

Appendix C

Folsom DS/FDR Draft EIS/EIR Errata

Public Draft Errata

This section illustrates revisions to Volume I of the Draft EIS/EIR, dated December 2006. Volume II of the Draft EIS/EIR has not been revised. Changes in text are signified by strikeouts where text is removed [~~Example~~] and by italics where text is added [*Example*]. Only substantial changes in text are presented in this section; editorial changes have not been included. Volume I and II of the Draft EIS/EIR are available in electronic format in Appendix C.

Executive Summary

Global change – Replaced “flood protection” with “flood damage reduction” throughout the section.

Page ES-6, Line 10

Pursuit of this goal constitutes the non-federal sponsors’ primary interest for integrating Corps flood damage reduction projects with Reclamation dam safety activities ~~is to increase flood protection for the downstream and surrounding communities on an expedited basis and realize cost sharing benefits of a coordinated effort.~~

Page ES-8

Additions. Additional features ~~to the JFP~~ may be proposed later as mutually determined by participating agencies in order to (1) achieve a minimum 1/200 year flood protection, or (2) as incrementally justified through appropriate analysis and evaluation. Potential additional features may include a raise of up to 3.5 feet for all embankments, or modification or replacement of the existing service gates or emergency spillway gates. Any additions to the JFP, as justified, will be for flood damage reduction purposes only.

Page ES-17, Table ES-2

Vegetation and Wildlife, 2nd bullet:

- Direct or indirect impacts to oak *and pine* woodlands, *riparian woodland and chaparral habitats*

Page ES-20, Line 1

Dewatering of the stilling basin would result in the removal of ~~non-native~~ fish species.

Page ES-20

Terrestrial Vegetation and Wildlife:

Construction of any of the project alternatives would have the potential to adversely affect special status species, native habitats and wetlands. ~~plant species, protected oak woodlands, result in losses of native vegetation, result in a permanent loss of project area wetlands, and impact elderberry shrubs, which host to the endangered valley elderberry long horn beetle.~~ All vegetation impacts can be mitigated to non-significant levels. Construction activities could result in the alteration or loss of habitat for wildlife special status species. These impacts could be mitigated to non-significant level. Wetlands downstream of MIAD would be monitored throughout construction.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Section 1.10.1.4

Global change – changed the Coordination Act Report (CAR) to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report (FWCAR).

Chapter 2 Project Description

Global change – Replaced “flood protection” with “flood damage reduction” throughout the section.

Page 2-15, Table 2-10

Under the new Auxiliary Spillway control structure for Alternative 3:

6 submerged tainter gates, ~~plus potential redundant water supply outlet connection~~

Page 2-15, Table 2-10

Under the new Auxiliary Spillway control structure for Alternative 4:

4 submerged tainter gates, ~~plus possible redundant water supply outlet connection~~

Page 2-63, Figure 2-15

Removed “Proposed Dike” text from Mooney Ridge.

Page 2-95, Table 2-16

Under Auxiliary Spillway, 2nd bullet:

- Control Structure – 6 Submerged Tainter Gates ~~plus redundant water supply outlet option~~

Page 2-97, Section 2.6.3, 3rd paragraph

~~Construction of the JFP Auxiliary Spillway control structure would include the installation of a separate, M&I outlet that would create flexibility for Reclamation to meet water delivery needs. One use for the outlet would be to provide a backup system for the delivery of water in emergency situations. If a pipeline were to be built for the delivery of water to a specific entity, that action would be analyzed in a supplemental environmental document.~~

Page 2-103

Permanent and Temporary Material Storage Areas:

Dike 7, D2, and MIAD are ~~the only~~ locations where permanent storage of excess material is highly likely.

Page 2-104, 3rd paragraph

Maximum releases utilizing project features would not be any larger than those allowed under the existing conditions. These ~~larger~~, earlier flows would conserve flood storage space. In addition, the top of the flood control pool could be raised to increase the flood storage space. The top elevation of the flood space and the release diagram would be specified after the Corps and Reclamation are in agreement on the rate of increase in flows and dam safety freeboard.

Page 2-114, first bullet

- Section 176 ~~XXX~~ of the Clean Air Act,

Page 2-115, Section 2.10.4

The contractor responsible for dewatering the stilling basin would prepare a fish removal *and recovery* plan that would be reviewed by a qualified fish biologist. A fish removal *and recovery* plan would be developed in conjunction with CDFG *and USFWS*, ~~would develop a fish recovery plan~~ in advance of dewatering the stilling basin. During dewatering and construction, the Corps, in consultation with CDFG *and USFWS*, would ensure that a qualified biologist is on site to implement a fish rescue operation. Fish would be removed in accordance with the CDFG *and USFWS* approved fish *removal and recovery* plan.

Page 2-116, Section 2.10.6.1

The SWPPP would include measures to minimize erosion and sediment transport to ~~to Battle Creek~~. It would include:

Page 2-118, Section 2.10.6.3

Reclamation and the Corps, in consultation with USFWS and DFG, would mitigate *permanent and* temporary habitat impacts associated with the Folsom DS/FDR actions on *or offsite* with appropriate habitat mitigation. Permanent impacts associated with the Folsom DS/FDR actions would be compensated for based on the *Fish and Wildlife* Coordination Act Report (FWCAR). The mitigation approach for permanent impacts presented herein includes consideration of the FWCAR requirement for compensation needs for seasonal wetland, riparian, *chaparral, oak/pine woodland* and upland (oak woodland) habitats.

Page 2-118, Section 2.10.6.4

The plan would be prepared to meet the specifications and mitigation requirements pertaining to Corps jurisdictional areas specified in the ~~Draft~~ *Final* Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report (FWCAR) ~~report~~ prepared for the project.

Page 2-119, 3rd bullet

- Restore habitats that have been temporarily affected by Folsom DS/FDR actions *from* ~~to~~ construction to predisturbance conditions if appropriate;

Chapter 3 Affected Environment, Impacts Analyses, and Mitigation Measures

Section 3.1 Hydrology, Water Quality, and Groundwater

Page 3.1-31, Section 3.1.4

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-~~12~~ *14* would reduce the significant impact on water quality, wetlands, and water levels to a less than significant level.

Section 3.4 Aquatic Resources

Page 3.4-18

This impact would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measures AQINV-1a through AQINV-1e *d* would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Page 3.4-20

This impact would be potentially significant but mitigable. Mitigation Measures *AQINV-1e* and *AQINV-2* would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Page 3.4-24, Section 3.4.4

Implementation of Mitigation Measures *AQINV-1a*, ~~*AQINV-1b*~~, and ~~*AQINV-1e*~~, through *AQINV-2*, and *FISH-1*, would reduce impacts to aquatic resources to a less than significant level.

Section 3.11 Cultural Resources

Page 3.11-1, Section 3.11.1.2, 2nd paragraph

Reclamation and the Corps have to take in account the effects of its undertaking on historic properties as defined in *36 CFR Part 60.4* and *36 CFR Part 800.16 (l)*.

Page 3.11-2, 4th paragraph

Project undertakings by Reclamation must follow directives and guidelines found in Reclamation Manuals LND P01, LND 02-01, and LND 07-01 and *LND 10-1*. LND P01 establishes policy and authority for cultural resource identification, evaluation and management of cultural resources. LND 02-01 provides directives and standards and clarifies the role of Reclamation regarding implementation of its cultural resources management responsibilities. *LND 07-01 provides procedures for compliance with Federal statutes when inadvertent discoveries of human remains occurs on Reclamation lands.* LND ~~10-01~~ *07-01* provides procedures for inadvertent discoveries *on Reclamation land* for cultural items which are under the authority of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Page 3.11-6, 2nd paragraph

From the 1870s until the 1890s, *The Nisenan culture* experienced a *cultural and religious* resurgence with the Ghost Dance revival of 1870. *Originating with the Paiute, the basic tenets included the end of the world and/or return of the dead, return of the world to Native Americans, and the destruction of White People (Bean and Vane 1978:670).*

Page 3.11-8, 3rd paragraph

~~The Construction of Folsom Dam was constructed in 1955~~ *completed in 1956* and consists of a concrete dam flanked by earth wing dams and dikes with a total length of approximately nine miles.

Page 3.11-10, 3rd bullet

- The Augustine Pattern (1,500 BP - Contact) is widespread in central California, and represents a mixture of traits retained from the ~~from the~~ Berkeley Pattern as well as a number of introduced traits, including bow and arrow technology as reflected in Gunther Barbed and other small projectile points.

Page 3.11-11, 2nd paragraph

The Kings Beach Complex (AD 500-1800) was distinguished by flaked obsidian and silicate implements, small projectile points, the bow and arrow, and occasional scrapers and bedrock mortars (Moratto 1984).

Page 3.11-12, 4th paragraph

Reclamation is in the process of completing a ~~National Register~~ *NRHP* nomination for the Central Valley Project (CVP). This nomination concludes that the dikes are non-contributing elements to the CVP Multiple Property Nomination (MPN). This determination will be reviewed by the Keeper of the *NRHP* ~~National Register~~.

Page 3.11-16, 5th – 7th paragraphs

CA-SAC-412 is close to, but does not extend into, the present Folsom DS/FDR area. P-31-60 is an isolated find that was not relocated during Pacific Legacy's survey. *The find was reported in fill on a bike path on top of the dam.* The cultural resources are listed in Table 3.11-8.

Folsom Dam, including the Right Wing Dam, was found eligible for listing on the NRHP by the Corps in the report titled Cultural Resources Archaeological Survey and ~~National Register~~ *NRHP* Evaluation of Folsom Dam and Properties for the Folsom Bridge Project and, on June 26, 2006, SHPO concurred with the finding that the dam is eligible under Criterion A.

Reclamation is in the process of completing a ~~National Register~~ *NRHP* nomination for the CVP. This nomination concludes that Folsom Dam, including the central concrete structure and both adjacent wing dams, is considered a contributing element to the CVP MPN. This determination will be reviewed by the Keeper of the *NRHP* ~~National Register~~.

Page 3.11-22, Table 3.11-12

1st Management Recommendation:

None, ~~provided~~ *resource previously determined ineligible for NRHP*

Page 3.11-22, 1st paragraph

The Folsom dam was found eligible for listing on the NRHP by the Corps in the report titled Cultural Resources Archaeological Survey and National Register Evaluation of Folsom Dam and Properties for the Folsom Bridge Project and, on June 26, 2006, SHPO concurred with the finding that the dam is eligible under Criterion A. If one and/or portions of Alternatives 1 through 5 are chosen, Reclamation and the Corps will follow the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA as implemented in 36 CFR Part 800. ~~and Reclamation's Policies and Directives found at LND P01, LND 02-01 and LND 10-01.~~ *Reclamation will follow the Policies and Directives found in LND P01 and LND 02-01, LND 07-01, and the Corps will follow guidelines found in the Planning Guidance Notebook, ER 1105-2-100.*

Page 3.11-22, 2nd paragraph

If one and/or portions of Alternatives 2 through 5 are chosen, Reclamation and the Corps will follow the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA as implemented in 36 CFR Part 800. ~~and Reclamation's Policies and Directives found at LND P01, LND 02-01 and LND 10-01.~~ *Reclamation will follow the Policies and Directives found in LND P01, LND 02-01, LND 07-01, and the Corps will follow guidelines found in the Planning Guidance Notebook, ER 1105-2-100.*

Page 3.11-22, 3rd paragraph

If one and/or portions of Alternatives 2 through 5 are chosen, Reclamation and Corps will follow the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA as implemented in 36 CFR Part 800. ~~and Reclamation's Policies and Directives found at LND P01, LND 02-01 and LND 10-01.~~ *Reclamation will follow the Policies and Directives found in LND P01, LND 02-01, LND 07-01, and the Corps will follow guidelines found in the Planning Guidance Notebook, ER 1105-2-100.*

Page 3.11-23, Section 3.11.2, 1st paragraph

A historic property and/or a historical resource, ~~a cultural resource~~ must possess at least one of the criterion of eligibility and retain the quality of integrity. The concept of integrity is usually interpreted to mean "intactness" of physical characteristics, but in terms of the NRHP and the CRHR, integrity is a measure of the degree to which a property retains or is able to convey the essential characteristics defined under one of the four eligibility criteria. These characteristics may be expressed through integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association of a property. An archaeological property may retain sufficient integrity to qualify it for the NRHP or CRHR if the property retains the ability to yield information important to an understanding of history or prehistory. ~~It must be demonstrated to have the~~

~~potential, or to have previously yielded, data that can be used to address important research questions.~~

Page 3.11-23, 2nd paragraph

None of the other identified cultural resources within the Folsom DS/FDR area have been formally evaluated as to their eligibility for listing on either the NRHP or the CRHR, *with the exception of ELD-261 which was found to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP.*

Page 3.11-24, Section 3.11.2.1, 1st paragraph

None of the other identified cultural resources within the Folsom DS/FDR area have been evaluated as to their eligibility for listing on either the NRHP or the CRHR, *with the exception of ELD-261 which was found to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP.*

Page 3.11-26, 1st paragraph

However, none of the other identified cultural resources have been evaluated as to NRHP and CRHR eligibility, *with the exception of ELD-261 which was found to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP.*

Page 3.11-29, 1st paragraph

If human remains are discovered, procedures outlined in 35 CFR 800.13(b) 'Discoveries without prior planning' and Reclamation's Directive and Standards for the Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (LND 07-01) will be followed.

Section 3.12 Land Use, Planning, and Zoning

Global change – changed all instances of “flood protection” to “flood damage reduction”.

Global change – changed all instances of Folsom Lake State Recreation Area to FLSRA.

Chapter 6 Consultation and Coordination

Page 6-5, Section 6.3.5

USFWS is participating in the Folsom DS/FDR pursuant to the ESA and FWCA. The project agencies are consulting with USFWS for preparation of a Biological Opinion and *Fish and Wildlife* Coordination Action Report.

To receive an electronic copy of the complete Folsom DS/FDR Revised Draft EIS/EIR, please e-mail Stacy Porter at portersm@cdm.com with your name and address.