of year.	ST51-29
4	17	24	Add: water temperature, instream flow degradation, elimination of	ST51-30

Response to comment ST51-24

Comment noted. This section on Harmful Invasive Species is intended to be a general overview.

Response to comment ST51-25

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-26

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-27

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-28

Please refer to response to comment ST51-27.

Response to comment ST51-29

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-30

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance. Issues related to water temperature, instream flow degradation, and elimination of spawning gravel recruitment below dams are already included in the terms "loss and degradation of habitat available for spawning and juvenile rearing" and "other adverse effects from CVP/SWP operations." The issue of poaching is addressed in the "illegal harvest" term.

			spawning gravel recruitment below dams, fish passage issues, and poaching in the list of continued threats.
4	18	13	The date needs to be corrected. It is March 30, 2012 (see http://www.fws.gov/sfbaydelta/species/longfin_smelt.cfm)
4	21	1	Mention that the California black rail is abundant in the brackish tidal marshes in Suisun Bay.
4	21	29	The California clapper rail is also a fully protected species.
4	22	13	Re: least tern, add that there have been breeding colonies documented in Suisun Marsh, near Montezuma Slough.
4	23	39	Re: LSA 2007 Report, bulrush and saltgrass are increasing in salt marshes due to changes in salinity. Harvest mice in Suisun Bay, a brackish marsh, are found in higher densities in mixed vegetation, pickleweed plus bulrush and saltgrass. Ref: Sustaita, D., P.F. Quickert, L. Patterson, L. Barthman-Thompson, S. Estrella. 2011. Salt marsh harvest mouse demography and habitat use in the Suisun Marsh, California. The Journal of Wildlife Management 75: 1498-1507.
4	26	22-41	This list of natural communities does not match the plant community types discussed later in the text (agriculture, developed/disturbed, invasive plants, nonnative grasslands/nonnative herbs, native grassland, inland dune scrub, etc.). We also suggest you include a cross-walk to BDCP natural communities.
4	67	37	DFG's Stage 2 should probably be referred to as ERP's Stage 2 actions throughout the document.
4	68	34-36	The Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) process, which is part of the Conservation Framework for the CVFPP, is proposing to implement restoration projects in advance of impacts to reduce temporal losses of habitat. The DEIR should include mention of this process and this type of "advance mitigation", especially for riparian forest habitats that will take decades to restore.
4	71	21	As additional information for the DEIR, the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project identifies areas of essential wildlife corridors and habitat linkages. It can serve also as a conservation planning tool for larger planning efforts such as the Delta Plan/DSC program.
4	76	29-30	The CVFPP also discusses the creation of a new floodplain in this location

Response to comment ST51-31

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-32

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-33

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-34

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-35

Comment noted, but the text on page 4-23, line 39 of the Draft Program EIR was not modified. The existing text includes results of the review of the report cited in the comment.

Response to comment ST51-36

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-37

Comment noted. The Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan refers to this document with a reference to DFG and other agencies. Therefore, the text on page 4-67, line 37 of the Draft Program EIR was not modified.

Response to comment ST51-38

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-39

This is a comment on the project, not on the EIR.

Response to comment ST51-40

Integration of restoration plans encouraged by the Delta Stewardship Council and restoration plans developed by other agencies, including DWR, in the Yolo Bypass, Delta, and Suisun Marsh are discussed in Section 2A of the Draft Program EIR under the definition of the Proposed Project and the alternatives. Therefore, no change has been made to the text on page 4-76, lines 29 and 30 referred to in this comment.

			which should be described.	
4	84	1-2	See comment for page 68. This comment also applies to this portion of the document.	ST51-41
4	85	33-34	See comment for page 71. This comment also applies to this portion of the document.	ST51-42
4	145	Table 4-2	Bryant's Savannah Sparrow (<i>Passerculus sandwichensis alaudinus</i>) is known to occur in Suisun Marsh. It was recently added to the CDFG Species of Special Concern list (Shuford and Gardali 2008). It needs to be considered by the DEIR. The species nests along the tidal marsh/upland ecotone and could be affected by activities along the marsh edge. In addition, more attention needs to be paid to preserve and restore this band of habitat for high tide refuge for other tidal marsh species. At present, geographic boundaries of this subspecies are not clear but according to the cited reference, the current known range includes Solano County.	ST51-43
5	21	1	Line 1 suggests that organic soils are more stable for levee building than plain clay sands. Please include citations as evidence.	ST51-44
23	1	8	We recommend after NCCP "intended to provide for the conservation and management of covered species." This more accurately conveys the NCCP standard.	ST51-45
23	1	14-17	We recommend including language that recognizes that the BDCP development process is a collaborative effort that also includes non-governmental organizations, and state and federal agencies	ST51-46
23	1	25	The NCCP will also provide "take" coverage for species listed under the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code section 2050 et seq.).	ST51-47
23	3	29	We recommend replacing the current language with the actual language of the Water Code-"If DFG approves the BDCP as a NCCP pursuant to NCCPA.	ST51-48
23	5	22	We recommend after "developed to", add the sentence: "provide for the conservation and management of covered species." This more accurately conveys the NCCP standard.	ST51-49
23	5	33	The BDCP is not being developed with the intent to meet the CESA standard.	ST51-50
23	5	35-36	Distinguish between application for a NCCP take permit and other	

Response to comment ST51-41

Please see response to comment ST51-38.

Response to comment ST51-42

Please see response to comment ST51-39.

Response to comment ST51-43

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-44

The sentence on page 5-21, line 1, of the Draft Program EIR referred to in this comment is describing the fact that the peat soils would not have as great a potential to liquefy as sandy and silty soils, not that the peat soils would be more stable for levee building.

Response to comment ST51-45

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-46

Section 23 provides a brief description of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, including a list of applicants for the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). Due to the brief nature of this description, details of the process that was implemented to develop the HCP and NCCP were not described in Section 23, including the use of a Steering Committee and other outreach methods to provide collaboration with other agencies and non-governmental organizations.

Response to comment ST51-47

The term "take coverage" under the California Endangered Species Act is addressed on page 23-5 of the Draft Program EIR.

Response to comment ST51-48

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-49

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-50

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-51

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

			processes, such as that required to obtain a CESA incidental take permit. Non-listed species are not authorized for take under CESA.	ST51-51
23	5	36	The definitions of "endangered, threatened, rare, etc." differ for each kind of protected species regulation. They are not the same for the state and federal Endangered Species acts. As an example, note footnote #7; the definition of "take" is that of the federal ESA, not CESA. CESA has a more limited take definition (Fish and Game Code Section 87). It is important to clearly distinguish the types of regulations and definitions between the various regulations. There are differences. Use of the terminology in the DEIR should be precise.	ST51-52
23	16	31	We recommend clarifying why the Biological Opinion (BO) remands are being referenced. The sentence needs to explain that the BO's contained modifications to project operations but have been remanded. Thus, some of the modifications are expected to change in the future.	ST51-53
23	25	12-14	The habitat credit agreement MOA has been finalized. We recommend modifying the proposed project to now encourage implementation.	ST51-54
23	29	21-24	The explanation for how the analysis in this chapter (as related to potential significant cumulative impacts involving BDCP) relates to the broader cumulative impacts chapter is unclear. This sentence suggests that this is a separate analysis yet it does not analyze whether the Delta Plan impacts (taken with the BDCP impacts) can be considered cumulatively significant. Is this analysis exclusively in the cumulative impacts section? If so, we recommend a better explanation regarding how this section fits in with the cumulative impacts section.	ST51-55
APPENDICES				
D			Include with each regulation type, the type of permits that may be required. Include most pertinent regulations for marine, riparian, wetland, and associated upland habitats. This ties into how the DSC intends to integrate the new program into these existing regulatory programs.	ST51-56
D	2.1.16.1	586	Delete the statement that the Conservation Strategy has evolved into the Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan. Also update the reference to the Draft Conservation Strategy for Restoration of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecological Management Zone and Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley Regions (Draft CDFG 2011a).	ST51-57

Response to comment ST51-52

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-53

In response to this comment, please see text change(s) in Section 5 in this FEIR.

Response to comment ST51-54

This is a comment on the project, not on the EIR.

Response to comment ST51-55

Please refer to Master Response 1.

Response to comment ST51-56

As described in Section 2B of the Draft Program EIR, the Delta Stewardship Council does not propose or contemplate directly authorizing construction or operation of any physical activities. Rather, through the Delta Plan, the Delta Stewardship Council seeks to influence the actions, activities, and/or projects of other agencies – the details of which are under the jurisdiction and authority of the individual agencies that will propose them in the future. The Delta Plan’s degree of influence on future undefined projects or permit programs is unclear. Accordingly, detailing specific types of permits that other agencies might require would be premature—and might involve inappropriate speculation—at this time.

Response to comment ST51-57

In response to this comment on page D-22, line 586, of the Draft Program EIR, the second and third sentences of this paragraph have been deleted and the reference to Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan and the citation has been updated to DFG (2011b). In addition, the full citation for the Draft Conservation Strategy has been added to the References section.

F		Tables	Usefulness of Tables of Flora and Fauna would be greatly increased by indicating native versus nonnative species.	ST51-58
F	F4-17	15	The last sentence of the paragraph on line 15 reads, "...listed under the federal and/or ESA and are described below." Insert "California" after and/or so it will read "...listed under the federal and/or California ESA and are described below."	ST51-59
F	F4-17	33-34	Provide the reference or list the "specifically named impassable dams."	ST51-60
F	F4-20	24	Change "predation on juvenile salmon..." to predation on juvenile salmonids..." because the paragraph is discussing both salmon and steelhead.	ST51-61
F	F4-20,21	35,39,9,17,24 (resp.)	Change "salmon" to "salmonids" for consistency.	ST51-62
F	F4-20,21	8	Section 1.2.4.1.4 Threats. There is no mention of insufficient instream flows as a threat to all life stages of salmonids in natal tributaries. Include a paragraph, with references, on the impacts of insufficient instream flows for salmonid migration, passage, spawning, rearing, and emigration.	ST51-63

Response to comment ST51-58

Comment noted.

Response to comment ST51-59

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-60

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-61

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-62

Comment noted; the requested change would not affect the evaluation of impacts and determination of significance.

Response to comment ST51-63

The issues associated with reduced stream flows are briefly described in the first paragraph in subsection 1.2.4.1.4 of Appendix F of the Draft Program EIR.