

Appendix C

Response to Comments

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION**

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements and Water Quality Certification for the Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Stream Maintenance Program

The Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) was the sole commenter during the Tentative Order's (TO's) 30-day public notice period, which closed on June 16, 2017. Staff's responses to the District's comments are provided below.

District Comments – June 15, 2017

***Comments 1 and 13 [page 1, Finding 3.a; page 7, Finding 34; and page 22, Provision D.30]:
2017 Maintenance Authorization***

The District provided the Regional Water Board with its Pre-Project Notification for 2017, a list of stream maintenance projects proposed for [fiscal year] 2017 maintenance season. The District requested that the tentative order be revised to incorporate a permitting mechanism for this proposed Year 1 work, with the understanding that revisions might be needed prior to approval of the 2017 Annual Work Plan. The District requested that it be allowed to submit, for work in 2017, additional sites or revisions to project scope by July 31.

Response to Comments 1 and 13

We concur with the proposed change. We reviewed the District's 12 proposed maintenance projects for 2017 and determined that they meet the criteria outlined in the TO. The TO has been revised to approve the District's 2017 Notification (Attachment C) as part of the TO. See Finding 34 on page 8 and Provision D.30 on page 22 for the additional permitting mechanism, stated below:

34. The Order authorizes work proposed in the Notification for the 2017 maintenance season, submitted on June 15, 2017. The District shall have until July 31, 2017, to submit an amended Notification for the 2017 maintenance season that identifies any additional sites or revisions to maintenance project scope. Additional or revised maintenance shall not commence until the District has received written approval from the Executive Officer. All subsequent years of the SMP shall adhere to the Notification submittal deadline required by this Order and the SMP Manual.

Comment 2 [page 1, Finding 3.b]: Quantitative thresholds

The District requested that staff incorporate text to indicate that the development of stream channel quantitative objectives shall incorporate the use of cross-sections, pictograms and other methods applicable to the variable conditions and data limitations at specific sites within the program.

Response to Comment 2

We concur with the proposed change and have incorporated this comment into Provisions D.13 and D.20 of the TO. We note that other parties with Board-approved Stream Maintenance Programs, such as the Sonoma County Water Agency, use the described methods as tools to help manage their

streams and maintenance work. Thus, this change is consistent with approaches the Board has accepted for other programs.

Comment 3 [page 2, Finding 5]: SMP Site List Updates

*The District requests that the following text, shown in bold, be added to finding 5:SMP activities shall be limited to sites identified in the revised SMP manual for all subsequent years **unless an addendum to the Order is filed with the Regional Board to include new sites which may arise as new projects are added to the District's maintenance program over time (i.e., from the Watershed Program).***

Response to Comment 3

We agree. We have added the requested language to Finding 5 and Provision D.38.b of the TO with the adjustments to the requested language shown in bold:

...unless an addendum to the Order is filed with the Regional Water Board, **publicly noticed, and approved by the Executive Officer** to include new sites that may arise as new projects are added to the District's maintenance program over time (i.e., from the Watershed Program).

As noted by the revision, we would publicly notice an addendum to the Order that adds new maintenance sites and address any comments received. The addendum would require Executive Officer approval, and, in the event of significant comment, we would consider bringing the item before the Board for its review. We recommend that if the District proposes additional sites, it do so during Years 1 and 4, when the Order otherwise requires revisions to the SMP to be publicly noticed and reviewed for Executive Officer approval.

Comments 4 and 19 [page 2, Finding 6 and page 17, Provision D.11]: Maintenance Work Limits

The District proposes the following limits of work at a particular site, annually, and over five years:

Maximum linear feet (LF) per site= 2800 LF/1.6 acres for [earthen and concrete] engineered flood control channels (this fits all of our sediment removal sites except for the Corte Madera mainstem at 4,000 ft.); Maximum annual total (5 year work plan totals in box) = 5,000 LF/2.87 acres; Maximum five-year total = 25,000 LF or 14,500 acres.

Response to Comments 4 and 19

The District is proposing limits that are different from the ones presented in the TO, which are as follows:

- a. Maximum length of maintenance within a concrete channel shall be 2,885 contiguous linear feet;
- b. Maximum length of maintenance within an earthen channel shall be 600 contiguous linear feet; and
- c. Maximum volume of debris or sediment removed from any site shall be 2,100 cubic yards.

These activities may not exceed the program wide cumulative annual total of 7,500 linear feet (LF) of creek channel and 11,000 cubic yards of sediment and debris. Over the 5-year term of this Order, these activities may not exceed the program wide cumulative total of 37,500 LF and 55,000 cubic yards of sediment and debris.

The proposed limit of 2,800 LF for concrete engineered channels is a decrease from the original limit of 2,885 LF and has been incorporated into the TO. However, to add the same limit for earthen engineered channels would be a substantial increase from the originally proposed limit of 600 LF. The bed and banks of earthen engineered channels and natural channels, including their riparian vegetation, provide a variety of water quality benefits and beneficial uses. Potential impacts to those beneficial uses are managed, in part, by limiting the extent of area and length that may be impacted during a particular season of work. We do not agree to the requested change for earthen engineered channels but do agree to increase the limit to 800 LF (revised text shown in bold below) as discussed further below. Additionally, we modified the text to clarify that, under the SMP, there are three types of channels (concrete engineered, earthen engineered, and natural) with separate limits as found in Finding 6 and Provision D.11 (text from Finding 6 shown below with revised text in bold):

- a. Maximum length of maintenance within a concrete engineered flood control channel is ~~2,885~~ **2,800** contiguous linear feet;
- b. Maximum length of maintenance within an earthen engineered flood control channel is ~~600~~ **800** contiguous linear feet;
- c. **Maximum length of maintenance within a natural channel is 600 contiguous linear feet; and**
- d. Maximum volume of debris or sediment removed from any site is 2,100 cubic yards.

These activities may not exceed a program-wide cumulative annual total of **5,000 linear feet** of creek channel and 11,000 cubic yards of sediment and debris. Over the Order's 5-year term, these activities may not exceed a program-wide cumulative **total of 25,000 linear feet** and 55,000 cubic yards of sediment and debris. **Exceptions to these limits may be approved on a case-by-case basis through the submittal of the Notification, acceptable to the Executive Officer, provided the project is demonstrated to not result in greater impacts than a project that conforms to the limits of this Order.**

Based on our review of the proposed sediment removal SMP sites, the 800 LF limit should be acceptable since there are only a few earthen engineered channel sites longer than 800 LF planned for maintenance. At those sites, only localized sediment removal is planned, making the actual LF of maintenance significantly less than the 800 LF limit. Accordingly, a longer reach limit is not warranted.

We have also included a mechanism for the District to propose work that exceeds the limits in exceptional cases, acceptable to the Executive Officer, provided the project is demonstrated to have minimal impacts that are less than or equal to impacts from maintenance work performed within the limits of the Order. In addition, the requested limit of 14,500 acres of maintenance in 5 years is unacceptable, and we assume it was a typo since the proposed annual acreage limits add up to 14.4 acres over 5 years.

Comment 5 [page 2, Finding 9]: Mitigation Requirements

The District proposes to change the language of Finding 9 to read (proposed revisions shown in bolded text):

The next increment of 0.1:1 mitigation ratio will be provided through on- or off-site mitigation: activities that avoid and minimize impacts, with the goal of increasing habitat value and function. These activities may include implementation of Avoidance and

Minimization Measures [AMMs] identified in the SMP Manual, removal of invasive non-native plant species, clearing of trash and debris from the channel, and replanting native species.... This increment mitigates for the temporary impacts that persist while on-site mitigation is becoming fully established. The intent of the SMP is to develop long-term improvements ~~to the District's creeks~~ to creeks within the District's jurisdiction.

Response to Comment 5

The Water Board defines mitigation activities as work to avoid, minimize, and compensate for project impacts. The District's SMP Manual includes Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs) in the SMP Manual that avoid and minimize as well as compensate (e.g., debris and trash removal, native willow staking). As such, the AMMs are mitigation activities. We have added these revisions (shown in bold) with the following adjustments to Finding 9 shown below. The incorporated revisions are meant to clearly reflect the guidelines already in place within the SMP Manual that ensure the District will meet the Water Board's mitigation requirements.

Temporary impacts from SMP activities that cannot be entirely avoided through pre-maintenance planning will be mitigated through implementation of environmental enhancement activities, **including, but not limited to, AMMs listed in the SMP Manual, such as native willow staking, planting of native riparian vegetation, trash removal, and non-native/invasive plant removal, within the flood control zones.** Mitigation under the SMP will be provided at a minimum ratio of 1.1:1 (acres/linear feet enhanced to acres disturbed). The first increment of 1:1 mitigation ratio will be provided onsite by directly restoring the area disturbed. The next increment of 0.1:1 mitigation ratio will be provided through on- or offsite mitigation activities **including, but not limited to, AMMs and other environmental enhancement activities that increase habitat value and function.** This increment mitigates for the temporary impacts that persist while onsite mitigation is becoming fully established. The intent of the SMP is to develop long-term improvements **to creeks within the District's jurisdiction.** Therefore, long-term enhancement projects, as well as projects that reduce the need for future maintenance implemented by the District, may be counted towards the 0.1:1 mitigation increment.

Provision D.26 has been modified similarly, as follows, to address this comment:

26. The District shall revise the SMP Manual to require a mitigation ratio of 1.1:1 for any temporary impacts and include specific mitigation actions **and/or avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs)** for temporary impacts at each SMP site. Each site shall be evaluated for the **appropriate AMMs** and mitigation action(s), which may include, but not be limited to; headwater-area erosion control, native willow staking, planting of native riparian vegetation, removal of trash, and removal of invasive plant species.

Comment 6 [page 3, Finding 11]: Large Woody Debris (LWD) Removal

The District requests that Finding 11 be revised to state (proposed revisions bolded):

LWD removal will only occur where woody debris poses a significant risk to infrastructure or could cause flooding due to diminished channel capacity. **The SMP Manual shall be revised to reflect that locations with recurring LWD (Large Woody Debris) removal shall be assessed for alternate treatments (i.e., adjustments in maintenance activities or potential capital improvements) so that the frequency of LWD removal/modification is reduced. These assessments shall be conducted as part of the pre-project assessments to**

investigate the root cause of reoccurring LWD removal and reported in the Pre-Project Notifications each year. The SMP Manual shall be revised to include an assessment of sites with recurring LWD removal or management activities to identify the cause(s) of LWD accumulation and need for removal or management. This assessment shall also identify adjustments in maintenance activities and/or alternate BMPs (e.g., capital improvements) that potentially address the cause(s) of recurring LWD accumulation and need for removal or management in order to reduce the frequency of LWD removal/modification maintenance activities.

Response to Comment 6

We appreciate the District's suggestion and have incorporated the comment into Finding 11 as shown below:

LWD removal will only occur where woody debris poses a significant risk to infrastructure or could cause flooding due to diminished channel capacity. **The SMP Manual shall be revised to reflect that locations with reoccurring LWD removal shall be assessed for alternate treatments (i.e., adjustments in maintenance activities or potential capital improvements) so that the frequency of LWD removal/modification is reduced. These assessments shall be conducted and documented as part of the pre-project assessments to investigate the root cause of reoccurring LWD removal and reported in the Notification each year.** ~~The SMP Manual shall be revised to include an assessment of sites with recurring LWD removal or management activities to identify the cause(s) of LWD accumulation and need for removal or management. This assessment shall also identify adjustments in maintenance activities and/or alternate BMPs (e.g., capital improvements) that potentially address the cause(s) of recurring LWD accumulation and need for removal or management in order to reduce the frequency of LWD removal/modification maintenance activities.~~

Comment 7 [page 4, Finding 12]: Mitigation for impacts to salmonid streams

The District requests that the following language be added to finding 12:

“Actions to mitigate impacts to salmonid streams may include implementation of Avoidance and Minimization Measures identified in the SMP Manual, removal of invasive non-native plant species, clearing of trash and debris from the channel, and replanting native species as well as long-term enhancement projects that reduce the need for future maintenance and/or directly improve salmonid habitat (i.e., fish passage projects).”

Response to Comment 7

We agree and have revised the text as requested.

Comment 8 [page 4, Finding 14]: Geomorphic coding system

The District requests that the following language be added to finding 14:

“Development of quantitative thresholds may employ include use of cross-sections, pictograms and other methods applicable to the variable conditions and data limitations at specific sites within the program.”

Response to District Comment 8

We agree and have included the text as requested.

Comment 9 [page 5, Finding 16]: Sediment Beneficial Re-use

The District requests that the bolded text be added to Finding 16:

*This Order requires the SMP Manual to be revised to indicate that, whenever feasible, the District shall beneficially re-use excavated sediments for appropriate road base applications. For all other instances, the District shall dispose excavated sediment at a certified landfill and will test materials in accordance with the landfill requirements **unless a beneficial reuse project is identified in the Pre-project Notification and appropriate testing of materials is completed in accordance the RWQCB regulations prior to reuse of the material in another project.***

Response to Comment 9

The Water Board supports a range of beneficial reuse options for excavated sediment. As such, the TO has been revised to allow reuse options other than road base, contingent on submittal of an acceptable Sediment Sampling and Analysis Plan in accordance with the *Guidelines for Implementing the Inland Testing Manual in the San Francisco Bay Region* (DMMO, September 2001), the *Beneficial Reuse of Dredged Materials: Sediment Screening and Testing Guidelines* (SFB-RWQCB 2000) or *The Designated Level Methodology for Waste Classification and Cleanup Level Determination* (CVR-RWQCB, 1989), as appropriate for the proposed disposal or reuse site.

The TO requires the District to maximize beneficial reuse of excavated sediment. Presently, the District most often reuses sediment as road base, but other options, including wetland restoration, may be available. Wetland restoration or other reuse options that could impact sensitive habitats require sediment testing to ensure sediment quality is protective of beneficial uses for the proposed option. In order to implement a sediment sampling and testing program, a Sediment Sampling and Analysis Plan must be completed in accordance with Provision D.4.b and submitted with the District's Annual Notification prior to beneficially reusing sediment for anything other than road base.

Comment 10 [page 5, Finding 18]: Quantitative Thresholds

The District requests that the following bolded text be added to Finding 18:

*This Order requires the SMP Manual to be revised to include a quantitative metric describing the degree to which vegetation is contributing to channel roughness and develop thresholds for acceptable channel roughness values for each SMP site to help identify when vegetation management is or is not necessary. **Development of quantitative metrics may include use of cross-sections, pictograms, and other methods applicable to the variable conditions and data limitations at specific sites within the program.***

Response to District Comment 10

We agree. Other Board-approved SMP programs have used tools the same as or similar to the suggested ones in their programs. We modified the TO as requested.

Comment 11 [page 6, Finding 25]: Levee Maintenance

The District requests that the following bolded language be added to finding 25:

*Levee maintenance activities occur when plant growth on levee roads impedes safe access to flood control facilities, **when levee safety inspections are required including on side slopes, and** ...when levees are eroding or settling such that they...*

Response to Comment 11

We agree with the proposed changes and have revised Finding 25 with the following additions to provide clarity on the activities associated with “limited mowing of side slopes”:

(...)Levee maintenance activities occur when plant growth on levee roads impedes safe access to flood control facilities and **for levee inspections**, when levees are eroding or settling such that they require additional fill material to achieve their original height, and/or when burrowing mammals damage the stability of levees. **Mowing frequency of side slopes is limited to one event every four years or as part of a post storm assessment or disaster declaration. On an annual basis, approximately 1,500 linear feet and 0.14 acres of levees may be mowed in one maintenance season. The entire length of the levee would be mowed on both the landward and creek side of the levee. On the creek side of the levee, mowing will target non-native vegetation and may include Baccharis (coyote bush) on the upper slope above the high tide line. Native tidal vegetation at the high tide line or lower will be avoided and will not be mowed. All AMMs for creek and levee maintenance shall be applied in accordance with the SMP Manual.**

Comment 12 [page 6, Finding 26]: Levee mowing

*The District requests that the following language be added to finding 26: “Levee maintenance activities include mowing access routes and **limited mowing of side slopes as needed in order to conduct geotechnical assessments for levee safety**, ... placing fill on levee tops, and...”*

Response to District Comment 12

We agree and modified Finding 26 as requested.

Comment 14 [page 8, Finding 36]: Annual Report

The District requests deletion of the following language in Finding 36: “...as well as a complete inventory assessing and prioritizing the SMP site list.” The District asserts that the requirement seems out of place because the District “would not assess and reprioritize our five year work plan in a Post-Project Annual Report. This would be more appropriate to move to the Pre-project Notification requirements.”

Response to Comment 14

We have not made the requested deletion because it would result in a misinterpretation of the TO’s requirements. The TO requires the District to compile a list of specific SMP sites with chronic maintenance problems that can be addressed with capital improvements or adjustments in maintenance techniques. In so doing, it identifies opportunities to reduce future maintenance needs and their associated impacts for the subset of sites with chronic maintenance problems. This list is separate from the overall SMP site inventory that prioritizes sites for maintenance covered under the TO.

We did modify Provisions D.29 and D.33 of the TO to require this list to be submitted with the Notification instead of the Annual Report, since the Notification deadline falls within the District’s capital improvement projects (CIP)/budget season. The list must be submitted separately from the list of annual maintenance sites already required in the Notification.

Comment 15 [page 9, Finding 42]: Application Fee

Do we need to establish the annual LF/CY limit and 5 year total?

Response to Comment 15

Yes, the TO establishes authorized limits of work. The application fee is based on the 5-year total of 25,000 LF. Accordingly, the current application fee is the maximum fee of \$120,000 with an Annual Active Discharge Fee of \$720 and an Annual Monitoring Fee of \$360. Fees are established by the State Water Board and are subject to change.

Comment 16 [page 10, Finding 44.c]: Biostabilization Methods

*The District requests that the following language be added to Finding 44.c: Biostabilization methods based on accepted guidelines **such as those** developed by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Corps;*

Response to Comment 16

We agree and revised Finding 44.c as requested.

Comment 17 [page 13, Discharge Specifications B.1]: Soil Erosion Control Measures

*The District requests that the following language be added to Discharge Specification B.1: “...**and the FishNet Manual: Guidelines for Protecting Habitat and Salmon Fisheries for County Road Maintenance (2008)**...”*

Response to Comment 17

We agree and revised the text as requested.

Comment 18 [page 17, Provision D.10]: Vegetation Management

The District requests that the following bolded language be added to Provision D.10:

*Further, the revised vegetation management measures shall include incorporation of environmental quality features into concrete or grouted flood control channels **where feasible**. Lastly, the revised vegetation management measures shall specify that emergent vegetation that impedes channel capacity shall be managed by removing above-ground biomass with manual methods, such as a scythe or weed-whacker, in the fall after the bird nesting season is complete, and leaving the subsurface rhizomes untouched. SMP sites at the confluence of creeks, **or up or downstream of culverts or flood control structures**, where vegetation has grown into the active channel may be approved for full removal of subsurface roots if it is determined to be necessary in order to maintain a low flow channel.*

Response to Comment 18

We have incorporated the following edit to Provision D.10 to clearly reflect the intent of this revision to the SMP Manual that it requires; the second change was incorporated as requested.

... Further, the revised vegetation management measures shall include incorporation of environmental quality features into concrete or grouted flood control channels **to the maximum extent practicable**.

Comment 20 [page 17, Provision D.13]: Quantitative Thresholds and Metrics

*The District requests that the following bolded language be added to Provision D.13: “...that proposed corrective actions are sufficient for each maintenance type. **Development of quantitative***

thresholds may employ include use of cross-sections, pictogram templates or other methods to establish thresholds that trigger maintenance activities. At a minimum, the vegetation management assessment shall include reach management strategies using...”

Response to District Comment 20

We agree and have incorporated the revision into Provision D.13. Please see also the response to Comments 2 and 10.

Comment 21 [page 19, Provision D.20.a]: Quantitative Thresholds and Metrics

The District requests that the following bolded language be added:

The District shall develop quantifiable objectives for channel roughness, channel dimensions, and determine the tolerance for loss of freeboard for all major channels contained in the SMP Manual *where data is available. Development of quantitative objectives may include use of cross-sections, pictograms and other methods applicable to the variable conditions and data limitations at specific sites within the program.*”

Response to District Comment 21

This language has been incorporated into the next sections b & c and is not necessary to incorporate here.

We have revised this section to clarify that the District and the Water Board will work together to select priority SMP sites to be used in the development of quantitative thresholds and that quantitative thresholds and metrics are not required to be developed for each individual site contained in the SMP, but rather may be addressed on a reach scale.

Comment 22 [page 19, Provision D.20.b]: Stage-Discharge relationships

The District requests that the following language be added: “The District shall provide preliminary estimates of stage-discharge relationships for SMP sites most likely to require maintenance. These estimates should be based on actual field measurements. For those channels lacking sufficient flow data, the District shall implement a program for developing stage-discharge relationships for larger magnitude flows, and *employ a combination of cross-sections, pictogram templates, or other methods applicable to the variable conditions and data limitations at specific sites within the program.*”

Response to Comment 22

We agree and have incorporated the requested revision. Please see also the response to Comments 2 and 10.

Comment 23 [page 19-20, Provision D.20.c]: Quantitative Thresholds

The District requests that the following bolded language be added: “For SMP sites most likely subject to the most frequent maintenance (reoccurring vegetation and sediment removal), the District shall develop estimates of channel dimensions/roughness for best establishing quasi-equilibrium conditions to avoid future excessive erosion of or deposition within an active channel while simultaneously maintaining an acceptable level of flood control. These dimensions can be established using a combination of information from regional stream restoration curves, reference reach data, computation of effective discharges, shear stresses, *cross-sections, pictogram templates, or other methods to establish thresholds that trigger maintenance activities.* These estimations of

active channel dimensions and roughness should guide the management approaches contained in the SMP and be used in implementing maintenance activities in order to achieve more sustainable channel shapes and floodplains.

Response to Comment 23

We agree and have incorporated the requested revision. Please see also the response to Comments 2 and 10.

Comment 24 [page 20, Provision D.22]: Large Woody Debris (LWD) Maintenance

The District requests that the following bolded language be added:

The District shall follow the procedures and protocols in the Fishnet 4C Manual when removing LWD for maintenance purposes. LWD shall not be removed or managed in a channel if it functions as habitat for salmonids and other threatened and endangered species ***unless the LWD poses a significant risk of blocking a culvert, bridge, or otherwise obstructing flow or causing structural damage; in that case it may be relocated, repositioned, and/or cabled to a stream bank in a manner to protect existing habitat.*** If the LWD poses a significant risk of blocking a culvert, bridge, or otherwise obstructing flow or causing structural damage it may be relocated, repositioned, and/or cabled to a stream bank in a manner to protect existing habitat.

Response to District Comment 24

We agree and have incorporated the requested revision with the following adjustments:

The District shall follow the procedures and protocols in the Fishnet 4C Manual when removing LWD for maintenance purposes.¹ LWD shall not be removed or managed in a channel if it functions as habitat for salmonids and other threatened and endangered species ***unless demonstrated to pose a significant risk of blocking a culvert, bridge, or otherwise obstruct flow or cause structural damage. In that case, it*** may be relocated, repositioned, and/or cabled to a stream bank in a manner that protects existing habitat to the maximum extent feasible. For channels designated by the SMP Manual to not have potential salmonid or other threatened and endangered species habitat, LWD can be immediately removed or relocated to a more suitable location if the LWD is posing a significant risk of flooding and/or structural damage.

District Comment 25 [page 23, Provision D.39]: Management Plan

The District requests that the following bolded language be added to Provision D.29:

Where available, management plans will be submitted with Pre-project Notifications for those reaches... reaches potentially functioning as migration, spawning, or high flow refugia habitat for anadromous fish or freshwater shrimp. The management plans are intended to guide maintenance activities in these reaches. Bullet 4: • Additions to the list of SMP sites (Appendix A) covered by this Order may be submitted, acceptable to the Executive Officer, with the revised SMP Manual prior to Year 2. SMP activities shall be limited to sites identified in the revised SMP Manual for all subsequent years, unless an addendum to the Order is filed with the Regional Board to include new sites which may

¹ Fishnet 4C, MFG, Inc., Prunuske Chatham, Inc., Pacific Watershed Associates (2004) Guidelines For Protecting Aquatic Habitat and Salmon Fisheries for County Road Maintenance, prepared for Fishnet 4C Counties, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Resources Agency

arise as new projects are added to the District's maintenance program overtime (i.e., from the Watershed Program.

Response to Comment 25

The initial requested change was incorporated into Provision D.39.c, with some adjustments. The purpose of this provision is to require the development of management plans for reaches of special concern (i.e., reaches where special status species are present or with potential habitat for those species) if they are not already in place. Through discussions with District staff, we agreed on the development of SMP management plans on a reach scale by Year 5:

Adjust program management strategies to a reach scale approach that provides management plans for those reaches potentially functioning as migration, spawning, or high flow refugia habitat for anadromous fish or freshwater shrimp. The management plans are intended to guide maintenance activities with reach- specific AMMs, BMPs, maintenance techniques, site prioritization and incorporated quantitative thresholds when applicable to enhance protection of priority habitats.

The second requested change was reformatted to Provision D.38.b and incorporated as requested.