

Delta Levees Program
Special Flood Control Projects Section
2022 Draft Project Solicitation Package
Table 1. PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSE

Comment Number	Date	Full Name	Organization	Location	Comment	Commenter Suggested Change(s)	Delta Levees Program Response	Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
1	10/7/2022	Erin Mullin	DSC	Page 2, Intent	Is a project considered multi-benefit if it has a combination of any of the listed factors such as to help prevent salinity intrusions or protect the deep-water ship channel?	N/A	Yes, multi-benefit projects may include levee improvements, habitat enhancement, helping prevent salinity intrusion, protection of freshwater conveyance, protection of state, local, and federal infrastructure, and/or protection of deep-water shipping channels. Since all projects are multibenefit they require a habitat component. The intent of this PSP is to include habitat enhancement as a part of the multi-benefit goal of this PSP. This supports the Delta Levee Program's mandate to provide net long-term habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species in the Delta. The PSP language will be modified to clarify the intent of this PSP's Multi-Benefit projects	Language modified on Page 1 of PSP: The goal for this Projects Solicitation Package (PSP) is to receive applications for Multi-Benefit projects that promote levee improvement (up to the DWR Bulletin 192-62 template), export water supply reliability, emergency response, seismic resiliency, and habitat enhancement. Language modified on Page 2 of PSP: 1.INTENT The intent of this PSP is to provide funding for public benefit in accordance with Section 12311 of the California Water Code for Multi-Benefit projects. Multi-Benefit projects may include levee improvements, habitat enhancement, helping prevent salinity intrusion, protection of freshwater conveyance, protection of state and local and federal infrastructure, and/or protection of deep-water shipping channels. Additionally, selected projects shall ensure no net loss of habitat and shall support the Delta Levees Program's mandate to provide net long-term habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species in the Delta. Therefore, proposed projects for this PSP should include a habitat component.
2	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 2, Intent	The language is not clear on what is considered a multi-benefit project because Andrea Lobato with DWR is saying it "must include a habitat component" when the language states it "may include".	Clarify the definition of multi-benefit	Please see Comment #1 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #1 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
3	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 2, Intent	It was very clear when enabling legislation for this program they understood that the enhancing component of this program was to be managed and controlled by the Department of Water Resources. Only recently that requirement has shifted and the Department is pushing it back to the locals. But the locals made it very clear at the start of this program that the Department would be responsible for net enhancement because of the programmatic phases of enhancement. The locals can't be effective with little postage stamp enhancement programs. An enhancement component is new and been drawn in due to multibenefits.	N/A	The Delta Levee Program's mandate is to provide net long-term habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species in the Delta. The Program accomplishes this Programmatically with its larger habitat projects on majority owned DWR properties such as Dutch Slough, Sherman Island, Twitchell Island etc., and to continue contributing toward the Program mandate with this PSP's intent of including habitat enhancement.	None
4	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 17, Cost Share	The department is making it required in the application that a commitment must be made to meet the financial obligations that would fall out of this review and a public entity would not be capable because these programs will cost between 2-15 million. Cost sharing 75% vs 90% will make or break Reclamation District ability to commit to fund these projects. Reclamation Districts collect 250 to 0.5 million dollar per year from assessments and they can't take one a 2 to 4 million dollar debt to construct a project. Their clients will not be able to commit to a variable cost share knowing that they can't offered the 75%. They won't be able put together a project financing plan without knowing the Department cost share	N/A	There is no commitment until the PFA is in place and the PFA will identify the cost share percentage. The Department won't know the percentage until the application have been reviewed and ranked. The Department will work with the Reclamation District to execute a funding agreement. in the past, the Districts have proposed a cost share that they merit in their proposal. Cost share is described in the Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects 2014 Guidelines (beginning on page 20). Program will estimate cost share by utilizing the 2014 Program Guidelines.	None
5	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 14 and 15, Table 5, Ecosystem Enhancement	The new requirement of only measure the success of the habitat component instead of measuring the performance of the target species is a fantastic change in new guidelines.	N/A	Thank you. The Program's goal is to work with all eligible LMA's to ensure successful implementation of the Program.	None
6	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	If Districts have a project that is ready for the Construction (phase 2 ready) can they skip Phase 1 and move straight to Phase 2?	N/A	Yes	None
7	10/7/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	A one week turn around for additional information from the Department is short, especially not knowing what information would be requested and depending on the their work load at the time of request.	Increase time for RFI one week turn-around	The Program allows one week for additional requested information to be submitted for the Concept Proposals. When Concept Proposals are chosen to move forward to full applications, the Program allows for consultation with DWR and CDFW prior to submittal of the Full Application.	The Delta Levee Special Flood Control Project Program will include the Concept Proposal in this PSP. Language will be added accordingly within the PSP.
8	10/7/2022	Nate Hershey	MBK	Page 8, Submission of Full App	The PSP is going away from the concept proposal. Not having concept proposals shifts the risk associated with the expense to the District. Full applications are big packages that require a lot of work. The concept proposal gave the Department a look at the potential project before moving forward with a full application.	Go back to concept proposals before requesting full applications	The Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects Program will include Concept Proposals in this PSP	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP

9	10/7/2022	Nate Hershey	MBK	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The language implies that more than \$37 million worth of project could be accepted, is that true? Also the language "first come first serve", so whoever gets the through the first phase will win and others might be left out or not receive funding until later?	N/A	Yes and Yes. The intent is to get projects in the queue because projects can take a different amount of time based on the complexity and permitting issue. Once a good set of projects have been submitted, the Department will review them and identify the percentage amount of funding. Ultimately, they would award more planning grants that they would have more construction funds for later; with the understanding that the Program continually gets money, and want to get projects built. We would want to have plans, specification, and permitted projects that are ready for construction waiting in the queue for funding that is available later. They don't have a set number of projects; it will depend on the proposals that are received.	None
10	10/7/2022	Nate Hershey	MBK	Appendix 1	Does DWR need to use the draft DLIS prioritizations for scoring (Appendix 1 of the PSP)?	N/A	Yes, if the draft is to change, PSP will take the changes in to account	None
11	10/7/2022	Nate Hershey	MBK	Page 16, Table 7, Climate Change...	Asked for a walkthrough for the climate change portion and expectation for level of effort are for a complete climate change analysis. seems like quite a bit of work, and selectively they'll have to figure out appropriate levels of effort. Some of this stuff would seem to be more appropriate to tackle in the design phase.	N/A	Climate change must be considered as part of the state's planning and investment decision. This includes considering a project through all phases to compare investment alternatives. Appendix 8 outlines a recommended process to consider climate for project proposals and provides informational resources to support the analysis. The first criteria/element of the element is to describe the climate change vulnerabilities of the project, such as the impact of sea level rise, and high storm water flows, especially in areas of significant subsidence. Another vulnerability might be increased frequency of drought and how drought response of increased ground water pumping could further exacerbate subsidence and decrease the stability of levees near the proposed project. The second scoring criteria element requires a more technical approach of looking at how a project is designed to anticipate climate impacts, such as evaluating how much sea level rise can the project withstand. Applicants should describe the method used to evaluate impacts of climate change on their project, such as through a deterministic or probabilistic approach. This is the most technical aspect of climate analysis. Applicants can contact DWR staff to access specific Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) technical products that may be used to analyze climate impacts for their proposed project or at the project scale. These and other resources are suggested as references in Appendix 8. The next criteria is for describing the project benefits and how these benefits might be impacted over time due to climate change. This includes long term project benefits such as flood protection, water supply. This aspect is more descriptive than requiring a technical analysis or modeling. Project adaptivity capacity refers to how much the project can respond and adapt to climate impacts over time. For example, are there elements in the project that are built in from the start to be "responsive" to climate impacts or are there elements that can be adjusted later with additional information about when climate impacts may occur? This is to address the uncertainty around when climate impacts may occur. DWR recognizes it is difficult to provide specific guidance or a tool for project design given the uncertainty of when impacts will occur. We are looking for applicants to demonstrate if the project is scalable and flexible enough to adapt to more adverse condition given the range of uncertainty around which these impacts may occur. Lastly, the project maintenance scoring criteria prompts applicants to think through how climate change could impact the longevity of the project over time and what plans might be needed in the event of significant climate event, such as contingency plans for maintaining projects in the event of levee failure or barriers to access. Overall, we are looking for a high-level climate analysis that can be done using existing studies and tools such as the Delta Adapts Vulnerability Assessment. The climate analysis should discuss impacts from a flood standpoint as well as climate impacts to the habitat elements of the project.	None
12	10/7/2022	Dominick Gulli	GME	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	If there is a max amount for application and if Districts can submit more than one application? Additionally, could one District get half the pot of money?	N/A	The draft PSP states that only one application per District may be submitted for a maximum amount of \$15 million. there will be two phases. Phase 1 is planning, design, and permitting and they may award 4 or 5 million depending on the quality of application that are received. Then that would leave enough money to fund 2 construction projects. That would then leave the other 2 or 3 projects working on plans, design, and permits (Phase 1) so that when more funding comes in, they would be ready for construction. Proposals are for an entire project. The PFAs that go out will be phased, the first phase includes plans, design, and permits and the second phase includes construction, implementation, close-out, and habitat maintenance.	None
13	10/7/2022	Dominick Gulli	GME	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	If a District is allowed to submit an application for \$15 million, if they are ranked the highest score will they be awarded \$15 million?	N/A	Districts would be funded a percentage for the first phase and if they are the first to complete Phase 1, then the Department would likely have enough of the \$37 million available to fund Phase 2 for that project. As described in a prior answer, this is a competitive process and Phase 2 may be funded once all of phase 1 has been successfully completed.	None
14	10/7/2022	Dominick Gulli	GME	Page 17, Cost Share	Assuming that the cost share will be higher than 75%, there used to be enhanced cost share components that they would need to add to receive the additional cost share. Is there a procedure for getting the higher cost share?	N/A	the Program Guidelines have the criteria for scoring . Cost share is described in the Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects 2014 Guidelines (beginning on page 20). Program will estimate cost share by utilizing the 2014 Program Guidelines.	None
15	10/7/2022	Dominick Gulli	GME	Page 15, Table 6, Static and Seismic Stability	Static and Seismic Stability is 0 to 65 points and that requires Seismic analysis. Why is so much credit being given to seismic considerations when the goal is to build at the Bulletin 192-82 standard, which already accounts for Seismic Stability?	N/A	Districts may propose HMP or Bulletin 192-82 and Districts should show the engineering behind why they are proposing their design. Since this is a competitive process, proposals should include the best possible engineering information to provide adequate background information for their proposal.	None
16	10/7/2022	Dominick Gulli	GME		Asked if a District can submit confidential questions for the PSP so as to be competitive and not show their hand to other contractors?	N/A	This is a Public Process. The Program will accept all comments during the public comment and review period and provide posted (internet) answers to questions and comments to the comments and questions.	None

17	10/7/2022	Mike Mirmazaheri	GEI	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Does not think that the concept of Phasing will not work for Districts. Previous phasing in the past was similar to: phase 1 was a screening and phase 2 was a decision making for application and that worked well. Now the District will propose a project and assuming they are ranked high to be placed on the list, then the PFA is signed for planning and permitting. The Districts will need to race against each other to submit Phase 1 before getting the PFA for Phase 2. Districts have always tried to use their limited funding to implement projects to show their constituencies their benefits. Districts are not in the business of completing studies and then letting them sit on shelf. Also permits have an expiration date on them and it can be a waste of time and money if no funding is available to complete the project. The PSP could potentially include a monitoring program so Districts could submit quarterly reports with projects and justification of any delays which could help keep projects moving forward instead of this new Phasing	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	The Program believes that the phased approach will help expedite funding for Multibenefit Projects in the Delta. In selecting projects through the PSP process, the Program will work closely to align available funding and project proposals to maximize Phase 2 funding. The Program may give priority to Projects that do not receive Phase 2 funding through a Directed Action when additional funding becomes available.	Language added to Page 9 of the PSP: "The Program may give priority to Projects that do not receive Phase 2 funding through a Directed Action when additional funding becomes available."
18	10/7/2022	Martin Berber	W&B	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Would a two-component project (setback levee: levee rehabilitation and then habitat enhancement) be restricted to starting construction until all the permits are obtained or could the portion of a project that has completed the permitting phase move forward to Phase 2 construction?	N/A	Proposals are based on complete projects only.	None
19	10/7/2022	Russel Ryan	MWD		Can PSP PowerPoint presentation be made available and sent out?	N/A	Yes, provided at November 2022 DLHAC to all mail recipients	None
20	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	"Funding for the Projects will be broken up into two phases with separate PFAs..." District has always entered into agreement with funding agencies knowing what the final product will be. As a local agency we are transparent with our constituency and accountable when expending district funds. Preparing applications and justifying projects are costly; therefore, it is important to assure our taxpayers that they will benefit from this effort. The absence of construction funds will not benefit the district and the intent of public safety.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
21	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	"The Phase 1 PFA will provide for planning, design, and permitting, while Phase 2 PFA will provide for construction, construction engineering and inspections, mitigation costs associated with construction, and project close out. DWR will not enter into Phase 2 funding until Phase 1 has been completed." Planning for a project includes CEQA documentation and permitting which both have limited life. CEQA documents, once circulated for comments and certified by our board, cannot be open ended. Permits also have expiration dates, especially the federal permits.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	We understand that are timeframes associated with permits and the Program is committed to funding these projects through Directed Action when funding becomes available.	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
22	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	"...however, successful completion of Phase 1 will not guarantee Phase 2 funding." Planning, design, and permitting are costly and time consuming. The district share is coming from the limited general fund with the goal of improving public safety. District is not interested to study the deficiencies unless the funding for construction is available in a foreseeable future.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
23	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Phase 2 funds will be available on a first come first served basis, depending upon available funding." Each project has its own uniqueness with impacts on the planning process timeline. The experience has shown that the federal agencies staff changes, and transitions affects permit issuance dates. A typical project will need to complete Section 7 Consultation, obtain 401 certification and concurrence from SHIPO, and wait for biological opinions from USFWS and NFMS prior to the USACE being able to issue its permit. The "first come first served basis" concept ignores this important processes	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	All regulatory activities identified in the comment will be completed under the Phase 1 grant. We expect the project proponent to comply with all applicable permitting requirements, including the ones mentioned. The Program will give priority to Projects that do not receive Phase 2 funding through a Directed Action when additional funding becomes available.	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
24	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	While we realize that your program is trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges, we believe phasing projects in the fashion presented on pages 8 and 9 of the PSP will be problematic for our district. As mentioned earlier we applaud you and your staff trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges; however, we don't believe the phasing approach in this PSP will benefit public safety given the district budgetary limitations and regulatory processes	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
25	10/17/2022	Mike Alvarez	RD 799	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The PSP limits one application per district, which we believe is a reasonable criteria given there is limited funds in the PSP. We also recommend each application to be limited in the size of its application amount, say \$5 million. The PSP currently allows up to \$15 million which is too high considering only \$37 million is in this PSP and there is no new special funding in the horizon.	We also recommend each application to be limited in the size of its application amount, say \$5 million.	A viable multi-benefit project will cost approximately \$15 million for a complete project from design through construction. The maximum total project cost will remain at \$15 million.	None
26	10/20/2022	Nate Hershey	MBK	Page 15, Table 6, Levee Standard	Climate Change Adaptation component requires building above the Bulletin 192-82 Standard, being Bulletin 192-82 the base. If the Climate Change Adaptation component analysis requires to build taller, would that be eligible under the Program? How is that going to be addressed? Which one is going to govern?	N/A	DWR has included Climate Change as part of this PSP, if a Climate Change analysis requires a levee that is higher in elevation, the Program will consider this during scoring and cost share on a case by case basis.	None
27	10/20/2022	Mike Mirmazaheri	GEI	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	The way phasing is presented, it is very different than previous PSPs. There is a reluctance on the districts to participate and whether they will spend the time and resources. Districts want to be the most effective with limited resources. I think the way the PSP is presented in phases could be a problem. Any thoughts on that? Any new information?	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
28	10/20/2022	Jeff Twitchell			When do you anticipate a formal PSP?	N/A	January-February 2023	None
29	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 1: FULL APPLICATION SUBMITTAL & PAGE 6 APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	By eliminating the concept proposal DWR is costing the local Reclamation District's a significant amount of money to see whether they have an acceptable application. Given the available funding for this PSP I would anticipate much fewer applications since we are competing for limited funds yet required to expend substantial money to apply.	Go back to concept proposals before requesting full applications	Please see Comment #8 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
30	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 2: INTENT	Is the protection of Deep-Water Shipping Channels a new beneficiary from these Projects?	N/A	No, the protection of Deep-Water Shipping Channels have been considered a beneficiary for past Projects as long as the Deep-Water Shipping Channel is within the legal Delta Boundary accepted by the Program (as identified in the CA Water Code 12220), as well as Deep-Water Shipping Channels adjacent to LMAs participating in the Program.	None
31	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 2: INTENT	Net Long Term Habitat Improvement (enhancement) was believed to be the DWR's responsibility. In 1988 (SB 34) it was agreed that DWR would allocate annual funding to plan and construct enhancement sites throughout the Delta which has been successfully accomplished throughout the Delta over the years. Apparently DWR is shifting its enhancement responsibility back to the local RD's.	N/A	Per California Water Code Sections 12310 - 12318, the Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects Program is a levee and flood control program. As per the California Water Code, the Program's mandate includes providing net long-term habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species in the Delta. Yes, the Program accomplishes this Programatically with its larger habitat projects on majority owned DWR properties such as Dutch Slough, Sherman Island, Twitchell Island etc. The intent of this PSP is to include habitat enhancement as a part of the multi-benefit goal of this PSP. Since all projects are multibenefit they require a habitat component. See Comment #3 Delta Levees Program Response	None
32	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 3: DEL TA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL	Are the DSC guidelines now a requirement or simply a guidance? The language in these application submittal requirements appear to be requirements not guidance.	N/A	The PSP incorporates DSC proposed regulations for Covered Actions and DLIS Funding Priorities List. The DLIS priority list is one of many factors considered, but represents less than 10% of the total scoring for this PSP. Projects that are not considered "Very high" or "high" priority can still get points if justification is provided.	None

33	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 4: CLIMATE CHANGE	EO B-30-15 requires State Agencies to take climate change into account. Please clarify that you are referring to Reclamation District's as State Agencies. What is full life-cycle cost accounting? Furthermore, the direction to individual Reclamation Districts to analyze, and plan for the impacts of climate change would be better served if DWR were to perform a Delta study that applied Delta wide. The cost of a detailed discussion of how the project defines, anticipates, and addresses climate change impacts, including a description of the method and data used to assess the potential impacts of flooding and/or sea level rise on the proposed project is not going to be an inexpensive undertaking.	N/A	EO B-30-15 directs state agencies to consider the impact of climate change in the State's planning and investment decisions. Grant awards made under the Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Solicitation are considered a state investment; therefore, DWR must consider climate change when making decisions about which projects to fund under this solicitation. DWR does not consider a Reclamation Districts as state agencies. What is full life-cycle cost accounting? Full life-cycle cost accounting refers to the analysis of all aspects of a project from planning and design, permitting, construction, ongoing operations, and maintenance through the life-span of the project, and potentially removal after the "useful" life of the project. Climate impacts should be assessed in all phases of the project. Appendix 8 provides guidance for conducting the climate change analysis and suggest several resources that can be used to carry-out the climate analysis for projects developed under this project solicitation proposal. For example, The Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Updates (DWR Public Draft 2022, DWR 2017), Delta Adapts Vulnerability Assessment (Delta Stewardship Council 2021), DWR Climate Action Plan: Phase III Vulnerability Assessment (DWR 2019), and Delta Levee Investment Strategy all provide relevant findings that can be used to assess climate change risks to the proposed project. However, because these assessments are not at the project scale, a project applicant may choose to conduct their own stand-alone climate risk assessment for their project. Cost and time of effort should be considered in the method or approach used for such an analysis. DWR expects that proposals can be responsive to the climate change scoring criteria using the existing tools and resources that are available. However, applicants might consider including more detailed or technically rigorous climate analysis an element of the project design phase in their proposals such that applicants could use the PSP funding to support the technical analysis that might be needed to inform project design.	None
34	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 5: ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	Is it possible for DWR to include the Water Code Sections that are referred to in these guidelines as appendices?	Add relevant CA Water Code excerpts to the appendix	Yes	Water Code Sections 12300-12318 will provided in the PSP appendices.
35	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 6: AVAILABLE FUNDS	Will DWR accept and fund Phase 2 applications only that are seeking funding to construct improvements provided a Reclamation District already has shovel ready plans?	N/A	Yes	None
36	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 6: APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	DWR requires a statement of the LMA's intent to enter into a Project Funding Agreement (PFA) with the Department of Water Resources (DWR), to implement a project under the Special Projects Program, and to provide local cost share for the project after signing a contract with DWR. Local RD's typically do not have any issues in signing a PFA but they may have an issue with agreeing in advance to a PFA award and to commit to a cost sharing agreement. I anticipate since the applying RD will not know its ultimate cost share with DWR they are going to have to propose a cost share that will fit their financial capability to adequately fund the project from the local's perspective.	N/A	Please see Comment #4 Delta Levees Program Response	None
37	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 7: APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	DWR requires a statement prepared by the Project Biologist discussing how the project intends to meet requirements of net habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species of the Delta. This may be a difficult task to complete during the Phase 1 application particularly when the project has yet to have been designed. I would suggest that this requirement be delayed till Phase 2 is implemented.	Delay statement by the Project Biologist discussing how the project intends to meet requirements of net habitat improvement and net benefit to aquatic species of the Delta until Phase 2.	The biologist statement will only be required with the Full Application, and not with the Concept Proposals.	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
38	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 7: APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	DWR requires a 1 week turn around if they contact the applicant to request more information. I would suggest depending on the complexity of the request that this be extended to at least 2 weeks.	Extend turn around period for RFI's	Please see Comment # 7 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
39	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 10: SCORING CRITERIA	The applicant will receive 0 points if not considered Very High or High priority under the Delta Levee Investment Strategy Priority List. This is a critical mistake given the system wide nature of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Not accounting the value of each and every island in the Delta system is a gross oversight and may tragically lead to multiple failures of islands within the system.	N/A	Please see Comment #32 Delta Levees Program Response	None
40	10/24/2022	Chris Neudeck	KSN, Inc.	PAGE 14: SCORING CRITERIA	The scoring is based upon the performance if the habitat and not the recovery of targeted species using the habitat, this is good	N/A	Thank you. The Program's goal is to work with all eligible LMA's to ensure successful implementation of the Program.	None
41	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	District has always entered into agreement with funding agencies knowing what the final product will be. As a local agency we are transparent with our constituency and accountable when expending district funds. Preparing applications and justifying projects are costly; therefore, it is important to assure our taxpayers that they will benefit from this effort. The absence of construction funds will not benefit the district and the intent of public safety.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
42	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Planning for a project includes CEQA documentation and permitting which both have limited life. CEQA documents, once circulated for comments and certified by our board, cannot be open ended. Permits also have expiration dates, especially the federal permits.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
43	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Planning, design, and permitting are costly and time consuming. The district share is coming from the limited general fund with the goal of improving public safety. District is not interested to study the deficiencies unless the funding for construction is available in a foreseeable future.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
44	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Each project has its own uniqueness with impacts on the planning process timeline. The experience has shown that the federal agencies staff changes, and transitions affects permit issuance dates. A typical project will need to complete Section 7 Consultation, obtain 401 certification and concurrence from SHIPO, and wait for biological opinions from USFWS and NFMS prior to the USACE being able to issue its permit. The "first come first served basis" concept ignores this important processes.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
45	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The PSP limits one application per district, which we believe is a reasonable criteria given there is limited funds in the PSP. We also recommend each application to be limited in the size of its application amount, say \$5 million. The PSP currently allows up to \$15 million which is too high considering only \$37 million is in this PSP and there is no new special funding in the horizon	Decrease the maximum total project cost of \$15 million to \$5 million	A viable multi-benefit project will cost approximately \$15 million for a complete project from design through construction. The maximum total project cost will remain at \$15 million .	None
46	10/27/2022	Regina Espinoza	BIMID	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	While we realize that your program is trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges, we believe phasing projects in the fashion presented on pages 8 and 9 of the PSP will be problematic for our district. As mentioned earlier we applaud you and your staff trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges; however, we don't believe the phasing approach in this PSP will benefit public safety given the district budgetary limitations and regulatory processes	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
47	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	District has always entered into agreement with funding agencies knowing what the final product will be. As a local agency we are transparent with our constituency and accountable when expending district funds. Preparing applications and justifying projects are costly; therefore, it is important to assure our taxpayers that they will benefit from this effort. The absence of construction funds will not benefit the district and the intent of public safety.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Delta Levees Program Comment #17 Change to PSP

48	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Planning for a project includes CEQA documentation and permitting which both have limited life. CEQA documents, once circulated for comments and certified by our board, cannot be open ended. Permits also have expiration dates, especially the federal permits.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
49	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Planning, design, and permitting are costly and time consuming. The district share is coming from the limited general fund with the goal of improving public safety. District is not interested to study the deficiencies unless the funding for construction is available in a foreseeable future.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
50	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	Each project has its own uniqueness with impacts on the planning process timeline. The experience has shown that the federal agencies staff changes, and transitions affects permit issuance dates. A typical project will need to complete Section 7 Consultation, obtain 401 certification and concurrence from SHIPO, and wait for biological opinions from USFWS and NFMS prior to the USACE being able to issue its permit. The "first come first served basis" concept ignores this important processes.	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
51	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The PSP limits one application per district, which we believe is a reasonable criteria given there is limited funds in the PSP. We also recommend each application to be limited in the size of its application amount, say \$5 million. The PSP currently allows up to \$15 million which is too high considering only \$37 million is in this PSP and there is no new special funding in the horizon	Decrease the maximum total project cost of \$15 million to \$5 million	A viable multi-benefit project will cost approximately \$15 million for a complete project from design through construction. The maximum total project cost will remain at \$15 million .	None
52	10/26/2022	Jim Waters	RD 2127	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	While we realize that your program is trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges, we believe phasing projects in the fashion presented on pages 8 and 9 of the PSP will be problematic for our district. As mentioned earlier we applaud you and your staff trying to resolve some ongoing program management challenges, however, we don't believe the phasing approach in this PSP will benefit public safety given the district budgetary limitations and regulatory processes	Do not phase the funding agreements for the proposed projects	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
53	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The draft PSP states that the solicitation makes up to \$37 million available for selected projects. During the question-and-answer period at recent public workshops, it was clearly stated that more than \$37 million worth of projects may be selected for potential funding. This would result in some selected projects having no funding for construction. These projects would essentially "sit on the shelf" for an indefinite amount of time, potentially resulting in a district carrying the financial burden of the local cost share for a project that does not get constructed.	N/A	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
54	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 5 and 6, Available Funding	The PSP states the total combined initial grant awards for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 shall not exceed \$15 million. Please confirm this amount applies to each individual applicant.	N/A	Total combined initial grant awards for both Phase 1 and 2 (described henceforth) shall not exceed \$15 million. DWR reserves the right to exceed this amount based on changed circumstances and shall be allowed within DWR's sole discretion.	None
55	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 8, Submission of Full App	The draft PSP does not include the ability for applicants to submit concept proposals. Full applications require a substantial amount of effort to prepare and are a significant expense for the applicant. A concept proposal provides the California Department of Water Resources with an opportunity to review and screen potential projects, thus minimizing the potential risk for the applicant. We recommend using concept proposals for initial review, similar to previous PSP's. Requiring applicants to submit full applications presents added risk and expense, and limits the proposal pool to only those Districts that can afford the high price for applying. This will potentially limit the benefit of the funding to only a few Districts, likely those with publicly owned or State-owned lands.	Go back to concept proposals before requesting full applications	Please see Comment #8 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
56	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 8 and 9, Submission of Full Application	The concept of phasing projects will likely be problematic. In the event that construction remains unfunded, environmental documents will become outdated. This potentially presents added risk and expense to the applicants and could create stranded investments.	N/A	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #17 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
57	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	PAGE 10: SCORING CRITERIA	The scoring based on the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Levee Investment Strategy (DLIS) investment priorities could be problematic. The DLIS investment priorities are labeled as "Preliminary Draft" and are subject to change. If the priorities change, the scoring of the projects will be inaccurate.	N/A	Please see Comment #32 Delta Levees Program Response	None
58	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 16, Table 7, Climate Change...	The climate change analysis required seems overly burdensome for a proposal. It seems more appropriate to perform a climate change analysis if a project is selected and funded	Require Climate Change Analysis after selection of projects	The Program has included Climate Change as part of a DWR requirement. Climate Change Analysis will be required as part of the Full Application of a Proposal. A Climate Change Analysis is an important component in determining a project scope.	None
59	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 15, Table 6, Levee Standard	The PSP allows projects to be constructed to the Bulletin 192-82 Standard. The PSP also requires a climate change analysis. If the results of the climate change analysis indicate that the levee should be built substantially above Bulletin 192-82 in order to mitigate effects of climate change, will the additional overbuild be allowed? What is the governing factor?	Allow overbuild if Climate Analysis recommends	Please see Comment #26 Delta Levees Program Response	None

60	11/2/2022	Nate Hershey and Mike Moncrief	MBK	Page 2, Intent	The Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program should fund flood protection projects as its primary function. The Delta Levees Program has successfully utilized a programmatic approach for multi-benefit objectives, rather than requiring multi-benefit elements for each individual project. This solicitation deviates from this practice, and limits the size and scale of flood protection provided by this grant at a time when the majority of non-project levees in the Delta do not meet the Bulletin 192-82 design standard	N/A	Please see Comment #31 Delta Levees Program Response	None
61	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 5	Paragraph 1: This is safer because less likely to break than a specific link. However, to aid a reader, could link directly to DLIS: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Add Link: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Link will be updated	Link added to Page 4 of PSP: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/
62	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 5	Paragraph 2: Again, fine to use our website, but could update or include a second link for covered actions: https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/	Add Link: https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/	Link will be updated	Link added to Page 4 of PSP : https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/
63	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 5	Paragraph 5: OPC currently updating this to a new, scenario-based approach. Depending on when the PSP is released, please check that OPC 2018 is still the most recent available.	N/A	The PSP will refer to the most recent OPC State Sea Level Rise Guidance	Update language on Page 4 of PSP: "Regarding planning for sea level rise, the Ocean Protection Council's 2018 State Sea Level Rise Guidance (or current version) provides information..."
64	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 5	Paragraph 6: "Required"? vs "requested" in the first sentence.	N/A	The Climate Risk in Investment Survey is only a request by DWR and responses to the survey do not affect scoring	None
65	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 6	Paragraph 1: It's not clear why this statement is here. Is it because there are islands/levees on the priority list and map that aren't eligible for funding? Maybe say "Not all islands/levees identified on the priority list are eligible for funding." or similar.	Maybe say "Not all islands/levees identified on the priority list are eligible for funding." or similar.	The first paragraph on Page 5 explains basic eligibility requirements for the DWR Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program PSP.	None
66	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 6	Paragraph 4: Consider adding a map or list of eligible islands/tracts based on 10,000AF of AAS. Adds clarity regarding eligibility.	Consider adding a map or list of eligible islands/tracts based on 10,000AF of AAS	The PSP specifies that eligible islands/tracts must have an AAS of 10,000AF or greater. Currently, the Program relies on the District's knowledge and understanding of the specifics of their islands/tracts. When the Program has the staff and resources to provide a map, we may include the information in future PSP's.	None
67	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 7	Section 5A, last bullet: This doesn't seem to square with the footnote that "descriptions may be limited to a discussion of elements/objectives".	N/A	Some applicants may have limited resources that prevent them from providing maps and drawings of proposed projects. The level of detail provided in the project description is at the discretion of the applicant; however, the scoring of their application will be affected, and they will not receive the full points available for the project description in "Table 3 Criteria, General Elements and Quality of Proposal" if information is lacking.	None
68	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Second bullet: Should add a footnote or further discussion on defining "net benefit", that mitigation is not eligible, and what will be eligible as "habitat" (i.e., planting native grasses vs. riparian). If aligned with the PSP, it could also benefit from expanding this to both aquatic and associated species, i.e. riparian not just fish.	Add footnote or further discussion on defining "net benefit."	Further discussion on habitat enhancement can be found in their respective sections of "Table 3. Scoring Criteria, General Elements and Quality of Proposal" and "Table 5. Scoring Criteria, Ecosystem Enhancement."	None
69	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Second bullet: How are "improvements" and "benefits" measured?	N/A	The habitat types of the AB360 program are measured in acres for riparian forest, scrub shrub and freshwater marsh, and linear feet of shaded riverine aquatic.	None
70	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Third bullet: Area? Also, consider a note on habitat quality or current function.	Consider a note on habitat quality or current function.	Please see comment #68 Delta Levees Program Response	None
71	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Fourth bullet: How are "improvements" measured?	N/A	Export water supply reliability improvements are measured by many factors which include but not limited to less frequent levee failures, preventing salinity intrusion, allowing north/south flows, flood control, allowing the water quality and system capacity to function to the satisfaction of the State and water users.	None
72	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Seventh bullet: This definition could be added above and help address an earlier comment.	Add definition above	It is unclear where you recommend this definition to be added, and which comment it will help address.	None
73	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 8	Eighth bullet: Note that this implies a certain level of detail for the project description. Are these typically completed at the level needed to support an Initial Study?	N/A	A draft CEQA checklist for the Full Application is required, but not for the concept proposal. District's have been able to provide this information in past PSP full applications.	Please see Comment #7 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
74	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 9	First bullet: Maybe differentiate a bit more that the Appendix 7 information won't be used to assess the 50-point climate change scoring item. This is a little confusing until you get to the end in Appendix 7.	Differentiate a bit more that the Appendix 7 information won't be used to assess the 50-point climate change scoring item	The PSP specifically states "See also Appendix 7 to provide the information requested in the Climate Risk in Investments Survey questions (note that responses to these questions do not affect scoring)."	None
75	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 11	First paragraph link: Again, may be easier for applicant to have more direct link: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Add Link: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Link will be updated	Link added to Page 11 of PSP : https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/
76	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 11	Second paragraph: Or "applicant's district must be responsible for an island/tract considered a Very-High priority for funding ..." or similar. The priority designations run with islands/tracts rather than districts.	Change language of second paragraph	Language will be modified to refer to islands/tracts instead of Districts	Language modified on Page 11 of PSP: "To receive maximum points the applicant's district must be responsible for an island/tract considered a Very-High priority for funding, based on the DSC's Delta Levee Investment Strategy Funding Priorities. -or- To receive 35 points the applicant's district must be responsible for an island/tract considered a High priority for funding, based on the DSC's Delta Levee Investment Strategy Funding Priorities. -or- The applicant will receive no points if its district is not responsible for an island/tract considered a Very-High or High priority for funding."
77	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 11	Third paragraph: See previous	See Comment #76 suggested Change(s)	Please see Comment #76 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #76 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
78	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 11	Fourth paragraph: See previous	See Comment #76 suggested Change(s)	Please see Comment #76 Delta Levees Program Response	Please see Comment #76 Delta Levees Program Change to PSP
79	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 11	Fifth paragraph: Or "that is not located on a Very-High or High priority island or tract"	Change language of fifth paragraph	Language will be modified	Language modified on Page 11 of PSP: "Note: The DSC Delta Plan provides the opportunity for a project not located on a Very-High or High funding priority island/tract to still be considered for funding, provided there is sufficient justification."
80	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 15	Under "Scoring Considerations": Could consider connectivity as well, e.g. either improving connectivity to nearby habitat and/or provide a refuge when there is no nearby habitat. This would be narrative only.	Consider habitat connectivity	Language will be added	Language added to Page 15 of PSP: "Quality of the project, including those projects that increase connectivity to other habitats, incorporate a higher diversity of habitat types into their habitat enhancement design,"
81	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 15	Under "Scoring Considerations", second bullet: May want to add detail here. For example, "Quantity of the enhancement being propose. For example, area, linear extent, quantification of habitat type and function, or other relevant factors"	Add detail to Scoring Considerations	Language will be added	Language added to Page 15 of PSP: "Quantity of the enhancement being proposed (linear feet for SRA and acres for other habitat types)."
82	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 15	Under "Scoring Considerations", third bullet: Consider clarifying for "negative" habitat impacts. For example, "Avoidance or minimization of negative habitat impacts to existing on-site or adjacent habitat or functions, that could reasonably occur as a result of the project"	Clarify negative habitat impacts	Negative habitat impacts are ultimately determined by CDFW and only approximated during the PSP. The suggested addition doesn't add needed information.	None
83	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 17	Table 7 text under "Project Benefits": Suggest adding some rationale for why the time period chosen is "reasonable" and aligned with the climate change assessment in the preceding question.	Add rationale for why the time period is "reasonable"	Language will be modified, changing "over a reasonable time period" to "expected life of the project".	Language modified on Page 17 of PSP, Table 7: changing "over a reasonable time period" to "over the expected life of the project".

84	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 17	Table 7 text under "Project Maintenance...": Somewhat similar to the last question. Consider combining.	Consider combining Project Benefit and Project Maintenance	Project Benefits criteria focus on project benefits and how those benefits may change over time due to climate impacts. Project Maintenance refers to how the project will be maintained over time given expected climate change and what contingency plans might be needed in the event of emergency response.	None
85	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 19	8D: Specifically call out Delta Reform Act as well?	Add language	Language will be modified to include the Delta Reform Act.	Language added to Page 19 of PSP, 8D: "All activities funded pursuant to the Program are required to be in compliance with all applicable environmental laws including the federal Clean Water Act, the Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act."
86	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 19	Last paragraph, 8F: Change to Delta Levees Special Projects	Change language	Language will be modified to refer to the Special Projects Program	Language modified on Page 19 of PSP, 8F: "To the extent practicable, a project supported by funds from the Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program will include signage and other relevant forms of..."
87	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 22	Appendix 1, Second bullet: Cannot comment in box above, but consider this URL: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Add Link: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/	Link will be updated	Footnote link updated on Page 22 of PSP: https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/dlis/
88	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 25	Does this only cover activities outside of district direct discretion, i.e. critical maintenance, emergency response? Or, any activity? Is there a financial requirement that the District would need to cover partial costs to implement this again?	N/A	This covers all activities by the District that may impact the developed habitat, or occurrences outside of the District's purview. As stated in the previous sentence, habitat maintenance will be covered under the Subventions Program.	None
89	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 31	Not critical, but could consider adding a link to most recent OPC guidance, future inflow projections/modeling from DWR. Or, simply refer to the guide that follows. It could be helpful for the organization to have a point of reference on which to describe their capacity to address climate change.	Consider adding a link to most recent OPC guidance	The climate risk questionnaire is used in all DWR grant and project solicitation proposals. The information collected here is not a factor in project scoring. We don't think additional resources specific to sea level rise guidance are needed for the climate risk questionnaire since the intent is to cover all potential climate impacts entities may be addressing.	None
90	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 31	At #4: And/or adaptation strategy	Add Language	Language will be updated by adding "and/or adaptation strategy" after "vulnerability assessment" in question #4.	Language added on Page 31 of PSP: "and/or adaptation strategy" after "vulnerability assessment" in question #4.
91	11/4/2022	Erin Mullin and Jeff Henderson	DSC	Page 33	J. Henderson: As this is new criteria for the program, consider reorganizing into a "guide" and "resources". The "guide" should speak directly to how to approach each of the questions in the scoring criteria (question by question), and the "resources" should provide reference materials that can be drawn upon. This mostly does that, but its really long compared to companion pieces on habitat, etc. Its not really clear what you're looking for. E. Mullin: Agree. I like the idea of having a climate change guide, similar to what OPR has prepared, but more centered on levees/water resources: https://resources.ca.gov/CNRALegacyFiles/docs/climate/01APG_Planning_for_Adaptive_Communities.pdf . Perhaps the guide could be a separate resource, and the content here can be made more concise as a checklist to address, with some key resources included.	Consider re-organizing Appendix 8	The comment is reasonable and the current layout of Appendix 8 could be revised to tie more closely to sections in the climate change scoring criteria table. Language could also be added to tie back to climate change scoring criteria table where most relevant. However, more time is needed to flesh out further revisions and re-organize Appendix 8. Due to staffing and time constraints, the language will be updated for a future PSP.	None