

Addendum to the Final Program Environmental Impact Report

**Implementation of the
Colorado River Quantification
Settlement Agreement**

September 2003

Coachella Valley Water District
Imperial Irrigation District
The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
San Diego County Water Authority

Addendum to the Final Program Environmental Impact Report

**Implementation of the
Colorado River Quantification
Settlement Agreement**

September 2003

Coachella Valley Water District
Imperial Irrigation District
The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
San Diego County Water Authority

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION AND CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND MITIGATION MEASURES | 1-1 |
| 1.1. Introduction | 1-1 |
| 1.2. Contents of the Addendum | 1-2 |
| 1.3. Previous Environmental Documentation | 1-3 |
| 1.4. Document Incorporated by Reference | 1-4 |
| 1.5. Description of the Proposed Project Addressed in the Certified PEIR..... | 1-4 |
| 1.6. Changes to the Proposed Project, New and Refined Mitigation Measures, and Modification of PEIR Table ES-1 | 1-5 |
| 1.7. Effects of Changes to the Proposed Project and Mitigation Strategy 2a | 1-18 |
| 1.8. Summary of Checklist Determinations | 1-20 |
| SECTION 2. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST..... | 2-1 |
| SECTION 3. EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS | 3-1 |
| 3.1. Aesthetics | 3-1 |
| 3.2. Agricultural Resources | 3-2 |
| 3.3. Air Quality | 3-3 |
| 3.4. Biological Resources | 3-4 |
| 3.5. Cultural Resources | 3-7 |
| 3.6. Geology and Soils..... | 3-7 |
| 3.7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... | 3-9 |
| 3.8. Hydrology and Water Quality | 3-11 |
| 3.9. Land Use and Planning | 3-13 |
| 3.10. Mineral Resources | 3-14 |
| 3.11. Noise | 3-14 |
| 3.12. Population and Housing | 3-16 |
| 3.13. Public Services | 3-16 |
| 3.14. Recreation..... | 3-17 |
| 3.15. Transportation and Traffic..... | 3-18 |
| 3.16. Utilities and Service Systems..... | 3-19 |
| 3.17. Mandatory Findings of Significance..... | 3-20 |
| SECTION 4. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE NEW AND REFINED MITIGATION MEASURES | 4-1 |
| SECTION 5. REFERENCES | 5-1 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-------|--|------|
| 1.6-1 | Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes..... | 1-6 |
| 1.6-2 | Comparison of Original and Revised QSA Delivery Schedules | 1-11 |
| 1.7-1 | Comparison of Salton Sea Impacts | 1-20 |
| 1.8-1 | Summary of Checklist Determinations | 1-20 |

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION AND CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Addendum

The purpose of this Addendum is to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with project modifications to the previously certified Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). The QSA (Proposed Project) would implement major components of California's draft Colorado River Water Use Plan (California Plan) and provide part of the mechanism for California to reduce its diversions of Colorado River water to the state's normal year apportionment of 4.4 million acre-feet (MAF). The QSA components would provide a framework for conservation measures and water transfers for a period of up to 75 years. The Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD), Imperial Irrigation District (IID), and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) are signatories to the QSA.

CVWD, IID, MWD, and the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), the QSA participating agencies, entered into an agreement to be co-lead agencies for the preparation of a PEIR. The PEIR was certified by each of the four co-lead agencies in June 2002. Subsequent to the certification of the PEIR, the co-lead agencies entered into negotiations to finalize the terms of the QSA. This Addendum describes the modifications in the QSA subsequent to the certification of the PEIR and establishes that none of the conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR have occurred.

An Addendum to the PEIR was approved by the co-lead agencies in December 2002 (December 2002 Addendum), evaluating changes made to the QSA as of that date. This Addendum carries forward all relevant information from the December 2002 Addendum, and evaluates all modifications made to the QSA between June 2002 and September 2003. The certified PEIR and this Addendum together constitute the CEQA documentation supporting the QSA approval.

To implement the QSA, it will be necessary for the co-lead agencies to execute a number of related agreements in addition to the QSA. These agreements cover administrative or fiscal activities needed to implement the QSA, and have no potential to cause physical environmental impacts beyond those caused by the QSA. Execution of these agreements is included within the scope of the QSA "project" evaluated in the PEIR and this Addendum.

Regulatory Background

According to Section 15164(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "[t]he lead agency or responsible agency must prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 [which calls for the] preparation of a Subsequent EIR have occurred."

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines lists the conditions that would require the preparation of a Subsequent EIR rather than an Addendum. These conditions are as set forth below:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, and shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the proposed proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternative.

After evaluating the environmental impacts associated with the changes to the Proposed Project, the co-lead agencies have concluded that none of the conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR have occurred.

1.2 CONTENTS OF THE ADDENDUM

Section 1 of the Addendum includes a description of previous environmental documentation and events following the PEIR certification, a description of the Proposed Project evaluated in the PEIR, changes to the Proposed Project since certification of the PEIR, new and refined mitigation measures for certain significant impacts at the Salton Sea, a minor modification to PEIR Table ES-1, and a summary of the analysis showing that a Subsequent EIR is not required pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Section 2 is an environmental checklist form evaluating the impacts of the changes to the Proposed Project. This form is based on the model prepared by the Office of Planning and Research and has been modified to reflect the significance criteria used in the PEIR.

Section 3 includes an explanation of each of the answers in the environmental checklist.

Section 4 is a discussion of the effectiveness of the new and refined mitigation measures in reducing or avoiding significant impacts to certain resources of the Salton Sea.

Section 5 is a list of references.

1.3 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION AND EVENTS FOLLOWING THE PEIR CERTIFICATION

Previous Environmental Documentation

While the PEIR was certified as complete by all four co-lead agencies, the QSA has not been approved by any of these agencies. The following environmental documentation was previously prepared for the Proposed Project:

1. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated on June 8, 2000 for a 30-day public review period ending on July 8, 2000.
2. An Initial Study was prepared and circulated concurrently with the NOP.
3. A Notice of Availability of the Draft PEIR was published in a major newspaper serving each of the areas of the co-lead agencies.
4. The Draft PEIR was released on January 30, 2002 and the public review period ended on March 26, 2002.
5. The PEIR was certified by each of the four co-lead agencies in June 2002.
6. The December 2002 Addendum was approved by the four co-lead agencies in December 2002. This Addendum carries forward all relevant information from the December 2002 Addendum.

Events Following the PEIR Certification

On September 9, 2002, IID submitted its water order to the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) for the delivery of 3.1 MAF of Colorado River water during 2003. In December, 2002, Reclamation announced that it had reviewed the water order pursuant to the procedure outlined in 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 417 and rejected IID's water order based upon its interpretation of IID's contract for the delivery of Colorado River water. Reclamation approved the delivery of a lesser amount. IID challenged the decision in the United States District Court and was granted a preliminary injunction against enforcement of the cutback. The Court stayed the case in April 2003 pending a new Part 417 review. Reclamation has been conducting a new Part 417 review, which is ongoing. The parties to the litigation have agreed to settle the litigation and terminate the 2003 Part 417 review on execution of a QSA by all parties that would resolve those issues.

On December 20, 2002, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued Revised Order WRO 2002-0013 approving IID's and SDCWA's "Amended Joint Petition for Approval of a Long-Term Transfer of Conserved Water From IID to SDCWA and to Change the Point of Diversion, Place of Use, and Purpose of Use Under IID's Permit 7642" (SWRCB 2002). The contractual agreements in the QSA and SWRCB Order WRO 2002-0013 provide the QSA participating agencies (CVWD, IID, MWD, and SDCWA) with the ability to conserve and transfer Colorado River water and to provide the environmental mitigation required by the environmental analyses and required by governmental permits.

In September 2003, the California State Legislature passed three bills related to the QSA and Salton Sea restoration, Senate Bill (SB) 277, SB 317, and SB 654. Collectively, these bills provide mechanisms for mitigation of the QSA's impacts on the Salton Sea, assure that implementation of the QSA will be consistent with Salton Sea restoration, and provide significant funding for Salton Sea restoration. Provisions of these bills that change the QSA are reviewed in Section 1.6.

1.4 DOCUMENT INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Consistent with Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the following document was used in the preparation of this Addendum and is incorporated herein by reference:

- *Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Quantification Settlement Agreement*, State Clearinghouse No. 2000061034, Volumes I and II, prepared for the Coachella Valley Water District, the Imperial Irrigation District, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the San Diego County Water Authority.

1.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ADDRESSED IN THE CERTIFIED PEIR

Project Location

The project location includes much of Southern California. The region of influence (ROI) comprises the historic floodplain of the Colorado River below Lake Mead and the areas that receive Colorado River water: the IID, CVWD, and MWD service areas, including the SDCWA service area. The service areas include all or part of Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial counties. The ROI also includes the lower Colorado River mainstem and the areas of conveyance and distribution of Colorado River water by these agencies.

Proposed Project

The Proposed Project involves a series of water transfers, water exchanges, water conservation measures, and other changes identified in the QSA. The QSA is a proposed agreement among CVWD, IID and MWD to budget their portion of California's apportionment of Colorado River water among themselves and to make water conserved in the IID service area and by lining the Coachella and All American canals available to CVWD, MWD, SDCWA, and others. Implementation of the QSA would not affect the diversion, distribution, and/or use of Colorado River water except within California. Within California, the QSA would only affect the diversion, distribution, and/or use of Colorado River water by the participating agencies. The

QSA would not affect the diversion, distribution, and/or use of Colorado River water by other agencies within California that hold rights to Colorado River water.

The QSA quantifies, by agreement, the amount of Colorado River water available to each of the participating agencies and calls for specific changes in the distribution of that water among the agencies for the quantification period. The quantification period extends for up to 75 years, although the QSA anticipates a transition period of approximately 25 years for the full implementation of water conservation/transfers and exchange projects. Many of the water conservation and transfer components of the QSA would be implemented incrementally over a period of several years.

1.6 CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, NEW AND REFINED MITIGATION MEASURES, AND MODIFICATION OF PEIR TABLE ES-1

Changes to the Proposed Project since Certification of the PEIR

Proposed Project changes between June 2002 and September 2003 are described below. Changes have occurred as the result of various negotiations that have included members of the California Assembly, parties representing California Department of Water Resources (DWR), California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), the United States Department of the Interior, and the four co-lead agencies. The description of each key change below is followed by an italicized discussion of why it does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Table 1.6-1, a revised version of PEIR Table 2.4-1, summarizes all changes to the Proposed Project negotiated between June 2002 and September 2003, including changes making the QSA consistent with SB 277, SB 317, and SB 654.

- A change in the water delivery (“ramp-up”) schedule would occur for the transfer of water from IID to SDCWA and from IID to CVWD. Table 1.6-2 summarizes these changes in ramp-up schedule by calendar year. This ramp-up schedule is provided for illustrative purposes. Minor adjustments may be made over the term of the QSA implementation. In general, under the revised ramp-up schedule there is a decrease in the transfer of water to SDCWA during the first 18 years and a slight increase in years 19 and 20. IID can make additional water deliveries available to SDCWA during the ramp-up period. There is a total decrease of 90 thousand acre-feet (KAF) in the water delivery to CVWD for the first 15 years and an equivalent increase through year 45. IID has the discretion to pick the conservation methods and water schedules consistent with state and federal law and the QSA and related agreements.

***QSA CEQA Determination.** This change in the delivery schedule does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because the overall amount of water transferred and related impacts would be less than described in the PEIR. Additionally, IID’s use of the same types of water conservation methods (e.g., on-farm conservation measures, delivery system improvements, and fallowing) that are currently contemplated were fully analyzed in the PEIR. Minor adjustments may be made to the ramp-up schedule provided in Table 1.6-2; however, no significant deviations are anticipated that would result in effects significantly different from those that were analyzed and presented in the PEIR and this Addendum.*

Table 1.6-1. Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes¹

| <i>Original QSA Component Terms as Analyzed in the Draft and Final Program EIR</i> | <i>QSA Revisions Between June 2002 and September 2003</i> |
|--|---|
| <p>A. Priority 3a Colorado River water capped at 3.1 MAFY</p> <p>IID consensually limits its consumptive use of Priority 3a water to a specified amount of 3.1 MAFY, subject to adjustment as provided in the QSA and the IOP.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |
| <p>B. QSA Changes to IID/MWD 1988 Agreement, IID/MWD/PVID/CVWD 1989 Approval Agreement, and MWD/CVWD 1989 Agreement to Supplement Approval Agreement</p> <p>MWD would forego, and would not be charged with, the use of 20 KAFY of IID conserved water. CVWD would be allowed the use of this 20 KAFY under terms of the 1989 IID/MWD/PVID/CVWD Approval Agreement, and MWD/CVWD Supplemental Agreement, as amended.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |
| <p>C. IID/SDCWA Transfer of conserved water (up to 200 KAFY)</p> <p>An amount of water equivalent to the amount of water conserved in IID service area would be transferred to SDCWA. At SDCWA’s election, the water would be delivered to Lake Havasu.</p> <p>Under the QSA, IID would transfer from 130 to 200 KAFY to SDCWA. The transfer would be expected to begin in 2002, and would increase by 20 KAF yearly until full implementation under the QSA between 2008 and 2011 (i.e., 130 and 200 KAF transferred to SDCWA). In addition, with implementation of the QSA, IID would conserve and transfer water to SDCWA in the following years and amounts: 2.5 KAF in 2005; 5 KAF in 2006; and 2.5 KAF in 2007 (termed “Early Water”).</p> <p>Water conservation measures within the IID service area include the following: On-farm conservation measures, water delivery system improvements, and fallowing. Under terms of the IID/SDCWA Conservation and Transfer Agreement, the first 130 KAFY of conserved water would come from on-farm conservation</p> | <p>Under the revised terms of the QSA, IID would conserve and transfer 200 KAFY to SDCWA. The transfer would start in 2003 or 2004 and would ramp up in the following years and amounts: 10 KAF in 2003; 20 KAF in 2004; 30 KAF in 2005; 40 KAF in 2006; 50 KAF in both 2007 and 2008; 60 KAF in 2009; 70 KAF in 2010; 80 KAF in 2011; 90 KAF in 2012; 100 KAF in each of year from 2013 to 2017; 130 KAF in 2018; 160 KAF in 2019; 190 KAF in 2020; and 200 KAF for each year thereafter. IID would deliver a minimum of 1 MAF to SDCWA from 2003 to 2017 as identified in the above ramp-up schedule. In addition, IID can make additional water available to SDCWA in amounts greater than ramp-up schedule, although not to exceed 200 KAFY. SDCWA would have the right, although not the obligation, to purchase water that IID makes available in amounts greater than the ramp-up schedule.</p> <p>Through year 15 IID would have the discretion to pick the conservation method that assures the achievement of Salton Sea salinity goals and water conservation and delivery schedules consistent with state and federal laws along with</p> |

Table 1.6-1. Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes¹

| <i>Original QSA Component Terms as Analyzed in the Draft and Final Program EIR</i> | <i>QSA Revisions Between June 2002 and September 2003</i> |
|---|---|
| <p>measures (not including fallowing). Conservation of the remaining 170 KAFY could come from water delivery system improvements and/or fallowing (for a total of 300 KAF conserved within the IID service area).</p> | <p>the QSA and related agreements.</p> <p>The initial term of the IID/SDCWA Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement would be 45 years with a renewal term of 30 years, for a total of up to 75 years. "Early water" transfer would be postponed until 2020.</p> <p>In addition, if SDCWA elects to pursue the East Mesa well field for Salton Sea mitigation, then IID would increase its annual deliveries to SDCWA to permit reductions in fallowing.</p> |
| <p>D. MWD/SDCWA Exchange of conserved water (up to 200 KAFY)</p> <p>SDCWA would exchange water conserved by IID under the IID/SDCWA Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement with MWD; MWD would divert that water at Lake Havasu; MWD would deliver an equivalent amount of water to SDCWA at the SDCWA/MWD delivery point in San Diego County.</p> | <p>In addition to the exchange of water conserved by IID under the IID/SDCWA Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement, SDCWA may exchange other Colorado River water it acquires through agreement with MWD for water from the PVID Land Management, Crop Rotation, and Water Supply Program, and the All American and Coachella Canal lining projects.</p> |
| <p>E. IID/CVWD/MWD Transfer of conserved water (up to 100 KAFY, also known as the First and Second 50 KAFY)</p> <p><i>First 50 KAFY</i></p> <p>An amount of water equivalent to the amount of water conserved in the IID service area, which CVWD elects to acquire, would be made available at Imperial Dam. Any amount not acquired by CVWD may be acquired by MWD, and could be diverted at Lake Havasu. Transfers of water under the First 50 KAFY would be expected to begin in 2007 and would increase by 5 KAF per year until the full 50 KAFY is achieved (2016).</p> <p><i>Second 50 KAFY</i></p> <p>An amount of water equivalent to the amount of water conserved in the IID service area, which CVWD elects to acquire, would be made available at Imperial Dam. Any amount not acquired by CVWD may be acquired by MWD, and could be diverted at Lake Havasu. After Year 45, MWD would bear the obligation to provide the Second 50 KAFY to CVWD.</p> | <p><i>First and Second 50 KAFY</i></p> <p>Under the revised terms of the QSA, First 50 KAFY transfer of conserved water would begin in 2008 and would ramp-up based on the following schedule: 4 KAF in 2008; 8 KAF in 2009; 12 KAF in 2010; 16 KAF in 2011; 21 KAF in 2012; 26 KAF in 2013; 31 KAF in 2014; 36 KAF in 2015; 41 KAF in 2016; 45 KAF in 2017; and 63 KAFY in 2018. Starting in 2019 the transfer amount would ramp-up at approximately 5 KAFY, until the annual amount conserved and transferred is 103 KAF (occurs in approximately 2026). This 103 KAFY would be conserved within the IID service area and transferred to CVWD and/or MWD (in the event that CVWD elects not to acquire all or a portion of this water) through 2047. Under the First 50 KAFY and after Year 45 of the QSA (calendar year 2047), IID would continue to conserve and transfer 50 KAFY for the remainder of the QSA term (2077). MWD's obligation to provide the Second 50 KAF after 2047 (Year 45 of the QSA) would not change.</p> |

Table 1.6-1. Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes¹

| <i>Original QSA Component Terms as Analyzed in the Draft and Final Program EIR</i> | <i>QSA Revisions Between June 2002 and September 2003</i> |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Early Water</i></p> <p>MWD would receive an option to acquire water conserved by IID in the following years and amounts: 2.5 KAF in 2005; 5 KAF in 2006; and 2.5 KAF in 2007. In the event that CVWD postpones the acquisition of the First 50 KAFY to a year later than 2007, MWD could also receive an additional 5 KAF in 2006; 7.5 KAF in 2007; and 10 KAF in each year from 2007 to 2014.</p> | <p><i>Early Water</i></p> <p>The early water transfer to SDCWA would be postponed until 2020. In addition, MWD would no longer receive an option to acquire the 2.5 KAF, 5 KAF, and 2.5 KAF of early water in 2005, 2006, and 2007, respectively.</p> <p>In the event that CVWD postpones the start of the acquisition of the First 50 KAFY to a year later than 2007, the water not taken by CVWD could go to MWD instead.</p> |
| <p>F. Transfer of conserved water (67.7 KAFY)</p> <p>An amount of water equivalent to the amount of water conserved by lining a section of the All American Canal would be diverted by MWD and/or IID (56.2 KAFY), and the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Parties (11.5 KAFY) via MWD and SDCWA facilities.</p> | <p>SDCWA may receive MWD's rights to conserved water from the lining of the All American and Coachella Canal lining projects.</p> |
| <p>G. Priority 6a Colorado River priorities and volume allocations</p> <p>Diversion of Priority 6a water in the following priorities and volumes: 38 KAFY to MWD, 63 KAFY to IID and 119 KAFY to CVWD, when available.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |
| <p>H. Priority 3a Colorado River water capped at 330 KAFY</p> <p>CVWD consensually limits its consumptive use of Priority 3a water to a specified amount of 330 KAFY, subject to adjustment as provided in the QSA and the IOP. Water conserved and transferred to CVWD under the QSA shall not count against CVWD's Priority 3a cap.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |
| <p>I. Transfer of conserved water (26 KAFY)</p> <p>An amount of water equivalent to the amount of water conserved by lining a portion of the Coachella Canal would be diverted by MWD, and/or IID (21.5 KAFY), and the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Parties (4.5 KAFY) via MWD and SDCWA facilities.</p> | <p>SDCWA may receive MWD's rights to conserved water from the All American and Coachella Canal lining projects.</p> |

Table 1.6-1. Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes¹

| <i>Original QSA Component Terms as Analyzed in the Draft and Final Program EIR</i> | <i>QSA Revisions Between June 2002 and September 2003</i> |
|---|---|
| <p>J. Transfer of water (35 KAFY) MWD would transfer 35 KAFY of its SWP entitlement to CVWD. CVWD would deliver 35 KAFY of its SWP entitlement to MWD at the Devil Canyon Afterbay; in exchange, MWD would forgo the use of 35 KAFY of Colorado River water for use by CVWD.</p> | No change. |
| <p>K. MWD Priority 4 and 5 Colorado River water cap MWD consensually limits its consumptive use of Priority 4 and 5 water to a specified amount of 550 KAFY and 662 KAFY, respectively, pursuant to the conditions as specified in the QSA, and subject to adjustment as provided by the IOP.</p> | No change. |
| <p>L. Over and Under Run of Priorities 1, 2 and 3b MWD shall be responsible, when necessary, in conjunction with the IOP for repayment of any overrun as a result of the aggregate use by Priorities 1, 2 and 3b in excess of 420 KAFY; to the extent that Priorities 1, 2 and 3b use less than 420 KAFY, MWD shall have the exclusive right to consumptively use such unused water.</p> | No change. |
| <p>M. Use by Miscellaneous PPRs and Federal Reserved Rights, including certain Indian Reservations Water forborne, when necessary, by CVWD and IID in the amount of 3 and 11.5 KAFY respectively, and water forborne by MWD in the aggregate amount in excess of 14.5 KAFY necessary to satisfy Miscellaneous PPRs and Federal Reserve Rights, including Indian Reservations.</p> | No change. |
| <p>N. QSA Shortage Sharing Agreement If there is less than 3.85 MAF of Colorado River water available under Priorities 1, 2, and 3 in any one year during the quantification period, shortages would be shared pursuant to the particular provisions of the Acquisition Agreements² and the Allocation Agreement³.</p> | No change. |

Table 1.6-1. Comparison of QSA Terms Identified in the PEIR and Proposed Changes¹

| <i>Original QSA Component Terms as Analyzed in the Draft and Final Program EIR</i> | <i>QSA Revisions Between June 2002 and September 2003</i> |
|---|---|
| <p>O. Socioeconomic Impacts of the IID/SDCWA Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement No significant impacts were identified.</p> | <p>A local entity would be established by IID to administer the receipt and disbursement of socioeconomic impact payments made by SDCWA and IID. SDCWA and IID would participate and provide support to the local entity.</p> |
| <p><i>Key:</i> MAFY = million acre-feet per year; KAFY = thousand acre-feet per year; PPR = Present Perfected Right; SWP = State Water Project</p> <p>(1) Transfers under the QSA may begin in calendar year 2003 or 2004. The amounts shown above would shift by one year if the transfers were initiated in 2004. All QSA components would terminate prior to, or at the end of the quantification period pursuant to the terms and conditions of the QSA, with the exception of the water transferred to the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Parties.</p> <p>(2) The Acquisition Agreements are collectively the IID/SDWCA Water Conservation and Transfer Agreement, the CVWD/MWD Acquisition Agreement, the IID/MWD Acquisition Agreement, the IID/CVWD Acquisition Agreement, and the MWD/CVWD SWP Transfer and Exchange Agreement.</p> <p>(3) The Allocation Agreement is a proposed agreement among the City of Escondido, Palo Verde Irrigation District, SDCWA, San Luis Rey River Indian Water Authority, Vista Irrigation District, the La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Rincon and San Pasqual bands of Mission Indians, MWD, CVWD, and IID, and the Secretary concerning the allocation of conserved water created by the All American and Coachella Canal lining projects.</p> | |

Section 1. Introduction and Proposed Project Changes

Table 1.6-2. Comparison of Original and Revised QSA Delivery Schedules

| Agreement Yr | Calendar Yr | IID/SDCWA Transfer (KAF) | | | IID/CVWD Transfer (KAF) ¹ | | | IID/MWD Transfer (KAF) | | | Total Delivery (KAF) | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------------------|----------|------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference | Original | Revised | Difference |
| 1 | 2003 ² | 20 | 10 | -10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | -10 |
| 2 | 2004 | 40 | 20 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 20 | -20 |
| 3 | 2005 | 62.5 | 30 | -32.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | -2.5 | 65 | 30 | -35 |
| 4 | 2006 | 85 | 40 | -45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | -5 | 90 | 40 | -50 |
| 5 | 2007 | 102.5 | 50 | -52.5 | 5 | 0 | -5 | 2.5 | 0 | -2.5 | 110 | 50 | -60 |
| 6 | 2008 | 120 | 50 | -70 | 10 | 4 | -6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 54 | -76 |
| 7 | 2009 | 140 | 60 | -80 | 15 | 8 | -7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 68 | -87 |
| 8 | 2010 | 160 | 70 | -90 | 20 | 12 | -8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 82 | -98 |
| 9 | 2011 | 180 | 80 | -100 | 25 | 16 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 96 | -109 |
| 10 | 2012 | 200 | 90 | -110 | 30 | 21 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 111 | -110 |
| 11 | 2013 | 200 | 100 | -100 | 35 | 26 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 126 | -109 |
| 12 | 2014 | 200 | 100 | -100 | 40 | 31 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 131 | -109 |
| 13 | 2015 | 200 | 100 | -100 | 45 | 36 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 | 136 | -109 |
| 14 | 2016 | 200 | 100 | -100 | 50 | 41 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 141 | -109 |
| 15 | 2017 | 200 | 100 | -100 | 55 | 45 | -10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 145 | -110 |
| 16 | 2018 | 200 | 130 | -70 | 60 | 63 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 193 | -67 |
| 17 | 2019 | 200 | 160 | -40 | 65 | 68 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 | 228 | -37 |
| 18 | 2020 | 200 | 192.5 | -7.5 | 70 | 73 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | 268 | -2 |
| 19 | 2021 | 200 | 205 | 5 | 75 | 78 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 288 | 13 |
| 20 | 2022 | 200 | 202.5 | 2.5 | 80 | 83 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 288 | 8 |
| 21 | 2023 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 85 | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 288 | 3 |
| 22 | 2024 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 90 | 93 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 293 | 3 |
| 23 | 2025 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 95 | 98 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295 | 298 | 3 |
| 24-44 | 2026-2046 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 100 | 103 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 303 | 3 |
| 45 | 2047 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 50 | 103 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 303 | 53 |
| 46-75 | 2048-2077 | 200 | 200 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| Total | | 14,110 | 12,890 | -1,220 | 4,650 | 4,650 | 0 | 10 | 0 | -10 | 18,770 | 17,550 | -1,220 |
| <p>Note: This ramp-up schedule is provided for illustrative purposes, and minor adjustments may be made to the schedule over the term of the QSA implementation. However, no substantial deviations from the ramp-up schedule that would result in environmental effects substantially different than those analyzed in the PIER are anticipated.</p> <p>1. Or MWD if CVWD declines to acquire.</p> <p>2. Transfers under the QSA may begin in calendar year 2003 or 2004. If transfers were to begin in 2004, the 75-year implementation period would end in 2078.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- The initial term of the IID/SDCWA Agreement would start in the year 2003 or 2004 instead of 2002.

***QSA CEQA Determination.** Delaying the start date of this 75-year agreement by one to two years does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because overall impacts would be as described in the PEIR.*

- SDCWA may elect to pursue at no cost to IID the East Mesa Well Field as an alternative “make-up” water source for Salton Sea impact mitigation. If it does, IID would increase its annual deliveries to SDCWA to permit reductions in fallowing.

***QSA CEQA Determination.** Use of groundwater in the East Mesa area as an alternative mitigation measure to provide water to the Salton Sea does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because its feasibility has not been determined, and cannot be determined at this time; hence, it is speculative and not proposed as a mitigation measure for QSA impacts. If this mitigation measure is eventually determined to be feasible and is considered for implementation by the co-lead agencies, subsequent environmental analysis would be required prior to its implementation.*

- “Early” water transfers to SDCWA would be postponed until 2020. Early water transfers to MWD would be deleted.

***QSA CEQA Determination.** Postponing the “early” water transfers to SDCWA until 2020 and eliminating the early water transfers to MWD does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because this amount of water is small in comparison with the overall amounts transferred, and because the overall volumes that were analyzed in the PEIR would not change.*

- **State Legislation**

In September 2003, the California Legislature approved three related bills (SB 317, SB 277 and SB 654) that facilitate implementation of the QSA, as well as restoration of the Salton Sea. SB 317 amends Fish & Game Code Section 2081.7 to permit DFG to authorize the take of certain species within the Imperial Valley and in and around the Salton Sea, as a result of aspects of the Proposed Project, subject to certain conditions. These conditions include IID’s provision of two 800 KAF increments of conserved water (a total of 1.6 MAF), as described in Section 2081.7(c)(1) and (2). The relationship between these two transfers and the environmental analysis set forth in this Addendum is discussed below.

Mitigation Increment

One increment of up to 800 KAF, described in Section 2081.7(c)(2) and referred to as the “Mitigation Increment,” must be provided by IID during the first 15 years of the QSA term. The contractual agreements included as part of the QSA provide for the conservation of the Mitigation Increment by IID and the delivery of the Mitigation Increment to the Salton Sea consistent with Mitigation Strategy 2a (refer to page 1-15 for a description of Mitigation Strategy 2a). This Addendum, through evaluation of Mitigation Strategy 2a, demonstrates that implementation of Section 2081.7(c)(2) in this

manner will not have any effect on the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project or the mitigation of those impacts.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because the Mitigation Increment merely provides a mechanism to implement the water conservation measures and subsequent delivery of that water to the Salton Sea for the purposes of mitigating impacts of the proposed transfers that were envisioned in Mitigation Strategy 2 (included in the PEIR) and its subsequent revision, Mitigation Strategy 2a. The Mitigation Increment would be conserved in a manner consistent with the conservation methods envisioned in both Mitigation Strategy 2 and Mitigation Strategy 2a. The amount of water conserved would be consistent with the amount identified in the PEIR, and conservation measures would consist of those identified in the PEIR, which include on-farm irrigation system improvements, water delivery system improvements, and/or fallowing, or any combination of these methods.*

SB 277, enacted concurrently with SB 317, establishes the Salton Sea Restoration Act (Act). The Salton Sea Restoration Act states the Legislature's intent that the State of California undertake the restoration of the Salton Sea ecosystem and the permanent protection of the wildlife dependent on that ecosystem. The Act establishes the Salton Sea Restoration Fund, administered by the Director of Fish & Game. The Act provides that Salton Sea restoration will be based on a preferred alternative to be developed as a result of a restoration study and alternative selection process described in Fish & Game Code Section 2081.7, as amended by SB 317.

It is anticipated that use of the Mitigation Increment to be provided by IID may be modified by DWR at some point during the first 15 years of the Proposed Project, based upon the needs of the approved Salton Sea restoration plan. Since a restoration plan has not been identified, assessed or approved, however, the use or transfer of the Mitigation Increment in any manner inconsistent with Mitigation Strategy 2a is speculative and cannot feasibly be assessed for environmental impacts at this time.

In order for DWR to change the use of the Mitigation Increment at any time during the 15-year period during which it is committed to the Salton Sea pursuant to Mitigation Strategy 2a: (1) the Secretary of Resources, in conjunction with DFG, DWR, the appropriate air quality districts, and the Salton Sea Authority and its advisory committee, first must have completed a restoration study to determine a preferred alternative for Salton Sea restoration along with the accompanying programmatic environmental documents; (2) the Secretary of Resources also must have found that the transfer of the Mitigation Increment is consistent with the preferred alternative for Salton Sea restoration; and, (3) DWR must relieve the QSA participating agencies from, or assume, the QSA participating agencies' obligations to implement Mitigation Strategy 2a and other mitigation measures and permit conditions related to the Proposed Project that are facilitated by the delivery of the Mitigation Increment to the Salton Sea, including assuming responsibility for all environmental impacts, including Salton Sea salinity, that are related to the use or transfer of the Mitigation Increment.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because the use of the Mitigation Increment in any manner inconsistent with*

Mitigation Strategy 2a is speculative. Subsequent environmental analysis under the direction of the Secretary of Resources would be required in order to change the use of this water. Additionally, the Salton Sea restoration is not part of the QSA; rather the QSA will make available water and funding, under specified conditions, for Salton Sea restoration activities. Specific restoration activities are speculative at this time and will require future environmental analysis under the direction of the Secretary of Resources.

Restoration Increment

The second 800 KAF increment, described in Fish & Game Code Section 2081.7(c)(1) and described herein as the “Restoration Increment,” must be transferred by IID to DWR, on a mutually agreed schedule, in exchange for \$175/per acre-feet, as adjusted annually for inflation. IID is required to commit to transfer the Restoration Increment as part of the contractual agreements included in the QSA, in order to satisfy the transfer requirement set forth in Section 2081.7(c)(1). To acquire the Restoration Increment, DWR must first assume the responsibility for all environmental impacts, including Salton Sea salinity, related to use or transfer of the Restoration Increment, and the responsibility for performance of all mitigation measures required under the environmental analysis and the related permits and approvals.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because the Salton Sea restoration is not part of the QSA; rather the QSA will make available water and funding, under specified conditions, for Salton Sea activities. Specific restoration activities are speculative at this time and will require future environmental analysis by the Secretary of Resources. Since the Salton Sea restoration plan has not been identified, assessed or approved, the environmental effects of the conservation, transfer and use of the Restoration Increment are speculative and cannot feasibly be assessed at this time. An assessment of the conservation, transfer and use of the Restoration Increment is not included in the PEIR, or this Addendum. As discussed above, the conservation, transfer and use of this water would require future environmental analysis by the Secretary of Resources.*

- Under the revised QSA, SDCWA may receive MWD rights to conserved water from the All American and Coachella Canal lining projects.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because (1) this provision would not change the amount of water conserved and transferred to MWD’s point of diversion in Lake Havasu as a result of the QSA, and (2) the water would replace water that MWD would have otherwise delivered to SDCWA (i.e., this water would replace water that SDCWA would otherwise order from MWD, but the overall amount of Colorado River water and MWD water used in the SDCWA service area would remain the same).*

- A total of up to 145 KAF of water conserved by IID may be transferred to urban agencies in 2006, 2009 or 2012 to meet benchmarks established in the Department of Interior’s Interim Surplus Guidelines.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because this amount of water is small in comparison with the overall amounts*

transferred, and would represent only a minor addition to the amount of water conserved and transferred under the QSA. Additionally, this change will not result in any new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The amount of water conserved would be similar to the amount identified in the PEIR. Conservation measures would consist of those identified in the PEIR, which include on-farm irrigation system improvements, water delivery system improvements, and/or fallowing, or any combination of these methods.

- A local entity would be established by IID to administer the receipt and disbursement of socioeconomic impact payments made by SDCWA and IID.

QSA CEQA Determination. *Creation of a local administrative entity does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA. It would cause no environmental impacts and would facilitate the receipt and disbursement of socioeconomic impact payments made by SDCWA and IID.*

- MWD may make up to 390 KAF available to SDCWA over the first 15 years of the Proposed Project from the Palo Verde Irrigation District (PVID) Land Management, Crop Rotation, and Water Supply Program.

QSA CEQA Determination. *This change does not trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR for the QSA because the PVID program is an approved project that was the subject of a separate EIR prepared and certified by PVID (PVID 2002). Water from this independently approved project is available to MWD and would be exchanged under the 1998 MWD/SDCWA Exchange Agreement. The PVID program is not part of the QSA and does not constitute a change to the QSA. Additionally, the PVID program does not change impacts associated with the QSA.*

New and Refined Mitigation Measures

This section discusses the refinement of a mitigation measure described in the PEIR and new mitigation measures that were added after the PEIR was certified. These changes are presented and evaluated in this Addendum for purposes of public disclosure. The mitigation measures described in the PEIR have not yet been made part of the Proposed Project; final mitigation measures will be adopted as part of the project only when the CEQA findings on significant impacts are made. Therefore, changes to unadopted mitigation measures would not require a Subsequent EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Even if the changes to mitigation measures were evaluated as Proposed Project changes, none of them would constitute substantial project changes, substantial changes in circumstances, or new information of substantial importance triggering the preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

Refinement of Mitigation Strategy 2

After the PEIR was certified, consultations between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), DFG, and the co-lead agencies resulted in the refinement of a mitigation strategy to reduce impacts to the biological resources of the Salton Sea that are a result of the reduction in flow to the Salton Sea from water conservation activities. One method of mitigating these impacts is to conserve more water than is necessary

to transfer to SDCWA and deliver the additional conserved water to the Salton Sea to maintain water surface elevation and salinity. This was identified as Mitigation Strategy 2 in the PEIR; under the refined mitigation measure (Mitigation Strategy 2a), for the first 15 years of the Proposed Project, additional water would be made available to the Salton Sea in an amount equal to that which would have flowed to the Sea absent the proposed conservation and transfer of water to SDCWA.

Under Mitigation Strategy 2a, water conserved by fallowing would generally require one-half unit of make-up water for each unit of water exported. Should water be conserved by on-farm conservation or other efficiency improvements, make-up water would be equal to the amount of water conserved. Water delivered to CVWD would be conserved by on-farm or other efficiency measures. Since the water conserved and transferred to CVWD is not being exported out of the Salton Sea watershed, no make-up water would be provided. One-third of the water conserved by IID and transported to the CVWD service area would be expected to drain to the Salton Sea following use in the CVWD service area. Overall, the combined conservation and transfer actions during the first 15 years of the Proposed Project would cumulatively reduce the inflow to the Salton Sea by approximately 0.8 percent¹.

DFG has reviewed implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a for its impact on Salton Sea salinity and reclamation and has prepared draft findings (DFG 2002) concluding that implementation of the QSA and the proposed mitigation during the first 15 years of the agreement:

1. will not result in a material increase in projected salinity levels at the Salton Sea;
2. will not foreclose alternatives for reclamation of the Salton Sea as summarized in Section 101(b)(1)(A) of the Salton Sea Reclamation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-372).

Additional Mitigation Measure for Biological Resources

The PEIR identified a significant impact to the brown pelican as an indirect impact from the reduction in inflow to the Salton Sea. After the PEIR was certified, a new mitigation was added to further reduce this significant impact.

- Roosting sites for the brown pelican will be constructed in the South San Diego Bay area and in the Outer Harbor of the City of Santa Barbara. The roost sites are to be functioning by 2018 and will be demonstrated to support at least 100 pelicans each and up to 1,200 in combination. The roost sites will be maintained through 2048.

This is a long-term measure that will help maintain the brown pelican populations in Southern California and will replace habitat lost at the Salton Sea due to increased salinity and the resultant loss of food source. This measure will provide long-term mitigation for this species

¹ It should be noted that in December 2002, the USFWS issued a Biological Opinion on the Bureau of Reclamation's Voluntary Biological Conservation Measures and Associated Conservation Agreements with the California Water Agencies and the Imperial Irrigation District's Water Conservation and Transfer to San Diego County Water Authority (Biological Opinion). The Biological Opinion concludes that the implementation of the QSA, including the changes to the Proposed Project, in combination with the proposed conservation (mitigation measures) will not jeopardize the existence of the listed species in and around the Salton Sea.

even after the salinity of the Salton Sea reaches levels when food sources for the species are substantially reduced.

Additional Mitigation Measures for Air Quality

The PEIR (section 3.7.2) identified a significant air quality impact resulting from fugitive dust emissions at the Salton Sea resulting from the decline in surface water elevation. The PEIR noted that “as the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project becomes more defined, additional mitigation measures to address air quality impacts may be identified.” Such measures were identified in the EIR/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project and have been added as mitigation measures. These measures would be implemented as needed. These measures are intended to provide a process to reduce any potential dust emissions due to the exposure of sea bottom. The four-step mitigation plan includes the following measures:

1. **Restrict Access.** Public access, especially off-highway vehicle access, will be limited, to the extent legally and practicably feasible, to minimize disturbance of natural crusts and soils surfaces in future exposed shoreline areas.
2. **Research and Monitoring.** A research and monitoring program will be implemented incrementally as the Salton Sea recedes. The research phase will focus on developing information to help define the potential for problems to occur in the future as the Salton Sea elevation decreases slowly over time. Historical information regarding dust emissions from exposed shorelines will be studied, the amount and ownership of land potentially exposed will be identified, sampling and monitoring will be conducted to determine the extent and toxicity potential of any airborne pollutants, and available information will be analyzed to predict the response of the sea salt crust to rainfall, humidity, temperature and wind. If it is determined that emissions contain selenium or arsenic, a health risk assessment will be prepared.
3. **Create or Purchase Offsetting Emission Reduction Credits.** This step will require negotiations with the local air pollution control districts to develop a long-term program for creating or purchasing particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) emission reduction credits. Credits will be used to offset emissions caused by the Proposed Project, as determined by monitoring (see measure 2 above). This step will not be used to mitigate toxic air contaminants (if any); Step 4 will be necessary if toxic air contaminants pose a significant health issue.
4. **Direct Emission Reductions at the Sea.** If sufficient offsetting emission reduction credits are not available or feasible, this mitigation plan will implement dust control measures, including, but not limited to, application of water to the Salton Sea shoreline to reduce particulate emissions, if feasible. If, at any time during the project term, feasible dust mitigation measures are identified, these could be implemented in lieu of other dust mitigation measures or the provision of mitigation water to the Sea.

Modification of PEIR Table ES-1

The residual impact was inadvertently omitted under the discussion of air quality impacts at the Salton Sea in Table ES-1 of the PEIR (page ES-47). The impact is stated as follows:

Although the new shoreline created by reduced inflows to the Salton Sea would only marginally increase the total land area within the ROI that presently generates fugitive dust, emissions from these areas would be significant due to the PM₁₀ nonattainment status of the region.

The residual impact is correctly stated on page 3.7-15 of the PEIR and this discussion is hereby incorporated in Table ES-1. The omitted wording is: "The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2 would reduce the impact from increased fugitive dust emissions at the Salton Sea to a less-than-significant level. If this strategy were not adopted as mitigation for biological impacts, increased fugitive dust emissions would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact." The conclusions of the PEIR have not changed.

1.7 EFFECTS OF CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND MITIGATION STRATEGY 2A

The changes to the Proposed Project are either changes to the timing of conservation and transfer (delivery), the amount of water transferred, or other administrative changes. No new construction would be required to accommodate these changes beyond that considered in the PEIR. This section compares the hydrologic changes to the water service areas of the co-lead agencies, the Colorado River, and the Salton Sea resulting from the Proposed Project and changes to the Proposed Project. It also compares the changes to the Salton Sea resulting from the implementation of Mitigation Strategies 2 and 2a. The additional mitigation measures for air quality and biological resources would not affect hydrologic resources and are not addressed here.

Changes to the Proposed Project

Water Service Areas

CVWD. Water conserved in the IID service area would be transferred to the CVWD service area in accordance with the new delivery schedule. This new schedule would result in a slower delivery (less water per year) for the first 15 years and slightly more water per year in each of implementation years 16 through 45. Approximately 90 KAF less would be delivered the first 15 years than under the Proposed Project evaluated in the PEIR; 90 KAF more would be delivered from years 16 to 45. Ultimately, the same total amount of water would be delivered to the CVWD service area as would have occurred under the Proposed Project evaluated in the PEIR.

IID. Water would be conserved within the IID service area and transferred to other service areas in accordance with the new delivery schedule. This new schedule would result in a slower rate (less water per year) of conservation and transfer than the maximum rate evaluated in the PEIR. Water quality in the IID drains and New and Alamo rivers during the first 15 years of implementation would be better than described in the PEIR since less water would be

transferred, resulting in a slower increase in the concentration of selenium and other dissolved solids. Total conservation and transfer rates would be slightly higher (3 to 13 thousand acre-feet per year [KAFY]) in implementation years 19 through 45. Conservation and transfer rates would be the same as evaluated in the PEIR from implementation years 46 through 75. Up to 1,220 KAF less water would be transferred from the IID service area compared to the maximum amount evaluated in the PEIR.

MWD. Changes to the Proposed Project would result in less water available for potential transfer to MWD. From 2003 through 2017, MWD would not have the option to receive any of the First 50 KAFY conserved water available to CVWD. For the remainder of the Proposed Project duration, MWD would have the option to obtain up to 90 KAF of additional conserved water if CVWD opted not to take all of the water available to CVWD under the revised ramp-up schedule.

SDCWA. Water conserved within the IID service area would be transferred to the SDCWA service area in accordance with the new delivery schedule. This new schedule would result in a slower ramp-up of deliveries (less water per year) for the first 18 years, slightly more water in implementation years 19 and 20, and the same amount of water per year in each of implementation years 21 through 45. The net effect would be a decrease of up to 1,220 KAF in water transferred to the SDCWA for use in their service area compared to the maximum amount evaluated in the PEIR.

Colorado River

Changes in the amount of water flowing down the Colorado River from implementation of the QSA are a result of the change in point of diversion from Imperial Dam to Parker Dam that would occur as a result of water transfers to SDCWA or MWD. Over the term of the Proposed Project, flow amounts (and median water surface and groundwater elevations) would be slightly greater than described in the PEIR since less water would be conserved within the IID service area and transferred to SDCWA than originally identified; i.e., more water would remain in the Colorado River for delivery to the IID service area. Overall, the amount of water conserved and transferred over the 75-year implementation period would be up to 1,220 KAF less than the total amount evaluated in the PEIR. Increased river flow generally results in an increase in median water surface and groundwater elevation. The river flows that would result from the changes to the Proposed Project are only slightly different than those evaluated in the PEIR, and are within the range of flows examined in the PEIR.

Salton Sea

Water conservation and transfers within the IID service area would reduce inflow to the Salton Sea. The PEIR indicated that the reduced inflow resulting from the Proposed Project would reduce mean water surface level elevation to approximately -250 MSL after 75 years and would increase salinity to approximately 60 parts per thousand (ppt) by 2012 (then implementation year 11). Implementation of the changes to the Proposed Project would slow the rate of change to mean water surface elevation and salinity concentration in the Salton Sea during the first years of the project. A comparison of the changes to the Salton Sea elevation and salinity for Implementation Years 15 and 75 is provided in Table 1.7-1.

Table 1.7-1. Comparison of Salton Sea Impacts

| Implementation Year | ELEVATION (FEET MSL) | | | | SALINITY (MG/L) | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | Proposed Project | Changed Project | Mitigation Strategy 2 | Mitigation Strategy 2a | Proposed Project | Changed Project | Mitigation Strategy 2 | Mitigation Strategy 2a |
| 15 | -239.2 | -235.6 | -231.5 | -231.9 | 75.2 | 61.4 | 56.4 | 57.2 |
| 75 | -249.8 | -249.6 | -235.3 | -247.5 | 162.3 | 147.6 | 86.4 | 143.3 |

Mitigation Strategy 2a

Under the PEIR’s Mitigation Strategy 2, water would have been provided to the Salton Sea to offset reductions in inflow to the Salton Sea as a result of the Proposed Project. Under Mitigation Strategy 2a, for the first 15 years of the Proposed Project, additional water (the Mitigation Increment) would be conserved or otherwise made available to the Salton Sea in an amount equal to that which would have flowed to the Sea absent the proposed conservation and transfer of water to SDCWA and MWD. A comparison of the changes to the Salton Sea elevation and salinity for Implementation Years 15 and 75 resulting from Mitigation Strategies 2 and 2a is provided in Table 1.7-1. Additionally, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would accelerate the increase in salinity to 60 ppt by 4 years in comparison to the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2.

1.8 SUMMARY OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS

Table 1.8-1 summarizes the explanation of checklist determinations in Section 3 of this Addendum. As indicated, none of the changes would result in an environmental impact beyond that identified in the PEIR.

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Aesthetics | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. No new construction would be required, nor would operational changes occur that would adversely affect aesthetic resources. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the already minor impact of the Proposed Project. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly lessened decrease in the mean surface elevation of the Salton Sea over the Project’s 75-year duration, which would slightly lessen the significant impact to aesthetic resources identified in the PEIR. | No impact. |
| Agriculture | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. No new construction would be required, nor would operational changes occur that would result in | No impact. |

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Agriculture (continued) | the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Less Colorado River water would be provided to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project than identified in the PEIR; however, the same amount of water would be available for agricultural purposes during this period since groundwater or other water sources would be used to offset the reduction. Ultimately, the amount of water provided to CVWD would be the same as originally proposed. No impacts to agriculture would result from the decrease in the amount of Colorado River water transferred to SDCWA since other sources of water (e.g., from MWD or other transfers) are available for agricultural use. | |
| Air Quality | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. No new construction would be required, nor would operational changes occur that could affect air quality. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the already minor impact of the Proposed Project. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact associated with fugitive dust emissions. | No impact. |
| Biological Resources | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the impacts of the Proposed Project impacts to aquatic, marsh, or riparian habitats and sensitive species that use these habitats. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea. This would result in slightly lesser impacts than described in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly lesser decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in slightly lesser impacts to desert pupfish than described in the PEIR. Significant impacts to the emergent and in-channel vegetation of the IID drains would be minimized temporarily since water would be conserved and transferred at a slower rate than identified in the PEIR. | No impact. |

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Cultural Resources | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. No new construction or other ground disturbance would be required. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the already less than significant impact identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact to exposed cultural resources. | No impact. |
| Geology and Soils | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require construction, grading, or other modifications that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with geologic hazards. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a temporary reduction in the amount of Colorado River water used to recharge the groundwater basin in the Coachella Valley since less water would be delivered to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project. Thus, groundwater levels in the CVWD service area could be somewhat lower than identified in the PEIR, and the potential for liquefaction hazards to increase would be lessened during this period. Ultimately, impacts would be as described in the PEIR since CVWD would receive the same total amount of Colorado River water. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, thus minimizing the already slight potential for erosion. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened potential for erosion. | No impact. |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require the use or transport of hazardous materials or would otherwise result in increased public risk. | No impact. |

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Hydrology and Water Quality | <p>The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. Significant, unavoidable impacts to the IID drains and Alamo River from the implementation of water conservation measures would be minimized temporarily since water would be conserved and transferred at a slower rate than identified in the PEIR, which would result in a slower increase in the concentration of selenium and other dissolved solids. Ultimately, impacts to the IID drains and Alamo River would occur as identified in the PEIR.</p> <p>Significant, unavoidable water quality impacts related to increased selenium in the CVWD drains temporarily would be less than described in the PEIR, because CVWD would receive 90 KAF less Colorado River water for the first 15 years of the Project as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project and, therefore, less water would be conveyed in the drains. Between years 16 and 45, CVWD would receive 90 KAF more to compensate for the earlier decrease, and impacts ultimately would be as described in the PEIR since the same overall amount of water would be transferred. Similarly, significant unavoidable impacts related to an increase in total dissolved solids (TDS) in the lower aquifer groundwater would be temporarily lessened.</p> <p>The Proposed Project could increase salinity of the Colorado River by as much as 1 mg/L below Hoover Dam and by as much as 8 mg/L at Imperial Dam. This adverse but less than significant impact would be slightly lessened as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project since less water would be diverted.</p> <p>The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea.</p> <p>The only impact to groundwater from the changes to the Proposed Project would be a temporary reduction in the amount of Colorado River water used to recharge the groundwater basin in the Coachella Valley since less water would be delivered to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project. The use of Colorado River water would continue to be a beneficial impact, as described in the PEIR, and ultimately, the amount of water used to recharge groundwater would be as described in the PEIR. The minor groundwater impacts to the IID service area would be somewhat less than described in the PEIR because less water would be conserved and transferred.</p> | No impact. |
| Land Use and Planning | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or in any way physically | No impact. |

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Land Use and Planning <i>(continued)</i> | divide an established community, nor would they conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect since they would not result in new or worsened significant environmental impacts. | |
| Mineral Resources | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or other ground disturbance and thus would not affect mineral resources. | No impact. |
| Noise | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or operational changes that could generate noise or expose people to noise. | No impact. |
| Population and Housing | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. None of the changes to the Proposed Project would affect population growth, nor would they alter the conclusions of the PEIR that the QSA would not foster economic or population growth or construction, would not remove obstacles to growth, would not require construction of additional community service facilities, and would not encourage or facilitate other activities that would significantly affect the environment. | No impact. |
| Public Services | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in increased population or otherwise require the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. | No impact. |
| Recreation | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in a population increase and thus would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen already less than significant impacts to recreational resources in this area, including sport fishing and other recreational activities dependent upon wildlife. The overall decline in mean | No impact. |

Table 1.8-1. Summary of Checklist Determinations

| <i>Environmental Impact Category</i> | <i>Potential Environmental Impacts of the Changes to the Proposed Project</i> | <i>Significance Determination</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Recreation (continued) | water surface elevation of the Salton Sea would be slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the severity of the significant impact to recreational facilities. The PEIR stated that increased salinity would hasten the decrease in the number of fish that live in the Salton Sea, significantly affecting sport-fishing opportunities. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea, which would slightly lessen the severity of this significant impact. | |
| Transportation and Traffic | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in population growth, new construction, or any other changes that would affect traffic. | No impact. |
| Utilities and Service Systems | The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the PEIR. No additional wastewater or solid waste would be generated. No construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities would be necessary. The changes to the Proposed Project seek to maintain an adequate water supply but would not in themselves create a demand for a water supply. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the already less than significant impact to hydropower production at Headgate Dam and Parker Dam. | No impact. |

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 2. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This checklist identifies the environmental impacts that would occur specifically as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>I. AESTHETICS</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</u> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural farmland. <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>III. AIR QUALITY</u> – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Substantially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Adversely impact federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) either individually or in combination with the known or probable impacts of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Section 15064.5? | | | | |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> - <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Involve construction on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on expansive soil as defined in the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Is the project located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private air strip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Result in exposure of the public to significant new hazardous situations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Create sufficient mosquito habitat to pose a threat to public health? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Violate (or cause the violation of) any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>XI. NOISE</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project result in:</i> | | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| levels existing without the project? | | | | |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| XII. POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| XIV. RECREATION – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project</i> | | | | |
| a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | |
| c. Cause the direct, substantial physical degradation of either public recreation uses or public recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially decrease opportunities for sport fishing, bird watching, or waterfowl hunting? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> – <i>Would changes to the Proposed Project:</i> | | | | |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Section 2. Environmental Checklist

| Issues & Supporting Information Sources | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Substantially reduce a hydroelectric facility's contractual ability to produce power (by reducing the amount of flow through the respective dam's powerplant)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u> | | | | |
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SECTION 3. EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS

This section offers an explanation for all answers checked in the Initial Study and Checklist Form included in Section 2 regarding the impacts of the changes to the Proposed Project. No environmental impacts in the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist Form were judged to be “potentially significant,” “less than significant with mitigation incorporated,” or “less than significant.” Thus, the changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines has occurred.

3.1 AESTHETICS

A complete discussion of the aesthetic impacts of the QSA as originally proposed (Proposed Project) is included in section 3.10 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to aesthetic impacts. The overall impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the aesthetic resources of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or operational changes that would adversely affect scenic vistas. The PEIR identified significant impacts to aesthetic resources if pipelines or pump stations were located in a visually sensitive area of the CVWD service area. This impact would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the already minor impact of the Proposed Project. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly lessened decrease in the mean surface elevation of the Salton Sea over the Project’s 75-year duration, which would slightly lessen the significant impact to aesthetic resources identified in the PEIR.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcrops, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or operational changes that would have the potential to damage scenic resources.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact. Refer to (a) above.

- d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or any other modifications that would result in substantial light or glare.

3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

A complete discussion of the agricultural impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.5 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur from the changes to the Proposed Project with respect to agricultural impacts. The overall impacts to agricultural resources would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require construction or operational changes that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The PEIR found that if fallowing were implemented in the IID service area so as to take farmland out of production on a longer-term or permanent basis and resulted in the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use, it would be a significant, unavoidable impact to agricultural resources in the Imperial Valley. Fallowing could occur in the IID service area under the Proposed Project changes, but not to a greater extent than described in the PEIR. The PEIR found that construction of recharge facilities in the CVWD service area could have a significant effect on agricultural resources if the facilities were located in agricultural areas, because they could convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. This impact, however, would be unaffected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

No Impact. No new construction would be required as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts would occur.

- c) **Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. As a result of changes to the Proposed Project, less Colorado River water would be provided to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project than under the Proposed Project; however, the same amount of water would be available for agricultural purposes during this period since groundwater or other water sources would be used to offset the reduction. Ultimately, the amount of water provided to CVWD would be the same as originally proposed. The same facilities would be constructed under the changes to the Proposed Project, and no new facilities would be required. Thus, potential impacts from construction on agricultural lands would not change. No impacts to agriculture would result from the decrease

in the amount of Colorado River water transferred to SDCWA since other sources of water (e.g., from MWD or other transfers) are available for agricultural use. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would not affect agricultural resources. Changes to the salinity and surface water elevation of the Salton Sea would not affect agricultural resources.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

A complete discussion of the air quality impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.7 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to air quality impacts. The overall impacts to air quality would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the air quality of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the changes to the Proposed Project:

a) Substantially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or operational changes affecting air quality. The PEIR evaluated impacts to the IID service area resulting from a variety of water conservation measures, including fallowing, on-farm conservation measures, and water delivery system improvements and indicated that these methods could be implemented in different combinations. Under the changes to the Proposed Project, water still could be conserved through a combination of these measures. Air quality impacts would not differ from those identified in the PEIR.

None of the air quality impacts identified in the CVWD service area would be affected by changing the schedule of water deliveries and amounts. PM₁₀ emissions (due to fugitive dust) resulting from construction of the Coachella Canal Lining Project would continue to constitute a short-term but significant and unavoidable impact, even after the implementation of mitigation. Construction-related activities associated with other facilities, such as recharge basins, pump stations, and pipelines, would also cause temporary impacts to local air quality and would be significant if they exceeded air pollutant thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) Project region. Due to their short-term nature, construction-related activities would not interfere with attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards over the long term.

Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which

would lessen the already minor impact of the Proposed Project. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact associated with fugitive dust emissions.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

No Impact. Refer to the discussion under (a) above.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

No Impact. Refer to the discussion under (a) above.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

No Impact. Refer to the discussion under (a) above.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

No Impact. The PEIR concluded that the effects of the Proposed Project on odors would be less than significant. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A complete discussion of the biological resources impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.2 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to biology impacts. The overall impacts to biological resources would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the biological resources of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Would the changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. The PEIR identified potentially significant impacts to habitat supporting state and federally listed threatened and endangered species along the Colorado River, within the IID and CVWD service areas, and at the Salton Sea. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to

the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the impacts to aquatic, marsh, or riparian habitats. Modifying the schedule of water deliveries to the CVWD service area would not affect biological resources. Impacts to the biological resources resulting from canal lining and the construction of facilities such as recharge basins, pipelines, and pump stations would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

The PEIR evaluated impacts to the IID service area resulting from a variety of water conservation measures, including fallowing, on-farm conservation measures, and water delivery system improvements and indicated that these methods could be implemented in different combinations. Under the changes to the Proposed Project, water still could be conserved through a combination of these measures. Impacts to biological resources would not differ from those identified in the PEIR.

The biological effects of accelerating the salinization of the Salton Sea were addressed in the PEIR. Significant impacts would result from the loss of food sources for fish-eating birds, including some sensitive species. Impacts to desert pupfish living in the shallow portions of the Salton Sea and nearby drains also were considered significant. The PEIR also identified the accelerated decrease in the water surface elevation of the Salton Sea as contributing to the significant impact to desert pupfish. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea. This would result in slightly lesser impacts than described in the PEIR. No substantial changes to other non-listed but sensitive species would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or operational changes that could adversely affect riparian or other sensitive habitats, and in some instances, impacts would be lessened. Significant impacts to the emergent and in-channel vegetation of the IID drains were identified in the PEIR as a result of the use of on-farm conservation measures, since this could decrease drain water flows and increase the salinity of these flows (although not total salt load). These impacts would be minimized temporarily since water would be conserved and transferred at a slower rate than identified in the PEIR. Ultimately, impacts to the vegetation of the IID drains would occur as identified in the PEIR. Impacts identified in the PEIR from construction in the IID and CVWD service areas would be unaffected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

The PEIR identified potentially significant impacts to aquatic, marsh and riparian habitats along the Colorado River due to the projected decrease in river flows. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would lessen the impacts to aquatic, marsh, or riparian habitats.

The PEIR indicated that the accelerated decline in Salton Sea levels caused by the implementation of the Proposed Project has the potential to result in the loss of tamarisk scrub vegetation. This impact to vegetation is considered adverse, but not significant since the impact will be to non-native vegetation. No significant impact to managed marsh vegetation is anticipated since the hydrology of these areas is not dependent upon the Salton Sea. These conclusions would be unchanged by the changes to the Proposed Project.

- c) **Adversely impact federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) either individually or in combination with the known or probable impacts of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No Impact. Refer to the discussion under (b) above.

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?**

No Impact. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the severity of the significant impact to the habitat used by razorback suckers for rearing and foraging identified in the PEIR. The movement of fish in the Colorado River would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project since no construction would occur, and changes to the water elevation would be within the range of normal fluctuations.

The PEIR indicated that the Proposed Project would significantly impact fish-eating birds and desert pupfish living in the shallow portions of the Salton Sea and in nearby drains. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly lesser decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in slightly lesser impacts than described in the PEIR.

- e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not significantly affect biological resources, and therefore would not create conflicts with local policies or ordinances.

- f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact. No Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other habitat conservation plans have been adopted for biological resources that would be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

A complete discussion of the cultural resources impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.8 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to aesthetic impacts. The overall impacts to cultural resources would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the cultural resources of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**
- b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**
- c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**
- d) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

No Impact. No aspects of the changes to the Proposed Project would result in construction or other ground disturbance that could affect cultural resources, including archaeological, historical, paleontological, or geologic features, nor would they result in the disturbance of any human remains. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the already less than significant impact identified in the PEIR. The PEIR indicated that reduction of the current and projected surface area of the Salton Sea may expose previously submerged cultural resources, which would be a significant impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact. The PEIR concluded that construction in the IID and CVWD service areas could significantly impact archaeological or paleontological sites, human remains, or significant historic architectural resources. None of these impacts would be altered as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

A complete discussion of the geology and soils impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.3 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to geology and soils impacts. The overall impacts to geology and soils would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the geology and soils of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
 - i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**
 - ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**
 - iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
 - iv) **Landslides?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require construction, grading, or other modifications that could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with earthquake faults, seismic ground-shaking or ground failure, or landslides. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a temporary reduction in the amount of Colorado River water used to recharge the groundwater basin in the Coachella Valley since less water would be delivered to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project. Thus, groundwater levels in the CVWD service area could be somewhat lower than identified in the PEIR, and the potential for liquefaction hazards to increase would be lessened during this period. Ultimately, impacts would be as described in the PEIR since CVWD would receive the same total amount of Colorado River water.

- b) **Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

No Impact. The PEIR indicated that on-farm water conservation measures and water delivery system-based conservation measures could cause a temporary increase in wind and water erosion of bare soils in the IID service area. These measures could still be implemented under the changes to the Proposed Project, and impacts would not exceed those identified in the PEIR. Construction-related erosion impacts in the CVWD service area would be unchanged. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, thus minimizing the already slight potential for erosion. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would result in a slightly lessened impact.

- c) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require new construction.

- d) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require new construction.

- e) **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

No Impact. Since no construction or population increases would occur, the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be required.

3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A complete discussion of the hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.11 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to hazards and hazardous materials impacts. The overall impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require the use of hazardous materials.

- c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require the use of hazardous materials.

- d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No Impact. No construction would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, no sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to

Government Code Section 65962.5 would be affected. The impacts identified in the PEIR (the potential siting of facilities in the IID and CVWD service areas) would remain unchanged.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact. No construction would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no safety impacts associated with proximity to public airports would occur.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact. No construction would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no safety impacts associated with proximity to public airports or private airstrips would occur.

- g) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No Impact. No construction would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project, nor would any other actions that could impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As discussed in the PEIR, construction in the IID and CVWD service areas may temporarily impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan if construction activities are located in proximity to evacuation or other emergency routes, but this impact would remain unchanged.

- h) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or increased population; nor would they create conditions that would increase the risk of wildland fires.

- i) **Result in exposure of the public to significant new hazardous situations?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in new construction or increased population; nor would they result in any other changes that could expose the public to new hazardous situations. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a slightly smaller decrease in the decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR, which would expose slightly less bottom sediment.

j) Create sufficient mosquito habitat to pose a threat to public health?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not create any standing water and thus would not increase mosquito habitat. The impact identified in the PEIR associated with the creation of new recharge basins in the CVWD service area would remain unchanged.

3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

A complete discussion of the hydrology and water quality impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.1 of the Final PEIR. Changes to the Salton Sea water surface elevation and salinity resulting from the changes to the Proposed Project are summarized in section 1.7 of this Addendum. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to hydrology and water quality impacts. The overall impacts to hydrology and water quality would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the hydrology and water quality of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

a) Violate (or cause the violation of) any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No Impact. The PEIR evaluated a range of water conservation measures that could be implemented in the IID service area, including fallowing and on-farm and delivery system improvements. Significant, unavoidable impacts to the IID drains and Alamo River from the implementation of water conservation measures would be minimized temporarily since water would be conserved and transferred at a slower rate than identified in the PEIR, which would result in a slower increase in the concentration of selenium and other dissolved solids. Ultimately, impacts to the IID drains and Alamo River would occur as identified in the PEIR.

Significant, unavoidable water quality impacts related to increased selenium in the CVWD drains temporarily would be less than described in the PEIR, because CVWD would receive 90 KAF less Colorado River water for the first 15 years of the Project as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project and, therefore, less water would be conveyed in the drains. Between years 16 and 45, CVWD would receive 90 KAF more to compensate for the earlier decrease, and impacts ultimately would be as described in the PEIR since the same overall amount of water would be transferred. Similarly, significant unavoidable impacts related to an increase in total dissolved solids (TDS) in the lower aquifer groundwater would be temporarily lessened.

The Proposed Project could increase salinity of the Colorado River by as much as 1 mg/L below Hoover Dam and by as much as 8 mg/L at Imperial Dam. This adverse but less than significant impact would be slightly lessened as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project since less water would be diverted.

The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharges?

No Impact. The only impact to groundwater from the changes to the Proposed Project would be a temporary reduction in the amount of Colorado River water used to recharge the groundwater basin in the Coachella Valley since less water would be delivered to the CVWD service area for the first 15 years of the Project. The use of Colorado River water would continue to be a beneficial impact, as described in the PEIR, and ultimately, the amount of water used to recharge groundwater would be as described in the PEIR. The minor groundwater impacts to the IID service area would be somewhat less than described in the PEIR because less water would be conserved and transferred.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require any construction, and thus would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of any sites or areas; nor would they involve altering the course of a stream or river. No siltation or erosion would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Erosion impacts identified in the PEIR that were associated with construction in the IID and CVWD service areas would not change as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require any construction, and thus would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of any sites or areas; nor would they involve altering the course of a stream or river.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

No Impact. No aspects of the changes to the Proposed Project would create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No Impact. No changes to the Proposed Project would have the potential to affect water quality other than as noted under (a) above.

- g) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No Impact. No housing would be constructed as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

- h) **Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No Impact. No structures would be constructed as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

- i) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not increase the risk of flooding. They would not substantively change the amount of water stored in dams along the Colorado River, nor would they result in operational changes that could in any way expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

- j) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

No Impact. No new construction would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project and no other aspects of these changes would increase the risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

A complete discussion of the land use and planning impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.4 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to land use and planning impacts. The overall impacts to land use and planning would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Physically divide an established community?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or in any way physically divide an established community.

- b) **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect since they would not result in new or worsened significant environmental impacts.

- c) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

No Impact. No Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other habitat conservation plans have been adopted for biological resources that would be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

A complete discussion of the mineral resources impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.3 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to mineral resources impacts. The overall impacts to mineral resources would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Result in the substantial loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in construction or other ground disturbance and thus would not affect mineral resources.

- b) **Result in the substantial loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in construction or other ground disturbance and thus would not affect mineral resources.

3.11 NOISE

A complete discussion of the noise impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.9 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to noise impacts. The overall impacts to noise would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project result in:

- a) **Exposure of persons to or generation of noise level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or any operational changes that could generate noise or expose people to noise. Potentially significant construction and operational impacts in the IID and CVWD service areas would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

- b) **Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or any operational changes that could generate vibration or expose people to vibration.

- c) **A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or any operational changes that could generate noise or vibration. Potential long-term significant impacts in the IID and CVWD service areas resulting from the operation of equipment such as pumps would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Project.

- d) **A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in any new construction or any operational changes that could generate noise. Potential significant impacts in the IID and CVWD service areas resulting from construction activities would not be affected by the changes to the Proposed Projects.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in the construction of new residences or workplaces.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in the construction of new residences or workplaces.

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

A complete discussion of the population and housing impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.13 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to population and housing impacts. The overall impacts to population and housing would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes in the Proposed Project:

- a) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact. The Proposed Project changes are either changes to the timing of conservation and transfer (delivery), the amount of water transferred, or other administrative changes. The changes to the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). The administrative changes (e.g., changing the beginning date of the IID/SDCWA Agreement and establishing a local administrative entity) would have no impacts on population growth, nor would the changes in delivery schedule and water distribution. None of the changes to the Proposed Project would affect population growth, nor would they alter the conclusions of the PEIR that the QSA would not foster economic or population growth or construction, would not remove obstacles to growth, would not require construction of additional community service facilities, and would not encourage or facilitate other activities that would significantly affect the environment.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require any new construction or any operational changes that would displace housing.

- c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not require any new construction or any operational changes that would displace people.

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

A complete discussion of the public services impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.12 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to public services impacts. The overall impacts to public services would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project result in:

- a) **Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**
- i. **Fire protection?**
 - ii. **Police protection?**
 - iii. **Schools?**
 - iv. **Parks?**
 - v. **Other public facilities?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in increased population or otherwise require the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities.

3.14 RECREATION

A complete discussion of the recreation impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.6 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to recreation impacts. The overall impacts to recreation would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to the recreational resources of the Colorado River and Salton Sea.

- a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in a population increase and thus would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

- b) **Would the project result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may result in adverse environmental impacts not discussed as part of the project?**

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

- c) **Cause the direct, substantial physical degradation of either public recreation uses or public recreational facilities?**

No Impact. The PEIR described a decrease in the water surface elevation of the Salton Sea that would affect existing recreational facilities, some of which would have to be relocated (i.e.,

campgrounds, docks) or re-established (i.e., roads and trails leading to the water). Decreasing water levels would expose footings and other remnants of campgrounds that are currently underwater. The impact to developed recreational facilities from decreased water levels is considered significant. The overall decline in mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea would be slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the severity of this significant impact.

d) Substantially decrease opportunities for sport fishing, bird watching, or waterfowl hunting?

No Impact. Significant impacts to recreational fishing resulting from construction of the All American Canal Lining Project would be unchanged by the proposed changes to the Proposed Project. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen already less than significant impacts to recreational resources in this area, including sport fishing and other recreational activities dependent upon wildlife. The PEIR stated that increased salinity would hasten the decrease in the number of fish that live in the Salton Sea, significantly affecting sport-fishing opportunities. The changes to the Proposed Project would result in a lower salinity concentration in the Salton Sea than described in the PEIR due to the reduced change in flow to the Sea, which would slightly lessen the severity of this significant impact.

3.15 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

A complete discussion of the Transportation/Traffic impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.12 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to transportation and traffic impacts. The overall impacts to transportation and traffic would be similar to those described in the PEIR.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

- a) **Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**
- b) **Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**
- c) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**
- d) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**
- e) **Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. The PEIR evaluated the traffic impacts associated with the construction and maintenance of on-farm conservation measures, and the changes to the Proposed Project would not result in population growth, new construction, or any other changes that would affect traffic. Potentially significant traffic impacts resulting from construction in the CVWD service area would not be altered as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project.

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

A complete discussion of the utilities and service systems impacts of the Proposed Project is included in section 3.12 of the Final PEIR. As discussed below, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of changes to the Proposed Project with respect to utilities and service systems impacts. The overall impacts to utilities and service systems would be similar to those described in the PEIR, although the changes to the Proposed Project would result in slightly lessened impacts to hydropower production on the Colorado River.

Would changes to the Proposed Project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact. No population increases would occur as result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no wastewater would be generated.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. No population increases would occur as result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no wastewater would be generated and no new water or wastewater facilities would be required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. No construction would be required as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be necessary.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No Impact. The changes to the Proposed Project seek to maintain an adequate water supply but would not in themselves create a demand for a water supply.

- e) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

No Impact. No population increases would occur as result of the changes to the Proposed Project; thus, no wastewater would be generated and no new water or wastewater facilities would be required.

- f) **Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

No Impact. Since no population increases or construction would occur, the changes to the Proposed Project would not generate solid waste.

- g) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact. Since no population increases or construction would occur, the changes to the Proposed Project would not generate solid waste.

- h) **Substantially reduce a hydroelectric facility's contractual ability to produce power (by reducing the amount of flow through the respective dam's powerplant)?**

No Impact. Power production on the Colorado River would not be significantly affected by implementation of the changes to the Proposed Project. Over the term of the project, Colorado River flow would be greater than or equal to that evaluated in the PEIR as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project. Thus, the median water surface elevation would generally decrease slightly less than described in the PEIR, which would slightly lessen the already less than significant impact to hydropower production at Headgate Dam and Parker Dam.

3.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

The changes to the Proposed Project would not create new impacts to fish and wildlife, and would not increase the severity of project impacts to fish and wildlife beyond those impacts discussed in the PEIR.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

The changes to the Proposed Project would not create new cumulative impacts or increase the severity of cumulative impacts beyond those impacts discussed in the PEIR.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The changes to the Proposed Project would result in no new environmental impacts to humans, either directly or indirectly.

As discussed above, none of the three conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines has occurred.

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE NEW AND REFINED MITIGATION MEASURES

This section evaluates the effectiveness of the new and refined mitigation measures described in section 1.6 in reducing or avoiding impacts to the aesthetic, air quality, biological, and recreational resources of the Salton Sea.

The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2 was identified in the PEIR as a means of avoiding the biological impacts to the Salton Sea resulting from Project-related inflow reductions. Since this mitigation strategy involved providing water to the Salton Sea to offset reductions in inflow to the Salton Sea as a result of the Proposed Project, it also served as a mitigation measure for aesthetic, air quality, and recreational impacts resulting from the projected decline in Sea elevation. After PEIR certification, Mitigation Strategy 2 was refined to create Mitigation Strategy 2a in response to input from the USFWS and DFG to make additional water available to the Sea during the first 15 years of the Project. This additional mitigation water is the same as "c(2)" mitigation water in SB 317.

As discussed in section 1.6, additional mitigation measures were added to further minimize significant impacts to air quality and brown pelicans resulting from reduced inflows to the Salton Sea.

AESTHETICS

The PEIR indicated that views of the Salton Sea from some public areas would include increased dry land and decreased open water as a result of the Proposed Project. The exposed area would look like the existing beach, but views of the water, considered a scenic vista, would be possible only from a much greater distance from the developed public viewing facilities at these locations.

As shown on Table 1.7-1, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would result in a lesser overall decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than would occur as a result of the changed Project, but it would result in a greater decrease than what would have occurred with the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2. However, other mitigation measures (cited below) were identified in the PEIR that would reduce significant impacts to aesthetic resources at the Salton Sea to a less-than-significant level:

- (1) Recreational facilities that would become further removed from the waters of the Salton Sea will be relocated to an appropriate site adjacent to the Salton Sea and access will be extended to the new shoreline so as to provide quality public viewing opportunities of the Salton Sea and its shoreline; and (2) interpretive facilities and materials will be developed and made available to the public at recreational areas and along public roadways. Interpretive displays may include historic photographs of the Salton Sea landscape and information about water conservation measures, including their effects on Salton Sea water levels.

These measures would be implemented as needed. Thus, impacts to the aesthetic resources of the Salton Sea would remain mitigated to less-than-significant levels, as identified in the PEIR.

AIR QUALITY

The PEIR indicated that although the new shoreline created by reduced inflows to the Salton Sea would only marginally increase the total land area within the region of influence that presently generates fugitive dust emissions, fugitive dust emissions from these areas are conservatively considered to be significant due to the PM₁₀ nonattainment status of the region.

The PEIR identified Mitigation Strategy 2 as a potentially feasible mitigation measure that would minimize fugitive dust impacts associated with the decline in Salton Sea water surface elevation. It noted that if Mitigation Strategy 2 were not adopted as a mitigation measure for biological impacts, increased fugitive dust emissions at the Salton Sea would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact. As shown on Table 1.7-1, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would make additional water available to the Sea during the first 15 years of the Project and would minimize air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions during this period. Its implementation would result in a lesser overall decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than would occur as a result of the changed Project, but it would result in a greater decrease than what would have occurred with the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2.

The PEIR noted, "as the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project becomes more defined, additional mitigation measures to address air quality impacts may be identified." Such measures were identified in the EIR/EIS for the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project and have been included as mitigation measures for the impacts of the changes to the Proposed Project.

The four-step mitigation plan that is included in this Addendum (refer to section 1.6 for additional detail), includes the following measures:

1. Restricting public access to the Salton Sea to minimize disturbance of natural crusts and soils.
2. Implementing a research and monitoring program to help define the potential for problems to occur in the future and identify solutions.
3. Creating or purchasing offsetting emission reduction credits.
4. Directly reducing emissions at the Salton Sea through implementing feasible dust mitigation measures and, if feasible, supplying water to the Sea to re-wet emissive areas.

This program would be implemented as needed. The IID Water Conservation and Transfer Project EIR/EIS indicates that a level of uncertainty would remain regarding whether or not the mitigation measures would reduce short-term and long-term impacts, and that cost and water availability may affect the feasibility of certain dust mitigation measures. Thus, long-range impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable. This is consistent with the determination in the PEIR that impacts would be significant and unavoidable if Mitigation Strategy 2 were not implemented.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The PEIR indicated that the acceleration of the increase in salinity of the Salton Sea would likely change the species composition of the invertebrate and fish populations and cause a decline in their general population size. The reduction of food sources for fish-eating birds, including the brown pelican, is considered a potentially significant impact.

The new and refined measures to mitigate these impacts to biological resources at the Salton Sea, like the mitigation measures initially identified in the PEIR, would reduce impacts to biological resources to less-than-significant levels, especially those associated with species listed under the federal and state Endangered Species Acts. As shown on Table 1.7-1, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would result in a lesser overall decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than would occur as a result of the changes to the Proposed Project, but it would result in a greater decrease than what would have occurred with the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2. The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would not result in a material increase in projected salinity levels at the Salton Sea during the first 15 years of the Project, but after that time it would result in a 4-year acceleration of the significant effects to fish-eating birds, including the brown pelican (due to the accelerated increase in salinity to 60 ppt, which would result in the loss of food source for these birds), compared to Mitigation Strategy 2. However, with implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a and the new brown pelican mitigation, minor change in the timing of the impacts associated with accelerated salinization would not affect the type or overall severity of the impacts. Impacts to Salton Sea biological resources are considered less-than-significant for the following reasons:

- DFG has reviewed implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a for its impact on Salton Sea salinity and reclamation and has prepared draft findings (DFG 2002) concluding that implementation of the QSA and the proposed mitigation during the first 15 years of the agreement: (1) will not result in a material increase in projected salinity levels at the Salton Sea; and (2) will not foreclose alternatives for reclamation of the Salton Sea as summarized in Section 101(b)(1)(A) of the Salton Sea Reclamation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-372).
- Projections made by the Salton Sea Accounting Model are based on a number of assumptions, including inflows to the Sea, evaporation rates and salt loadings. The model output provides projections that have statistical confidence levels spanning a number of years. Under the Future Baseline (which represents what is reasonably expected to occur in the future given well-defined trends and other parameters such as adopted or on-going programs), the Salton Sea is projected to reach 60 ppt between the years 2018 and 2030. For the PEIR analysis, 60 ppt was assumed to represent the threshold for substantial reduction of the reproductive capability of fish in the Sea. The provision of make-up water under Mitigation Strategy 2a for 15 years would provide water to the Sea to the lower end of that confidence range. The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a is projected to result in the salinity of the Sea reaching 60 ppt between the years 2017 and 2021. Given that the confidence interval around the Future Baseline nearly encompasses the confidence interval for Mitigation Strategy 2a and considering that the difference in the mean year in which the salinity is projected to

exceed 60 ppt is small (i.e., 4 years), implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would have a similar effect on fish-eating birds at the Sea as would occur under implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2.

- Salton Sea salinity levels of 60 ppt have been considered by many as the level where reproduction levels of fish and invertebrates substantially decline, ultimately reducing population levels. The 60 ppt level is not an absolute threshold for several reasons. The salinity in the Salton Sea is not homogeneous, and there will continue to be areas where salinity levels are lower and fish populations will persist. In particular, it is anticipated that areas of the Sea, particularly at the mouths of the New and Alamo rivers, will continue to support a fishery and thus a food source for fish-eating birds (USBR 2002). Also, the reaction of fish and invertebrates to increased salinity will be variable and it is reasonable to assume that some invertebrates and fish will survive in areas of higher salinity for a longer period of time. Therefore, the decline in fisheries and related reduction of fish eating bird populations will likely be more gradual than the 60 ppt salinity level would indicate.
- Two roost sites for the brown pelican will be constructed along the Southern California coast as an additional mitigation measure. The roost sites are to be functioning by 2018 and will be demonstrated to support at least 100 pelicans each and up to 1,200 in combination. The roost sites will be maintained through 2048. This measure will help maintain the brown pelican populations in Southern California and replace habitat lost at the Salton Sea due to increased salinity and the resultant reduction of food source. This measure will also provide long-term mitigation for this species even after the salinity of the Salton Sea reaches levels when food sources for the species are substantially eliminated.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The PEIR found that reduction of the surface area of the Salton Sea may expose previously submerged cultural resources, which would leave those resources susceptible to site erosion and looting. This could result in a significant impact to cultural resources. As shown on Table 1.7-1, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would result in a lesser overall decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than would occur as a result of the changed Project, but it would result in a greater decrease than that which would have occurred given the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2. However, other mitigation measures (cited below) were identified in the PEIR that would reduce significant impacts to cultural resources at the Salton Sea to a less than significant level:

After 15 years, IID will conduct a series of archaeological and paleontological surveys at regular intervals (once every 3 years) to check the freshly exposed lands for the presence/absence of archaeological or paleontological sites. Discovered sites will be properly recorded with the appropriate California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS) office. Sites recorded with CHRIS offices will be evaluated for their integrity and significance and appropriate avoidance measures and/or measures to reduce physical harm would be developed. Data recovery excavation to mitigate for loss of

archaeological data resulting from unavoidable impacts will be conducted as needed. Monitoring of construction by qualified archeologists will take place as appropriate. Tribal permission would be obtained before entry onto tribal lands.

These measures would be implemented as needed. Thus, impacts to the cultural resources of the Salton Sea would remain mitigated to less-than-significant levels, as identified in the PEIR.

RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Recreational Facilities

The PEIR noted that decreasing surface water elevation of the Salton Sea would affect existing recreational facilities, some of which would have to be relocated (i.e., campgrounds, docks) or reestablished (i.e., roads and trails leading to the water). Decreasing water levels would expose footings and other remnants of prior campgrounds that are currently underwater. The impact to developed recreational facilities from decreased water levels is considered significant.

As shown on Table 1.7-1, the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would result in a lesser overall decline in the mean water surface elevation of the Salton Sea than would occur as a result of the changed Project, but it would result in a greater decrease than what would have occurred with the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2. However, other mitigation measures (cited below) were identified in the PEIR that would reduce significant impacts to recreational resources at the Salton Sea to a less than significant level:

If the decrease in the water surface elevation of the Salton Sea results in the exposure of public docks, launch ramps, or other public structures, thus precluding their intended use, then funding will be provided for the relocation of public docks, launch ramps, or other public structures in proportion to the water elevation decrease that is attributable to the Proposed Project. The relocation of these facilities may be temporary and ongoing until the Sea reaches its minimum and stable elevation, at which point permanent facilities will be provided. Footings and other remnants of campgrounds that are exposed due to the accelerated decline in surface water elevation of the Salton Sea will be removed.

These measures would be implemented as needed. Thus, impacts to the recreational resources of the Salton Sea would remain mitigated to less-than-significant levels, as identified in the PEIR.

Sport-Fishing

The PEIR stated that increased salinity would hasten the decrease in the number of fish that live in the Salton Sea, adversely affecting sport-fishing opportunities, which would be a significant impact. The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would not result in a material increase in projected salinity levels at the Salton Sea during the first 15 years of the Project, but after that period, it would result in a 4-year acceleration of the significant effects to the sportfishery (due to the accelerated increase in salinity to 60 ppt, which would result in the reduction of food source for fish), compared to Mitigation Strategy 2. However, the minor change in the timing of the impacts associated with accelerated salinization would not affect the type or overall severity

of the impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a, impacts to sportfishing are considered less-than-significant for the following reasons:

- DFG has reviewed implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a for its impact on Salton Sea salinity and reclamation and has prepared draft findings (DFG 2002) concluding that implementation of the QSA and the proposed mitigation during the first 15 years of the agreement: (1) will not result in a material increase in projected salinity levels at the Salton Sea; and (2) will not foreclose alternatives for reclamation of the Salton Sea as summarized in Section 101(b)(1)(A) of the Salton Sea Reclamation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-372).
- Projections made by the Salton Sea Accounting Model are based on a number of assumptions, including inflows to the Sea, evaporation rates and salt loadings. The model output provides projections that have statistical confidence levels spanning a number of years. Under the Future Baseline, which represents what is reasonably expected to occur in the future given well-defined trends and other parameters such as adopted or on-going programs, the Salton Sea is projected to reach 60 ppt between the years 2018 and 2030. For the PEIR analysis, 60 ppt was assumed to represent the threshold for substantial reduction of the reproductive capability of fish in the Sea. The provision of make-up water under Mitigation Strategy 2a for 15 years would provide water to the Sea to the lower end of that confidence range. The implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a is projected to result in the salinity of the Sea reaching 60 ppt between the years 2017 and 2021. Given that the confidence interval around the Future Baseline nearly encompasses the confidence interval for Mitigation Strategy 2a and considering that the difference in the mean year in which the salinity is projected to exceed 60 ppt is small (i.e., 4 years), implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2a would have a similar effect on fish-eating birds at the Sea as would occur under implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2. While all of the benefits identified in the PEIR as resulting from the implementation of Mitigation Strategy 2 would not be realized, the refined strategy would not result in habitat conditions substantially different than those that would have resulted from this mitigation measure and therefore would not result in a new or worsened impact to fish-eating birds.
- Salton Sea salinity levels of 60 ppt have been considered by many as the level where reproduction levels of fish and invertebrates substantially decline, ultimately reducing population levels. The 60 ppt level is not an absolute threshold for several reasons. The salinity in the Salton Sea is not homogeneous and there will continue to be areas where salinity levels are lower and fish populations will persist. In particular, it is anticipated that areas of the Sea, particularly at the mouths of the New and Alamo rivers, will continue to support a fishery (USBR 2002). Also, the reaction of fish and invertebrates to increased salinity will be variable and it is reasonable to assume that some invertebrates and fish will survive in areas of higher salinity for a longer period of time. Therefore, the decline in fisheries will likely be more gradual than the 60 ppt salinity level would indicate.

SECTION 5. REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). 2002. Draft Findings of the Department of Fish and Game with Respect to the Implementation of the Quantification Settlement Agreement and the Salton Sea Made Pursuant to Section 2081.7(c) of the Fish and Game Code.
- Coachella Valley Water District, Imperial Irrigation District, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and San Diego County Water Authority (CVWD, IID, MWD, and SDCWA). 2002. Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Implementation of the Colorado River Quantification Settlement Agreement, State Clearinghouse No. 2000061034, Volumes I and II.
- Palo Verde Irrigation District (PVID). 2002. Final EIR for Palo Verde Irrigation District (PVID) Land Management, Crop Rotation, and Water Supply Program.
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2002. Revised Order WRO 2002-0013 - for the *"Amended Joint Petition for Approval of a Long-Term Transfer of Conserved Water From IID to SDCWA and to Change the Point of Diversion, Place of Use, and Purpose of Use Under IID's Permit 7642"*.
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). 2002. Biological Assessment of Reclamation's Proposed Section 7(a)(1) Conservation Measures for Listed Species in the IID/Salton Sea Areas (July and October) and cover letter to Steve Thompson, USFWS re: Errata to July 2002 Biological Assessment of Reclamation's Proposed Section 7(a)(1) Conservation Measures for Listed Species in the Imperial Irrigation District/Salton Sea Areas.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2002. Draft Biological Opinion on the Bureau of Reclamation's Voluntary Biological Conservation Measures and Associated Conservation Agreements with the California Water Agencies and the Imperial Irrigation District's Water Conservation and Transfer to San Diego County Water Authority.

This page intentionally left blank.