Malibu Creek Ecosystem Restoration Study

Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California

Appendix S

Response to Comments

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District

August 2020

This page was intentionally left blank for duplex printing.

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) thank the public for their comments on the draft Integrated Feasibility Report (IFR) during the January – March 2017 comment period. Our agencies have considered all comments in preparation of the Final IFR. This portion of the appendix provides summary responses to all comments received by mail or email during the IFR public comment period, as well as to verbal comments provided to our agencies during the March 1, 2017, public hearing held at the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in Calabasas, California.

The tables below are organized to display USACE and CDPR responses in the following order: (1) responses on topics that were raised by multiple public and/or agency interests (displayed as General Response (GR)-A to GR-G); (2) responses to individual agency comments (response #'s 1-28); (3) responses to individual comments from the general public (response #'s 29-151). Responses to agency and public comments include a column on the right side for locations in the IFR to find updates made after the comment period, or other relevant response information, as applicable. Numbered responses with blue cells indicate responses to verbal comments provided during the public hearing.

Copies of the letters and emails received during the public comment period are on file. Responses associated with verbal comments provided at the public hearing, and applicable sections of the public hearing transcript, are also included in the list of letters and emails.

GENERAL RESPONSES

Table of General Comments and Responses		
Response Number	**General Theme**	**Response**
GR-A	Flood Risk	The study plan formulation process included a key constraint to maintain the downstream existing and future without-project condition (No Action) level of flood risk along the lower reaches of Malibu Creek within the SCPOA residential community and the city of Malibu. This constraint was used to avoid potential for adverse flood-induced impacts associated with the ecosystem restoration measures considered for Rindge Dam and the impounded sediment. Existing and future without-project condition level of flood risks were used as a basis for comparison to the action alternatives. The flood risks were understood to be a concern to downstream residents. Potential downstream sedimentation and flood risk impacts associated with the No Action and action alternatives were evaluated in the IFR and described in detail in Appendix B, Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Sedimentation, Section 19 - Flood Risk Comparison. Soils in the Malibu Creek watershed are highly erodible. Flows originating in the upper watershed proceed at high velocities through narrow and steep portions of the area, carrying a sediment load. Rindge Dam reached capacity for trapping and impounding sediment many decades ago. Sediment transported by storms during and after storm events will pass over the dam spillway or over the crest of the dam arch during high flow events. It is estimated that it will take approximately 20-100 years before pre-dam natural transport is restored to the lower reaches of the Malibu Creek watershed below Rindge Dam, and the lagoon and shoreline. Hydraulic and sediment transport modeling conducted for the No Action plan (Alternative 1) indicates that watershed sediment eroded and transported downstream during storm events would continue to deposit in the lower reaches of Malibu Creek over a 75-year period of analysis, generally raising the creek bed elevation by several feet and increasing the flood risk to populated reaches. The current ecosystem restoration study and action alternatives are not charged with reducing the flood risk that is projected to occur under the No Action Alternative, and not attributable to action alternatives. The NER plan and the LPP, the Recommended Plan, were formulated to minimize potential increases in flood risks to Malibu Creek reaches below Rindge Dam during and after construction activities. During each construction year, the Rindge Dam impounded sediment

		would be mined at a rate equal to the lowering of the dam concrete arch. By following this approach, the remaining volume of impounded sediment would be at the same height as the remaining portion of dam arch each interim storm season throughout the construction timeframe. Other alternatives that involved natural transport of sediment were shown to result in substantial deposition downstream, requiring structural measures (floodwalls) to offset the flood risk impacts. The natural transport alternatives were not recommended for implementation. Although the Alternative 2 options, including the NER plan and the LPP, avoid the significant impacts of the natural sediment transport alternatives, the feasibility-level modeling for Alternative 2 options indicates some increase in creek bed and water surface elevation in some downstream reaches. Over the period of analysis, the creek bed elevation may increase by an additional 0.3 to 1 foot compared to the No Action alternative in some portions of the populated reaches. Similarly, the modeling also shows that when comparing the Alternative 2 options to the No Action Alternative for the 1% chance exceedence flood event (100-yr storm), the same reach of Malibu Creek could experience a 0.5 to 1.2-foot increase in water surface elevation. Appendix B contains further analysis and discussion of related issues. It is possible that model calibration uncertainties, the conservative downstream boundary condition (referenced in Section 1.10.10), and procedures associated with stopping and starting the sediment transport model to provide outputs during interim years over the period of analysis are driving factors in some or all of the differences identified in bed and water surface elevation when comparing Alternatives 1 and 2. Because the feasibility level modeling for Alternative 2 options show increases in creek bed elevations compared to the No Action Alternative, Environmental Commitment WR-4 would be implemented. Additional modeling would occur during the PED phase as described in Section 4.4.2 of the IFR. If such modeling shows a difference in bed elevation compared to the No Action Alternative, project construction would include non-structural measures, anticipated to consist of targeted sediment removal during or at the conclusion of construction, as needed to address the increase in bed elevation.
GR-B	Traffic Congestion, Control, and Damages Due to Trucks	Traffic is a significant concern in the project area along Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu Canyon Road, and other regional roadways. Potential traffic impacts could occur due to the increased traffic along haul routes, as well as from the potential need for new traffic signals at the construction exit on Malibu Canyon Road, or near the Malibu Pier parking lot under the NER plan. The USACE and CDPR have committed to performing a detailed traffic analysis during the Pre-Construction Engineering and Design phase (Section 5.9 Environmental Commitment T-1). This up-to-date analysis would be used to develop a traffic management plan, which will be

		coordinated with the appropriate local agencies. In addition, a Road Repair Plan would be developed to ensure proper maintenance and repair of utilized roadways occurs if any significant construction-related damage were caused by heavy vehicles or machinery associated with the project (Section 5.9 Environmental Commitment T-2).
GR-C	Federal Funding	Congressional authorization of the recommended plan and appropriation of funds will be required prior to construction. Subsequent to authorization, the Federal government and non-Federal sponsor must enter into a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), pursuant to which the Federal government would contribute 65 percent of the total first cost for construction of the NER plan (Section 12.6.1 Federal Responsibilities). The non-Federal sponsor would provide 35 percent of the total first cost of the NER plan and all incremental costs of the LPP. The sponsor must also agree to operate and maintain the project in perpetuity and comply with applicable Federal laws and policies (see Section 12.6.2 of the IFR).
GR-D	Water Quality	No significant impacts to water quality are expected as a result of the project. As indicated in the IFR and as required by the Clean Water Act, during the Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED) phase USACE would seek and obtain (or deem a waiver of) section 401 Water Quality Certification. In addition, the construction contractor would develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction in accordance with section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The SWPPP includes all necessary erosion and sediment control measures and best management plan implementation, monitoring, and reporting. Implementation of the terms of the 401 WQC, unless waived, and the SWPPP would ensure the project remains in compliance with all substantive Clean Water Act requirements.
GR-E	Air Quality	The air quality data and discussions presented in the draft IFR, as well as the associated air quality appendix, have been updated to clarify the methods used to calculate emissions. In particular, a detailed description of the labeling discrepancies between the body of the IFR and Appendix L, as well as the methods used to update Appendix L data, has been provided in the Supplemental Air Quality Analysis at the front of Appendix L. Air quality environmental commitments have been incorporated into the project description to reduce emissions from mobile sources and minimize air quality impacts to the extent practicable (Section 5.12.3; AIR-1 to AIR-8). These include the requirement to use model year 2023 engines for all construction years beyond 2027, and the requirement to use Tier 3 or higher engines.
GR-F	Sediment Quality	As described in Section 5.4.2, initial testing of sediment grain size and quality has been performed. This testing was coordinated with the Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) and the preliminary results indicate that a quantity of the impounded sediment is beach-compatible. In addition, this section of the IFR contains an environmental commitment to perform additional sediment testing prior to and during excavation

		(see ER-3). This testing would be coordinated with the SC-DMMT to ensure that the excavated sediment is compatible with beach and/or nearshore placement, as appropriate.
GR-G	Transport, Placement and Use of Rindge Dam Impounded Sediment	Measures considered for the array of alternatives described in the IFR considered multiple uses and means of transport for the sediment impounded behind Rindge Dam, including consideration of where the sediment would have gone without the dam in place. Transport methods of the Rindge Dam impounded sediment included consideration of storm flows transporting sediment to lower reaches of Malibu Creek and the Malibu coastal area, or removal of some or all of the impounded sediment through use of trucks, slurry pipelines, conveyors, or combinations thereof. Based on years of coordination with members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and associated evaluation and comparison of alternative plans, it was concluded that natural transport of large volumes of the Rindge Dam impounded sediment downstream during storms would have significant adverse impacts to aquatic habitat and species, in addition to potential detrimental impacts to downstream development. Use of conveyors and pipelines to transport the impounded sediment to the coastal environment and other locations also had significant adverse impacts to aquatic habitat and species, and were not carried into the final array of alternatives. Hauling sediment from behind the dam to various destinations using trucks (Alternatives 2a1, 2b1, 2c1, 2d1, 4a1, 4b1, 4c1, 4d1) were more preferable than natural transport of large volumes of the impounded sediment, and include the NER plan (Alt 2d1). Hauling and transporting sediment using a combination of trucks and barges (Alternative 2a2, 2b2, 2c2, 2d2, 4a2, 4b2, 4c2, 4d2), was ultimately the most preferable and selected combination of transport methods for the impounded sediment, including the Recommended Plan (LPP), Alternative 2d2. Traffic safety at construction sites and transportation impacts along Malibu Canyon Road, Las Virgenes Road, and other thoroughfares are also analyzed in the IFR with measures provided to minimize potential adverse effects. While both the LPP and NER plan use trucks to transport two-thirds of the volume of the impounded sediment from the dam area to the Calabasas Landfill, the LPP shifts hauling of the remaining one-third volume of sands to Highway 101 and the Ventura Harbor, transferring from there to barges, followed by placement in the Malibu nearshore environment, downcoast of the Malibu Pier. The NER plan utilizes trucks only for hauling and placement of the remaining one-third volume of impounded sediment, and different hauling routes. A portion of the remaining impounded sediment is temporarily placed at an upland storage area (Site F) near CDPR Headquarters. This material, and the remaining volume of sand layer of impounded sediment is hauled to the Malibu shoreline using trucks travelling through the lower portion of the watershed along Malibu Canyon Road and the PCH to the shoreline placement site by the parking lot downcoast of the Malibu Pier.

		During the feasibility study, chemical and bioassay test results showed that all of the impounded sediment could be used for a variety of coastal and inland beneficial purposes. The sand-rich layer of impounded sediment, about one-third of the total volume, was evaluated and adopted for placement at either the shoreline (NER) or nearshore environment (LPP). While various options to beneficially utilize the remaining two-thirds volume of sediment impounded behind Rindge Dam were formulated and discussed with the TAC members and other interests, no commitments for other uses of the sediment could be secured during the feasibility study process. Therefore, the Calabasas Landfill was selected for placement of this remaining volume of impounded sediment and analyzed for Alternatives 2 and 4. Moving forward, the Pre-Construction Engineering and Design Phase allows for an opportunity to revisit assumptions on other potential uses of Rindge Dam impounded sediment, beyond the sand-rich layer of sediment that is already identified to be placed in the coastal environment.

RESPONSES TO AGENCY COMMENTS

1. US Department of Interior		
Commenter: Whitlock, Janet L. – Regional Environmental Coordinator		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

2. US Department of Commerce – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – National Marine Fisheries Service		
Commenter: Thom, Barry A. – Regional Administrator		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your statement of support of the LPP.	N/A
1	The language in Section 1.7.1 has been revised to more clearly reflect the federal interest related to contributing to the recovery of steelhead.	Section 1.7.1
2	The language in Section 1.10.2 has been revised as suggested.	Section 1.10.2
3	The paragraph of the IFR being referenced in this comment discusses the choice of steelhead as a keystone species for the purposes of this study. This choice was made	N/A

	based on existing information, and this choice was made prior to the suggested references. While we appreciate the suggested references as providing additional important information pertinent to this study, they are not appropriate for inclusion in the referenced discussion in the IFR.	
4	Concur. The project does not alter natural features that may impede fish passage under low flow conditions.	N/A
5	The text in Table 2.7-1 has been revised as suggested. The USACE anticipates addressing NMFS's specific concerns during formal consultation to be initiated during the Pre-construction Engineering and Design phase.	Section 2.7, Table 2.7-1
6	The bullet has been revised as suggested.	Section 2.7
7	The suggested information referencing the extension of the DPS to the Tijuana River has been added.	Section 2.7
8	The suggested revision to the citation to the NMFS Steelhead Recovery Plan has been implemented.	Section 3.3.4
9	The reference to potential use of Malibu Lagoon has been revised to indicate potential use based on the known importance of estuarine habitats to a broad range of salmonid species, as well as observations from local experts.	Section 3.4.5
10	The suggested reference to extension of the protected range of steelhead has been added.	Section 3.4.9
11	We have reviewed the references provided, and added additional information and a citation relevant to the current status of steelhead in Malibu Creek.	Section. 3.4.9
12	Reference to NMFS's previous analysis of the potential impacts of climate change on west coast salmonids has been added.	Section 3.12.5
13	A brief discussion has been added to describe potential operational and maintenance difficulties associated with maintaining fish passage through a facility during high flow events.	Section 4.1.8
14	The language in this section has been clarified to indicate that institutional knowledge, and not a detailed cost analysis, was used in considering the cost versus benefits associated with removal of Century Dam.	Section 4.1.8
15	Thank you for indicating your concurrence that the removal of upstream barriers would increase the benefits associated with the proposed project.	N/A

3. US Department of Commerce - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – National Marine Fisheries Service
Commenter: Yates, Chris – Assistant Regional Administrator

Comment Number	Response	Location in IFR
1	As described in Section 5.4 of the IFR, the recommended plan now includes nearshore marine surveys for rocky reef and surf grass (Environmental Commitment BIO-16). This requirement will provide for the avoidance of these habitats during construction, and further includes an approach to monitor and address any potential impacts to rocky reef or surf grass.	Section 5.4.1
2	Thank you for your support of the LPP. The USACE has responded to EFH Conservation Recommendations by separate correspondence, dated June 21, 2017, pursuant to EFH consultation regulations. A copy of the EFH correspondence is provided as Appendix A.	No change.

4. US Environmental Protection Agency – Region 9		
Commenter: Goforth, Kathleen Martyn – Manager, Environmental Review Section		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your statement of support for the ecosystem restoration actions evaluated in the IFR.	
1	The air quality data and discussions presented in the IFR, as well as the associated air quality appendix, have been updated to clarify the methods used to calculate emissions. In particular, a detailed description of the labeling discrepancies between the body of the IFR and Appendix L, as well as the methods used to update Appendix L data, has been provided in the Supplemental Air Quality Analysis at the front of Appendix L. The measures originally identified as mitigation measures in the analyses contained in Appendix L were incorporated as part of the project description, as described in Section 5.12.1 and detailed in the Supplemental Air Quality Analysis. As such, those alternatives that were referred to in the main volume of Appendix L as "mitigated" are equivalent to the current unmitigated alternatives as displayed in the IFR and detailed in the Supplemental Air Quality Analysis. The measures to reduce emissions which are included as project elements are not discretionary, and therefore, no conformity determination is needed.	Section 5.12.1 and Appendix L
2	Table 5.12-3 has been corrected as suggested and further updated to reflect the current attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin.	Section 5.12.3
3	The IFR has been updated to include the suggested mobile source controls as environmental commitments incorporated into the project description (AIR-1 to AIR-8; Section 5.12.1), with the exception of the 3 "best available emissions control technologies" commitments. The first of these commitments requires using model year	Sections 5.12.1 and 9.2.10

	2010 or newer on-highway vehicles. However, incorporated into the project description (Section 5.12.1) is the requirement to use model year 2023 for all construction years beyond 2027. The project is anticipated to begin construction in 2025 at the earliest, and therefore the existing requirement is likely to be more stringent than that proposed. The second of these commitments requires USEPA Tier 4 vehicles. The project requires Tier 3 or higher vehicles, as described in Section 5.12.1. The construction fleet utilized during construction phase of this project would be representative of the overall regional construction fleet and while required to use Tier 3, would also include a mix of Tier 4 vehicles representative of the existing fleet during construction. To date, no air quality minimization measures have been rejected due to economic infeasibility (Administrative Control #1). As described above, the IFR currently contains environmental commitments to include Tier 3 or higher vehicles, and vehicles model 2023 or newer. The construction fleet is anticipated to be representative of the available and modern emissions technology being utilized in the region, which is likely to include a mix of Tier 4 vehicles. As such, add-on emissions controls and alternative fuel vehicles are not anticipated to be necessary (Administrative Control #2). The IFR also contains an environmental commitment to develop a transportation management plan (Section 5.9.1). This plan would address traffic and parking management, to include measures to minimize traffic and maintain traffic flow, and therefore meets the intent of the suggested Administrative Control #3.	
4	As described in Section 5.4 of the IFR, the recommended plan now includes nearshore marine surveys for surf grass prior to the placement of sediment in the nearshore environment (Environmental Commitment BIO-16). This requirement will provide for the avoidance of surfgrass during construction. BIO-16 further includes an approach to monitor sediment placement and implement adaptive management to avoid potential impacts to surfgrass.	
5	Monitoring of sediment placement in the marine environment would be performed during construction as described in Environmental Commitment BIO-16 in Section 5.4.1. Adaptive management, as described in the MAMP, follows the requirements of Section 2039 of WRDA 2007 and Section 1161 of WRDA 2016, and is limited to monitoring required to evaluate success and implement adaptive management related to achieving project objectives. The MAMP does not cover monitoring associated with avoiding or minimizing impacts. However, both monitoring and adaptive management of nearshore placement is included in BIO-16.	Section 5.4.1

6	Section 5.2.1 of the IFR contains an environmental commitment to perform additional sediment testing prior to and during excavation (Environmental Commitment ER-3). This commitment also specifies that this testing would be coordinated with the SC-DMMT.	Section 5.2.1
7	The IFR has been revised to align what was originally referred to as a Habitat Restoration Program with the Revegetation and Planting Plan, and is described as Environmental Commitment BIO-8 (see Section 5.4.1). This plan is largely a design function and as such would be prepared during PED phase and would not be available for inclusion in the Final IFR. However, the requirements of the revegetation plan and restoration targets are adequately described in the IFR and associated MAMP (Appendix I). This includes restoration goals and targets, monitoring periods and metrics, and decision criteria and processes for adaptive management.	Section 5.4.1, Appendix I
8	Consultation is addressed in detail in Appendix K, and has been updated to include all consultation and coordination that has occurred since circulation of the draft IFR. The distribution list for the Final IFR will include all tribes to which copies of the Final IFR will be sent.	Appendix K

5. California Coastal Commission		
Commenter: Street, Joseph – Environmental Scientist		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your support of the goals and objectives of the Malibu Creek ecosystem restoration study.	
1	The USACE has prepared a consistency determination, which was transmitted to the California Coastal Commission on 1 October 16, 2017, requesting concurrence that the project is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of California's approved Coastal Management Plan. The CCC unanimously concurred with USACE's consistency determination on March 9, 2018.	
2	While the USACE has not yet developed exact quantitative estimates of temporary habitat loss that would occur during construction in relation to potential net habitat gain that will result from project completion, the purpose of the project is ecosystem restoration with a resulting increase in habitat function. By design, the project is anticipated to result in a net gain in habitat function and quantity. Pursuant to USACE policy, the USACE does not provide wildlife or habitat mitigation for impacts resulting from ecosystem restoration projects, and therefore the project must ensure that restoration efforts result in no net loss of sensitive or protected habitats, such as wetlands. Detailed quantitative estimates of specific habitat types will be developed	

	during the PED phase in order to document consistency with this policy. As a result, no net loss of sensitive habitats, including wetland habitat, would occur as the result of the proposed project.	
3	The USACE will prepare a detailed Revegetation and Planting plan during PED as specified in Environmental Commitment BIO-8. This plan will include a program for invasive and non-native species management during construction. During PED, the USACE will also prepare an operations, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation plan to address the maintenance required. The USACE and CDPR are responsible for carrying out the monitoring and adaptive management plan (MAMP) after construction of each project phase/component until ecological success criteria are met, but for no more than ten years. While the CDPR is undertaking maintenance, the cost-shared monitoring for ecological success by the USACE would be initiated and continue for five years or until ecological success is achieved as defined by established success criteria, but for no longer than ten years (MAMP monitoring period). Should a feature be determined not to be functioning as intended, adaptive management measures would be implemented to address the issue. Currently, the USACE and CDPR anticipate that ecological success can be achieved in five years.	Section 12
4	As described in Section 5.4.1 as Environmental Commitment BIO-4, potential nesting habitat and vegetation would be removed from the project area prior to the bird nesting season to the maximum extent possible If vegetation removal during nesting season cannot be avoided, a biologist would be present during vegetation removal to further monitor construction and establish buffers, as necessary, to avoid impacts to nesting birds. In addition, Environmental Commitment BIO-1 requires construction to be overseen by a biologist to ensure compliance with pertinent regulations. Compliance efforts would include ensuring that unauthorized take under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act does not occur.	Section 5.4.1
5	Monitoring of sediment placement in the marine environment will be performed during construction, as specified in Environmental Commitments WR-2 and BIO-16. These commitments require the monitoring of potential effects to sensitive marine habitat and adjustment of placement locations and methods as necessary.	Sections 5.3.1 and 5.4.1
6	As described in Section 5.4.2, initial testing of sediment grain size and quality has been performed. In addition, Section 5.2.1 of the IFR contains the commitment to perform additional sediment testing prior to and during excavation (Environmental Commitment ER-3). This commitment includes coordination of testing with the SC-DMMT.	Sections 5.4.2 and 5.2.1
7	The habitats at both the beach and nearshore placement locations are expected to be characteristic of open coast nearshore invertebrate populations. Common species	

	include polychaetes (*Apoprionospio pygmaeus* and *Nemertea* sp.), bean clams (*Donax gouldii*), and amphipods (such as *Mandibulophoxus unocirostratus*). The plan currently recommended for implementation, the LPP, includes nearshore placement. This would temporarily bury invertebrates at the placement site, but would only gradually add sands to the beach with no direct impacts to beach invertebrates or the food chain dependent on them. Indirect impacts would be negligible as the invertebrate community would be expected to burrow as sand is deposited in a manner similar to natural seasonal aggradation.	
8	While the IFR mentions that barges would allow for the placement of a greater range of materials offshore (i.e. boulders), this is currently not part of the recommended plan. If changes to the project description to include placement of such material are implemented in the future, such changes would be accompanied by appropriate analysis, coordination, and permitting, as necessary.	N/A
9	Currently, the LPP is being recommended for implementation. Unlike the NER plan, the LPP does not require any temporary closure of parking in Malibu along the PCH, as materials would be placed offshore using a barge. As such, no parking mitigation is considered necessary. In the unlikely event that the NER plan were to be authorized instead of the LPP, requiring temporary closure of parking along PCH at the Malibu Pier parking lot, the need for additional parking would be coordinated with the city of Malibu and others, and evaluated in the Traffic Management Plan as described in Section 5.9.1 under Environmental Commitment T-1, with details provided to the Coastal Commission.	
10	Thank you for making us aware of the Coastal Commission enforcement actions adjacent to the project footprint. If beach placement at the NER site is chosen for implementation, close coordination with the Coastal Commission will occur to ensure compatibility with the ongoing enforcement actions.	N/A

6. California Department of Fish and Wildlife		
Commenter: Courtney, Betty J. – Environmental Program Manager I, South Coast Region		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Pursuant to USACE policy, the USACE does not provide wildlife or habitat mitigation for impacts resulting from ecosystem restoration projects, and therefore the project must ensure that restoration efforts result in no net-loss of sensitive or protected habitats. The Revegetation and Planting Plan (See IFR, Environmental Commitment BIO-8), to be developed during the Pre-Construction Engineering and Design phase, will ensure no net loss in habitat quality or quantity results from implementation of the project. In addition, and as described in Appendix I of the IFR, a monitoring and adaptive management plan will be implemented after construction is complete to ensure successful establishment of the restoration area, and to adaptively manage the restoration area if restoration goals are not being achieved.	Section 5.4.2, Section 9.2.1 Appendix I
2	Upland Site F is not a component of the LPP, which is the plan being recommended for implementation. However, if Upland Site F were to be required for construction, pre-construction surveys for Lyon's pentachaeta will be conducted as required by Environmental Commitment BIO-15. If the species is present and may be affected by the project, the USACE would consult with USFWS as required under the Endangered Species Act. In addition, Section 5.4.2 has been updated to indicate that if the species is discovered, CDPR would consult with CDFW as appropriate.	Section 5.4.1
3	Information from the existing marine surveys performed by the USACE was utilized to select both beach and nearshore placement areas in order to avoid impacts to marine resources to the maximum extent practicable. The marine surveys are discussed in Section 1.10.9 of the IFR, and the results are displayed in Figure 1.10-2.	Section 1.10.9
4	The IFR contains specific discussion of southern steelhead, California grunion, and California least tern (Section 3.4.9 and Section 5.4.2). Of the other sensitive resources mentioned in the comment, abalone, Pismo clam, and sea palm are not present at either of the analyzed placement sites. One sand dollar bed was identified during the nearshore surveys, but this bed will be avoided during placement and no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated. Rocky reef and kelp are also present in the general region, but as described in the IFR placement locations have been identified based on marine surveys to specifically avoid impacts to sensitive marine resources (see response #3 above). While California brown pelicans are present along the coast, they are no longer a listed species under the ESA or CESA and no impacts to this species are anticipated.	Sections 3.4.9. 4.9.2, and 5.4.2

	In addition, the IFR now includes Environmental Commitment BIO-16, which requires monitoring of potential effects to sensitive marine habitat and adjustment of placement locations and methods as necessary.	
5	As described under response #4 above, Environmental Commitment BIO-16 includes marine monitoring during sediment placement actions, which will allow for monitoring of potential effects to sensitive marine habitat and adjustment of placement locations and methods as necessary. In addition, neither Pismo clam nor abalone were identified in the project area during the nearshore surveys performed. Since the placement location is in an area of high erosion, this is anticipated to preclude the establishment of Pismo clam beds in the vicinity. As a result, further surveys for these species are not considered necessary.	Section 5.4.1
6	Environmental Commitments have been updated to include that any relocation efforts covering state or federally protected species will be coordinated with USFWS and/or CDFW, as appropriate.	Section 5.4.1

7. California Department of Transportation — Office of Transportation Planning		
Commenter: Watson, Dianna – IGR/CEQA Branch Chief		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	If any work is required to be performed within the State Right-of-Way, CDPR will obtain appropriate rights from Caltrans prior to construction. If any state facilities require modification, these modifications will be designed to meet all mandatory design standards and specifications. No such modifications have been identified at this time.	N/A
2	The USACE is aware of the sensitivity relative to storm water run-off. As specified in Environmental Commitment WR-1, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared prior to construction to ensure storm water is managed appropriately. This SWPPP would be prepared by the construction contractor, in coordination with the USACE, and implementation of the SWPPP will be required during construction in accordance with section 402 of the Clean Water Act.	Section 5.3.1, Section 9.2.2
3	Prior to the use of any oversized or heavy construction equipment on State highways, appropriate Caltrans permits will be acquired by the construction contractor. As described in Section 5.9.1, construction traffic would be limited to the off-peak hours of 9am – 3pm (or 9am to 2pm during school season) in order to meet Los Angeles County traffic requirements.	Section 5.9.1
4	As described in Section 5.9.4 and Environmental Commitment T-1, a Transportation Management Plan would be prepared during the Pre-Construction Engineering and	Section 5.9.4, Section 9.2.8

	Design phase of the project in order to address transportation related issues and reduce traffic impacts to the maximum extent practicable.	
5	Although the CEQA guidelines have been updated to reflect SB 743, the provisions of section 15064.3 apply prospectively as described in section 15007, and do not apply statewide until July 1, 2020. The IFR is expected to be finalized before this section goes into effect.	N/A

8. California Department of Water Resources		
Commenter: Jones, Shawn O. – Regional Engineer		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The project does not include any alternatives that would result in restoration of an impoundment behind Rindge Dam, and therefore it is anticipated that Rindge Dam will remain outside of CDWR's jurisdiction.	N/A

9. California State Clearinghouse		
Commenter: Morgan, Scott – Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	N/A

10. California State Lands Commission		
Commenter: Oggins, Cy R. – Chief, Division of Environmental Planning and Management		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The CDPR will coordinate with the CSLC to obtain necessary rights for nearshore placement within CSLC jurisdiction during the construction phase. Thank you for providing the information regarding jurisdiction in the proposed project area, the existing CDPR lease information, and the point of contact.	
2	Emissions from barging and associated support vessels have been calculated and are now included in the emissions data contained in Section 5.12. Section 5.12.1 contains specific details in the subsection Barge and Support Vessels. Details of these calculations can also be found in the updated Supplemental Air Quality Analysis in Appendix L.	Section 5.12.1, Tables 5.12-4 and 5.12-8, Appendix L
3	The project area is located above the range of tidal effects on Malibu Creek and would not be affected by sea level rise, with the exception of the beach and nearshore	

	placement sites. Project activities at those sites will be limited to beach nourishment activities that will be too short in duration and volume to be affected by sea level rise.	
4	Pre-construction surveys for special status plant species shall note the presence of non-native, invasive plant species. In addition, post-construction monitoring of the restoration area (as described in Appendix I of the IFR), would include identification and removal of non-native vegetation in order to meet restoration goals. As noted in Section 12.1.2 of the IFR, CDPR has significant knowledge on invasive pests present along Malibu Creek due to decades of work along it. The presence of red swamp crayfish, New Zealand mud snail, golden clam, and other invasives is well documented. With the presence of a qualified biologist during construction, as required under Environmental Commitment BIO-1, removal of the dam is not expected to result in the introduction of any new non-native, invasive plant species to the Pacific shoreline.	
5	The USACE determined that the project would have no effect on these species as described in the IFR. Sections 3.4.6 and 5.4.2 describe grunion use of the area, potential impacts to grunion due to the project, and describe the anticipated beneficial effects to this species. Under beach placement alternatives, sand would be distributed on the beach in fall and winter, outside of the grunion season, and outside of plover and tern breeding season. Sand placed in the nearshore under the LPP and other plans with nearshore placement would be placed during grunion season, but is not expected to have any effect on grunion spawning because the beaches nearest to the placement site are unsuitable for grunion spawning due to narrowness of the beach and the lack of dry sand above MHHW. Section 5.4.2 details the USACE's no effect determinations for both western snowy plover and its critical habitat and California least tern. Because the USACE has determined that the project will have no effect on either of these species or designated critical habitat for the plover, no mitigation measures are considered necessary for these species.	Section 3.4.6 and Section 5.4.2
6	Language referencing the state lands jurisdiction over cultural resources found on tidal lands has been incorporated into the regulatory setting discussion of the cultural resources section (Section 3.5.1).	Section 3.5.1
7	Consultation with the SHPO is complete. The status of such consultation is described in Sections 9.1.7 and 11.1.9 of the IFR.	Section 9.1.7 and Section 11.1.9
8	As described in Section 5.2.2 of the IFR, based on core samples, a preliminary determination was made that there is a layer that contains grain sizes typical of the coastal environment that is suitable for beach and/or nearshore placement. Sands in the Malibu Creek watershed are a source of sands for the downcoast beaches. As such, the color of sands to be taken from the material behind Rindge Dam are expected to match	

	nourished beaches in both grain size and color. Therefore, matching native color of beach material would not be necessary. Additionally, the sands would be placed into the nearshore environment (Recommended Plan), the volume of material being placed is minor, and would be readily subject to transport and intermixing with existing sediment, making it quickly indistinguishable from existing sands after placement and migration to the downcoast shoreline. Suitability of this material for beach nourishment was discussed with the Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) which concurred in the USACE's initial determination that the materials were suitable for beach nourishment. Section 5.2.1 of the IFR contains an Environmental Commitment to perform additional sediment testing prior to and during excavation (ER-3). This testing would be coordinated with the SC-DMMT to ensure that the excavated sediment is compatible with beach and/or nearshore placement as appropriate.	
9	The potential impacts of sand deposition in this area are discussed in Section 5.4 of the IFR. The USACE has determined that the project would not affect the lagoon or the coastal areas offshore of Surfrider Beach, so that the project would have no effect on surfing conditions, as discussed in Section 4.5 of Appendix O of the IFR (Coastal Engineering). As stated in Appendix O, some placed sediment may temporarily move to the west from the placement area, but it would eventually travel east and away from the primary surfing area. The shoreline change model shows some increased beach width near Malibu Lagoon but would return to the normal levels by the end of the placement window. This increased beach width would not alter the waves at Malibu Point but may cause the waves to break slightly further offshore for a short period of time.	

11. County of Los Angeles - Department of Beaches and Harbors		
Commenters: Jones, Gary – Director; Kelly John – Deputy Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	For the Recommended Plan, no access to County-owned beaches, or beach/parking closures are anticipated to be required. These impacts were confined to plans including beach placement of sediments. If a plan with the beach placement option were to be chosen for implementation, all appropriate coordination and permitting associated with County-owned lands would be finalized prior to construction.	N/A
2	The Recommended Plan does not utilize PCH for trucking, hauling, or material placement. As such, no impacts to the County-owned Surfrider beach would occur.	N/A

3	This location is not utilized as part of the Recommended Plan, and review and approval of plans by the County will not be required.	
4	Additional analyses as proposed are not required, as potential downstream sedimentation and flood risk impacts were evaluated in the IFR (described in detail in Appendix B: Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Sedimentation). Based on the analyses performed, the Recommended Plan would not result in a significant increase in downstream sedimentation or flood-risk relative to baseline conditions. As such, associated mitigation measures are not necessary. The IFR already requires the construction contractor to develop a Hazardous Substances Control and Emergency Response Plan (see environmental commitment HAZ-2 in Section 5.13.1), which will cover actions taken in the event that storms or high creek flows compromise the site.	Appendix B
5	As described in the IFR (Section 5.2.3) and as required in Environmental Commitment ER-1 (Section 5.2.1), additional slope stability and geotechnical evaluations will be performed during PED. These analyses will be used to develop slope stabilization measures and ensure protection of adjacent resources, including Malibu Canyon Road.	

12. County of Los Angeles – Department of Public Works		
Commenter: Pestrella, Mark – Director; Proano, Pat – Deputy Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The USACE does not believe that additional traffic analyses are necessary at this time, as the existing traffic analyses were sufficient in scope and detail to properly characterize potential impacts as a result of the range of alternatives. While it is true that the existing traffic analysis utilized an earlier start time than those required by the county, revising the start time utilized in the traffic impacts analysis would not alter the outcomes presented in Section 5.9. The traffic analyses are based on the maximum possible traffic to determine worst case impacts, and performing new analyses to adjust the start time to 9:00 am would not alter the overall outcome of the traffic analyses. While this would reduce the number of traffic trips during AM peak hours, overall traffic analyses still show potentially significant impacts to traffic due to PM Peak Hour traffic increases and percentage based increases along Malibu Canyon Road and Pacific Coast Highway. Therefore, impacts would remain Class I even with the adjustment of start times. The remaining analyses presented in the IFR (including schedule, duration, and truck trips associated with air quality analyses) utilized the 9:00 am start time as shown in the project descriptions in Section 4.4, and it is the project's intent to adhere to the 9:00 am requirement.	N/A

	As described in the IFR, a detailed Traffic Management Plan would be developed during PED (see Section 5.9 Environmental Commitment T-1). This traffic analysis would be implemented utilizing the correct start time as required by the county. The plan would include an analysis sufficient to ensure that traffic impacts are avoided, reduced, or mitigated to the maximum extent practicable. This document would be circulated to LADPW for review.	
2	Site access would be discussed in the Traffic Control Plan, which is to be developed during PED. This plan will evaluate the entrance point to the construction area off of Malibu Canyon Road. A copy of the plan will be provided to LADPW prior to initiation of construction.	
3	Environmental Commitment T-2 requires the construction contractor to prepare a road repair plan prior to construction. This plan will address project-induced impacts to the surface of Malibu Canyon Road in the vicinity of the Rindge Dam impounded sediment area access ramps. A copy of the plan will be provided to LADPW prior to initiation of construction.	Section 5.9.2, T-2
4	It is the intent of the CDPR to provide replacement bridges for the two private Malibu Meadows Road Crossing (CC2) and the Crater Camp Road Crossing (CC3). The CDPR will conduct such activities in compliance with Title 26 of the Los Angeles County Building Code.	Section 5.2.3
5	The current Geotechnical Engineering Appendix to the IFR (Appendix D) includes references to all items listed in the minimal requirements for a geotechnical report. These items will be addressed during PED, and/or prior to the onset of any construction. For canyon wall stability during and after unloading, see Section 4 - Geotechnical and Geologic Constraints (pp. D22-23), and Section 5.6 - Stability of Canyon Slopes (D-38). For dam stability, see Appendix C-Civil and Structural, and Appendix D Section 4 (D-23), and Section 5.5 - Dam Stability during Deconstruction (D37-38). For road stability: Section 5.6 (D-38). For erosion and scour changes after dam removal: Section 4 (D-23), Section 5.6 (D-39), and Section 7.7 - Stability of Canyon Slopes (D-44). For landslides: Section 3.3.2- Landslides (D-19), and Section 7.7 (D-44). For haul roads: see Appendix C, Appendix D Section 4 (D-22), and Section 7.6 - Current Haul Ramp Concept (D-44).	Appendix D
6	Further geotechnical investigations will occur during PED.	Section 5.2.3
7	All access roads will be designed to withstand flows over the life of the project.	
8	The USACE is not subject to County stormwater codes. However, as described in Section 5.3, the construction contractor would develop and implement a SWPPP during construction in accordance with section 402 of the Clean Water Act.	Section 5.3

9	The city of Calabasas will be coordinated with in regards to LV3 and LV4.	
10	The information related to Trancas Canyon has been clarified in the IFR.	Section 3.3.5
11	See GR-A and GR-D.	Appendix H
12	Corrections associated with the listed miscellaneous comments have been made in the IFR.	
13	Specific plans for each of the upstream barriers will not be available until the PED phase. USACE and CDPR will coordinate with Los Angeles County on County-owned upstream barriers during the PED phase, and will provide additional details, sketches and draft-final plans and specifications, as requested.	
14	The USACE and CDPR have further evaluated the bridge's weight capacity and determined the bridge has sufficient design strength to support the construction-related traffic for the life of the project. Road repairs, which would include bridges, are covered by Environmental Commitment T-2.	Section 9.2.1, Section 5.9.1
15	Project funding would be cost-shared as established in existing regulations and as discussed in the Section 12. 3 of the IFR.	Section 12.3

13. County of Los Angeles – Fire Department		
Commenter: Vidales, Frank – Chief, Forestry Division		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The IFR contains consideration of potential impacts to rare and endangered species, vegetation, archeological and cultural resources, and erosion control. As described in Section 5.13, the project area has been proposed as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. As a result, Environmental Commitment HAZ-1 requires the construction contractor to prepare a fire prevention and response plan to reduce the risk of fires. This plan will require approval by the Los Angeles County Fire Department prior to implementation.	Section 9.2.1, Section 5.13

14. City of Malibu		
Commenter: Brager, Robert L. – Public Works Director/City Engineer/Floodplain Administrator		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The Locally Preferred Plan, or LPP, is a term in USACE policy that identifies a plan that the non-Federal sponsor requests be recommended instead of the plan the Federal	

	government would otherwise select based on Federal criteria. For this study, the non-federal sponsor is California Department of Parks and Recreation.	
2	Section ES-2 describes the need for the proposed project, while Section ES-3 discusses problems and opportunities which the study addresses. These sections do not contain any discussions of project related impacts. For the executive summary of potential impacts, please see ES-5, or for detailed discussions on project-related impacts, refer to Section 5.	
3	The discussion referenced describes how Rindge Dam has slowed baseflow velocity upstream due to changes in slope associated with the sediment impoundment. This section does not reference alterations to flow velocity downstream of Rindge Dam at the Cross Creek Bridge area. The commitments of the recommended plan related to addressing flood risk are discussed in Response GR-A.	See GR-A.
4	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-A
5	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-B.
6	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-E
7	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-D
8	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	Section 5.11
9	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The Serra floodwall is not impacted by the recommended plan.	Section 4.9, Section 5.5.2 , Section 5.6.2
10	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The number of truck trips per day vary within the estimated range provided in the IFR due to the amount of operating hours available for hauling each day, the composition of the sediment being excavated at that time, and different hauling distances for the various sediment placement sites over the construction period.	Section 5.9 Appendix C Appendix F
11	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. See Response GR-A.	See GR-A
12	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-B

13	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The recommended plan does not include placement of sand on the beach.	Section 4.9, Section 5.8.2
14	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-B
15	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	N/A
16	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	N/A
17	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The Calabasas Landfill has the capacity to accept the estimated volume of impounded sediment.	Section 5.14.2
18	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	Table 4.2-1
19	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The recommended plan does not include shoreline placement of sand.	Section 4.9, Section 5.9
20	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR.	See GR-B
21	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. The recommended plan does not include shoreline placement of sand.	Section 4.9
22	The question is in reference to the Executive Summary. Full details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. See Environmental Commitment T-1, T-2 and T-3.	Section 9.2.1
23	The reference to line 21 incorrectly quotes the IFR by omitting key portions of the sentence. This section actually states “If not handled properly, dam removal can pose a substantial though temporary flood risk”. This section does not state that removal of the dam, under all scenarios, will result in flood risk.	See GR-A
24	The statement is incorrect in that the dam does not currently restrict the flow of sediments, nor would it restrict the flow of sediments in the future if left in place or removed. See Appendix B for additional information. Lagoon water levels will not increase due to implementation of the recommended plan. Climate change and predicted sea level changes will affect lagoon water surface elevations (See Section 8 of Appendix B and Appendix O). For the California coast south of Cape Mendocino sea levels are estimated to rise by 1.6 to 11.8 in by 2030 above 2000 levels, 4.7 to 24 in by	Section 3.3.4 Appendix B Appendix O

	2050, and 16.5 to 65.7 in by 2100 (IFR Section 3.3.4). Sediment deposition in the lagoon will occur in future years with or without a project. Under the No Action alternative (Alt 1), about 2 feet of deposition would occur in the lagoon based on the sediment modeling of the 50-year period of record (see Appendix B, Section 16.2.2). For the recommended plan (LPP) and the NER plan, the model results for the period of record show up to 3.25 feet of deposition would occur (Appendix B, Section 16.3.1).	
25	The use of suitable sands for beach nourishment is a small part of the overall project. The major benefits are to migratory fish in the creek by reestablishing both an aquatic and terrestrial wildlife corridor that have proven benefits.	
26	This reference does not accurately represent the information contained in the IFR, and the word speculative is not used. The IFR states that "Rindge Dam sediments to nourish the shoreline and the nearshore environment creates a unique 'win-win' ecological and economic nexus that may achieve multiple public benefits". The IFR does not state in any location that downstream flooding is a certainty. All project alternatives include measures or commitments to ensure compliance with the study constraint regarding project-induced flood risk.	See GR-A
27	Silt and sediment are currently being deposited along the creek and to the ocean and the project would have no substantial effect on this process. Since this sedimentation is the result of native material in the Malibu Creek system, removal of Rindge Dam is not anticipated to change roughness.	See GR-A
28	See GR-A.	Appendix H
29	Use of 20 cubic yard trucks to remove materials as well as the use of the nearshore placement site as part of the LPP will minimize truck traffic. In addition, hours of operation will restrict truck traffic to acceptable times. The IFR also contains an environmental commitment (T-1) to develop a transportation management plan (Section 5.9.1). This plan will evaluate traffic flow and potential traffic impacts, and traffic control measures will be developed, for implementation during construction, to minimize impacts to traffic to the maximum extent practical.	Section 9.2.1, Section 5.9.2, Section 5.9.4
30	Chemical and bio-assay tests were conducted on the impounded sediment during the study. In addition, the USACE will conduct a Sampling and Analysis Program, in consultation with the Southern California Dredged Material Management Team, to evaluate the suitability of sands for beach nourishment (see Environmental Commitment ER-3 in Section 9.2.1).	GR-F Section 4.2, Section 4.9.2, Section 9.2.1
31	The nearshore placement site (recommended plan) and beach nourishment site (NER plan) are not located near the kelp beds mentioned and have no potential for adversely affecting those kelp beds.	Figure 4.9-5 Appendix O

32	The IFR states that for the California coast south of Cape Mendocino, sea levels are estimated in the NRC study to rise by 1.6 to 11.8 in by 2030 above 2000 levels, 4.7 to 24 in by 2050, and 16.5 to 65.7 in by 2100.	Section 3.3.4
33	See GR-A.	Appendix B
34	See GR-A. Rindge Dam has no storage capacity left to trap flood flows and does not slow down flow velocity or otherwise attenuate flows during moderate to large storm events.	Section ES.5.1 Appendix B
35	Bank erosion occurs during storm events under the No Action (Alt 1) condition. The recommended plan (LPP) and the NER plan do not present an increased erosion risk to private property, utility lines, or structures in Malibu Creek reaches below Rindge Dam.	Appendix B
36	See GR-A.	Appendix B
37	See GR-A.	Appendix B
38	See GR-A.	Appendix B
39	As described in Section 5.2.2 of the IFR, based on core samples, a preliminary determination was made that there is a layer that contains grain sizes typical of the coastal environment is suitable for beach and/or nearshore placement. Suitability of this material for beach nourishment was discussed with the Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) which concurred in the USACE's initial determination that the materials were suitable for beach nourishment. A Sampling and Analysis Plan will be performed in the PED. The Sampling and Analysis Plan, the Sampling and Analysis Plan Report, and the USACE's final suitability determination will be presented and discussed with the SC-DMMT. In addition, Section 5.3.1 of the IFR also describes that a SWPPP will be developed prior to, and implemented during, construction. The SWPPP will address the transport and control of sediment as required by the Clean Water Act.	Section 5.2.2; 5.3.1
40	As described in the IFR (Section 5.2), additional slope stability and geotechnical evaluations will be performed during the PED as required in Environmental Commitment ER-1. These analyses will be used to develop slope stabilization measures and ensure protection of adjacent resources, as well as incorporated as necessary into the project SWPPP.	Section 4.9.5, Section 5.2
41	See response #40 above.	Section 4.9.5, Section 5.2
42	See GR-A.	GR-A
43	See response to comment 24	Section 3.3.4 Appendix B Appendix O

44	Silt deposits would occur in areas well above the effects of any sea level change in the creek.	Appendix B
45	Hydrologic, hydraulic, and sediment transport modeling conducted for this study are not to be used to update FEMA floodplain maps.	Appendix B
46	The recommended plan (LPP) and NER plan do not increase storm flow velocities in the lower reaches of Malibu Creek that include the Cross Creek bridge and Malibu Creek bridge. The model results do not show and risk of scour in the bridge locations for either of these plans.	GR-A Appendix B
47	The statement referenced in this comment is specific to Criterion 1 of the traffic analysis, while the table referenced covers all significance criteria for traffic. Under Criterion 1, the impacts to traffic on this road segment are not significant as the initial analyses indicated that the increase in traffic will not result in an increase in the level of service. As such, this section is accurate and does not require revision. See Environmental Commitments T-1 and T-3.	Section 5.9, Section 9.2.1
48	The existing traffic analyses in the IFR resulted in a finding that there would potentially be significant impacts to traffic as a result of both the LPP and NER plan. As such, additional details about the requested intersections would not result in a change in the decision-making, documentation, or level of impacts expected. However, the USACE has also committed to performing a detailed traffic analysis during PED. See GR-B for additional details.	GR-B
49	See response #48 above.	N/A
50	Details regarding this aspect of the project can be found in the main text of the IFR. See Environmental Commitments T-1 and T-3.	Section 4.9,Section 5.9, Section 9.2.1
51	See Environmental Commitments T-1 and T-3.	GR-B Section 9.2.1
52	The recommended plan (LPP) will not alter tidal patterns.	Appendix O
53	The risk to access to from the Cross Creek Road Bridge to the Serra Canyon Property Owners Association does not change when comparing the No Action (Alt 1) condition to the recommended plan (LPP).	GR-A
54	See Environmental Commitments T-1 and T-3.	Section 5.9, Section 9.2.1
55	Repairs would be based on actual damages incurred as a result of the increased truck traffic and would not be limited to spot patching. See Environmental Commitment T-2.	GR-B, Section 9.2.1
56	While the parking lots would be closed, access would be maintained to local businesses. The IFR contains additional discussion of parking (Section 5.9.3). This closure would also take place during the off-season for beach recreational uses, so that impacts would be minimal. In addition, this parking closure is limited to the NER plan. Currently, the LPP	Section 5.9.3

	is being recommended for implementation. The LPP does not require use of this parking area.	
57	See GR-A.	Appendix B
58	Options to allow for natural transport of sediment were evaluated in the IFR under Alternatives 3 and 4. As discussed in the IFR, natural sediment transport would require the construction of floodwalls in areas below Rindge Dam to address increases in flood risk. The impacts associated with floodwall construction were significant, and included cultural, biological, aesthetic, water and noise impacts. As a result, these alternatives were not recommended for implementation.	GR-A
59	Any impacts to water quality would be highly localized and are not expected to extend downstream to any city facilities. In addition, Section 5.3.1 of the IFR also describes that a SWPPP will be developed by the contractor prior to, and implemented during, construction. The SWPPP will address the transport and control of sediment as required by the Clean Water Act.	Section 5.3.2
60	The reference has been deleted from Appendix H	GR-A
61	Adverse changes would be highly localized and short term in duration. Beach placement increases would not be discernible over background wave-induced turbidity. Nearshore turbidity would dissipate within one hour of each placement event. In addition, the USACE has committed to monitoring off-shore sediment placement under the recommended plan (LPP) in order to ensure short-term or minor impacts are further minimized to the maximum extent practicable. See Environmental Commitment ER-3.	Section 9.2.1 Appendix O
62	See response to comment 30.	GR-F Section 4.2, Section 4.9.2, Section 9.2.1
63	The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) is a member of the TAC and is fully aware of the project. The USACE has received a letter of support for the project from the LARWQCB, and is committed to applying for a Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act during PED.	Section 5.3.2
64	The Malibu Creek ecosystem restoration project does not consist of any development in the floodplain, nor will it result in any development within the floodplain. Therefore, the floodplain associated approvals and permits are not applicable.	N/A
65	The Malibu Creek ecosystem restoration is a federal project taking place within the coastal zone of California. The USACE has obtained concurrence with its consistency determination from the California Coastal Commission in accordance with section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP) from the city of Malibu is not applicable to the USACE, however, CDPR will obtain a CDP.	N/A

66	See GR-A.	GR-A
67	Sediment transport has been modeled for all action alternatives considered in the IFR. Neither the NER plan nor the LPP are expected to result in substantial changes to sediment flow in the creek.	See GR-F
68	Traffic would be two-way.	See GR-B
69	See GR-B.	See GR-B

15. South Coast Air Quality Management District		
Commenter: Sun, Lijin – Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	In order to properly evaluate emissions in accordance with the CEQA thresholds established in the IFR (Section 5.12.2), the IFR has been revised to include daily emissions from barging and associated support vessels. These calculations are now included in the emissions data contained in Section 5.12, and evaluated in comparison to the established CEQA thresholds. Details of these calculations can also be found in the updated Supplemental Air Quality Analysis in Appendix L.	Section 5.12.1, Tables 5.12-4 and 5.12-8, Appendix L
2	Appendix L does contain labeling discrepancies compared to the IFR language with regards to the construction schedule as specified in your comment. Including revised labels and headings in Appendix L would have required re-running the entirety of the initial analyses to generate a new copy of the document, which was not feasible from a cost or schedule perspective. Therefore, a detailed Supplemental Air Quality Analysis has been provided at the front of Appendix L to thoroughly explain all of the labeling discrepancies, including the construction start date discrepancies, between tables in the IFR and those in the main volume of the Appendix.	Section 5.12, Appendix L
3	The original emissions analyses were completed prior to the availability of EMFAC 2014 and In-Use Off-Road Equipment 2011. The USACE believes that utilizing the updated software modules would not result in significantly different results, nor would it result in different determinations than those described in the existing air quality analyses. The air quality analyses methods performed in 2011 are very similar to calculations available in the specified software updates. Therefore, the cost increase and time delay associated with performing updated air quality analyses utilizing new software is not justified given that such results are not likely to result in a different analytical outcome or decision.	N/A
4	The lower half of Table 5.12-4 in the draft IFR referenced the incorrect data. This table has been corrected in the final IFR. The correct data resulted in NOx emissions exceeding SCAQMD thresholds and all other emissions remaining under the SCAQMD	Table 5.12-4

	thresholds. This is the same outcome as the original air quality analyses, which were based on the incorrect data originally included in Table 5.12-4.	
5	The table format suggested by SCAQMD is not feasible due to project specific issues. The localized daily emissions calculated for alternatives, including the removal of upstream barriers, results in emissions at numerous different locations within the watershed occurring in different construction years. In order to appropriately track these emissions with clarity, this information is displayed as separate tables in Section 5.12. In addition, the IFR was structured to analyze each alternative in a separate section. Therefore, to remain consistent with formatting throughout the IFR, the emissions from each alternative are split into the appropriate analysis sections. Combining emissions as suggested would both remove the ability to track separate emissions components, and would be inconsistent with the remainder of the IFR's structure. To alleviate the difficulty of following the air quality analyses as contained in the draft IFR and Appendix L, an updated Supplemental Air Quality Analysis has been added to Appendix L, which clearly describes the process by which data from Appendix L was summarized, updated, and displayed in the IFR.	Section 5.12, Appendix L
6	SCAQMD Rule 1403 is now described in Section 5.12.2, and associated Environmental Commitment AIR-6 is now in Section 5.12.1.	Section 5.12.2 and 5.12.3
7	As required in Environmental Commitment AQ-7, the use of Tier 3 vehicles is required as part of the project description. In addition, construction efforts beyond 2027 will be required to use model 2023 or newer engines as specified in Environmental Commitment AQ-8. These are included as features within the project description and as such are not necessary as mitigation measures. As discussed in Section 5.9.4, Environmental Commitment T-1 includes development of a Transportation Management Plan prior to construction. This plan will determine what traffic control methods are appropriate. The Transportation Management Plan will address traffic flow and signal synchronization, in part reducing unnecessary idling and traffic trips through traffic flow improvement, as required to partially fulfill Environmental Commitment AQ-1. Due to the limited access points to the project area, construction efforts cannot be re-routed. In addition, several feasible Environmental Commitments reducing emissions from mobile sources have now been included in Section 5.12.3, as suggested by the USEPA.	Section 5.12.3

16. American Fisheries Society – California-Nevada Chapter		
Commenter: Merz, Joseph – President and Certified Fisheries Professional		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your statement of support for the removal of Rindge Dam. As described throughout the analyses and mitigation measures contained in the IFR, impacts to aquatic and riparian species are being minimized to the maximum extent practicable.	N/A
1	Surveys show no Pacific lamprey or red-legged frogs in the project area, although recent surveys for red-legged frog have confirmed the species presence upstream of the project footprint on Las Virgenes Creek. The USACE has determined that the project would not affect tidewater goby or red-legged frog. However, pre-construction surveys will be performed for red-legged frogs and, if discovered, the USACE will revisit its effects determination and consult with the USFWS under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act with the USFWS, if required.	

17. Blue Planet United		
Commenter: Hempel, Marilyn – Executive Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	N/A

18. California Trout – Southern California Regional Office		
Commenter: Meneghin, Candice – Conservation Program Manager		
Comment Number	Response	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the study and Locally Preferred Plan.	N/A

19. EcoMalibu		
Commenter: Purvey, Bob – President		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the study and Locally Preferred Plan.	N/A

1	As described throughout the IFR, a variety of alternatives were analyzed, including a range of natural transport options under Alternatives 3 and 4. Based on the evaluation process described in the IFR and potential impacts of each alternative, natural transport of sediment is not currently being proposed. The plan being recommended for implementation is the LPP.	
2	While night trucking has the potential to reduce the total construction timeframe by allowing mining operations to occur over a longer period each day, extensive early coordination with the County of Los Angeles during preparation of the IFR indicated that consideration of night trucking would be problematic. There are a variety of existing local, regional and state regulations that govern considerations of reasonable truck traffic operations in the project area. These regulations include specific hours when hauling and sediment delivery and placement is permitted in the project area, and currently do not allow for night trucking. Lighting necessary for Rindge Dam sediment mining and hauling operations at night would also have negative effects on biological communities in the area. Productivity at night would be slower than daytime operations, increasing mining and hauling costs. As a result of the regulatory restrictions, biological impacts, and additional costs, night trucking was not considered to be a viable option for this feasibility analysis. Based on comments from the CDPR and others, the inclusion of sediment mining and hauling measures in the Rindge Dam area will be revisited during PED to reassess the regulatory viability, and associated beneficial and detrimental biological and cost impacts.	Section 3.9

20. Endangered Habitats League		
Commenter: Silver, Dan – Executive Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the study.	N/A

21. Heal the Bay		
Commenters: Pease, Katherine – Watershed Scientist; Kampalath, Rita – Science and Policy Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your statement of support for the LPP.	
1	The spillway exists currently, and is therefore part of the baseline condition. While continued unauthorized use of the spillway may result in continued habitat degradation in minimal areas, this is not an impact caused by the project but a pre-existing condition.	N/A

	As such, these impacts cannot be attributed to the project action alternatives that don't remove the spillway.	
2	Sediment placement locations have been chosen to avoid direct impacts to surfgrass, and only indirect impacts due to tidal transport of sediments would occur. The potential indirect impacts to nearby surfgrass are expected to be negligible. In addition, monitoring will be conducted during sediment placement to ensure there are no significant impacts to surfgrass or other protected marine habitats (see Environmental Commitment BIO-16 in Section 5.4.1).	Section 5.4.1
3	Section 4.4.2 of the IFR (Alternative 2 Options), provides a summary of upland and shoreline options considered for the Rindge Dam impounded sediment during this study, including beneficial reuse of all of the sediment (refer to the subsection on Upland Site – Rindge Dam Impounded Sediment Placement Options). The USACE, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR), and the Technical Advisory Committee collaboratively discussed options for beneficial use of the impounded sediment for several years, both within and outside of the watershed, but were not able to obtain necessary commitments from land owners and other oversight agencies on other uses of the remaining 2/3 volume of sediment that would be placed in the Calabasas Landfill. The remaining 2/3 volume of the impounded sediment did not meet compatibility criteria for beach nourishment. Natural transport of this material to downstream reaches of Malibu Creek would have potentially significant adverse effects to the environment, along with the potential to increase the flood risk to downstream communities if the larger grain-sized sediment were released downstream during storm events (see Section 4.4.3 – Alternative 3 – Natural Transport of Impounded Sediment in the IFR).	Sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3
4	As discussed in Appendix O of the IFR (Coastal Engineering), the nearshore placement site immediately downcoast of Malibu Pier, and adjacent shoreline area that would temporarily benefit from nourishment, are areas that would typically be expected to receive sand nourishment from an unimpeded Malibu Creek. The primary goal was to place sands as close as possible to where they would have been in the absence of Rindge Dam without adversely impacting sensitive habitat areas to the west of the pier (see Figure 4.11-3 – Nearshore Placement Area), and surfing at Surfrider Beach. Although it is recognized that other beaches also face shortfalls and need sand, as discussed in Section 4.4.2 of the IFR, the volume of sand present in the area behind the dam is not sufficient to also address the needs of other beaches.	Section 4.4.2 and Appendix O
5	The primary consideration in the final selection of a placement area was selecting a site that would have received the material naturally in the absence of Rindge Dam. In	

	addition, sites were chosen to further avoid potential impacts to sensitive aquatic habitats. As described in response #4 above, the volume of material present is also not enough to remedy the sediment shortfalls at other beaches in the region, and these beaches also do not meet the primary consideration to choose a location where the sediment would have naturally been deposited from the watershed.	
6	Sand transport was modeled as part of the study. Details are available in Appendix B, Section 15 of the IFR (Hydrology, Hydraulics and Sedimentation) and in Sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 of Appendix O (Coastal Engineering).	Appendix O and Appendix B
7	Removal of Rindge Dam and the accumulated sediments as well as construction work on upstream barriers will be preceded by removal of all vegetation, including any non-native species. Revegetation of impacted areas will include provisions for the control and removal of invasive species during the post-construction monitoring and adaptive management period after planting of native species has been completed. In addition, CDPR will continue efforts to control invasive species within Malibu Creek State Park.	
8	The USACE has incorporated all necessary BMPs to limit the spread of invasive species into the project area, as specified in Environmental Commitment BIO-3. The contractor would be required to meet standard contract requirements for limiting the spread of non-native species, including cleaning of all equipment before it is used on-site to prevent the spread of species from previous work. The contractor would be required to thoroughly clean all construction equipment at the prior job site in a manner that ensures all residual soil is removed and that egg deposits from plant pests are not present. The contractor would be required, as necessary, to consult with the USDA Plant Protection and Quarantine (USDA - PPQ) jurisdictional office for additional cleaning requirements that may be necessary. All sediments to be used for beach nourishment would be tested for grain size compatibility as well as contaminants to ensure any material placed in the marine environment is compatible. However, there is no need to test this material for non-native seedbank as this material would either be placed off-shore or in the Calabasas Landfill, and not in any upland location where potential invasive seeds could establish. Similarly, while invasive invertebrates have the potential to also be present (i.e., New Zealand mud snail), these species are not capable of survival in either the off-shore marine environment or at the Calabasas Landfill and no additional testing or treatment is anticipated to be necessary.	Section 5.4
9	While specific water quality monitoring parameters have not yet been established, the IFR clearly commits the USACE to applying for 401 Water Quality Certification prior to	N/A

	construction, completing a SWPPP under section 402 of the Clean Water Act, and complying with all substantive Clean Water Act requirements. The specific monitoring, BMPs, and reporting associated with the water quality certification or NPDES permit will not be known until PED, but will be implemented, as required. In addition, the IFR contains a Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan (Appendix I), which addresses success metrics to be evaluated and adaptive responses to be implemented immediately after construction to ensure restoration goals are achieved.	
10	The TMDL reference has been updated, although the numeric thresholds have not changed since the 2003 TMDLs.	Section 3.3.8
11	Editorial corrections made to the referenced figure number.	Figure 3.3.7
12	While we are aware the data in the EIS is not the most recent, conditions within the watershed have not changed significantly since the initial data was gathered for the IFR. Reviews of updated data available from Heal the Bay and USEPA reveals that the ranges cited in Section 3.8.3 are still representative of the ranges of conditions in more recent data sets and remains valid. Therefore, updating the tables, figures, and data within the document would not serve to better inform decision making or substantively change any of the information presented.	N/A
13	The coliform discussions in Section 3.8.3 have been updated as suggested.	Section. 3.8.3
14	Thank you for your comment. As described in the IFR, beneficial use of sediment within the watershed is being implemented to the extent practicable.	

22. Kern River Conservancy		
Commenter: Ananian, Gary – Executive Director		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

23. Mountains Restoration Trust		
Commenter: Smith, John "Jack" – Project Manager		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support.	

24. San Fernando Valley Audubon Society		
Commenters: Osokow, Mark B. – Member of the Board of Directors; Weeshoff, David A. – Conservation Chair		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Neither the Recommended Plan (the LPP) nor the NER plan require floodwalls. Floodwalls are only included in variations of Alternative 3 and 4. The impacts associated with these alternatives are described throughout Section 5 associated with each resource. While alternatives requiring floodwalls were evaluated in the IFR, these are not being recommended for implementation.	
2	While Alternative 3 was evaluated in the IFR as one option in the array of alternatives, it is not being recommended for implementation.	
3	While Alternative 3 was evaluated in the IFR as one option in the array of alternatives, it is not moving forward for authorization.	
4	While Alternatives requiring floodwalls were evaluated as an option in the array of alternatives, they are not being recommended for authorization. The Recommended Plan does not require floodwalls. Floodwalls are only included in variations of Alternative 3 and 4. The impacts associated with these alternatives are described throughout Section 5.	
5	Sands to be used for beach nourishment would be tested prior to placement for grain size compatibility as well as the presence of contaminants.	See GR-F
6	As described in Section 3.9 of the IFR, truck traffic would be limited to hours outside of rush hour, including the avoidance of trucking during high traffic times and around school hours.	Section 3.9, See GR-B
7	The USACE and CDPR have committed to implementing methods to minimize potential impacts to nesting birds. As described in the IFR in Section 5 under Environmental Commitment BIO-4, the clearing of vegetation would take place outside nesting season to the extent possible. If vegetation removal during nesting season cannot be avoided, a biologist would be present during vegetation removal to further monitor construction and establish buffers, as necessary, to avoid impacts to nesting birds. In addition, Environmental Commitment BIO-1 requires construction to be overseen by a biologist to ensure compliance with pertinent regulations. This includes compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Endangered Species Act. This monitoring will ensure that appropriate avoidance and minimization efforts are implemented during construction.	Section 5.4.4

25. Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission		
Commenters: Ford, Tom – Executive Director; Topel, Jack – Environmental Scientist		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	While night trucking has the potential to reduce the total construction timeframe by allowing mining operations to occur over a longer period each day, extensive early coordination with the County of Los Angeles during preparation of the IFR indicated that consideration of night trucking would be problematic. There are a variety of existing local, regional and state regulations that govern considerations of reasonable truck traffic operations in the project area. These regulations include specific hours when hauling and sediment delivery and placement is permitted in the project area, and currently do not allow for night trucking. Lighting necessary for Rindge Dam sediment mining and hauling operations at night would also have negative effects on biological communities in the area. Productivity at night would be slower than daytime operations, increasing mining and hauling costs. As a result of the regulatory restrictions, biological impacts, and additional costs, night trucking was not considered to be a viable option for this feasibility analysis. Based on comments from the CDPR and others, the inclusion of sediment mining and hauling measures in the Rindge Dam area will be revisited during the Pre-construction Engineering and Design phase to reassess the regulatory viability, and associated beneficial and detrimental biological and cost impacts.	Section 3.9
2	While the New Zealand mud snail has been found throughout much of the Malibu Creek watershed, project activities are not expected to contribute to the spread of this species. Sediment from the creek would be placed at either the Calabasas Landfill or in the nearshore marine environment. The New Zealand mud snail cannot survive in either of these environments, and therefore would not spread as the result of sediment placement. During development of construction details during Pre-construction Engineering and Design phase, the USACE will further evaluate the status of New Zealand mud snail and other invasive invertebrates in the project area.	

26. Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy		
Commenter: Edelman, Paul – Deputy Director for Natural Resources and Planning		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

27. Surfrider Foundation – West Los Angeles, Malibu Chapter		
Commenters: Sekich-Quinn, Stefanie – HQ Coastal Preservation Manager; Hamilton, Graham – West LA/Malibu Chapter Coordinator		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Compared to the overall volume of sediment impounded behind Rindge Dam, the quantity of sediment that is beach compatible is relatively low, based on the initial sampling and analysis performed during the IFR study period. Combining the two placement methods would be prohibitively expensive and would not be beneficial given the small volumes of sands being considered usable for beach nourishment purposes.	
2	Alternative beach and nearshore placement sites were considered during the initial Feasibility Study Phase of this project. The sites selected were based on habitat type (avoiding sensitive resources, including submerged aquatic vegetation), the need for beach nourishment, and the location downcoast from the mouth of Malibu Creek, which is where the sand would have been transported naturally if the dam had not been in place.	Section 4.4.2, Figures 4.4-5 to 4.4-8
3	The USACE considered using Broad Beach as a beach placement site, however, given the construction schedule for this project (construction starting in 2025, removal of sand layer in 2028) that site does not work. Work at Broad Beach is expected to be completed prior to the start of construction on Malibu Creek.	
4	See GR-G.	
5	As described in Section 4.4.2 of the IFR, alternative beach and nearshore placement sites were considered during the initial Feasibility Study Phase of this project. The sites selected were based on habitat type (avoiding sensitive resources, including submerged aquatic vegetation), the need for beach nourishment, and the location downcoast from the mouth of Malibu Creek, which is where the sand would have been transported naturally if the dam had not been in place.	Section 4.4.2
6	While Alternatives requiring floodwalls were evaluated as an option in the array of alternatives, these are not being recommended for authorization. The Recommended	

	Plan does not require floodwalls. Floodwalls are only included in variations of Alternative 3 and 4. The impacts associated with these alternatives are described throughout Section 5.	

28. Trout Unlimited		
Commenters: Strickland, Jessica D. – California Field Coordinator; Noble, Cindy – Council Chair; Blankenship, Robert – Chapter President		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments and written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

29.		
Commenter: Adams, Robert		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Malibu Creek Restoration Study.	

30.		
Commenter: Adams, Bo		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

31.		
Commenter: Agnew, Joe		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

32.		
Commenter: Allen, Dr. Larry G.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

33.		
Commenter: Atkinson, Glen		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

34.		
Commenter: Barabe, Russell		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

35.		
Commenter: Bell, Sean		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

36.		
Commenter: Bell, Donald		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your support of the project.	

37.		
Commenter: Bellon, Robert J.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your support of the project.	

38. Malibu Surfing Association		
Commenter: Blum, Michael		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Addressing erosion issues on Surfrider Beach is not one of the project purposes. However, as described in Section 4.4.2 of the IFR, alternative beach and nearshore placement sites were considered during the initial Feasibility Study Phase of this project. The sites selected were based on habitat type (avoiding sensitive resources, including submerged aquatic vegetation), the need for beach nourishment, and the location downcoast from the mouth of Malibu Creek, which is where the sand would have been	Section 4.4.2

	transported naturally if the dam had not been in place. Ultimately, the placement areas utilized in the final array of the IFR best met the project's study objectives while maximizing benefits and minimizing costs.	

39.		
Commenter: Boller, Scott		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

40.		
Commenter: Brady, D. H.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

41.		
Commenter: Briscoe, Don L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-A.	

42.		
Commenter: Bubar, Lorraine		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

43.		
Commenter: Bubenik, Justin J.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

44.		
Commenter: Budenholzer, Joe		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

45.		
Commenter: Burns, Jim		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

46.		
Commenter: Byer, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

47.		
Commenter: Cinadr, Brian		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

48.		
Commenter: Cook, N.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

49.		
Commenter: Coradeschi, Andy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan, as well as the verbal comments provided during the public meeting.	

50.		
Commenter: Cozard, David		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As described in Section 4.1 of the IFR, a variety of sediment removal options were considered during initial formulation. Based on a variety of screening processes, only mechanical and natural transport were carried forward to the final array analyzed in the IFR.	

51.		
Commenter: Cronin, Paul		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

52.		
Commenter: Cullip, Richard		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

53.		
Commenter: Dahlstrom, Berl D.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

54.		
Commenter: Dauksis, Russell Peter		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

55.		
Commenter: De La Rosa, Edward J.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

56.		
Commenter: DeGregori, Randy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-G.	
2	Options to allow for natural transport of sediment were evaluated in the IFR under Alternatives 3 and 4. These options are similar to the dam-notch proposed in your letter. As discussed in the IFR, natural sediment transport would require the construction of floodwalls in areas below Rindge Dam. The impacts associated with floodwall construction were significant, and included cultural, biological, aesthetic, water and noise impacts. In addition, the additional impacts associated with Alternatives 3 and 4 resulted in these alternatives not qualifying as the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As a result of the additional impacts associated with variations of Alternative 3 and 4, these alternatives were not recommended for implementation.	See Sections 5.2 through 5.5 for discussion on impacts of floodwalls. See Appendix H for Clean Water Act Section 404 discussion.

57.		
Commenter: Deshotels, Robert		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	
1	As described in the IFR in Section 5.5.3, mitigation measure CR-1 includes installation of interpretive signs at the Sheriff's Honor Camp site. These signs would explain the	Section 5.5.3

	cultural significance of the area, the dam, and the purposes behind removal and restoration.	

58.		
Commenter: Dexter, Glenn		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	
1	As described in Section 4.4.2 of the IFR, alternative beach and nearshore placement sites were considered during the initial Feasibility Study Phase of this project. The sites selected were based on habitat type (avoiding sensitive resources, including submerged aquatic vegetation), the need for beach nourishment, and the location downcoast from the mouth of Malibu Creek, which is where the sand would have been transported naturally if the dam had not been in place.	Section 4.4.2

59.		
Commenter: Distler, Gabriele		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

60.		
Commenter: Distler, Robert		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

61.		
Commenter: Doebel, Linda		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

62.		
Commenter: Driscoll, Dr. Lawrence		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

63.		
Commenter: DuKet, Thomas P.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

64.		
Commenter: Edwards, Rev Doug		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

65.		
Commenter: Esgate, Steve		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

66.		
Commenter: Fiduk, Steve		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

67.		
Commenter: Fitzgerald, Eric		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

68. Serra Canyon Property Owners Association		
Commenter: Follert, R Jeffrey		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-A. Although the United States cannot provide indemnification due to the Antideficiency Act's prohibition against obligations in advance and in excess of appropriations, the recommended plan includes additional hydraulic and sediment modeling during the PED phase, along with measures for avoiding an increase in flood risk if shown by the modeling to be needed.	

69.		
Commenter: Foster, Dave		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

70.		
Commenter: Gautrey, Gerlinde		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

71.		
Commenter: Goldbloom, Erwin		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

72.		
Commenter: Grisanti, Paul		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As described in the IFR, Alternative 3 would require the construction of floodwalls below Rindge Dam. The impacts associated with floodwall construction were significant, and included cultural, biological, aesthetic, water and noise impacts. In addition, the additional impacts associated with Alternatives 3 resulted in this alternative not qualifying as the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As a result of the additional impacts associated with variations of Alternative 3, these alternatives were not recommended for implementation.	See Sections 5.2 through 5.5 for discussion on impacts of floodwalls. See Appendix H for CWA 404 discussion.
2	See GR-G.	
3	As described in the IFR (Section 5.2.3), additional slope stability and geotechnical evaluations would be performed during the Pre-construction Engineering and Design phase. These analyses will be used to develop slope stabilization measures and ensure protection of adjacent resources, including Malibu Canyon road.	Section 5.2.3

73.		
Commenter: Hamm, Kelly		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Options to allow for natural transport of sediment were evaluated in the IFR under Alternatives 3 and 4. These options are similar to the dam-notch method proposed in your letter. As discussed in the IFR, natural sediment transport would require the construction of floodwalls in areas below Rindge Dam. The impacts associated with floodwall construction were significant, and included cultural, biological, aesthetic, water and noise impacts. In addition, the additional impacts associated with Alternatives 3 and 4 resulted in these alternatives not qualifying as the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As a result of the additional impacts associated with variations of Alternative 3 and 4, these alternatives were not recommended for implementation.	See Sections 5.2 through 5.5 for discussion on impacts of floodwalls. See Appendix H for CWA 404 discussion.
2	See GR-G	

74.		
Commenter: Hand, Lesley D.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the study.	

75.		
Commenter: Hart, Michael		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The IFR does not state that fish lifts do not work for steelhead. As described in Section 4.1.5 of the IFR, a variety of fish passage options were considered to provide passage over the dam without removing it. The IFR describes how fish passage facilities can be highly effective under the right circumstances. However, these options were not considered feasible in Malibu Creek due to extreme difficulty and cost associated with operating and maintaining such facilities, and the difficulty accessing and developing infrastructure in the Project Area due to topographic and land use constraints.	Section 4.1.5

76.		
Commenter: Hill, R. Scott		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

77.		
Commenter: Hilton, Lisa		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comment.	
2	While some habitat does exist above Rindge Dam in the impounded sediment area, this habitat does not exist in a natural state due to the existence of the dam. The aquatic habitat is disconnected from the downstream watershed, blocking passage of any native aquatic organisms upstream. The dam also acts as a barrier or detriment to most terrestrial organisms. While the existing habitat above Rindge Dam would be temporarily	

	impacted during construction, the outcome of the project would result in significantly improved habitat quality and connectivity in the Project Area.	
3	See GR-B.	
4	Temporary facilities developed during construction include parking, staging, and work areas and would be removed after the project is complete. Water and plumbing needs would be provided by temporary measures during construction, such as portable toilets and/or water trucks. New permanent facilities to be developed as part of the project are limited to interpretive signage and some short-term parking spaces within the existing paved portion of Sheriff's Overlook. No new permanent parking lots, water or plumbing facilities would be added to this area.	
5	Implementation of the project would provide significant benefits to residents of California, as well as the nation as a whole. As summarized in Table 2.7-1 of the IFR, the Project Area contains significant valuable resources, and restoration efforts in the watershed would benefit most of these resources. Numerous Federal agencies have indicated that removal of Rindge Dam would provide significant benefit to scarce and sensitive natural resources. Implementation of the project would restore connectivity to the watershed, providing significant benefits to the endangered steelhead, and potentially benefiting other protected species by restoring natural processes to the watershed. Other protected species occupying the watershed include the California red-legged frog and western pond turtle.	Section 2.7
6	Steelhead are adapted to high gradient mountain streams across the west coast of North America. The National Marine Fisheries Service, the Federal agency tasked with recovery of the steelhead, has identified Malibu Creek as a critical recovery area for steelhead. Furthermore, NMFS has provided the USACE with a letter stating their support for our goal of restoring Malibu Creek. Given the significant expertise on steelhead found within the NMFS and USACE, the USACE is confident that the uphill nature of the creek would not hinder steelhead from colonizing areas above Rindge Dam, if the dam were to be removed.	
7	As described in Section 5.4.2, initial testing of sediment grain size and quality has been performed. This testing was coordinated with the SC-DMMT, the multi-agency team that oversees the placement of sediment in the ocean in southern California. Preliminary results indicated that some quantity of the impounded sediment would be beach-compatible, and as a result would be appropriate for beach/nearshore placement. In addition, the IFR contains a commitment to perform additional sediment testing prior to and during excavation in Environmental Commitment ER-3. This testing would be	Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2

	coordinated with the SC-DMMT to ensure that the excavated sediment is compatible with beach and/or nearshore placement as appropriate.	
8	As described in the IFR, the purpose of the project is to restore the Malibu Creek ecosystem. The project did not evaluate any recreation related development or alternatives. Upon completion of the project, the local sponsor would be required to maintain the restored area for the life of the project. Maintenance of the restored area would target ensuring that the restored ecosystem continues to support the high quality habitat it was designed to restore. Developing the area for other recreational uses would directly conflict with the restoration goals. As described in response #4 above, no new parking, plumbing, or water facilities are being developed for this project.	Section 1.3
9	The Project Delivery Team utilized past studies, field investigations, experts from multiple fields of science and technology, and models and other tools to advance the decision-making process, with an understanding of the geography and dynamics that have formed the Malibu Creek watershed. Costs are reflective of the planning process and array of alternatives investigated.	
10	The USACE has performed substantial analyses to determine what would happen once the dam is removed. These include analysis of existing geotechnical and biological conditions, and hydrology and hydraulic modeling to look at current, future without project, and future with project scenarios. In addition, the USACE has committed to further analyses during PED. As a result, the USACE disagrees with the comment that there is no way to tell what would happen when the dam is removed.	

78.		
Commenter: Hoffberg, Neal		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

79.		
Commenter: Hunt, Timothy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

80.		
Commenter: Huntley, Steven E.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

81.		
Commenter: Jester, Lee		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

82.		
Commenter: Johnson, Richard		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

83.		
Commenters: Kipner, Steve; Kipner, Lizzie		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-A. Although the United States cannot provide indemnification due to the Antideficiency Act's prohibition against obligations in advance and in excess of appropriations, the recommended plan includes additional hydraulic and sediment modeling during the PED phase, along with measures for avoiding an increase in flood risk if shown by the modeling to be needed.	

84.		
Commenter: Klamerus, Sonny		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

85.		
Commenter: Knight, Christopher		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

86.		
Commenter: Knur, Reinard		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As described in the IFR, extensive further geotechnical investigations are planned for PED to better characterize the existing risk for activation of a landslide in the Rindge Dam and impounded sediments area, and future risks based on implementation of a project. The slope stability (landslide) risks are characterized throughout the IFR (Appendix D – Geotechnical Engineering; IFR Sections 3.2.5, 4.4.2, 4.9.3, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 12.1.2; Appendix F - Cost Engineering). Significant costs and schedule considerations have been added for investigations during the Pre-construction Engineering and Design phase that would further evaluate landslide risk and slope stability. A more detailed list of the scope of these geotechnical investigations is provided in Appendix F and the cost-schedule risk analysis prepared by the Project Delivery Team. This information will be used to design and implement any measures necessary to protect Malibu Canyon road during PED, and reduce potential for slope failure in the Rindge Dam and impounded sediment area during and after construction.	
2	As described in the IFR, the project includes removal of numerous upstream barriers in addition to Rindge Dam, resulting in approximately 18 miles of aquatic habitat being opened to steelhead use upon completion of the project. While Tunnel Falls does represent a barrier during dry conditions, this barrier is passable to steelhead under moderate and higher flows. Steelhead in southern California have evolved to migrate at specific times of year, triggered by rainfall and high flow events, which coincides with when passage over Tunnel Falls would be available. Such migration patterns are typical of steelhead in southern California drainages, and are not unique to Malibu Creek.	
3	Although it is recognized to be a costly financial investment, from the perspective of CDPR, and many other local, regional, national public and non-profit agencies, and public interests, there is support in moving forward with the recommended plan (LPP) to provide the restoration benefits to the Malibu Creek watershed ecosystem. The study supports Federal interest in moving forward, but will require the endorsement from the	

	USACE Chief of Engineers, and Congress to ultimately decide to authorize and fund this project.	
4	The estimated cost of the Malibu Creek project is commensurate with the complexity and challenges associated with the project. Federally-led ecosystem restoration projects with similar, or significantly greater costs, are not uncommon when addressing complex and large-scale restoration needs. For example, in this region the USACE worked with multiple interests to complete an ecosystem restoration study for an 11-mile stretch of L.A. River. Implementation of the authorized project is estimated at $1.3 billion, with around $500 million of this representing construction costs. Beyond southern California, the USACE has ongoing restoration efforts in the Florida Everglades with an estimated total project cost of $14 billion. Other examples of similar scope and cost include the Chesapeake Bay and the Kissimmee River restoration projects, and the Elwha and Glines Canyon Dams removal (led by the National Park Service). In addition, the USACE expends significant funding annually on conservation efforts associated with steelhead and other salmonids.	

87.		
Commenter: Kotin, Muriel S.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

88.		
Commenter: Kuchenski, Steve		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

89.		
Commenter: Kwon, Suzy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

90.		
Commenters: Lee, Priscila; Lee, Mel; Lee, Celene		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

91.		
Commenter: Leibowitz, Rose		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

92.		
Commenter: Leski, Dennis		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

93.		
Commenter: Luddy, William		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

94.		
Commenter: Malnar, Peggy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

95.		
Commenter: Marcus, Ben		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

96.		
Commenter: Martin, Joel W.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

97.		
Commenter: Matus, David		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

98.		
Commenter: McCollum, Jan		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your comments.	

99.		
Commenter: McDonald, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The article quoted does not accurately represent the status of steelhead or other upstream barriers. While Tunnel Falls exists above Rindge Dam, it only represents a barrier when flows are low. Steelhead do not migrate during low flow conditions. Steelhead in southern California have evolved to migrate at specific times of year, triggered by rainfall and high flow events, which coincides with when passage over Tunnel Falls would be available. Such migration patterns are typical of steelhead in southern California drainages, and are not unique to Malibu Creek. The recommended plan is expected to provide significant ecosystem benefits to a variety of species and habitats, not just steelhead. Using an estimate of 100 fish to compare costs to benefits relative to steelhead does not accurately portray the benefits of the project. With restoration of connectivity to 18 additional miles of habitat, steelhead are expected to reproduce in the system, resulting in increased population sizes. Therefore comparing the number of steelhead to the total project cost is not a reasonable method for comparing costs to benefits.	
2	See GR-B.	Section 5.9
3	As described in the IFR, options to lower the dam sequentially and allow for natural transport were evaluated (Alternatives 3 and 4). While natural transport alleviates some of the trucking and traffic impacts, it creates significant additional downstream impacts due to sediment transport and the need to build floodwalls. This results in significant additional impacts to cultural and water resources (Sections 5.3.2 and 5.5.2), as well as noise impacts to adjacent communities. In addition, due to the need for floodwalls that are not required under variations of Alternative 2, Alternatives 3 and 4 cannot be considered the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative as required under the Clean Water Act (Appendix H; Section III).	Section 5.5.2, Section 5.3.2, Appendix H.

100.		
Commenter: McMorrow, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

101.		
Commenter: McWha, Bill		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The National Environmental Policy Act requires Federal agencies examine a reasonable range of alternatives prior to the significant commitment of resources on a project. In addition, numerous other state and Federal regulations require appropriate analysis and disclosure of potential impacts. The Endangered Species Act requires that a Biological Assessment be prepared for any major construction activity by a Federal agency that has the potential to effect listed species. As a result, USACE and CDPR disagree with the statement that the study is useless.	

102.		
Commenter: Menzies, Jim		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Please see GR-A. The Recommended Plan was designed to avoid increase in flood risk, including through the methods for removing the dam and sediment in stages. See Sections 4.9.5 and 5.2.2 of the IFR regarding landslides, liquefaction and debris flow risks associated with construction-related impacts. Section 9.2.1 of the IFR contains several Environmental Commitments (ER-1 and WR-4) to further analyze slope stability and flood risks associated with the recommended plan (LPP).	
2	See GR-B.	
3	Please see response GR-A. Although the United States cannot provide indemnification due to the Antideficiency Act's prohibition against obligations in advance and in excess of appropriations, the recommended plan includes additional hydraulic and sediment modeling during the PED phase, along with measures for avoiding an increase in flood risk if shown by the modeling to be needed.	

103.		
Commenter: Miller, Michael		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

104.		
Commenter: Mirman, Alan		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-A.	

105.		
Commenter: Moses, Jeff		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

106.		
Commenter: Mowlavi, Patricia		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

107.		
Commenter: Nelson, Greg		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

108.		
Commenter: Nelson, Pam		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

109.		
Commenter: Neubeiser, Timothy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

110.		
Commenter: Nourish, Bruce		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

111.		
Commenter: O'Brien, Jess		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

112.		
Commenter: O'Kelly		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

113.		
Commenter: Olson, Glenn		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

114.		
Commenter: Orellana, Carlos A.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

115.		
Commenter: Parker, Nat		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As detailed in the IFR, the currently proposed plan would place beach-compatible materials (sands and similar grain sizes) just offshore of Malibu Pier area, which is the same vicinity where natural deposition of such sediments would have occurred in the absence of Rindge Dam.	

116.		
Commenter: Payan, Wenda		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

117.		
Commenter: Payne, Anne		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	The USACE did not use the terms “potential downstream flooding” during the public meeting. However, the USACE did state that formulation of alternatives occurred in a manner to specifically address and avoid creating any increased flood risk to the Serra Canyon community.. The USACE discussed the deposition of sediment below Rindge Dam and described that, under the natural transport options of Alternatives 3 and 4, modelling indicated deposition below the dam would increase and that the deposition would potentially increase flood risk. However, this impact is a primary reason Alternatives 3 and 4 were not proposed for implementation. The Alternative being proposed for implementation is Alternative 2, which does not result in similar downstream	See GR-A

	impacts. Please see GR-A for further information. Transcripts of the meeting are included in this Appendix.	
2	Please see response GR-A and GR-B. Although the United States cannot provide indemnification due to the Antideficiency Act's prohibition against obligations in advance and in excess of appropriations, the recommended plan includes an Environmental Commitment and Mitigation Measure for development and implementation of a traffic management plan, which includes addressing any significant construction-related damage to roadways as discussed in GR-B. See GR-A for more information related to addressing flood risk.	
3	As discussed in the IFR and response GR-A, a primary constraint of the study is to avoid adverse flood induced impacts in downstream reaches of Malibu Creek from the ecosystem restoration measures. Alternatives that showed significant flood risk impacts were not recommended for implementation. The recommended plan includes additional hydraulic and sediment modeling during the PED phase, along with measures for avoiding an increase in flood risk if shown by the modeling to be needed.	
4	Potential impacts to birds, as well as potential benefits to birds from restoration, are discussed in Sections 3.4 and 5.4 of the IFR.	
5	See GR-A. Based on the modeling conducted to date, the downstream habitat impacts during storms would not change between the No Action and the project (LPP).	

118.		
Commenter: Payne, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See comment response #117 above.	

119.		
Commenter: Petit, Steven		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

120.		
Commenter: Radanovich, Kevin		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

121.		
Commenter: Ramsey, Christopher		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the TSP.	
1	See GR-A.	

122.		
Commenter: Rees, Brenda		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

123. Santa Barbara Flyfishers		
Commenter: Riffle, Lew		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

124. a		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Tunnel Falls, the “ten-foot high waterfall” just above Rindge Dam referred to in this comment is not an impassable barrier, as stated. Tunnel Falls, as described in Section 2.2.1 of the IFR, is a series of pools and small falls formed by a bedrock outcropping. While Tunnel Falls does represent a barrier during dry conditions, under moderate and higher flows, this barrier is passable to steelhead. Steelhead in southern California have	Section 2.2.1, Section 3.4.9

	evolved to migrate at specific times of year, triggered by rainfall and high flow events, which coincides with when passage over Tunnel Falls would be available. Such migration patterns are typical of steelhead in southern California drainages, and are not unique to Malibu Creek. Malibu Creek is within the natural range of the steelhead, and published evidence exists documenting likely steelhead presence above Rindge Dam. While the references to previous stocking and recovery of fish remains are useful information, neither prove that steelhead did not naturally occur in the upper watershed. In 2005, an archival records review of steelhead trout in the Santa Monica Mountains documented trout presence upstream of Rindge Dam (Dagit, R. B. Meyer and S. Drill. 2005). This includes a 1916 article in the Los Angeles Times, noting that William Sartor caught a 30" trout in Cold Creek. In the 1920s there were reports of 6.5kg steelhead caught migrating upstream in the lower reaches of Las Virgenes and Cold Creek (Titus, et al 1997). Archaeological records show signs of steelhead (*O. mykiss)* being eaten by Chumash upstream of Rindge Dam. At least two *O. mykiss* vertebrae were found in the Talepop site (CA-LAN 229) located near the entrance of Malibu Creek State Park, and vertebrae were reported in two separate studies (John Johnson, 1982 and Ken Follett, 1969). The reason freshwater fish consumption may not have been identified in earlier studies referenced by the commenter is likely due to the size of the screens used. The 1960s excavation was largely conducted using ¼" screen, although 1/8" mesh was used for a couple of excavation units. Due to the small size, ¼" screens would result in the loss of a significant portion of smaller fish remains.	
2	The steelhead of southern California are particularly adapted to arid, hot, and variably flowing watersheds of the region, as described in the final listing of the ESU by NMFS in 1997. All watersheds near human habitation in the U.S. are subject to potential spills and pollution from proximity to human activities. This is not a unique situation for Malibu Creek, nor does the USACE view this as a reason to not pursue restoration in the watershed.	
3	The USACE has consulted with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officer, Indian Tribes and communities, other interested parties, and the public pursuant to the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and NEPA. As described in Section 3.5.3 of the IFR, the USACE recognizes the cultural and historic importance of Rindge Dam, as it is a prime	Section 3.5.3

	example of engineering and an intrinsic part of the rich history of the SMMNRA, beginning with the Chumash, the Spanish explorers, early settlers and homesteaders, and later, literary and visual artists. The dam and its associated components, the spillway and water distribution pipeline, have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)under Criterion C as a rare and well-preserved example of a privately funded reinforced concrete arch dam in the Santa Monica Mountains. Also as noted in the comment, while being NRHP eligible (or listed) provides certain legal protections from demolition, these protections are not solely preventive. NRHP eligibility requires that preservation of property not under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal agency, but potentially affected by Federal agency actions, is given full consideration in planning (NHPA at 54 USC section 306102(b)(2)), including the opinions of all contributors. That consideration has been carried out through the NEPA process and also under the regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA (36 C.F.R. Part 800), which provide a consultative process to determine a course of action to assess and resolve adverse effects, which can range from avoidance to mitigation. Based on comments and concerns received from other members of the public, agencies, and consulting parties, the USACE and CDPR have elected to remove the dam.	
4	As discussed in response #2 above, the USACE is aware of the bedrock outcropping at Tunnel Falls. While Tunnel Falls does represent a barrier during dry conditions, under moderate and higher flows, this barrier is passable to steelhead.	
5	Rindge Dam has no storage capacity left to trap flood flows and does not slow down flow velocity or otherwise attenuate flows during moderate to large storm events. The vertical drop in elevation from the upper boundary of the impounded sediment footprint to just below Rindge Dam would be the same with the No Action or LPP. The gradient and flow of flood waters in reaches below the dam is not impacted by the presence or absence of the dam.	ES.5.1
6	The USACE recognizes there are geotechnical concerns associated with removal of the impounded sediment behind Rindge Dam. As described in the IFR (Section 5.2.1), additional slope stability and geotechnical evaluations will be performed during PED. These analyses will be used to develop slope stabilization measures and ensure protection of adjacent resources, including Malibu Canyon Road.	Section 5.2.1
7	Dam removal would have a localized effect on velocities in Malibu Creek with grade (slope) changes in the former dam and impounded sediment area. Other reaches of Malibu Creek would not experience an increase in velocity or force of flood waters with removal of the dam.	

8	While the water table has been raised in the impounded sediment footprint due to the presence of Rindge Dam, the larger aquifer in this portion of the watershed would not be destroyed by the removal of Rindge Dam. The water table would drop within the boundary of the impounded sediment area behind Rindge Dam, and would lower back to the pre-dam alluvium level of the creek. Pumping groundwater for use for firefighting is not within the scope of this study or project.	
9	Thank you for your comment. Setting aside lands for a wilderness preserve is not within the scope of this study or project.	
10	There is no evidence to suggest that toxic spills are a significant concern in the future, nor that leaving the dam in place would help to contain such spills.	

124. b		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for submitting a copy of May 22, 1998 letter to USACE on Century Ranch fish remain studies.	

124. c		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for the exhibits from the early 1900's.	

124. d		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for the February 26, 2017 letter. Actions were taken to delete the noted reference in your February 23, 2017 letter, as requested.	

124. e		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for the March 24, 2017 letter and attachments on cultural aspects of the study, including information on 1892 water rights in Malibu Canyon; the 1993 and 1994 letters about County of Los Angeles on applications to register Rindge Dam as a state point of historical interest; the August 21, 2002 letter on historical events; the April 18, 2006, May 26, 2006 and August 14 letters about a suggested historical district in Malibu Canyon; and information on the 1853 grizzly bear encounters.	

124. f		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for the March 27, 2017 letter and corrections associated with the prior March 24, 2017 letter.	

124. g		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your March 19, 2017 letter and attachments on steelhead trout.	

124. h		
Commenter: Rindge, Ronald L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for the February 27, 2017 notification of your comment letter and exhibits.	

125.		
Commenter: Roma, Mattt		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

126.		
Commenter: Rose, Loretta		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

127.		
Commenters: Rosenfeld, Jean; Rosenfeld, Judy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	Thank you for your comments.	

128.		
Commenter: Rosenfeld, Jean L.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As described in GR-A, Rindge Dam is currently filled to capacity with sediment and does not provide any downstream flood protection benefits. See GR-B for discussion of traffic related concerns. As described in the IFR (Section 5.2.1), additional slope stability and geotechnical evaluations will be performed during the pre-construction engineering and design phase. These analyses will be used to develop slope stabilization measures and ensure protection of adjacent resources, including Malibu Canyon Road. There is no evidence to suggest that toxic spills are a significant concern in the future, nor that leaving the dam in place would help to contain such spills.	See GR-A, GR-B, Section 5.2.1

129.		
Commenter: Rosenfeld, Joan		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See response GR-B for discussion and reference to impacts to roads due to traffic, and road repair. See response GR-A relative to flooding concerns.	See GR-A, GR-B
2	See response GR-A. During the PED	

130.		
Commenter: Sharpton, Debra		
Comment Number	Response	Location in IFR
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

131.		
Commenters: Simons, Mr. and Mrs. John		
Comment Number	Response	Location in IFR
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

132.		
Commenter: Speck, Bill		
Comment Number	Response	Location in IFR
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

133.		
Commenter: Suwara, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

134.		
Commenter: Swenson, Ramona		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

135.		
Commenter: Thille, George R.; Thille, Carol H.		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

136.		
Commenter: Thompson, Jan		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As required under NEPA and CEQA, the potential impacts of this project on the Serra Retreat neighborhood have been studied in detail, as discussed throughout the IFR. USACE designed alternatives and Environmental Commitments, and as necessary included mitigation measures, to minimize potential impacts as described throughout the IFR.	See Sections 3 & 5 of the IFR

137.		
Commenter: Tobin, John		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

138.		
Commenter: Treeves, Bill		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

139.		
Commenter: Tsuda, Jim		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

140.		
Commenter: Vodantis, Stephen		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

141.		
Commenters: Knur, Hans W.; Knur, Anneliese		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As described in the IFR, and summarized in response GR-A, Rindge Dam is entirely filled with sediment. It does not currently provide any flood protection nor does it impound water. Currently, whatever water flows into the impoundment area behind Rindge Dam also flows out. Therefore, removal of Rindge Dam will not result in an increase in the volume of water flow downstream.	See GR-A
2	See GR-B.	
3	As described in the draft IFR, benefits are expected to extend beyond just benefits to steelhead. With restoration of connectivity to 18 additional miles of habitat, steelhead are expected to reproduce in the system, resulting in increased population sizes. However, in addition to these benefits, the project will provide benefits to additional sensitive species, and scarce and diverse habitats. Other protected species occupying the watershed that will potentially benefit from restoration include the California red-legged frog and western pond turtle. While not quantified in this study, benefits to area beaches and nearshore areas are also likely to occur as sediment transport cycles are restored to pre-dam conditions.	

142.		
Commenter: Wald, Steph		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

143.		
Commenter: Waterman, Chuck		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

144.		
Commenter: Waycott, Ralph		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

145.		
Commenter: Wesshoff, Dave		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the project.	

146.		
Commenter: Weigand, Michael		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

147.		
Commenter: Weisberg, Steven		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

148.		
Commenter: Wolhaupter, Charles		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	As shown in this appendix, a large number of citizens, clubs, organizations, and state and Federal agencies are in support of the removal of Rindge Dam and other components of the proposed restoration of Malibu Creek. This includes the local sponsor, California Department of Parks and Recreation, as well as the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Federal agency charged with protecting sensitive marine resources, as well as the endangered steelhead. In addition, many members of the local community have written letters of support for the project.	

149.		
Commenter: Wollner, Jackie		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

150.		
Commenter: Yeuell, Dr. Paul		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
1	See GR-B. The USACE has committed to evaluating traffic impacts in greater detail, implementing measures to reduce traffic impacts to the maximum extent practicable, and implementing a road repair plan to fix any damage potentially caused as the result of project-related traffic.	
2	While recreation measures were initially considered in the Rindge Dam area, CDPR determined that direct recreational access to the restored area would likely result in conflict with the project's restoration goals, and could potentially result in a reduction of	

	the project's projected ecosystem benefits. Trails in this area were not included as viable measures.	
3	See GR-B. While the pier parking lot was proposed for use under the NER plan, the plan currently being proposed for implementation is the LPP, which does not require use of the pier parking lot.	
4	In 2005, an archival records review of steelhead trout in the Santa Monica Mountains documented trout presence upstream of Rindge Dam (Dagit, R. B. Meyer and S. Drill. 2005). This includes a 1916 article in the Los Angeles Times, noting that William Sartor caught a 30" trout in Cold Creek. In the 1920s there were reports of 6.5kg steelhead caught migrating upstream in the lower reaches of Las Virgenes and Cold Creek (Titus, et al 1997). Archaeological records show signs of steelhead (*O. mykiss*) being eaten by Chumash upstream of Rindge Dam. At least two *O. mykiss* vertebrae were found in the Talepop site (CA-LAN 229) located near the entrance of Malibu Creek State Park, and vertebrae were reported in two separate studies (John Johnson, 1982 and Ken Follett, 1969).	

151.		
Commenter: Zagarella, Jeremy		
Comment Number	**Response**	**Location in IFR**
SS	Thank you for your written support of the Locally Preferred Plan.	

This page left intentionally blank for duplex printing.