

CHAPTER 2

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

BACKGROUND

The three forks of the upper American River originate high in the Sierra Nevada and drain approximately 1,875 square miles of mountainous terrain before converging at Folsom Dam and Reservoir, about 25 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento (plate 1). Completed in 1956 by the Corps of Engineers, Folsom was originally authorized in the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944 as a single-purpose flood control facility, designed to protect the urbanized flood plain in Sacramento. In 1949, prior to commencement of construction, the 1944 authorization was amended to enlarge the reservoir, add water supply and hydropower to its purposes, and integrate Folsom into the multipurpose CVP (Central Valley Project) operated by Reclamation. During the flood season, Reclamation is required to operate Folsom in accordance with flood control criteria set forth in a flood control diagram adopted by the Secretary of the Army under the authority of Section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Over the years this diagram has been modified to reflect operating experience. The current diagram became effective November 7, 1986.

In the 1950's, Corps designers envisioned a reservoir with a flood storage capacity adequate to contain the flood of 1937, then the flood of record in the American River watershed, without releasing flows in excess of 115,000 cfs (cubic feet per second) into the leveed channel downstream from Folsom Dam. At that time, the maximum flood event which could be contained under this design standard (Reservoir Design Flood) was thought to be extremely rare. However, in December 1955, just months before the newly constructed reservoir was scheduled to formally commence operations, a major storm blanketed northern California. Heavy rains caused uncontrolled flooding in the Feather River basin north of Sacramento, triggering catastrophic property damage and loss of life in the Yuba City/Marysville area. In the American River basin, the storm generated enough runoff to fill the empty reservoir behind Folsom Dam in just 4 days, a feat the designers had thought would take several months. Shortly thereafter, the Corps reevaluated the hydrologic assumptions underlying earlier estimates of the protective capacity of Folsom and concluded that the Reservoir Design Flood was probably no more than a 1/120-year event. Folsom was thus deemed incapable of providing Sacramento with the level of flood protection intended in the 1949 authorization. During the decades that followed, a concerted effort was originally made to augment Folsom Reservoir by creating new storage capacity at the confluence of the North and Middle Forks of the American River near Auburn for water, power, recreation, and flood control.

Purpose of and Need for Action

The multipurpose Auburn Dam was authorized in 1965. Construction by Reclamation began shortly thereafter, and by 1975 a cofferdam, diversion tunnel, and excavated keyways were in place. However, growing environmental opposition, changing Federal water resource development priorities, and a significant earthquake near Oroville Dam resulted in a halt in construction to review the seismic safety of the dam. Although a panel of dam engineering experts determined that a multipurpose facility could be safely constructed at the site, financial support for the dam waned and construction did not recommence.

Sacramento joined the National Flood Insurance Program in 1978 and adopted appropriate ordinances to ensure that its land use planning policies complied with NFIP standards. Since these standards focused on development in areas subject to flooding in a 100-year flood event, and since Sacramento was then deemed to have at least a 120-year level of protection, development proceeded without restriction in low-lying areas within the American and Sacramento River flood plain. This flood plain encompasses a land mass of about 115,800 acres (plate 6). About half this land lies within Natomas, an area which now contains over \$3 billion worth of damageable residential, commercial, and industrial property, including Sacramento Metropolitan Airport. Outside Natomas and the Dry Creek area immediately east of the basin, the flood plain straddles the American River. To the north, it covers about 6,000 acres. South of the American River, the flood plain covers about 45,000 acres and encompasses much of downtown Sacramento, the State Capitol, California State University at Sacramento, the City of Sacramento's water treatment facility, and a number of large residential areas to the south. Altogether, the Corps estimates that the flood plain area outside Natomas and Dry Creek contains nearly 400,000 residents and about \$35 billion worth of damageable property. Direct structure-inundation damages from levee failure during a 400-year storm would be about \$16 billion. Grade elevations in most of these areas are significantly lower than water-surface elevations in the river channels during major floods, thereby creating the potential for extensive deep flooding if levees are overtopped or if they otherwise fail due to prolonged high flows. As a result, the Corps estimates that a levee failure along the American River during a 100-year storm could cause as much as \$9 billion in damages. Both of these storm event damage figures are based upon the original flood plains from the 1991 feasibility report.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this flood control study was to identify a plan, from among three action plans, that would significantly increase the level of flood protection for much of the Sacramento area from flooding along the lower American River. The three action plans provide a level of flood protection (probability of flooding in any one year) from 1 in 180 years to less than 1 in 500 years. This study identified the Detention Dam Plan as the NED plan (the NED plan provides the highest level of flood protection and has the greatest net annual benefits). This study concentrates on flood control and does not address a multipurpose water supply project.

The purpose of this final SEIS/EIR is to analyze the environmental and related impacts of the various plans which could be implemented and that would significantly increase the level of protection for much of the Sacramento area from flooding from the American River. This final SEIS/EIR was prepared in response to direction provided by Congress in the Fiscal Year 1993 Supplemental Appropriations Act to supplement information presented in the December 1991 American River Watershed Investigation, California, Feasibility Report.

This report:

- Reviews significant assumptions, alternatives, conclusions, and recommendations made in the 1991 feasibility report.
- Discusses significant changes to baseline conditions which influence the formulation of acceptable and effective alternative flood control plans and which have occurred since completion of the feasibility report.
- Describes additional studies and their results in compliance with guidance provided in, and as the result of, the 1993 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.
- Reassesses and revises alternative plans to increase flood protection to Sacramento in light of the additional studies.
- Displays the three candidate plans.
- Presents the NED plan, which is also the non-Federal sponsor's selected plan.

NEED FOR ACTION

The community's exposure to uncontrolled flooding was powerfully demonstrated in February 1986, when major storms in northern California caused record floodflows in the Sacramento River Flood Control System. Although the Sacramento metropolitan area was largely spared, localized flooding was serious to the north in the town of Rio Linda and in the Pleasant Grove area of South Sutter County. In addition, floodwaters forced hundreds of residents in the Rio Linda/Elverta and Strawberry Manor areas of Sacramento County to flee their homes. Only a determined flood fight prevented a collapse of the east levee of the Sacramento River (which protects more than 35,000 residents of the Natomas area), 5 miles north of downtown Sacramento. In the American River basin, releases from Folsom Dam exceeded the design capacity of the lower American River levee system for over 2 days and caused extensive erosion along the toe of the north and south levees of the American River near California State University, Sacramento. Had the rains continued, even higher releases from Folsom Dam would have been required, with the potential for levee failure.

Purpose of and Need for Action

In March 1991, the Corps' Sacramento District published a draft feasibility report and draft EIS/EIR which identified as the NED Plan the 400-year alternative, an expandable flood detention dam at Auburn capable of storing up to 894,000 acre-feet of floodwater. In June 1991, The Reclamation Board and SAFCA jointly requested the Corps to pursue the 200-year alternative, a scaled-down version of the NED Plan, consisting of an expandable flood detention dam at Auburn capable of temporarily storing up to 545,000 acre-feet of floodwater.

Based on these considerations, the Assistant Secretary of the Army granted an exception to the NED Plan, and the 200-year alternative was identified as the "Selected Plan" in the final feasibility report and final EIS/EIR issued in December 1991 for administrative review in Washington and eventual presentation to Congress. For a variety of procedural and substantive reasons, Congress declined to authorize the selected plan in 1992.

Congress asked that additional information be provided on several alternatives to the plan selected in the 1991 feasibility report, including higher flood control releases from Folsom Dam, use of existing upstream reservoirs, and operational and structural modifications to Folsom Dam and Reservoir. This document was prepared in response to direction provided by Congress in the Fiscal Year 1993 Supplemental Appropriations Act to supplement information presented in the December 1991 ARWI (American River Watershed Investigation, California) Feasibility Report. This Supplemental Information Report is referred to as the ARWP (American River Watershed Project, California) and addresses a number of changed conditions and new alternatives that have been developed since the completion of the first report.

EFFORTS TO PROVIDE INCREASED FLOOD PROTECTION

AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED INVESTIGATION (ARWI)

On the basis of the Corps findings and conclusions, the Continuing Appropriations Act (Public Law 100-202, July 1988) authorized the Corps to commence the feasibility phase of the ARWI (American River Watershed Investigation) on a cost-shared basis with the State. The State in turn entered into an arrangement with local agencies interested in the project to act as local sponsors. These agencies included Placer County, which contributed funds to the feasibility study in its initial phases, and the agencies which now comprise and are represented by SAFCA: City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, Sutter County, Reclamation District 1000, and the American River Flood Control District.

The plan formulation process consisted of the following tasks:

- Establish specific objectives for implementing a plan to resolve the identified flood problems and, to the extent possible, related water resource needs.

- Define constraints and criteria for formulating an implementable plan.
- Identify, document, and evaluate management measures to address the planning objectives.
- From the most viable management measures, assemble, display, and evaluate an array of alternatives, consistent with planning constraints and criteria, to address the study objectives.
- Identify the plan that maximizes NED (national economic development) benefits.
- Compare and evaluate the alternatives and select and display a plan for recommended implementation.

In carrying out these tasks, the Corps considered a wide range of potential flood control measures. With respect to controlling American River flows, the following measures were found to be feasible:

- Construct a flood detention dam near Auburn.
- Increase the amount of storage allocated to flood control on a seasonal basis at Folsom.
- Lower the spillway at Folsom to permit more efficient use of the space allocated to flood control.
- Increase the design release from Folsom into the lower American River channel.

These measures were combined into six alternatives, including a 400-year detention dam at Auburn, a 200-year detention dam, a 150-year plan containing structural and operational modifications at Folsom with downstream levee improvements, and three 100-year (FEMA) alternatives involving increased Folsom storage (only), downstream levee improvements (only), and a scaled-down version of the 150-year plan. These alternatives were carried forward for detailed evaluation within the framework of the principles and guidelines adopted by Congress in 1986 to guide the planning of Federal water resource projects.

Three overriding considerations were offered in support of this alternative: (1) the smaller dam met the non-Federal sponsors' minimum goal of providing Sacramento with at least a 200-year level of flood protection; (2) the 200-year alternative was less costly than the NED Plan; and (3) the smaller dam was thought to be more acceptable to environmental interests than the NED Plan. Instead, in language set forth in Section 9159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-396) and subsequent congressional correspondence (see chapter I), the Corps was directed to reevaluate Sacramento's flood control options and provide the following: (1) additional

Purpose of and Need for Action

information on the gating and expandability features of the flood detention dam, (2) a more detailed analysis of the costs and benefits of modifying Folsom Dam, improving the efficiency of flood control operations at Folsom, and increasing the conveyance capacity of the American River levee system, and (3) a reassessment of the costs and benefits of enlarging Folsom Reservoir or, alternatively, creating offstream storage capacity along Deer Creek in the Cosumnes River watershed.

SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS SINCE 1992

The following actions subsequent to the 1992 legislative session have affected the scope and nature of the Corps response to Congress' call for a reevaluation of the American River project: (1) SAFCA's construction of the Natomas features of the project with local funds (SAFCA Local Project); (2) execution of a 5-year agreement between SAFCA and Reclamation to modify the operation of Folsom Reservoir (Interim Reoperation); (3) initiation of planning for a bank protection project along critical reaches of the lower American River under the authority of the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project (Lower American River Bank Protection Project); and (4) initiation of a regional water study, the American River Water Resources Investigation, by Reclamation in conjunction with Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, and San Joaquin Counties. These actions and their effect on the Corps plan formulation process are discussed below.

SAFCA Local Project

This project, which modifies the project authorized by Congress, received a Department of the Army permit in June 1993 and will provide the Natomas basin and portions of the lower Dry and Arcade Creek watersheds with 100-year or greater flood protection. The project is designed to accommodate flows in the lower American River up to 180,000 cfs and is thus compatible with all the main stem American River alternatives being evaluated in connection with the ARWI. Nevertheless, the project does not depend on any upstream improvements to remove the protected areas, including the Natomas basin, from the regulatory flood plain. These project improvements and the direct and indirect (growth-inducing) impacts caused by the project are fully described in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Revised Natomas Area Flood Control Improvement Project (Final EIR) and the supplemental environmental documents issued in connection with the Final EIR which are available through the SAFCA office at 1007 - 7th Street, Fifth Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. (See plate 8.)

Interim Reoperation

This project was implemented by agreement between SAFCA and Reclamation in February 1995. The implementing agreement requires Reclamation to operate Folsom Reservoir during the flood season in accordance with a flood control diagram (1993 Diagram) designed to reduce the probability of flooding by levee failure to a 1 in 100 chance in any year. The 1993 Diagram ties Folsom Reservoir storage to storage in the

three largest non-Federal reservoirs in the American River watershed: Union Valley, Hell Hole, and French Meadows. When these reservoirs have between them at least 200,000 acre-feet of space available for flood storage, Folsom may store up to 575,000 acre-feet of water, reserving at least 400,000 acre-feet of empty space for flood storage as required under the Corps 1986 flood control diagram. When the upstream reservoirs fill so that less than 200,000 acre-feet of space is left for flood storage, Folsom Reservoir must be drawn down to compensate. When the upstream reservoirs are full and no space is available for flood storage, Folsom may store no more than 305,000 acre-feet of water, reserving 670,000 acre-feet for flood storage. To protect the environmental and recreational resources in the lower American River, the Interim Reoperation implementing agreement further obligates Reclamation to ensure that Folsom Reservoir releases during the spring refill period from March 1 to June 30 are at least equal to the lesser of (1) the releases that would have been made if Folsom had continued to be operated in accordance with the 1986 Diagram or (2) 3,000 cfs.

The implementing agreement obligates SAFCA to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of this changed operation. These impacts include reduced CVP water deliveries, reduced CVP power generation, increased power costs for local water agencies taking deliveries directly from Folsom Reservoir, reduced reservoir recreation opportunities, increased exposure of shoreline cultural resources to damage, and increased temperatures potentially harmful to the fishery in the lower American River. The agreement anticipates that this mitigation will generally take the form of annual payments for replacement of the lost or expended resources. However, SAFCA has undertaken two significant permanent improvements in connection with Interim Reoperation: (1) modification of the shutter system which controls the elevation (and therefore the temperature) of releases through the main dam and (2) boat ramp extensions in the Brown's Ravine/Hobie Cove area to permit access to the reservoir at the lowest water-surface elevations required under the 1993 Diagram.

Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, Lower American River

The Corps of Engineers and The Reclamation Board in cooperation with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency are proposing to construct streambank protection on the lower American River under the Federally authorized Sacramento River Bank Protection Project. The purpose of the streambank protection is to protect the integrity and reliability of Federal flood control levees, while preserving existing environmental values and the wild and scenic recreational status of the lower American River and parkway.

Bank protection is proposed under the currently authorized Sacramento River Bank Protection Project because (1) immediate actions are necessary at sites to reduce the threat of levee failure, (2) an existing authorized project can address these critical sites, and (3) bank protection is needed on the lower American River regardless of what alternative is selected as a result of the American River Watershed Investigation.

Since January 1994, the Lower American River Task Force, composed of flood control agencies, resource protection agencies, and local interest groups, has been developing

Purpose of and Need for Action

a locally-preferred erosion control plan for the lower American River which includes streambank protection measures to reduce the immediate and future risks of levee failure. The bank protection is proposed for construction in 1997. Longer term streambank protection may be needed at any location along the Federal levee system where levees become threatened by erosion. Thirteen potential sites have been identified that may become critical in the future. Other sites may be identified from future flood events.

Alternative designs for streambank protection under consideration include designs to preserve and recreate as much aquatic and riparian habitat values and visual quality as feasible. Large, woody material is proposed along the shoreline, and marsh and riparian vegetation would be established on the streambank protection structure.

A Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report is scheduled to be distributed for agency and public review and comment in the spring of 1996. This environmental document will assess the environmental effects of the streambank protection project and alternative plans.

American River Water Resources Investigation

The American River Water Resources Investigation was initiated in the fall of 1991 under the authority of the American River Basin Development Act (Public Law 81-356). It is being organized by the Bureau of Reclamation. Federal funding is available on a year-to-year basis through the House Appropriations Committee, provided 50 percent matching funds are contributed in equal shares by the non-Federal sponsors of the study—the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority, the American River Authority, the San Joaquin Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the Sacramento County Water Agency (in partnership with the City of Sacramento). The purpose of the investigation is to identify significant water resource needs within the American River study area, formulate alternative plans to meet those needs, and determine a preferred alternative. The study objectives are to: (1) manage ground-water basins and surface-water supplies to maintain beneficial uses and to protect water quality; (2) provide water to meet projected (year 2030) water demands, including municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs; (3) provide flows sufficient for water-oriented recreation; (4) sustain riverine and associated biological environment; and (5) be consistent with ongoing activities addressing flood protection needs. The study is proceeding in four phases. Phase one consists of identifying water-related needs by examining existing systems. This phase was completed in February 1995. Phase two consists of plan formulation, analysis, evaluation, and identification of a preferred plan. Reclamation completed this phase in July 1995. Phase three, in which Reclamation will determine the feasibility of the preferred plan, prepare a Planning Report and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and circulate this document for public review and comment, is due for completion in 1996. In Phase four, public comments will be addressed, and a final report will be prepared and then submitted for a decision by Congress in 1996.

ALTERNATIVES REPORT

In November 1994, the Corps took the first step in the ARWP reevaluation by issuing an Alternatives Report designed to address the issues raised by Congress in Public Law 102-396, account for changes in the assumptions and methodology used in the 1991 final report, and provide the non-Federal sponsors with an opportunity to reassess their recommendations with respect to the project.

Essential Conclusions

In answer to the issues raised in Public Law 102-396, the Alternatives Report reaffirmed the following essential conclusions of the 1991 final report. First, with the completion of the remedial work needed to stabilize the east levee of the Sacramento River, uncontrolled flooding along the American River poses the primary threat to Sacramento. Second, although structural and operational modifications to Folsom Dam and Reservoir combined with an increase in the conveyance capacity of the lower American River levee system would significantly reduce the risk of such uncontrolled flooding, construction of substantial new flood storage capacity at Auburn would be the most cost-effective approach to protecting the people and property occupying the American River flood plain. Third, creating new storage through enlarging Folsom Reservoir or through constructing an offstream reservoir along Deer Creek in the Cosumnes River watershed would not be cost effective and would give rise to a series of additional problems that would make these alternatives unacceptable. Fourth, a flood detention dam could be designed and constructed at the Auburn site in a manner that would not preclude efficient expansion of the dam into a permanent water storage facility. Fifth, the impacts of operating such a flood detention dam on the environmental and recreational values currently found in the American River canyons could be minimized, particularly if the dam includes increased outlets and operational gates designed to minimize the frequency and depth of canyon inundation and the rate of reservoir drawdown once inundation occurs.

Changed Circumstances

The changed circumstances affecting the Corps' reevaluation of the project are discussed above. They include construction of the SAFCA Local Project, interim reoperation of Folsom Reservoir, implementation of a bank protection project along the lower American River, and Reclamation's concurrent analysis conducted under the ARWRI. The November 1994 Alternatives Report accounted for these changes as follows.

In consideration of the SAFCA Local Project, the Alternatives Report excluded essentially all the Natomas features identified in the 1991 final report from the American River Project and retained only minor improvements along the east levee of the Sacramento River to ensure that Natomas is afforded the same level of protection as the lands in other portions of the American River flood plain. This adjustment eliminated the location benefits associated with growth in Natomas and substantially all the inundation reduction benefits which were attributed to the Local Project area in the Final Report.

Purpose of and Need for Action

In consideration of Interim Reoperation, the Alternatives Report assumed that in the absence of any congressional action to improve the existing American River flood protection system, SAFCA and Reclamation would indefinitely extend operations under the 1993 Diagram to ensure that the urbanized portions of the American River flood plain continue to be protected to at least the 100-year level. Accordingly, the No-Action Alternative described in the Alternatives Report assumed "permanent reoperation" based on an indefinite extension of the SAFCA-Reclamation implementing agreement.

In consideration of the decision to proceed with a bank protection project in the lower American River, the Alternatives Report assumed the completion of this project under the previously authorized Sacramento River Bank Protection Project.

Finally, in consideration of Reclamation's concurrent pursuit of the ARWRI, the Alternatives Report did not focus on enhancing water supply opportunities in the American River watershed incidental to the flood control objectives of the ARWP. The report recognized that these opportunities would be separately evaluated by Reclamation and presented to Congress in 1996, along with a "bridging document" explaining the relationship between the flood control and water supply alternatives included in each study.

Changed Methodology

In an effort to strengthen the quality of the reevaluation, the Alternatives Report incorporated a new methodology developed by the Corps to reduce the uncertainties associated with projected flood frequencies and with the water-surface elevations and damages associated with rare flood events.

Referred to as "risk and uncertainty analysis," this methodology relies on computer simulations to capture a range of potential outcomes, thus accounting more effectively for (1) the uncertainties associated with projected precipitation and runoff patterns in the American River watershed, due to the relatively limited record on which such projections must be based, (2) the uncertainties associated with the operation of Folsom Dam during a flood event, due to potential mechanical problems with the gates, potential downstream levee problems that would curtail releases, and inaccurate inflow data, and (3) the uncertainties associated with the performance of the downstream levee system due to natural changes in the river system over time, manmade incursions into the river channel, and reductions in channel capacity resulting from increased vegetation growth and changes in channel maintenance practices.

This new methodology enabled the Corps to reevaluate the level of flood protection provided by the alternatives studied in connection with the ARWP. Significantly, the Corps concluded that structural and operational modifications to Folsom combined with an increase in the conveyance capacity of the lower American and Sacramento River levee systems could provide in excess of a 200-year level of flood protection.

Changed Alternatives

Based on the above changes in assumptions and methodology, the Alternatives Report revised the array of alternatives carried forward for detailed analysis in the 1991 final report. First, the Natomas features of these alternatives were eliminated based on completing the Local Project. Second, based on the assumption that interim reoperation would be indefinitely extended in the absence of any congressional action to improve the existing flood control system, alternatives displayed in the December 1991 EIS/EIR were not evaluated. Third, the measures included in the 150-year alternative were reformulated to create four separate alternatives. The "Folsom Modification Alternative" combined the structural modifications of Folsom Dam called for under the 150-year alternative with a modified version of the 1993 Diagram. The "Maximum Release," "Moderate Release," and "Minimum Release" combined these Folsom improvements with variations of the measures included in the 150-year alternative to increase the conveyance capacity of the existing levee system. Fourth, the Alternatives Report upgraded the level of protection provided by the two detention dam alternatives included in the 1991 final report and added a third detention dam alternative with a downsized storage capacity sufficient to provide 200-year protection using the new risk and uncertainty methodology. Finally, minor improvements to the east levee of the Sacramento River were added to all the alternatives to ensure that the lands within the Natomas basin received the same level of protection from the Sacramento River as from the American River.

REVIEW PROCESS

Issuance of the Alternatives Report facilitated the first substantial public and agency review of the status of the ARWP since the adoption of Public Law 102-396 in 1992 and permitted the non-Federal sponsors to reassess their recommendations with respect to the "Selected Plan" advanced to Congress in 1992. This review process produced three significant actions. First, the non-Federal sponsors advanced an additional plan for review. Designated the "Stepped Release," this alternative combines the storage requirements of the 1993 Diagram with elements of the Maximum and Moderate Release Alternatives displayed in the report. By staggering the timing of design outflows from Folsom, this plan preserves most of the benefits of the Maximum Release Alternative while minimizing the infrastructure costs associated with conveying higher flows to the mouth of the American River and resizing the Sacramento and Yolo Bypass systems to convey these flows to the Delta.

Second, the parties agreed that a DSIR (Draft Supplemental Information Report) would be prepared, and that this document, accompanied by a stand-alone DSEIS/SDEIR (Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report) would be circulated for public review and comment during the summer of 1995.

Third, the non-Federal sponsors indicated that they would make no further decisions with respect to the ARWP until after the public review and comment period. At that point, as in June 1991, the sponsors were in a position to designate a locally preferred plan. This

Purpose of and Need for Action

decision allowed the Corps to complete its reevaluation of the ARWP and prepare final feasibility and environmental documents by March 1996. The draft document was released for public and agency review in accordance with NEPA and CEQA in August 1995. Comments were solicited and responses developed; these were taken into consideration when the final document was prepared. Comments and responses are presented in appendix M. The Reclamation Board and SAFCA identified the Detention Dam Plan as their selected plan. The document will next proceed to the Washington-level review in anticipation of a congressional decision on the project during the 1996 legislative session.