

CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings of documents completed pursuant to NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that address environmental issues related to providing CVP water to the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions and using the CVP water within the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions. These documents include the CVPIA PEIS, the associated Draft Biological Opinion, and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Shasta County General Plan.

Following completion of the PEIS, Reclamation prepared additional environmental documentation for renewal of long-term water service and repayment contracts, including this EA to address the site-specific impacts relating to contract renewals within the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions.

It should be recognized that under each of the descriptions presented in this chapter, references to “No Action Alternative” and other alternatives are specific to the referenced documents, not to the alternatives described in this EA.

3.2 CVPIA PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

On October 30, 1992, the President signed into law the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-575) that included Title XXXIV, the CVPIA. The CVPIA amended the previous authorizations of the CVP to include fish and wildlife protection, restoration, and mitigation as project purposes having equal priority with irrigation and domestic uses, and fish and wildlife enhancement as a project purpose equal to power generation. Through the CVPIA, The U.S. Department of the Interior is developing policies and programs to improve environmental conditions that were affected by the operations, management, and physical facilities of the CVP. The CVPIA also includes tools to facilitate larger efforts in California to improve environmental conditions in the Central Valley and the San Francisco Bay-Delta system. The PEIS addressed the potential impacts and benefits of implementing provisions of the CVPIA. The PEIS was prepared by Reclamation and the USFWS.

The analysis in the PEIS was intended to disclose the probable region-wide and cumulative effects of implementing the CVPIA and to provide a basis for selecting a decision among the alternatives. The PEIS was developed to allow subsequent environmental documents to incorporate by reference the analysis in the PEIS and limit the need to re-evaluate the region-wide and cumulative impacts of CVPIA. In some cases, worst-case assumptions were used to maximize the utility of the analysis for tiering within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the PEIS.

As the project-specific actions are considered, the lead agencies must determine if the specific impacts were adequately analyzed in the PEIS. If the actions under consideration were previously evaluated and the impacts of such actions would not be greater than those analyzed in the PEIS or would not require additional mitigation measures, the actions could be considered part of the overall program approved in

the ROD for the CVPIA PEIS. In such a case, an administrative decision could be made that no further environmental documentation would be required. If a tiered document is appropriate, the tiered document may be an EIS or an EA. The tiered documents can use the PEIS by reference to avoid duplication and focus on new alternatives or more detailed site-specific effects. Therefore, only changes from the alternatives considered in the PEIS, and impacts not previously addressed, would be addressed in detail in the tiered documents.

3.3 LOCALIZED IMPACTS OF PEIS ON PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The primary impact to CVP water service contractors, as described in the PEIS, is not due to the contract provisions, but rather to the implementation of the CVPIA. The re-allocation of CVP water to fish and wildlife purposes under CVPIA reduced average annual CVP water deliveries to water service contractors from 2,270,000 acre-feet/year under the PEIS No Action Alternative to 1,933,000 acre-feet/year under all of the PEIS alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative. The reduction occurred differently for various classifications of users, as summarized below.

- Average annual CVP water deliveries for agricultural water service contractors located in the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions decreased 12 percent from pre-CVPIA Affected Environment conditions.
- Average annual CVP water deliveries for municipal and industrial water service contractors located in the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions decreased 4 percent from pre-CVPIA Affected Environment conditions.

3.4 SHASTA COUNTY WATER RESOURCES MASTER PLAN PHASE I REPORT – CURRENT AND FUTURE WATER NEEDS

The Shasta County Water Resources Master Plan (October 1997) was prepared for the Redding Area Water Council and other Shasta County water users. As an initial step in regional water supply planning to meet future needs in the Redding Basin, a diverse assemblage of entities, including water purveyors, industries, and private interests, formed a group to identify current and long-term water supply needs throughout Shasta County. Through this effort, the study sponsors developed a program for regional planning to meet the current and future needs of water users within and outside the Redding Basin. The Phase 1 study provides the basic factual information upon which subsequent work can be premised. Phase 2 will include preparing a Groundwater Management Plan (Assembly Bill [AB] 3030 Plan), a groundwater model, and an Integrated Resource Plan. Phase 3 will involve developing implementation and financial plans for the recommended alternative. The implementation plan will also include compliance under CEQA.

The document provides a description of the hydrographic basin, specific background information for each of the water purveyors and service areas, land use, water supplies and needs, and an annual water budget. This information was used extensively to describe and quantify conditions within the Affected Environment section of this EA.

3.5 OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Under state planning law, each city or county must adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for future planning and development. A General Plan is not a detailed, parcel-specific, policy statement. Instead, it establishes a generalized pattern of future land use which provides the basis for more detailed, site-specific plans.

Existing general plans and their supporting documents were used in the preparation of this EA, providing background information for resource-specific discussions of the Affected Environment. The City of Redding (Draft March 2000) and the City of Shasta Lake (March 1999) have each adopted a General Plan. The two cities represent the minority of the Shasta and Trinity River Divisions' service area. The majority of the service area falls within unincorporated portions of Shasta County. In these areas, land use planning is subject to guidelines identified in the Shasta County General Plan (October 1998). Other documents used in the preparation of this EA include Water Conservation Plans for BVWD (January 1995), CCCSD (November 1994), City of Redding (undated, assume 1994), and City of Shasta Lake (March 1994).

3.6 FOCUS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The scope of the analysis in this EA is limited to existing available sources, including the Final CVPIA Programmatic EIS (1999). This EA specifically evaluates the incremental effects of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 on socioeconomic resources. Socioeconomic resources are evaluated to describe potential incremental impacts resulting from the proposed revised pricing structure that is part of the proposed action. Potential secondary effects to other resources due to direct effects on socioeconomic resources are described in the EA sections on land use, biological resources, trust assets, environmental justice, and cultural resources.