CHAPTER 5
REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

The information presented in this chapter describes the revisions that have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS. These changes are minor modifications and clarifications to the Draft EIR/EIS, and do not change the environmental impact conclusions in the Final EIR/EIS. The majority of the changes are made to ensure the accuracy of the document.

To indicate that text has been removed from the document, the words that have been deleted are identified by a solid line through the text. The words in italics indicate that new text has been added. The revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS are listed by chapter and page number. None of these changes constitute a substantial change to the project, as defined by CEQA.

5.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Page ES-7: The first paragraph under Environmental Impacts/Consequences is revised as follows:

  This EIR/EIS includes analytical sections for the following ~~17~~*16* resource categories: surface water supply and management, groundwater resources, power production and energy consumption, flood control, surface water quality, fisheries and aquatic resources, terrestrial resources, recreation, visual resources, cultural resources, air quality, land use, socioeconomics, growth inducement, environmental justice, and Indian Trust Assets.

- Some of the information presented on pages ES-14 to ES-16 in Table ES-1 was mislabeled, and did not correctly reflect the information that was presented in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The analyses in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS (e.g., pages 9-60, 9-89 to 9-90, 9-118, 9-147, 9-176 to 9-177, 9-206, 9-235) acknowledged that carriage water would be used to maintain salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta. Section 9.5 (pages 9-264 to 9-265) of the Draft EIR/EIS also described how carriage water would be used as a protective measure to maintain water quality in the Delta. Therefore, as discussed in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, any potentially significant impacts to salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta as a result of implementing one of the action alternatives would be avoided or minimized. To more accurately present the information in Table ES-1, the labeling of impacts for several of the locations that evaluated salinity and chloride concentrations under the action alternatives, relative to the bases of comparison, are changed from "LTS" to "LSM". Additionally, carriage water also would likely be used to maintain Delta conditions under the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition. However, it is not the responsibility of this project to mitigate for potential impacts that would be caused by other actions that are unrelated to the Proposed Yuba Accord and, thus, where appropriate, the labeling of impacts for the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition, in Table ES-1 are changed from "LTS" to "PS".

  Because the information contained in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS also is used in this Final EIR/EIS, the changes in labeling of impacts that have been made to reflect these changes are presented in Table 1-2 of the Final EIR/EIS.

5.2 CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

- Page 1-1: The sentence in the middle of the second paragraph is revised as follows:

  ~~and~~ Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) have a goal to obtain water for the CALFED Bay/Delta Program (CALFED) to use for protection and restoration of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) fisheries and for improvements in statewide water supply reliability, including supplemental water for the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP).

- Page 1-21: In response to Comment SA1-1, the second paragraph on page 1-21 is revised as follows:

  ~~CDFG is a CEQA responsible agency and trustee agency involved in the Fisheries Agreement process. CDFG would have the decision-making responsibility of approving and implementing the Fisheries Agreement, including participating on the RMT. YCWA also would pursue coordination and consultation with CDFG for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) compliance.~~

  CDFG is a CEQA Responsible Agency and Trustee Agency involved in the Fisheries Agreement process. CDFG would have the decision-making responsibility of approving and implementing the Fisheries Agreement, and would participate on the River Management Team (RMT). CDFG would also be acting as a CEQA Responsible Agency when issuing any permit that might be required under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

5.3 CHAPTER 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND CEQA EXISTING CONDITION/NEPA AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

- Throughout Chapter 2, the reference (~~Reynolds et al. 1993~~) is replaced with (*DWR and Reclamation 2004*).

- Page 2-2: Figure 2-1 is revised, and is included in Chapter 6 of this Final EIR/EIS as Figure 6-1.

- Page 2-18: The last sentence of the final paragraph on page 2-18 is revised as follows:

  Since 2002, routine fish surveys have registered sharp declines in several pelagic (open-water) species, including the delta smelt, a species listed as a threatened species under the federal and state Endangered Species Acts ~~provided in Chapters 4 and 5~~.

5.4 CHAPTER 3 – PROPOSED PROJECT/ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

- Page 3-6: The following new sentence is added at the end of the first paragraph in Section 3.2.1.1:

  The latest draft of the proposed Fisheries Agreement is included in the Final EIR/EIS as Appendix M1.

- Page 3-6: In response to Comment SA3-5a (see Chapter 4) and to provide clarification regarding the status of the Feather River Point of Diversion/Rediversion that was proposed in the draft Fisheries Agreement, the following text has been added to Section

3.2.1.1 of the Draft EIR/EIS. This additional text is inserted after the second paragraph in Section 3.2.1.1:

A YCWA proposed petition for a Feather River Point of Diversion/Rediversion near the confluence of the lower Yuba River and the Feather River is described in Section 4.1.3 of the draft Fisheries Agreement that is included in Appendix B to the Draft EIR/EIS (see Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix B, page B-21.) However, after preparation of this draft agreement YCWA, Reclamation and DWR decided not to pursue this facility as part of the Yuba Accord Alternative. Therefore, this facility is not described or analyzed in this EIR/EIS.

- Page 3-10: The first sentence of Section 3.2.1.2 is changed as follows:

  YCWA would enter into individual Conjunctive Use Agreements with *any* ~~each of the~~ participating Member Units~~:~~ *These participating Member Units could include some or all of the following Member Units:* BWD, BVID, DCMWC, HIC, RWD, SYWD, and WWD. *Alternatively, YCWA may decide instead to enter into annual agreements with some or all of these participating Member Units, which would be similar to the proposed Conjunctive Use Agreements but each only for one year, for the groundwater-substitution programs necessary to satisfy YCWA's obligations under the Fisheries and Water Purchase Agreements, and for any additional groundwater-substitution transfers that would be agreed to by YCWA and the Member Units. "Participating members" in the following paragraphs refer to the Member Units that have annual or longer-term conjunctive-use agreements with YCWA that are in effect for the year in question.*

- Page 3-12: The typographical error in the last sentence of the third full paragraph (i.e., no period at the end of the sentence) has been corrected.

- Page 3-12: The fourth full paragraph is revised as follows:

  The Water Purchase Agreement would require a petition to *the* SWRCB to add the CVP (Jones Pumping Plant) and SWP (Banks Pumping Plant) as new points of diversion/rediversion and the CVP and SWP as new places of use, as necessary to implement the Water Purchase Agreement.

- Page 3-23: The following new Section 3.2.1.6 is added immediately before the old Section 3.2.1.6:

3.2.1.6 PHASED WATER PURCHASE AGREEMENT

As a result of the August 31, 2007 draft interim remedies order in the NRDC v. Kempthorne litigation, Reclamation has decided to delay completion of its ESA compliance for the Proposed Project/Action, and to wait to complete its ROD for the Proposed Project/Action until the ESA re-consultations for OCAP are completed. Until Reclamation issues its ROD, the Yuba Accord Alternative therefore would be implemented with just YCWA and DWR being parties to the Water Purchase Agreement. During this first phase, DWR and Reclamation would not execute the Tier 2 Agreement, and Reclamation would not execute its Tier 3 Agreements with CVP contractors. The same amount of Component 1 water still would go to the EWA Program. For Components 2, 3 and 4 water, DWR still would execute Tier 3 agreements with SWP contractors, and DWR also would execute water-purchase agreements with interested CVP contractors. The latest draft of the Water Purchase Agreement for this first phase is included in the Final EIR/EIS as Appendix M2.

After Reclamation issues its ROD, Reclamation would consider joining the Water Purchase Agreement. If Reclamation were to decide to join the Water Purchase Agreement, then, during this second phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, YCWA, DWR and Reclamation all would be

parties to the Water Purchase Agreement, DWR and Reclamation would execute the Tier 2 Agreement, and Reclamation and the CVP contractors would execute their Tier 3 agreements, as described in Section 3.2.1.3

Even with this proposed phasing, the Fisheries Agreement and YCWA's obligations to maintain the lower Yuba River flows that are specified by the agreement would not change. Similarly, none of the Yuba Project operations or lower Yuba River flows that are described in the Draft EIR/EIS for the Yuba Accord Alternative would change. The effects of this phasing on the Delta Region and Export Service Area are discussed in Section 3.2 of the Final EIR/EIS.

- Pages 3-23: The heading "~~***3.2.1.6, OTHER PERTINENT PROJECTS AND AGREEMENTS***~~" is changed to "***3.2.1.7, OTHER PERTINENT PROJECTS AND AGREEMENTS"***.
- Page 3-27: The last full sentence of the last paragraph on page 3-27 is revised as follows:

  The continuation of *the* EWA Program as a long-term management tool also is being considered by the EWA Agencies[11].
- Page 3-28: The second to last sentence in the carryover paragraph on page 3-28 is revised as follows:

  For this reason, the analyses in this EIR/EIS that concern future conditions assume that a long-term EWA Program or a program equivalent to the EWA will be implemented, with conditions similar to those for the existing EWA *P*~~p~~rogram, and this ~~EIS/EIR~~*EIR/EIS* identifies the Delta fish protection actions at the CVP and SWP pumping facilities as "the EWA Program or an equivalent program."
- Page 3-28: The heading "Modified Flow Alternative" is changed to "**3.2.2, MODIFIED FLOW ALTERNATIVE**".
- Pages 3-28 to 3-29: Section numbers 3.2.1.7 through 3.2.1.11 are changed to "3.2.1 through 3.2.5".
- Pages 3-29 to 3-31: "3.2" in all of the section numbers on these pages are changed to "3.3".
- Page 3-31: The heading "**3.3, SUMMARY OF COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**" is changed to "**3.4, SUMMARY OF COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**".
- Pages 3-32 to 3-34: "3.4" in all of the section numbers on these pages are changed to "3.5".
- Page 3-34: The heading "**3.5, PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**" is changed to "**3.6, PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**".
- Page 3-36: The heading "**3.6, ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR OR PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE**" is changed to "**3.7, ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR OR PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE**".
- Page 3-11: In Section 3.2.1.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the following text has been added after the second sentence in the fourth paragraph to describe the protective measures that would be implemented to ensure that the aquifer is maintained at sustainable levels:

The principal means of doing so would be through YCWA's and DWR's Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program that would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project/Action. The Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program includes the following three components: (1) groundwater transfer monitoring and reporting specifications; (2) a groundwater pumping operations plan; and (3) a third-party impacts action plan. A summary of each component is presented below, and the complete Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program is presented in Exhibit 3 to the Water Purchase Agreement, which is in Appendix M2.

Groundwater Monitoring

In cooperation with DWR, YCWA has monitored Yuba County groundwater conditions for many years, and many aspects of the groundwater resources are well known. YCWA and DWR have worked cooperatively to develop a groundwater transfer monitoring and reporting program specific to Yuba County for past groundwater substitution water transfers. YCWA has also developed a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP), which was adopted on March 1, 2005 pursuant to Water Code Sections 10750 et seq. The GMP formalizes a monitoring program that includes measuring water levels in wells that are part of a dedicated monitoring well network, a plan to expand the network, annual reporting provisions and other groundwater monitoring activities. Since 2005, YCWA has constructed eight additional groundwater monitoring wells for this program (see DWR, Memorandum Report, "Monitoring Well Construction Technical Assistance," April 2007). Information gathered from the activities specified in the GMP, along with the activities described in Exhibit 3 to the Water Purchase Agreement, will be used to assess effects of groundwater pumping on groundwater resources, and to provide reasonable assurances that any water pumped and accounted for as part of any groundwater substitution is in lieu of surface water delivered by YCWA to its Member Units. YCWA will continue to work with DWR and the Member Units to identify and resolve any new groundwater monitoring issues.

Groundwater Pumping Operations Plan

The Groundwater Pumping Operations Plan in Exhibit 3 to the Water Purchase Agreement sets forth the procedures by which the total amount of water to be transferred will be determined. These amounts include Components 1, 2, 3 and 4 water. A portion of the water will be from surface water and a portion may be provided through groundwater substitution pumping. YCWA will determine the amount of water to be provided through groundwater substitution pumping (in consultation with the Member Units) by: (1) estimating the amount of surface water that will be transferred for the year by operation to the flow schedules in the Fisheries Agreement and the September 30 target New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage level; (2) determining the amount of water from groundwater substitution pumping that Member Units can make available through wells of farmers who are willing to participate in the program and whose farms are located within a participating Member Unit; and (3) determining the amount of water that can be pumped within the safe yield of the basin without contributing to long-term overdraft and without resulting in significant unmitigated impacts to other groundwater users in the basin.

The procedures that will be used to determine the amount of water that can be pumped within the safe yield of the basin without contributing to long-term overdraft, and without resulting in any significant unmitigated third-party ("Third Party" or "Third Parties") impacts to other groundwater users in the basin will be determined by the groundwater pumping operations plan. The monitoring plan will be used to obtain information from which the determination will be made of the condition of the groundwater basin in the spring of the year during which groundwater substitution pumping is planned. Based on this condition, YCWA will determine the expected response of the basin to the proposed pumping for that year and the resulting condition of the basin at the conclusion of the pumping. Determination of the expected condition

at the conclusion of the pumping will be made by examining the historic response of the basin during previous years when pumping occurred and by examining the recovery of the basin during pumping years and successive years, and by comparing these basin responses with the planned pumping. Analysis of the historical responses of the basin to pumping will be used to develop empirical relationships between pumping and basin drawdown and recovery. These empirically derived relationships will be the formulas that will be used to determine the basin response to the proposed pumping.

The determination of the basin response to the proposed pumping will result in an estimated basin condition at the end of pumping and an estimated condition for the spring of the next year. This estimated condition will be compared to historical groundwater levels in the basin. In 1991, YCWA and Member Units completed a groundwater substitution transfer to provide water to other parts of California under the Governor's Emergency Drought Water Bank in response to a severe statewide drought. The groundwater levels that occurred in the fall of 1991 at the end of pumping did not result in any overdraft of the groundwater basin or any significant unmitigated Third-Party impacts. Groundwater levels had been lower than these levels during the 1980's, but the extent of effects of these lower levels on groundwater users in the basin is not well known. Therefore, the fall 1991 groundwater levels will be used for comparison with the estimated condition of the basin that will result from the proposed groundwater pumping under the Yuba Accord Alternative.

If the estimated levels are above the fall 1991 levels, then significant unmitigated Third-Party impacts will not be expected. If the estimated levels are below the fall 1991 levels, then further examination of potential impacts and consultation with the participating Member Units and the GMP Water Advisory Group[1] will be required. Even if the determination is that estimated levels resulting from proposed pumping will be above the fall 1991 levels, the participating Member Units still will be consulted, and each participating Member Unit must individually approve the proposed pumping in its area or such pumping will not occur. If the amount of proposed pumping that will not cause fall groundwater levels to drop below 1991 levels cannot be confirmed using the procedures described above, then a lower amount of pumping that satisfies the conditions of this section will be determined using these procedures. The YCWA Board reserves the right to restrict the maximum amount of groundwater substitution pumping and the right to resolve any disputes in the Water Advisory Group regarding maximum amount of groundwater pumping.

If for any year the total amount of groundwater pumping that is determined to be acceptable under this section is less than the total amount of Components 1, 2 and 3 water that is provided for in the Agreement, minus the amount of surface water to be transferred, then YCWA may either: (1) use additional surface water through supplemental surface water transfer to provide Components 1, 2 and 3 water; or (2) advise DWR that the total unmet amount of Components 1, 2 and 3 water will not be provided during the present year and instead will be owed to the Buyers and repaid in a manner detailed in the Water Purchase Agreement.

---

[1] *The GMP Water Advisory Group is a group that was formed under the GMP to provide input and guidance on groundwater issues. The GMP Water Advisory Group comprises representatives from local groundwater users, including municipal water purveyors, Member Units, reclamation districts and others. Groundwater substitution pumping that would result in levels near the fall 1991 levels will occur only if the Member Units and the GMP Water Advisory Group agree to allow such pumping.*

Third-Party Impacts Action Plan

The Third-Party Impacts Action Plan describes actions that will be undertaken by YWCA and Member Units to respond to impacts to Third Parties that occur because of groundwater substitution pumping for transfers under this Agreement. Third Parties include local groundwater users that could be affected by fluctuations in groundwater levels because of the pumping of such groundwater substitution water. YCWA and the participating Member Units agree that prompt responses to and mitigation of potential impacts to Third Parties are an important requirement for YCWA's present and future groundwater substitution transfers.

A series of steps will be taken to ensure that the groundwater substitution component of the Yuba Accord Alternative does not cause significant, unmitigated impacts to Third Parties. Under the action plan, groundwater substitution pumping must not produce significant unmitigated impacts on Third Parties, impacts must be identified and mitigated as quickly as possible, and there must be ongoing, open communications with affected Third Parties. Because not all potential impacts can be known in advance, this plan provides a process for responding to concerns expressed by local groundwater users who believe that their water-production facilities are being or will be impacted by groundwater substitution pumping under the Yuba Accord Alternative. Upon either YCWA or the Member Unit receiving notification of a potential Third-Party impact, YCWA or the Member Unit will immediately notify the other party of the nature of the potential impact. The Member Unit will promptly (within one day) contact the Third Party and obtain all available information regarding the nature and extent of the potential impact, and provide that information to YCWA. The Member Unit also will regularly update YCWA on the status of the Member Unit's response.

If the Third Party is not within the boundaries of any participating Member Unit of YCWA, then YCWA will either: (1) determine if it is evident that the Third Party is in close proximity to the groundwater-production facilities within a participating Member Unit, and designate the Member Unit or Member Units responsible for responding to the potential impact; or (2) consult with an Advisory Group[2] concerning which Member Unit or Member Units should be designated for responding to the potential impact.

After the Third Party has been contacted and the relevant information regarding the potential impact has been received, the participating Member Unit will develop an approach (subject to approval by YCWA) to: (1) determine whether the Third Party has actually been impacted by groundwater pumping by the Member Unit, and, if so; (2) mitigate for the impact. YCWA will be available to provide assistance to the Member Unit in developing the foregoing approach. YCWA and the Member Unit will consult with the applicable Advisory Group in developing the approach referred to in this section.

YCWA will resolve any dispute concerning implementation of this action plan, including which participating Member Unit will be responsible for mitigating a potential impact, whether it is reasonably likely that there was a Third-Party impact, and the measures to be taken by the Member Unit to mitigate the impact. If a Member Unit fails to carry out its responsibilities under this action plan, then YCWA will be authorized (but not required) to perform the responsibilities of the Member Unit and recover its reasonable costs in doing so from the Member

---

2 As a contractual condition of a Member Unit participating in the groundwater substitution component of this Agreement and the Yuba River Accord, the Member Unit will identify a contact person or persons who will be responsible for initially responding to a notification of a potential Third-Party impact, and take the other action specified in this section. The contact persons for the Member Units will also serve on a Yuba Groundwater Substitution Program Advisory Group ("Advisory Group") for either the area north of the Yuba River or the area south of the Yuba River.

Unit, including deducting these costs from payments due the Member Unit for the groundwater substitution transfer. YCWA will consult with the applicable Advisory Group in carrying out its responsibilities under this section.

It is the intention of this action plan that: (1) any Third-Party impact that is reasonably likely to have been caused by implementation of the groundwater substitution program will be promptly and substantially mitigated; (2) as to any Third-Party impact that is not reasonably likely to have been caused by implementation of the groundwater substitution program, the Third Party will be provided information to reasonably demonstrate the reasons that there were no impacts; and (3) YCWA, the participating Member Units and the Advisory Group will be involved in the implementation of this action plan. Actions that will be taken to mitigate an impact include, but are not limited to, deepening of the impacted Third Party's well or lowering of pump bowls, cessation of pumping in the area of the impacted well, and providing a temporary or permanent alternative water supply to the Third Party.

5.5 CHAPTER 4 – OVERVIEW OF ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Page 4-18: The following text is inserted under a new heading titled, **4.11, ADDITIONAL ANALYSES OF THE YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE BECAUSE OF PHASING**:

  Chapter 3.2 of the Final EIR/EIS discusses the effects of phasing the Yuba Accord Alternative.

5.6 CHAPTER 5 – SURFACE WATER SUPPLY AND MANAGEMENT

- Pages 5-50 and 5-51 of Table 5-32 is revised as follows:

Table 5-32. Breakdown of Annual Water Transfer Components for the Yuba Accord Alternative

Year	SVI Year Type	CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative								NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative							
		SWP Alloc.	CVP Alloc.	C1	C2	C3A	C3B	C4	Total	SWP Alloc.	CVP Alloc.	C1	C2	C3A	C3B	C4	Total
		%	%	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	%	%	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF
1922	AN	94%	86%	60				9	69	78%	92%	60				9	69
1923	BN	95%	72%	60				8	68	85%	64%	40					40
1924	C	14%	0%	60	30	40		21	151	14%	0%	60	30	40		12	142
1925	D	40%	43%	60	15		35		110	38%	48%	60	15	40			135
1926	D	73%	15%	36	15	15			66	67%	8%	41	15	15			71
1927	W	93%	78%	83					83	80%	86%	79					79
1928	AN	77%	66%	61				16	77	73%	72%	77					77
1929	C	24%	6%	60	30	40		20	150	24%	0%	46	30	40		20	136
1930	D	68%	33%	43	15	40		5	103	65%	31%	52	15	40		5	112
1931	C	23%	3%	47	13				60	22%	4%	47	13				60
1932	D	31%	14%	58	15	39			112	28%	17%	58	15	39			112
1933	C	31%	0%	60	30	40		25	155	29%	4%	60	30	40		25	155
1934	C	34%	11%	60	30	40		18	148	33%	12%	60	30	40		18	148
1935	BN	94%	35%	48					48	89%	36%	60			5		65
1936	BN	91%	55%	60				9	69	83%	51%	76					76
1937	BN	86%	41%	60			11		71	72%	39%	60			16		76
1938	W	93%	100%	62					62	77%	100%	62					62
1939	D	90%	58%	59	15		40	35	149	84%	68%	60	15			76	151
1940	AN	94%	52%	60			21		81	84%	62%	83				3	86
1941	W	92%	86%	48					48	80%	93%	60				4	64
1942	W	93%	87%	71					71	86%	95%	55					55
1943	W	89%	85%	24					24	78%	92%	58					58
1944	D	96%	45%	60	15		40	47	162	92%	52%	46	15			75	136
1945	BN	94%	75%	75					75	86%	73%	61					61
1946	BN	94%	64%	59					59	88%	77%	36					36
1947	D	68%	41%	60	15		40	88	203	67%	39%	60	15		40	90	205
1948	BN	69%	66%	77					77	66%	77%	104				7	111
1949	D	54%	64%	60	15			97	172	52%	71%	59	15		40	26	140
1950	BN	80%	30%	60		17			77	74%	34%	60		16			76
1951	AN	95%	71%	56					56	87%	78%	56					56
1952	W	92%	99%	40					40	80%	100%	56					56
1953	W	93%	74%	55					55	87%	81%	55					55
1954	AN	95%	70%	124					124	88%	84%	73				69	142
1955	D	37%	46%	60	15		40	37	152	35%	45%	48	15	40		35	138
1956	W	93%	75%	73					73	82%	82%	72				2	74
1957	AN	82%	78%	60				10	70	76%	83%	60				10	70
1958	W	93%	97%	22					22	82%	99%	59					59
1959	BN	80%	72%	77					77	78%	74%	61				18	79
1960	D	54%	32%	0	15	40		16	71	53%	31%	1	15	40		35	91
1961	D	57%	61%	60	15			253	328	57%	62%	60	15		40	193	308
1962	BN	84%	66%	88					88	79%	92%	88					88
1963	W	93%	75%	55					55	82%	96%	55					55
1964	D	78%	48%	0	15			64	79	76%	61%	43	15			75	133
1965	W	82%	83%	104					104	74%	87%	113				32	145
1966	BN	95%	67%	42					42	87%	77%	30					30
1967	W	93%	99%	30					30	79%	99%	83					83
1968	BN	86%	78%	30					30	79%	82%	45					45
1969	W	92%	100%	81					81	81%	100%	69					69

Table 5-32. Breakdown of Annual Water Transfer Components for the Yuba Accord Alternative (continued)

Year	SVI Year Type	CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative								NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative							
		SWP Alloc.	CVP Alloc.	C1	C2	C3A	C3B	C4	Total	SWP Alloc.	CVP Alloc.	C1	C2	C3A	C3B	C4	Total
		%	%	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	%	%	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF	TAF
1970	W	93%	72%	109					109	87%	79%	73				38	111
1971	W	93%	71%	77					77	87%	84%	60				17	77
1972	BN	68%	68%	72					72	66%	76%	60				25	85
1973	AN	94%	78%	83					83	83%	86%	60				9	69
1974	W	93%	80%	24					24	83%	89%	55					55
1975	W	93%	77%	25					25	84%	93%	55					55
1976	C	75%	15%	60	30	40		24	154	75%	24%	0					0
1977	C	3%	3%	13					13	3%	5%	60	30	28			118
1978	AN	94%	99%	57					57	75%	99%	56					56
1979	BN	94%	78%	55					55	80%	67%	55					55
1980	AN	92%	87%	56					56	79%	95%	56					56
1981	D	87%	74%	42	15			75	132	81%	78%	13	15			75	103
1982	W	93%	98%	79					79	80%	100%	67					67
1983	W	92%	99%	0					0	83%	99%	0					0
1984	W	93%	78%	16					16	84%	86%	27					27
1985	D	94%	59%	30	15			53	98	90%	69%	0					0
1986	W	85%	72%	99					99	73%	65%	125					125
1987	D	68%	41%	60	15		40	35	150	67%	31%	60	15	40		35	150
1988	C	11%	10%	51	30	30			111	11%	1%	51	30	30			111
1989	D	81%	40%	0	15		14		29	80%	43%	39	15		15		69
1990	C	23%	0%	60	30	40		105	235	22%	0%	60	30	40		66	196
1991	C	20%	12%	60	30	40		7	137	20%	13%	60	30	40		7	137
1992	C	37%	33%	36	30				66	35%	23%	33	30				63
1993	AN	94%	69%	57					57	81%	85%	58					58

Note: CVP allocations are for South of Delta agricultural contractors.
Transfer volumes as simulated using environmental impact modeling tools.

5.7 CHAPTER 6 – GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

- In response to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIR (see the response to Comment LA2-1 in Chapter 4), the following text has been added to the end of Section 6.4 on page 6-90 of the Draft EIR/EIS:

  To protect groundwater resources that may be affected by the Proposed Project/Action, the following measures have been incorporated into the project to continue to maintain the quality of groundwater resources in the North Yuba and South Yuba basins.

  - *Mitigation Measure 6-1: A Groundwater Monitoring and Reporting Program will be implemented to minimize and/or avoid potential impacts to local groundwater users in the Yuba Region*
  - *Mitigation Measure 6-2: A Third-Party Impacts Action Plan will be implemented to minimize and/or avoid potential impacts to local groundwater users in the Yuba Region*

  A full description of each mitigation measure, including the implementation commitments that are described in Exhibit 3 to the Water Purchase Agreement, is provided in Section 6.2.1 and in Appendix M2 of the Final EIR/EIS.

5.8 CHAPTER 9 – SURFACE WATER QUALITY

- Related to the changes in labeling of impacts described in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS (see Section 5.2 above), text was added to several of the analytical sections in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS that evaluated changes in salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta to provide additional clarification regarding the use of protective measures to maintain Delta conditions. The analyses in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS (e.g., pages 9-60, 9-89 to 9-90, 9-118, 9-147, 9-176 to 9-177, 9-206, 9-235) acknowledged that carriage water would be used to maintain salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta. Section 9.5 (pages 9-264 to 9-265) of the Draft EIR/EIS also described how carriage water would be used as a protective measure to maintain water quality in the Delta. Therefore, as discussed in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, any potentially significant impacts to salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta as a result of implementing one of the action alternatives would be avoided or minimized.

  For those evaluations that addressed salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta for Water Code purposes, the text in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS is revised as follows:

  > While refined modeling studies conducted for years showing impacts under the simplified modeling assumptions indicate that, despite more detailed examination, there could still be impacts, it is anticipated that real-time operational changes *(see Section 9.5)* would further reduce impacts to a level that would not unreasonably affect Delta water quality.

  For those evaluations that addressed salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta for CEQA/NEPA purposes, the text in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS is revised as follows:

  > While refined modeling studies conducted for years showing impacts under the simplified modeling assumptions indicate that, despite more detailed examination, there could still be impacts, it is anticipated that real-time operational changes *(see Section 9.5)* would further reduce impacts to less than significant levels…

  Additionally, carriage water also would likely be used to maintain Delta conditions under the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition. However, it is not the responsibility of this project to identify, or make commitments of mitigation for potential impacts that would be caused by other actions that are unrelated to the Proposed Project/Action and other action alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS. It also cannot be assumed that other actions under the CEQA No Project Alternative would implement a similar type of mitigation. Therefore, where appropriate, the labeling of these impacts for the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition, in Table ES-1 is changed from "LTS" to "PS". For consistency purposes in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, text in Section 9.2.7.1 that relates to the evaluations of salinity and chloride concentrations for the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition, is modified as follows:

  > While refined modeling studies conducted for years showing impacts under the simplified modeling assumptions indicate that, despite more detailed examination, there could still be impacts~~, it is anticipated that real-time operational changes would further reduce impacts to less than significant levels.~~ Therefore, the CEQA No Project Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing

Condition, would have a ~~less than~~ *potentially* significant impact on Delta water quality.

5.9 CHAPTER 10 – FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES

- Throughout Chapter 10, the reference ~~(SWRCB 1994)~~ is replaced with *(CDFG Website 2007)*.
- Throughout Chapter 10, the reference ~~(IEP 2007)~~ is replaced with *(CALFED Website 2007)*.
- Throughout Chapter 10, the reference ~~(WWWCO website)~~ is replaced with *(DWR Website 2007)*.
- Throughout Chapter 10, the reference ~~(CDFG 1994)~~ has been removed.
- Throughout Chapter 10, the reference ~~(Hurley 1975)~~ has been removed.
- Page 10-44: In response to Comment SA1-6, the first paragraph under Section 10.1.6.2 on page 10-44 is revised as follows:

  ~~The California Endangered Species Act (CESA, Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2089) establishes various requirements and protections regarding species listed as threatened or endangered under state law. California's Fish and Game Commission is responsible for maintaining lists of threatened and endangered species under CESA. CESA prohibits the "*take*" of listed and candidate (petitioned to be listed) species (Fish and Game Code Section 2080) "*Take*" under California law means to "*…hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch capture, or kill…*" (Fish and Game Code Section 86).~~

  CESA, Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2089 contains various provisions to protect species listed as threatened or endangered species under the act. Section 2080 prohibits the take of any threatened or endangered species, except as authorized by the act. Such authorization may be by an incidental-take statement under Section 2080.1, an Incidental Take Permit under Section 2081, a permit, memorandum of understanding or plan under Section 2081.1, or a Natural Community Conservation Plan under Section 2835. Section 86 of the Fish and Game Code defines "take" to mean "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill." California's Fish and Game Commission is responsible for establishing the lists of threatened and endangered species under CESA and for adding species to these lists and removing species from these lists.
- Page 10-400: The first paragraph under Section 10.3, Cumulative Impacts, is revised as follows:

  For analytical purposes of this EIR/EIS, the projects that are considered well defined and "reasonably foreseeable" are described in Chapter ~~20~~*21*, Cumulative Impacts.
- Page 10-400: The second paragraph under Section 10.3, Cumulative Impacts, is revised as follows:

  Although most of the proposed projects described in Chapter ~~20~~*21* could have project-specific impacts that will be addressed in future project-specific environmental documentation, future implementation of these projects is not expected to result in cumulative impacts to regional water supply operations, or water-related and water

dependent resources that also could be affected by the Proposed Project/Action or alternatives (see Chapter ~~20~~*21*).

- Page 10-401: The last sentence of Section 10.3, Cumulative Impacts, is revised as follows:

  These projects are described in Chapter ~~20~~ *21* and qualitatively addressed below.

5.10 CHAPTER 11 – TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES

- Throughout Chapter 11, the reference ~~(Detrich 1980)~~ is replaced with *(Detrich 1980, as cited in DWR 2005)*.
- Throughout Chapter 11, the reference ~~(DWR 1988)~~ is replaced with *(YCWA et al. 2005)*.
- Throughout Chapter 11, the reference ~~(Gittens 1968)~~ is replaced with *(Gittens 1968, as cited in DWR 2005)*.
- Throughout Chapter 11, the reference ~~(Lehman 1979)~~ is replaced with *(Lehman 1979, as cited in DWR 2005)*.
- Page 11-45: The second sentence under Section 11.2.3 on page 11-45 and Section 11.2.4 on page 11-57 has been revised as follows in response to Comment I1-2:

  Because the assessment methodologies are primarily community based, potential ~~affects~~ *effects* on vegetative communities are assumed to also apply to those plant and wildlife species that could potentially utilize or reside within those communities.

5.11 CHAPTER 14 – CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Throughout Chapter 14, the reference ~~(Baldrica 2000)~~ is replaced with *(Reclamation et al. 2003)*.
- Throughout Chapter 14, the reference ~~(Deal 1980)~~ is replaced with *(Reclamation et al. 2003)*.
- Throughout Chapter 14, the reference ~~(Hines 1987)~~ is replaced with *(DWR 2001)*.
- Throughout Chapter 14, the reference ~~(Riddell and Olsen 1966)~~ is replaced with *(Reclamation et al. 2003)*.
- Page 14-6: The first sentence of the first paragraph under Existing Cultural Resources is revised as follows:

  Many prehistoric and/or ethnographic sites ~~were~~ *have been* recorded along the banks of the lower Sacramento River. ~~in 1934 by R.F. Heizer~~, ~~who~~ *Many of these sites have been* described ~~them~~ as burial mounds ~~which had~~ *that have* been partially or completely leveled for agriculture or other development ~~(Heizer 1934)~~.

5.12 CHAPTER 20 – INDIAN TRUST ASSETS

- Throughout Chapter 20, the reference ~~(Meals 1978)~~ is replaced with *(Reclamation et al. 2003)*.

5.13 CHAPTER 21 – CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- Page 21-6: A typographical error in Table 21-1 on page 21-6 has been corrected as follows:

54~~f~~	YCWA Flood Control Operations Obligations

5.14 CHAPTER 23 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

- Pages 23-4 and 23-5: In response to Comment SA1-8, the text on page 23-4 and 23-5, paragraphs 4 and 5 has been revised as follows:

~~The CESA (CDFG Code Section 2050 et. seq.) establishes state policy to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance threatened or endangered species and their habitats. The CESA mandates that state agencies should not approve projects that jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species if reasonable and prudent alternatives are available that would avoid jeopardy. Unlike the federal ESA, under CESA there are no mandated state agency consultation procedures. For projects that would affect a species that is federally and state-listed, compliance with ESA satisfies CESA if CDFG determines that the federal incidental take authorization is consistent with CESA (CDFG Section 2080.1). For projects that would result in take of a state-listed species, the project proponent must apply for a take permit under CDFG Section 2081(b).~~

~~YCWA and Reclamation have had numerous meetings with CDFG (see Section 23.2.7,), where discussions focused on determining the scope of work, identifying listed and proposed species potentially affected by the Proposed Project/Action, as well as developing a suitable approach for assessing the potential effects of the action on listed and proposed species and their habitat. Upon review of the Proposed Project/Action and associated mitigation measures (where applicable), CDFG will issue a written finding based upon it's determination of whether the Proposed Project/Action would jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat essential to the continued existence of the species. The written finding will also include CDFG's determination of whether the Proposed Project/Action would result in any taking of an endangered or threatened species incidental to the Proposed Project/Action (Fish and Game Code Section 2081).~~

CESA (Fish and Game Code Sections 2050 to 2089) establishes state policy to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance any threatened or endangered species and its habitat. CESA contains various provisions to protect species listed as threatened or endangered species under the act. Section 2080 prohibits the take of any threatened or endangered species, except as authorized by the Act. Such authorization may be by an Incidental Take Statement under Section 2080.1; an Incidental Take Permit under Section 2081; a permit, memorandum of understanding or plan under Section 2081.1, or a Natural Community Conservation Plan under Section 2835.

Unlike the federal ESA, under CESA there are no mandated state agency consultation procedures. However, CEQA requires notice to responsible and trustee agencies regarding the preparation of EIRs and allows for meetings to expedite consultation (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15082). YCWA and Reclamation have had numerous meetings with CDFG (see Section 23.2.7), where discussions focused on determining the scope of work, identifying listed and proposed species potentially affected by the Proposed Project/Action, as well

as developing a suitable approach for assessing the potential effects of the action on listed and proposed species and their habitat. If CDFG issues any permit under CESA for the Proposed Project/Action, then, in issuing the permit, CDFG will be acting as a CEQA Responsible Agency and will independently consider the EIR prepared by YCWA (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15096).

5.15 CHAPTER 25 – REFERENCES

5.15.1 GENERAL EDITS

- The following reference: ~~(Jones & Stokes 2003)~~ is revised to read as (*Reclamation and Freeport Regional Water Authority 2003*).

  ~~Jones & Stokes. 2003. Freeport Regional Water Project. Volume 1: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. July 2003. Prepared by Jones & Stokes Associates. Available at http://www.freeportproject.org.~~

  Reclamation and Freeport Regional Water Authority. 2003. Volume 1: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Freeport Regional Water Project. July 2003. Prepared by Jones & Stokes Associates. Available at http://www.freeportproject.org.

- The following reference: (~~USFWS 2004~~) is revised to read as (*USFWS 2005*):

  USFWS. ~~2004~~ *2005*. Long-Term Central Valley Project and State Water Project Operations Criteria and Plan Biological Opinion for Delta Smelt.

5.15.2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The following references are added at the top of Page 25-1 under a new heading, *Executive Summary*:

  Council on Environmental Quality. 2007. NEPA's Forty Most Asked Questions. Available at http://www.nepa.gov/nepa/regs/40/40p3.htm. Accessed on June 12, 2007.

  Reclamation. 2000. Public Review Draft National Environmental Policy Act Handbook.

  Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and CDFG. 2003. Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1996032083.

5.15.3 CHAPTER 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND THE CEQA EXISTING CONDITION/NEPA AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

- The following reference: ~~Reynolds, F. L., T. Mills, R. Benthin, and A. Low. 1993. Central Valley Anadromous Fisheries and Associated Riparian and Wetlands Areas Protection and Restoration Action Plan. Draft.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *DWR and Reclamation. 2004. Administrative Draft Sacramento Valley Water Management Program Short-Term Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report.*

5.15.4 CHAPTER 10 – FISHERIES AND AQUATIC RESOURCES

- The following reference: (~~SWRCB. 1994. Technical Report, Lower American Court Reference.)~~ is removed and is replaced with: *CDFG. 2007. Sacramento River Late-Fall Chinook Salmon. Website. http://www.dfg.ca. gov/hcpb/species/ssc/sscfish/.*
- The following references are removed:

  ~~CDFG. 1994. Central Valley Anadromous Sport Fish Annual Run Size, Harvest, and Population Estimates, 1967 through 1991. Inland Fisheries Technical Report, Third Draft. Sacramento, CA.~~

  ~~Hurley, G. V. 1975. The Reproductive Success and Early Growth of Smallmouth Bass, Micropterus Dolomieu Lacepede, at Baie Du Dore, Lake Huron, Ontario. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto.~~

- The following references are added:

  CALFED. 2007. Website. Souza, K.; Hieb, K.; Fleming, K.; Bryant, M.; Baxter, R. Apparent Growth Rates of Pelagic Fishes and Relationship to Abundance (2.b.)

  CDFG and YCWA. 1965. Stream Flow Release Agreement between Yuba County Water Agency and the California Department of Fish and Game. September 2, 1965.

  DWR. 2007. WOMT Summary 3/6/2007. WOMT Meeting Notes – Website wwwoco.water.ca.gov/calfedops/womt/2007/03_06_2007_summary.pdf

  Federal Power Commission. 1966. Federal Power Commission Order Amending License for YCWA Project No. 2246.

  NMFS. 2005. Final Biological and Conference Opinion for the Proposed Yuba River Development Project License Amendment for FERC License No. 2246 and its Effects on Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon and Central Valley Steelhead

5.15.5 CHAPTER 11 – TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES

- The following reference: ~~Detrich, P. J. 1980. Pit 3,4,5 Bald Eagle Study. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Redding, California. Unpublished Report.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Detrich, P. J. 1980. As cited in DWR. 2005. Application for New License Oroville Facilities FERC Project No. 2100 Volume IV PDEA Appendices Part 1 - Appendices A,B,C,D,E,F.*
- The following reference: ~~DWR. 1988. Initial Study for the Transfer of Water From the Yuba County Water Agency to the Department of Water Resources of the State of California. Redding, CA.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *YCWA et al. 2005. Environmental Analysis for the Proposed Temporary Transfer of Water from the Yuba County Water Agency, Yuba River Development Project to the California Department of Water Resources CALFED Environmental Water Account Project/2005 Dry Year Water Purchase Program*
- The following reference: ~~Gittens, E. F. 1968. A Study on the Status of the Bald Eagle in Nova Scotia. M.S. Thesis, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Gittens. 1968. As cited in DWR. 2005. Application for New License Oroville Facilities FERC Project No. 2100 Volume IV PDEA Appendices Part 1 - Appendices A,B,C,D,E,F.*

- The following reference: ~~Lehman, R. N. 1979. A Survey of Selected Habitat Features of 95 Bald Eagle Nests in California. Prepared for CDFG Wildlife Management Branch, Administrative Report 79-1. Sacramento. 23 pp.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Lehman, R. N. 1979. As cited in DWR. 2005. Application for New License Oroville Facilities FERC Project No. 2100 Volume IV PDEA Appendices Part 1 - Appendices A,B,C,D,E,F.*

5.15.6 CHAPTER 14 – CULTURAL RESOURCES

- The following reference: ~~Baldrica, M. 2000. Pendola Fire Salvage Time Sale. Ms. 05-17-1398, on file with the Tahoe National Forest Downieville Ranger District, Camptonville, California.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and CDFG. 2003. Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1996032083.*
- The following reference: ~~Deal, K. 1980. Elbow Timber Sale. Ms. 05-17-287, on file at the Tahoe National Forest, Downieville Ranger District, Camptonville, California.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and CDFG. 2003. Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1996032083.*
- The following reference: ~~Hines, P.W. 1987. Lake Oroville State Recreation Area, Statewide Resources Management Plan, Project 118-151-1, 1986-1987. MS on file at the Department of Parks and Recreation, Cultural Heritage Division, Sacramento.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *DWR. 2001. Initial Information Package, Relicensing of the Oroville Facilities. FERC License Project No. 2100.*
- The following reference: ~~Riddell, F. and Olsen. 1966. New Bullards Bar Reservoir Archaeological Reconnaissance. On file with the Tahoe National Forest Downieville Ranger District, Camptonville, California.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and CDFG. 2003. Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1996032083.*
- ~~The following reference: Heizer, R. F. 1934. Archaeological Site Survey Records for CA-SAC 26, 28, 29, 30, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46~~ is removed.

5.15.7 CHAPTER 20 – INDIAN TRUST ASSETS

- The following reference: ~~Meals, H. 1978. Bullards Bar Trail. Ms. 05-17-208, on file at the Tahoe National Forest, Downieville Ranger District, Camptonville.~~ is removed and is replaced with: *Reclamation, DWR, USFWS, NMFS, and CDFG. 2003. Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse No. 1996032083.*

5.16 APPENDIX B – PROPOSED LOWER YUBA RIVER ACCORD AGREEMENTS

- Some of the provisions of the Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement have been amended since the Draft EIR/EIS was issued in June 2007. Although the final provisions of the Fisheries Agreement are still being negotiated and likely will not be finalized until the agreement is executed, the modifications that have been discussed by the parties involved to date are included in Appendix M1 of the Final EIR/EIS.

- Some of the provisions of the Water Purchase Agreement have been amended since the Draft EIR/EIS was issued in June 2007. Although the final provisions of the Water Purchase Agreement are still being negotiated and likely will not be finalized until the agreement is executed, the modifications that have been discussed by the parties involved to date are included in Appendix M2 of the Final EIR/EIS.

5.17 APPENDIX D – MODELING TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

- Page A-18: The sentence in the middle of the last paragraph is revised as follows:

  This step has been taken ~~to~~ so that the Smartville flow requirement controls New Bullards Bar Reservoir operations when appropriate.

- Page A-25: The sentence in the middle of the second paragraph under Section A.4.4, Yuba Accord Alternative is revised as follows:

  In the first 8 years of the agreement (~~2007~~*2008* through December 31, 2015), Reclamation and DWR would purchase 60 TAF per year of Component 1 water, for a total of 480 TAF.

5.18 APPENDIX F1 – SURFACE WATER SUPPLY AND MANAGEMENT MODEL OUTPUT

- Tables F1-3, F1-11, F1-19, F1-27, F1-28, F1-43, and F1-51 of Appendix F1 are revised to read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CEQA YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE CEQA NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Table F1-3. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	CEQA No Project Alternative			CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative			Change (CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative-CEQA No Project Alternative)			Percent Change (CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative-CEQA No Project Alternative)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,508	142	289	1,508	142	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,318	137	289	1,318	137	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,157	128	289	1,155	128	289	-2	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Dry	871	112	284	860	112	284	-11	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	405	83	243	382	83	243	-23	0	0	-6%	0%	0%
All Years	1,093	123	280	1,086	123	280	-7	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CEQA MODIFIED FLOW ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE CEQA NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Table F1-11. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	CEQA No Project Alternative			CEQA Modified Flow Alternative			Change (CEQA Modified Flow Alternative-CEQA No Project Alternative)			Percent Change (CEQA Modified Flow Alternative-CEQA No Project Alternative)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,508	142	289	1,508	142	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,318	137	289	1,318	137	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,157	128	289	1,155	128	289	-2	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Dry	871	112	284	860	112	284	-11	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	405	83	243	382	83	243	-23	0	0	-6%	0%	0%
All Years	1,093	123	280	1,086	123	280	-7	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CEQA YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE CEQA EXISTING CONDITION

Table F1-19. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	CEQA Existing Condition			CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative			Change (CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)			Percent Change (CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,516	142	289	1,508	142	289	-8	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,329	137	289	1,318	137	289	-11	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,165	128	289	1,155	128	289	-10	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Dry	869	112	284	860	112	284	-9	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	389	83	243	382	83	243	-7	0	0	-2%	0%	0%
All Years	1,095	123	280	1,086	123	280	-9	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CEQA MODIFIED FLOW ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE CEQA EXISTING CONDITION

Table F1-27. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	CEQA Existing Condition			CEQA Modified Flow Alternative			Change (CEQA Modified Flow Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)			Percent Change (CEQA Modified Flow Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,516	142	289	1,508	142	289	-8	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,329	137	289	1,318	137	289	-11	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,165	128	289	1,155	128	289	-10	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Dry	869	112	284	860	112	284	-9	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	389	83	243	382	83	243	-7	0	0	-2%	0%	0%
All Years	1,095	123	280	1,086	123	280	-9	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CEQA NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE CEQA EXISTING CONDITION

Table F1-28. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	CEQA Existing Condition			CEQA No Project Alternative			Change (CEQA No Project Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)			Percent Change (CEQA No Project Alternative-CEQA Existing Condition)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,516	142	289	1,508	142	289	-8	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,329	137	289	1,318	137	289	-11	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,165	128	289	1,157	128	289	-8	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Dry	869	112	284	871	112	284	2	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Critical	389	83	243	405	83	243	17	0	0	4%	0%	0%
All Years	1,095	123	280	1,093	123	280	-2	0	0	0%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEPA YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE NEPA NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Table F1-43. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	NEPA No Project Alternative			NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative			Change (NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative-NEPA No Project Alternative)			Percent Change (NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative-NEPA No Project Alternative)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,619	143	289	1,619	143	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,435	140	288	1,435	140	288	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,215	129	289	1,213	129	289	-2	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Dry	924	115	284	912	115	284	-12	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	411	82	239	388	82	239	-23	0	0	-6%	0%	0%
All Years	1,165	124	280	1,158	124	280	-7	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEPA MODIFIED FLOW ALTERNATIVE COMPARED TO THE NEPA NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Table F1-51. CVP South-of-Delta Water Service Contractor and Refuge Deliveries

Year Type	Deliveries (TAF)											
	NEPA No Project Alternative			NEPA Modified Flow Alternative			Change (NEPA Modified Flow Alternative-NEPA No Project Alternative)			Percent Change (NEPA Modified Flow Alternative-NEPA No Project Alternative)		
	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge	Ag	M&I	Refuge
Wet	1,619	143	289	1,619	143	289	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Above Normal	1,435	140	288	1,435	140	288	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Below Normal	1,215	129	289	1,213	129	289	-2	0	0	0%	0%	0%
Dry	924	115	284	912	115	284	-12	0	0	-1%	0%	0%
Critical	411	82	239	388	82	239	-23	0	0	-6%	0%	0%
All Years	1,165	124	280	1,158	124	280	-7	0	0	-1%	0%	0%

5.19 APPENDIX F4 – GATAER MODEL OUTPUT

- Page 1336 (for all comparative modeling scenarios): The headings for columns 2, 3, 6 and 7 in the delta smelt salvage projections model output are revised to indicate *median salvage* for each alternative, not ~~average salvage~~.

5.20 APPENDICES J AND K – ESA COMPLIANCE AND FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT COMPLIANCE

- Because Reclamation would not participate in the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative and because YCWA does not anticipate needing to apply for any incidental-take authorization under CESA for the Yuba Accord Alternative, Appendices J and K are deleted. Any required compliance with the statutes covered by these appendices will be described in subsequent documents prepared by Reclamation or YCWA.