

From: [Dominick Gulli](#)
To: [Delta Council Smith Canal Cert](#); [Mullin, Erin@DeltaCouncil](mailto:Mullin.Erin@DeltaCouncil); [Giorgi, Erika@DeltaCouncil](mailto:Giorgi.Erika@DeltaCouncil)
Subject: Presentations for meeting
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 8:46:07 AM
Attachments: [131009 summary.pdf](#)
[190317 floodplane exhibits 2.pdf](#)
[190308 local cost share 3.pdf](#)
[131002 GME SJAFCA SOQ.pdf](#)

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Dominick Gulli has shared OneDrive files with you. To view them, click the links below.



[190317 floodplane exhibits 2.pdf](#)



[190308 local cost share 3.pdf](#)



[131002_GME_SJAFCA_SOQ.pdf](#)

<!--[endif]-->

Enclosed are electronic documents to be presented to the board at the upcoming meeting.

Thank You

Dom Gulli
Save Das Point
209 649 4555

From: Dominick Gulli <greenmountaindom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:15 PM
To: smithcanalcert@deltacouncil.ca.gov; Mullin, Erin@DeltaCouncil;
erika.giorgi@deltacouncil.ca.gov
Subject: Re: Comments on Smith Canal

My apologies when I read the comments, I focused on the Thursday part and not the 28th so I will submit additional detailed comments when due.

Dom Gulli

From: Dominick Gulli <greenmountaindom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:03 PM
To: smithcanalcert@deltacouncil.ca.gov; Mullin, Erin@DeltaCouncil;
erika.giorgi@deltacouncil.ca.gov
Subject: Comments on Smith Canal

enclosed are additional comments

From: Dominick Gulli <greenmountaindom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2019 4:08 PM
To: smithcanalcert@deltacouncil.ca.gov; Mullin, Erin@DeltaCouncil;
erika.giorgi@deltacouncil.ca.gov
Subject: Attachment H

Reference is made to communications of parties 19-01-04 SJAFCA mail RE Smith Canal Gate C20188-question for parties.

There are more discrepancies between the tow documents. For example: Enclosed are the following documents:

6/26/15 email chain with attachment of appendix H and its exclusion from the EIR.

Attachment H from the DSC determination "Smith Canal FEIR2015"

Attachment H from the administrative record SJA-CEQ-00602..

The differences with attachments was modified to SJAFCA's benefit.

As stated in the GME 11/23/15 correspondence to ICF and SJAFCA the Summary and evaluation of alternates presented by Green Mountain Engineering is a biased presentation that is not based on the evidence, sound engineering or best available science.

See rebuttal comments 7-03, 7-05, 7-07, 7-21

Further still, but not limited to:

- 1)The levee is everywhere above the required FEMA elevation so the bulkhead is not required for freeboard.
- 2) The patrol road provided absolutely provides access for maintenance
- 3) The smith canal is tidal and the access road will be available at least 12 hours every day, plus the elevation can simply be revised if necessary.
- 4) SJA-CEQ-01495 states that the existing levee is between 12 to 15 and that there . The enclosed map prepared by the DWR Urban Levee Evaluation indicates the levees meet the requirement of 3 ft freeboard above the higher 200 year flood stage. The minor deficiencies listed at the Pershing ave bridge are in fact not deficient as the bridge has a concrete guard rail that provides significant additional freeboard.
- 5) SJA-CEQ-01495 also states that the inspection and maintenance is not corrected for the landside of the levee as the existing encroachments remain. Since the filing of the FEIR both Levee Districts have adopted operations and maintenance plans that satisfy FEMA Conditional

Letter of Map Revision criteria with the encroachments in place. The levees are frequently loaded and will still be required to perform their job when the Gate is Closed.

Please have SJAFCAs more thoroughly review the SmithCanalFEIR2015 Gate with the admin record SJA-CEQ for the litigation including all attachments and exhibits.

Thank You

Dominick Gulli PE.PLS

Save Dads Point.