First Set

TERESA JORDAN
3152 SHAD COURT
SIMI VALLEY, CA 93063
TELEPHONE NO. (805)522-5016

TO: Attn: Mr. Paul Dabbs, Chief
Water Resources Evaluation Section
Statewide Water Planning Branch
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

FAX NO.: (916) 651-9289

DATE: July 30, 2008

NO. OF PAGES: 7 (includes cover sheet)

RE: South Coast Hydrologic Region
Draft -- Public Comments
Deadline August 01, 2008.

3152 Shad Court
Simi Valley, CA 93063
July 30, 2008

Attn: Mr. Paul Dabbs, Chief
Water Resources Evaluation Section
Statewide Water Planning Branch
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Re: South Coast Hydrologic Region Draft--Public Comments
Deadline August 01, 2008.

Dear Mr. Dabbs:

As of July 10, 2008, I have waited for the posting of the South Coast Hydrologic Region's Working Draft. Since as of this writing only the South Coast Hydrologic Region's Initial Draft is posted--the Regional Reports section of the DWR's Website still says "*coming soon*"--I am submitting my comments in the Initial Draft, and ask for a 15 days time extension in order to submit my comments on the Working Draft once it is posted on the DWR's Website.

Mr. Dabbs, please note that entries in the Initial Draft such as "Text to be added...", and "Will collect information..." I have left alone awaiting Working Draft.

#1 - After comparing the South Coast Hydrologic Region's Initial Draft "Contents" pages with the San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region's Working Draft "Contents" pages

QUESTION: 1 Why are these pages not labeled "Table of Contents"? Were the words left out to not confuse the reader with the Water Plan Update's Table of Contents (Pages 5i and 5ii)?

QUESTION: 2 Will the South Coast Hydrologic Region Working Draft's "Contents" include Groundwater and Recycled Water under Water Supplies(Page 5i)?

QUESTION: 3 Will the South Coast Hydrologic Region Working Draft's "Contents" include Drought Management Challenges under Regional Water and Flood Planning and Management(Page 5i)?

QUESTION: 4 Will the South Coast Hydrologic Region Working Draft's "Contents" include Flood Management under Climate Change (Page 5i)?

QUESTION: 5 Will the South Coast Hydrologic Region Working Draft's "Contents" include Flood Management under Response Strategies(Page 5i)?

QUESTION: 6 Will the South Coast Hydrologic Region Working Draft's "Contents" include Flood Management under Implementation Next Steps(Page 5i)?

#2 - It is stated on Page 5-2 that "Other notable areas of population growth in the region include the Thousand Oaks-Moorpark area in Ventura County."

QUESTION: Does that not also include the City of Simi Valley?

#3 - With regards to the Regional Water Conditions section, under Water in the Environment, on Pages 5-3 and 5-4

QUESTION: While "Environmental water use is limited in the South Coast Hydrologic Region", are there not managed wetlands within the Santa Monica Mountains and partners Rim of the Valley Corridor for the Los Angeles and Ventura Counties area?

#4 - With regards to Water Supplies on Page 5-4, it is stated "Local water resources development over the last 20 years has included...conservation..." Not in the City of Simi Valley in Ventura County! Best Management Practices have replaced a

Conservation employee position. And, the City has joined a conglomerate of water entities in order to better fight water conservation State requirements and proposals.

#5 - With regards to the State Water Resources Control Board(SWRCB)'s 2002 Statewide Recycled Water Survey on Page 5-5

QUESTION: Is there a tentative schedule for an update of that survey?

#6 - Please note that the current terminology used by the State Water Resources Control Board staff for the SWRCB is the "State Water Board", and for the RWQCB it is the "Regional Water Board". The currently used terminology for both bodies is being considered under the public review and comment period for the State Water Board's proposed Clean Water State Revolving Fund(CWSRF) Policy Amendments--August 21, 2008 deadline. (Page 5-5)

#7 - Page 5-5, the second paragraph that begins with "Most basin adjudications..." should be expanded.

#8 - Page 5-7, to the Water Quality section's list of "Issues" add Perchlorate, TCE, and the Santa Susana Field Laboratory(SSFL).

QUESTION: Does the "Regional salt management/ salt imbalance" bullet point also cover "brine"? If not, also list brine under "Issues".

#9 - Please note that I have no confidence in the Metropolitan Water District(MWD) since the District's staff has to date not responded to my comments submitted during the 2000 Urban Water Management Plan Update. I received a telephone call from District staff stating such.

#10 - Page 5-7, for the listed Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board watersheds, include in parenthesis the county. The reader should not have to cross-reference a lot of material.

QUESTION: Is the last sentence of the third paragraph, under the Water Quality section, stating that the "watersheds" are also just "Some" that "have been identified but not prioritized"? Or are all watersheds listed?

#11 - Page 5-8, under Historic Floods's second bullet point, Significant historic floods, include the 1992 Las Llajas Dam breach or overflow during the heavy downpour that led to the undermining of a City of Moorpark bridge because of water volume.

#12 - Page 5-9, for the first and second bullet points under "Constructed Flood Protection Facilities" include in parenthesis the county, or group them by county to be reader friendly.

#13 - Page 5-10, "Simi Valley" is included under the "Flood Governance" third bullet point(Table). The City received a better Community Rating because it states it has a Flood Library--the information is not in one place, it is scattered in different department--and it lists the emergency related program with regards to a dam located miles from Eastern Ventura County. The City's 1997 the FEMA FIS and FIRMs were not accurate or complete. FEMA required thousands of dollars for the public appeal, and there was no guarantee that the documents would be modified.

#14 - Page 5-10, for the "Operating Procedures" first bullet point(General Reservoir Operating Rules) include the county in parenthesis that facilities are located in to make it reader friendly.

QUESTION: Why was the Wood Ranch Dam/Bard Reservoir not included?

#15 - Page 5-12, under "Challenges", it is stated in the third bullet point that "Identify disadvantaged communities and describe what is being done to enhance water supplies."

QUESTION: Why is this still not done to date when entities applying for IRWM funds can get points for including them?

#16 - Page 5-12, under "Challenges", include the Santa Susana Field Laboratory(SSFL).

#17 - Page 5-12, under "Challenges", the fourth bullet point is not clear. Not sure if changing the word "integrate" to "integration" helps.

#18 - Page 5-12, under "Challenges", include update of cities and counties general plans. Some entities general plan updates put the Governor's Office of Planning and Research in violation of Government codes that state warn local government after 8 years, and after 10 years to turn the matter over to the Attorney General's office.

#19 - Pages 5-13 to 5-16, under Looking to the Future section, while the Calleguas Municipal Water District is mentioned, the County of Ventura is considerably overlooked.

QUESTION: Is the "Calleguas" mentioned in the third paragraph that begins with "In 2000..." the same as the Calleguas Municipal Water District, or the Calleguas Creek Watershed area?

#20 - The Water Plan Update in general must speak loud and clear about commitment to the public participation process. My public participation process rights have been violated by the County of Ventura Board of Supervisors with regards to my comments on the Draft Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and the Ventura County Watershed Protection District Board of Directors with regards to my comments on the Draft Flood Mitigation Plan, as well as the FEMA with regards to my comments on the current FEMA/County of Ventura/Nolte Preliminary Flood Insurance Study(FIS), and Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps(FIRMs). These documents are incomplete and inaccurate. The City of Simi Valley does not respond to my comments submitted on the Preliminary Base Budgets even though the documents cover State and federal funding.

ERRORS

1. Page 5-4, it is stated in the last sentence before "PLACEHOLDER Table 5-1" that "Ventura County Flood Control District". Please note that in the new Millennium the aforementioned District is now named the Ventura County Watershed Protection District.

2. Page 5-6, the third paragraph that begins with "Various water rights...", a ")" is missing between "others" and ".".

3. Page 5-11, the entity listed in the first bullet point, under the Integrated Regional Water Management section, should read "Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County IRWM".

4. Page 5-13, under Drought and Flood Planning's first bullet point(Regional Flood Plans or Flood Planning Agencies), "Ventura County Watershed Protection District", and "Ventura County Flood Control District" are listed under the "Subject" bullet point. These agencies are once and the same. Either list the Ventura County Watershed Protection District and delete the Ventura County Flood Control District, or state "Ventura County Watershed Protection District(formerly the Ventura County Flood Control District)".

Sincerely,

Mrs. Teresa Jordan

Mrs. Teresa Jordan