

---

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (13-023)**

*CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT INTERIM RENEWAL CONTRACTS FOR WESTLANDS  
WATER DISTRICT, SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT, AND PAJARO  
VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT AGENCY 2014-2016*

**Appendix F**  
**Biological Opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

---

February 2014



IN REPLY REFER TO:  
08ESMF00-2014-F-0035

## United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2605  
Sacramento, California 95825



FEB 28 2014

### Memorandum

To: Area Manager, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, South Central California Area Office,  
Fresno, California

From: Field Supervisor, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, California  
*Swain*  
Acting

Subject: Consultation on the Interim Renewal Water Service Contracts for Westlands Water District, and the 3-way Partial Assignment from Mercy Springs Water District to Pajaro Valley Water Management Area, Santa Clara Valley Water District, and Westlands Water District for March 1, 2014 – February 29, 2016

This is in response to the request from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) for consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) dated October 29, 2013, on the potential effects to listed species from the execution of Central Valley Project (CVP) Interim Renewal Contracts (IRCs) for two years beginning on March 1, 2014 and ending February 29, 2016, for five Westlands Water District (WWD) contracts and the three-way partial contract water assignment (Delta Division 3-way IRC) from Mercy Springs Water District (MSWD) to Pajaro Valley Water Management Area (PVWMA) and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). Your request was received in our office via e-mail on October 31, 2013. This document represents the Service's analysis of potential effects of the action on the Federally-listed as endangered California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*), and Federally-listed as threatened giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*). This memo also provides our concurrence with Reclamation's determination that renewal of the IRCs described above are not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) the Federally-listed as endangered San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*), blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia silus*), and San Joaquin woolly-threads (*Monolopia congdonii*). Critical habitat has not been designated for any of the species considered in this document. This response has been prepared pursuant to section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and in accordance with the regulations governing interagency consultations (50 CFR §402). We received your October 29, 2013 request for reinitiation of this consultation under the Act and Biological Assessment (BA) for the Proposed Action on October 31, 2013. Reclamation made a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the Proposed Action available for public comment on December 13, 2013.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

The Service's consultations on the Long Term Contract Renewals (LTCRs) addressed the diversion of water at prescribed diversion points and times for the use of that water on a specified land area (the contractors' service area). All IRCs, while identifying a full contract amount, recognize that the delivery of full contract amount is subject to availability of water and other obligations of the CVP (such as Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) and consultation requirements under the Act). There is a clear linkage between contract renewals and the operation of the CVP. The impacts of the operation of the CVP (OCAP) are being addressed in a separate but parallel consultation(s) to ensure that all effects on listed species and designated critical habitat are being identified and consulted on.

This consultation is based on information provided in your October 29, 2013 request for consultation, the December 2013 DEA for these IRCs, the October 2013 BA, e-mails transmitting additional information, information provided by Reclamation's South Central California Area Office for the 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012 consultations involving some or all of these IRCs, and other information in our files. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file in the Service's Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office.

As a result of the small quantity of contract supply for the Delta Division 3-way IRC from Mercy MSWD (6,260 acre feet/year), which includes the CVP contractors PVWMA, SCVWD and WWD Distribution District #1 (DD#1), and an environmental commitment in the DEA (page 13) stipulating that "no native or untilled land (fallow for three consecutive years or more) may be cultivated with CVP water without additional environmental analysis and approval" (land conversion commitment), Reclamation has determined that the renewal of this IRC will have no effect on the Federally-listed species or critical habitats identified in Appendix A and is not requesting concurrence with those determinations.

Reclamation has requested concurrence with a NLAA determination for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, the San Joaquin kit fox, and the San Joaquin woolly-threads. The information provided for this consultation, as well as the short duration of this project and land conversion commitment in the DEA, provides the basis for the Service to concur with Reclamation's determination that the WWD IRCs are NLAA the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, San Joaquin kit fox, or San Joaquin woolly-threads. No critical habitat for Federally-listed species has been designated or proposed within WWD.

The Service's concurrence with NLAA for the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, the San Joaquin kit fox, and the San Joaquin woolly-threads relies on Reclamation's conclusion that CVP contract deliveries do not result in land use changes that would adversely affect Federally-listed species or critical habitat. The Service requests that prior to the next renewal of these IRCs or long term contract renewals (LTCRs), whichever comes first, Reclamation revises and updates the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) Comprehensive Mapping Program (described below) to validate the key commitment in the BA and DEA for this project. The Service specifically requests validation that districts that receive this IRC water will not use the water to convert native lands to other uses, thereby validating Reclamation's conclusion that CVP contract deliveries do not result in land use changes that would adversely affect Federally-listed species or critical habitat.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Reclamation has also requested formal consultation for the California least tern and giant garter snake based on the potential for effects associated with subsurface agricultural drainage contamination indirectly related to deliveries of WWD's IRCs. This biological opinion will focus on the effects of WWD's IRCs on these two species.

#### CVPIA Comprehensive Mapping Program

In the CVPIA Programmatic biological opinion (CVPIA BiOp) dated November 2000 (Service File 98-F-0124), Reclamation and the Service committed to develop a Comprehensive Mapping Program (as described on pages 2-62 and 2-63 of the CVPIA BiOp), to identify remaining natural habitats and cropping patterns within the State-permitted CVP Place of Use (POU), and identify any changes within those habitats that have occurred from 1993 to 1999, and then every 5 years thereafter. The Service is unaware of any recent habitat/crop mapping efforts for CVP POU completed by Reclamation since 2005. Habitat maps for WWD provided by Reclamation in the BA are from 2008. Additional maps for the SCVWD, including land use from 2010 for only a portion of the district, were provided by Reclamation via e-mail on January 23, 2014. The land use data in these maps were not classified in a manner consistent with previous datasets for the Comprehensive Mapping Program. Without consistent land use classification, loss of habitat cannot be reliably tracked. No information was provided by Reclamation on habitat trends for listed species (i.e., comparing current extent of listed species habitats with prior datasets from the Comprehensive Mapping Program).

We refer Reclamation to the language regarding the Comprehensive Mapping Program on page 2-64 of the CVPIA BiOp: *"Reclamation and the Service will use the best scientific and commercial information available, in conjunction with data from aerial photograph analysis to monitor trends in the environmental baseline for listed species. It is the ultimate goal of Interior to assure that listed species are being recovered. For any species affected by the CVP that are continuing to decline, the Service and Reclamation will immediately assess critical needs for the species and determine whether it is appropriate to expand the Conservation Program or implement other conservation measures. Any native habitat converted to agricultural or municipal/industrial use within the water service area without prior biological surveys, as required by Reclamation prior to the delivery of Reclamation water, will be evaluated to determine what mitigation measures will be required."*

#### **Introduction**

This biological opinion is a reinitiation of the Service's *February 29, 2000* Biological Opinion on IRCs (Service File 00-F-0056), and our consultations of *February 27, 2002* (Service File No., 02-F-0070), *February 27, 2004* (Service File No., 04-F-0360), *February 28, 2006* (Service File No., 06-F-0070), *December 15, 2008* (Service File 08-F-0538-1), *December 22, 2009* (Service File 08-I-0538-2), *February 26, 2010* (Service File 08-F-0538-3), and *February 29, 2012* (2012-F-0256-1). This consultation addresses the effects of the proposed renewal of six IRCs in the San Luis Unit (SLU) and Delta Division of the CVP, which are being established in accordance with Section 3401(c) of the CVPIA for a maximum period of 2 years. The water delivered for these IRCs will be used for agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes, and will not exceed water allocations determined by existing CVP operations criteria established in applicable Biological Opinions from the Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the effects of the continued long-term operation of the CVP and State Water Project (OCAP). Interim CVP water contract renewals are consistent with the tiered implementation of the CVPIA, as described

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

in the CVPIA BiOp (Service File 98-F-0124).

### **Consultation History**

The consultation history, prior to the current proposed action, was identified in detail in the previous consultation on WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs and is hereby incorporated by reference (Service File 2012-F-0256-1).

*October 31, 2013:* The Service receives a memo via e-mail from Reclamation requesting informal and formal consultation under the Act on WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs. The transmittal includes a Biological Assessment as an attachment.

*December 12, 2013:* The Service receives a hard copy of the memo from Reclamation requesting informal and formal consultation under the Act on WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs. The transmittal includes a hard copy of the Biological Assessment.

*December 13, 2013:* The Service receives via email from Reclamation, a press release announcing the availability of the DEA and draft Finding of No Significant Impact for WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs.

*January 23, 2014:* Reclamation provides additional maps via email to the Service of SCVWD CVP boundary, land use, listed species observations, and critical habitat.

*January 27, 2014:* Reclamation provides a table of Federally-listed species with designated critical habitat within the SCVWD.

### **Relationship of the Proposed Action to Other Reclamation Actions**

Our 2010 consultation on WWD and Delta Division 3-Way IRCs (Service File 08-F-0538-3) included narrative on related Reclamation actions and this narrative is hereby incorporated by reference.

### **Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the CVP and State Water Project**

The effects of water exports from the Delta on protected species are addressed separately by NMFS and Service in consultations on continued long-term operation of the CVP and State Water Project (SWP). Biological Opinions have been issued by NMFS (2009) and Service (December 15, 2008, Service File 08-F-1481-5) for the effects of the continued long-term operation of the CVP and SWP. However, since that time, the United States Court, Eastern District of California remanded the BiOps, and, Reclamation was ordered by the Court to comply with NEPA before accepting the Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives of the BiOps. It is expected that once a new Proposed Action is selected through the NEPA process, Reclamation will provide a new BA to the Service and NMFS and request consultation. In the meantime, Reclamation continues to comply with the existing BiOps and Court orders.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

#### Santa Clara Valley Water District Pipeline Maintenance Program

The San Felipe Water Delivery System was designed and built by Reclamation to deliver water from the San Luis Reservoir to portions of San Benito County and the Santa Clara Valley via the Coyote Pump Plant. The system is maintained by the SCVWD. Facilities in the San Felipe System include the Santa Clara Conduit and Tunnel, the Pacheco Conduit and Tunnel, Pacheco Pump Plant, Coyote Pump Plant, the Bifurcation Station, the Hollister Conduit and San Justo Reservoir. Age, wear, corrosion, leaks and loss of integrity due to seismic activity and other geologic processes all contribute to the degradation of the pipelines as time progresses. Preventative and corrective maintenance must be performed to uphold the integrity of the system and to ensure water delivery.

In August of 2007, the Bureau of Reclamation requested initiation of formal consultation for the Pacheco and Santa Clara Conduits/Tunnels Pipeline Maintenance Program (PMP) on the California red-legged frog and its critical habitat, the California tiger salamander and its critical habitat and the least Bell's vireo. Reclamation requested concurrence with the determination that the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the San Joaquin kit fox. In August 2007 Reclamation sent a BA and subsequently made some minor revisions. A revised BA was sent in March of 2008.

As workload issues did not allow time to prepare and issue a BiOp, Reclamation consulted with the Service on PMP activities for late 2007 (File Number: 81420-2008-1-0346) and again for early 2009 (File Number: 81420-2009-F-0245). No funding was available for any activities in 2009/2010. On June 29, 2010 Reclamation again requested a BiOp from the Service for the overall program but the Service informed Reclamation verbally that staffing would not allow this and that Reclamation should request another short-term consultation. On February 3, 2011, Reclamation received a BiOp addressing the effects of another short-term action (File Number: 81420-2010-F-1010). SCVWD conducted more work on a limited area along the Santa Clara Conduit in fall of 2011, within San Benito County. Reclamation made a determination of no effect on Federally-listed species and critical habitat for that action.

The SCVWD intends to implement the PMP activities on 21 additional pipelines that are owned and maintained by the District. The SCVWD has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the District PMP, covering all pipelines; however, Reclamation is only involved in work associated with the Pacheco and Santa Clara Conduits and Tunnels.

#### SJR Exchange Contractors Transfer Programs

The Service completed an informal consultation on a 25-year extension of a water transfer program (Transfer Program) involving the San Joaquin River Exchange Contract Water Authority (SJRECWA) on November 30, 2012 (Service File 2011-I-0701-3). Two of the water districts included in the Transfer Program, Central California Irrigation District and Firebaugh Canal Water District, participate in the Grassland Bypass Project (GBP) described in more detail below. One of the potential effects of the Transfer Program and associated tailwater recapture actions (recycling and reuse of surface water runoff within the SJRECWA districts) is a reduction in flows to the San Joaquin River and Salt and Mud Sloughs in the Grasslands Ecological Area (Grasslands marshes). The SJRECWA has installed over 250 low lift stations for the purpose of tailwater recapture that has resulted in the recapture and reuse of about 135,000 acre-feet/year (AFY) of tailwater (80,000 AFY developed for the Transfer Program and

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

about 54,000 AFY developed for use within the SJRECWA service area) that historically flowed into surface waterways including the Grasslands marshes and San Joaquin River. One of the key assumptions in the Environmental Impact Statement/Report for the Transfer Program was that the methods used to develop water for transfer will cause no change in current hydrologic conditions in waterways.

#### Grassland Bypass Project Revised Monitoring Plan

In 2009, Reclamation completed an Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision, and the Service completed a Biological Opinion (GBP BiOp; Service File 09-F-1306) on the proposed continuation of the GBP, 2010-2019. The Proposed Federal Action for the extension of the GBP is the execution of the Third Use Agreement between Reclamation and the San Luis Delta-Mendota Water Authority for the Federally-owned San Luis Drain (SLD) (Use Agreement). The term of the new Use Agreement is January 01, 2010, through December 31, 2019. Under the Proposed Action, the GBP will continue to consolidate subsurface drainwater collected from the 97,400 acres of agricultural lands in the Grasslands Drainage Area (GDA) and use a portion of the SLD to convey some of the highly contaminated drainwater around wetland habitat areas of the Grasslands marshes. The collected drainwater is discharged from the SLD into Mud Slough (North) for six miles before the slough reaches the San Joaquin River at a location three miles upstream of the river's confluence with the Merced River. The Federal action is the implementation of that Use Agreement.

Subsequent to the time that the Service completed consultation on the GBP, Reclamation made available for public comment on April 2, 2013, a revised monitoring plan (RMP) for the GBP. The Service provided comments to Reclamation on the RMP on April 22, 2013 (Service File 13-TA-0368), including comments on the proposed elimination of monitoring and reporting of two stations in the Grasslands marshes (Station L2 – San Luis Canal, and Station M2 – Santa Fe Canal). It is our understanding that the RMP has not yet been finalized, but it is anticipated that Reclamation will finalize the plan sometime during 2014.

The RMP proposes to discontinue the monitoring and reporting of Stations L2, and M2 in the Grasslands marshes part of the GBP. It notes however, that monitoring will continue through other monitoring efforts, but the frequency of monitoring will decrease from weekly to monthly. The RMP notes on page 15, number 4 the following with respect to monitoring at Stations L2 and M2: "Site L2 (CCID San Luis Canal); and Site M2 (Santa Fe Canal) will be dropped from the GBP program, but will continue to be monitored by Grasslands Water District. Reclamation will provide funding to assist with selenium analyses at these sites."

### **BIOLOGICAL OPINION**

#### **Description of the Proposed Action**

The purpose of the proposed action is to execute one Delta Division and five SLU IRCs, between Reclamation and the contractors listed in Table 1 below, for a two-year period from March 1, 2014 through February 29, 2016, as required by, and to further implement CVPIA Section 3404(c). Execution of these six IRCs will provide the contractual relationship for the continued delivery of CVP water to the contractors pending execution of the long-term renewal contracts. Westlands WD's main contract (14-06-200-495A-IR3) is currently on its third interim renewal contract. The Proposed Action would be the fourth. The remaining IRCs listed in Table 1 are



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

currently on their thirteenth interim renewal contract. The Proposed Action would be the fourteenth.

**Table 1. Interim Contracts, Contract Entitlements and Purpose of Use**

Contractor	Contract number	Contract Entitlement (AF)	Purpose of Use
<b>DELTA DIVISION</b>			
PVMWA, WWD DD#1, SCVWD (3-way assignment from MSWD)	14-06-200-3365A-IR13-B	6,260	Ag or M&I
<b>SAN LUIS UNIT</b>			
WWD	4-06-200-495A-IR3	1,150,000	Ag or M&I
WWD DD#1 (full assignment from Centinella Water District)	7-07-20-W0055-IR13-B	2,500	Ag or M&I
WWD DD #1 (full assignment from Widren Water District)	14-06-200-8018-IR13-B	2,990	Ag or M&I
WWD DD #1 (full assignment from Broadview Water District)	14-06-200-8092-IR13	27,000	Ag or M&I
WWD DD #2 (partial assignment from MSWD)	14-06-200-3365A-IR13-C	4,198	Ag or M&I

The Proposed Action would continue these existing IRCs, with only minor administrative changes to the contract provisions to update the previous IRCs for the new contract period. In the event that new long-term water contracts are executed involving these contracts, the IRCs would then expire.

No changes to the contractors' service areas or water deliveries are part of the Proposed Action. Central Valley Project water deliveries under the IRCs can only be used within each designated contract service area (Figure 1). The proposed IRC quantities (Table 1) remain the same as in the existing interim renewal contracts. Water can be delivered under the IRCs in quantities up to the contract total, although it is likely that deliveries will be less than the contract total. The terms and conditions of the Delta Division and five SLU IRCs analyzed within the DEA for this action are incorporated by reference into the Proposed Action.

For the purposes of this consultation, and as outlined in the BA for this action, the conservation measures from the CVPIA BiOp apply to the WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs for the period of March 1, 2014 through February 29, 2016, or until long-term contracts are executed, whichever comes first. These measures are summarized in Appendix D. In addition, the DEA for WWD and Delta Division 3-way IRCs includes a land conversion commitment that stipulates the District receiving this water will not be able to expand their service areas, bring native or fallowed lands (fallowed and untilled for three years or more) into cultivation, or alter current environmental conditions without further environmental review and approval.

#### Westlands Water District

Westlands WD's permanent distribution system consists of 1,034 miles of closed, buried pipeline that conveys CVP water from the San Luis and Coalinga Canals and 7.4 miles of unlined canal that conveys CVP water from the Mendota Pool. The area served by the system encompasses about 88 percent of the irrigable land in the district, including all land lying east of the San Luis Canal. The district also operates and maintains the 12-mile long, concrete-lined Coalinga Canal, the Pleasant Valley Pumping Plant, and the laterals that supply CVP water to Coalinga and



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Huron. Westlands WD provides water via gravity water service and pumping from the San Luis Canal depending on location.

On June 5, 1963, WWD entered into a long-term contract (Contract 14-06-200-495-A) with Reclamation for 1,008,000 acre-feet of CVP supply from the San Luis Canal, Coalinga Canal, and Mendota Pool. In a stipulated agreement dated September 14, 1981, the contractual entitlement to CVP water was increased to 1.15 million acre-feet. The long-term contract expired on December 31, 2007. The first deliveries of CVP water from the San Luis Canal to WWD began in 1968.

In addition to the CVP supply, groundwater is available to some of the lands within WWD. The safe yield of the aquifer underlying the District is about 200,000 acre-feet (WWD 2009). Westlands WD supplies groundwater to some district farmers and owns some groundwater wells, with the remaining wells privately owned by water users in the district. Other water supply sources available to the district for purchase include floodwater diverted from the Mendota Pool in periods of high runoff and water transfers.

#### Santa Clara Valley Water District

The SCVWD includes all of Santa Clara County. The CVP place of use, however, does not include the entire county. Although CVP water is commingled with other sources of water, CVP water can only be applied in the CVP place of use within the SCVWD (see Figure 1).


Included in the 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012 IRCs, this interim renewal is the delivery of water from the partial assignment of MSWD to WWD Distribution District #1 (DD#1), and SCVWD. In 1999, MSWD assigned 6,260 acre-feet of its CVP Contract to the PVWMA, WWD DD #1, and the SCVWD (Contract 14-06-200-3365A-IR13-B). In conjunction with this Partial Contract Assignment, PVWMA, SCVWD and WWD DD #1 executed the "Agreement Relating to Partial Assignment of Water Service Contract" (Related Agreement). In general, the Related Agreement allows SCVWD and WWD DD#1 to take delivery of the water on an interim basis unless and until PVWMA is ready to take delivery of this CVP water. For the purposes of this consultation and as provided in the BA, PVWMA is assumed to not take this water until after 2019. The proposed action does not include an analysis of the construction of a conveyance structure or effects of the delivery of CVP water to PVWMA service area. Pajaro VWMA currently has no infrastructure to divert and convey CVP water to its service area, and will not have that capability at any time during this 2-year IRC period.

#### **Key Assumptions**

Because of the complex history as well as the complex present environmental and regulatory context of IRCs, and because this action is related to a number of other Reclamation actions, the Service has had to make a number of assumptions about likely future events and context of the interim renewal action. While not exhaustive, the following list of key assumptions has been central to our effects analysis. As such, the failing of any key assumption should be considered reason for reinitiating consultation on these IRCs. The Service assumes the following:

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

**Figure 1. Overview of Proposed Action Area**



1. Reclamation will continue to adhere to the conservation measures from previous IRC consultations, specifically to ensure that project water is not used in a manner that adversely affects listed, proposed or candidate species. The Service considers the scope of this conservation measure to include the assurance that project water will not be used in whole or in part to facilitate the conversion of existing natural habitat to agricultural or other purposes and this determination is essential to the conclusions made regarding the overall effects of the proposed action. If this fundamental assumption is violated, or is not valid, then the effects analysis and conclusion of this BiOp will need to be reviewed, which may prompt reinitiation of this consultation.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

2. Reclamation will continue to implement in a timely manner relevant environmental commitments, conservation measures, and terms and conditions from other biological opinions as appropriate. These commitments include implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operations and Maintenance of the CVP (November 21, 2000, Service File No., 98-F-0124), and the Grassland Bypass Project 2010-2019 (Service File No., 09-F-1036). Other CVP-related, non-CVPIA actions benefiting fish, wildlife, and associated habitats and related to effects of IRCs will continue, with at least current funding levels, including:
  - a. the Central Valley Habitat Monitoring Program's Comprehensive Mapping;
  - b. implementation of the Central Valley Habitat Monitoring Program's Land Use Monitoring and Reporting; and
  - c. CVP Conservation Program and CVPIA B(1)(other) Habitat Restoration Program.
3. The analysis for this opinion is based on the assumption that CVP water contract amounts and deliveries will remain consistent with those provided and analyzed in the Final PEIS for CVPIA and the 2008 OCAP biological opinion.

#### **Analytical Framework for the Jeopardy Analysis**

In accordance with policy and regulation, the jeopardy analyses in this Biological Opinion rely on four components: (1) the Status of the Species, which evaluates the species' range-wide condition, the factors responsible for that condition, and its survival and recovery needs; (2) the Environmental Baseline, which evaluates the condition of the species in the action area, the factors responsible for that condition, and the relationship of the action area to the survival and recovery of the species; (3) the Effects of the Action, which determines the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed Federal action and the effects of any interrelated or interdependent activities on the species; and (4) Cumulative Effects, which evaluates the effects of future, non-Federal activities in the action area on the giant garter snake, San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, California least tern, and San Joaquin woolly-threads.

In accordance with policy and regulation, the jeopardy determination is made by evaluating the effects of the proposed Federal action in the context of the species' current status, taking into account any cumulative effects, to determine if implementation of the proposed action is likely to cause an appreciable reduction in the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of the species in the wild.

The jeopardy analysis in this Biological Opinion places an emphasis on consideration of the range-wide survival and recovery needs of the giant garter snake and California least tern and the role of the action area in the survival and recovery of these species as the context for evaluating the significance of the effects on the proposed Federal action, taken together with cumulative effects, for purposes of making the jeopardy determination.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

### **Action Area**

The action area includes all areas to be directly or indirectly affected by the Federal action and not merely the immediate areas involved in the Proposed Action [50 C.F.R. §402.02)]. The action area for this Proposed Action falls mainly within portions of western Fresno and Kings Counties and a portion of Santa Clara County (see Figure 1).

The action area primarily consists of lands within the boundary of the CVP's SLU and San Felipe Division. The action area also includes the canals and waterways that convey agricultural runoff and subsurface drainage flows from agricultural lands within and down slope of the SLU (including those in the Grasslands marshes) back to the San Joaquin River.

The action area also includes the CVP Service Areas of the WWD and SCVWD. The WWD boundary covers 605,422 acres of which 595,884 acres are within the CVP Place of Use Boundary (permitted to receive CVP water). In 2006, WWD purchased 9,100 acres of lands previously owned by Broadview WD and these lands are now considered part of WWD DD#1. SCVWD, which is within the San Felipe Division of the CVP, encompasses the entire Santa Clara County; however, the permitted place of use for the CVP water is considerably smaller. Maps of the CVP Contract Service Area boundaries are included in the DEA for this action and are hereby incorporated by reference.

### **Status of the Species**

#### California Least Tern

For the most recent comprehensive assessment of the species' range-wide status, please refer to the California Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation (USFWS 2006a). This 5-year review resulted in a recommendation that the species' listing status be down-listed to Threatened as a result of recovery efforts that have ameliorated, but not removed, threats to the population; intensive, site-specific management is still required to reduce threats of habitat loss and predation that would reverse the population recovery that has been seen since the species was listed. Threats evaluated during the 5-year review and discussed in the final document have continued to act on the species since the 2006 review was finalized; however, to date no project has proposed a level of effect for which the Service's SFWO has issued a biological opinion of jeopardy for the species. In 2009 the Service published a Spotlight Species Action Plan for the California least tern (USFWS 2009), which included the statement that nesting has occurred sporadically but increasingly at inland sites in the Bay-Delta and Central Valley. The Service initiated another 5-year status review for the California least tern in 2010.

#### Giant Garter Snake

For the most recent comprehensive assessment of the species' range-wide status, please refer to the Giant Garter Snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation (USFWS 2012). No change in the species' listing status was recommended in this 5-year review. Threats evaluated during that review and discussed in the final document have continued to act on the species since the 2012 5-year review was finalized, with loss and fragmentation of habitat from both urban and agricultural development, as well as the potential loss of habitat associated with changes in rice production, being the most significant threats. To date, no project has proposed a level of effect for which the Service's SFWO has issued a biological opinion of jeopardy for the species.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

### **Environmental Baseline**

As defined at 50 CFR 402.2, the environmental baseline includes the past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in the Action Area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the Action Area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultation, and the impact of State or private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation in process.

The environmental baseline for a portion of the action area considered in this consultation, the surface waters in the Grasslands marshes and San Joaquin River, was updated in the Grassland Bypass Project Biological Opinion for 2010 – 2019 (GBP BiOp) (Service File 09-F-1036), and is incorporated here by reference. Further, the environmental baseline for the giant garter snake was updated in the GBP BiOp, and as the action area for this IRC consultation is consistent with the action area for the GBP BiOp, these species' baselines are incorporated here by reference as well.

The baseline condition for IRCs assumes that any drainage service provided to the SLU be consistent with the project description and assumptions in the San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation (SLDFR) BiOp (Service File 06-F-0027). Any drainage management implemented in a manner not considered in the SLDFR BiOp will need to undergo separate section 7 consultation pursuant to the Act.

### Land use patterns within the San Luis Unit

In the BA for Long Term Contract Renewal for the SLU (SLU BA; USBR 2004a), Reclamation estimated that about 14 percent of the Unit's land area remained undeveloped. Approximately 71 percent of undeveloped lands were in the hills surrounding the Pleasant Valley near the City of Coalinga and the Kettleman Hills near the City of Avenal. The remaining 29 percent was in the northern portion of the SLU near Santa Nella and various small parcels throughout the Unit. Approximately 75 to 81 percent of the SLU was estimated to be irrigated farmland, 2.5 percent to be in oil production, and 1.5 percent to be in urban areas, farmsteads, and transportation and conveyance facilities (CDWR 2004, USBR 2004a).

The SLU BA estimated that in 2004, about one half of the Unit's irrigated farmland was used for the production of cotton (35 percent) and tomatoes (16 percent). About 11 percent was used for orchards and vineyards, half of which is used for the production of almonds. The remaining farmland was used for a variety of crops, such as alfalfa, asparagus, wheat, melons, corn, grain, and various pasture crops (CDWR 2004; USBR 2004).

Since the 2004 SLU BA, there has been a trend toward an increasing proportion of WWD planted in permanent crops (orchards and vineyards) (Phillips 2006; WWD 2005-2013 crop reports), particularly on the western, non-drainage impaired portion of the district (Phillips 2006). Phillips (2006) estimated that acreage of permanent crops in the Fresno County portion of the SLU has increased nearly eightfold between 1977 and 2000 and nearly fourfold between 1994 and 2000. Most of these permanent crops were planted in the western third of WWD. Annual crop reports from WWD from 2005 – 2013<sup>1</sup> indicate that permanent crop acreage has

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: [www.westlandswater.org](http://www.westlandswater.org)



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

nearly doubled since 2005 (from 88,833 acres of trees and vines in 2005 to 160,728 acres in 2013).

In 2007 Cypher *et al.* estimated that there were approximately 5,559 acres of suitable habitat and 20,543 acres of moderately suitable sub-optimal habitat currently available for San Joaquin kit fox in the SLDFR study area. Most of the suitable and most of the sub-optimal San Joaquin kit fox habitats identified in 2007 remained between the western boundary of WWD and Interstate 5. The kit fox is the only listed species considered in this consultation that may at times utilize crop lands to any extent.

Municipal and industrial activities in each of the communities that utilize the contract water have resulted in destruction, modification, or degradation of habitat used by San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, California jewel flower, and San Joaquin woolly-threads (SWRCB 1999). Many, but not all of these activities took place prior to implementation of the Act in 1973 and prior to the listing of the species considered in this consultation, and were not subject to the provisions of the Act. In the SLU BA, Reclamation identified approximately 34,860 acres of urban or industrial land uses including transportation corridors, industrial areas, farmsteads and urban/residential areas in the SLU. The largest block of this total (25,290 acres) is the industrial transportation category, which includes the I-5 corridor and other roadways and individual farmsteads.

#### California Least Tern

The environmental baseline for California least tern in the San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation Biological Opinion (SLDFR BiOp; Service File 06-F-0027) is incorporated by reference. In addition, it has been determined by the Service that there is suitable habitat for California least terns in the action area. As denoted in the spotlight species action plan for the California Least Tern 2010-2014 (USFWS 2009), "(n)esting has also occurred sporadically but increasingly at inland sites in the Bay-Delta and Central Valley." Numerous sightings of California least terns have been documented in the southern San Joaquin Valley in Kings County near WWD. The first record for the Tulare Basin, a single adult, was observed in 1995 at Tulare Lake Drainage District's North Evaporation Basin northwest of Corcoran. The first Central Valley breeding record was from Kings County near Kettleman City. A second breeding site was recorded in Kings County in 1999, a third at Tulare Lake Drainage District's (TLDD) Hacienda Evaporation Basin in 2003 and 2004, and breeding has continued in the county with one pair at Westlake Farms South evaporation pond near Kettleman City fledging a single chick in 2009 and a pair of chicks in 2010 (Conard, 2009; Marschalek, 2011). The evaporation ponds where least terns have nested are proximate to big surface water canals (the Blakely canal and the Cohn Levee for Westlake Farms South and the Homeland and Liberty Farms Canals and South Wilbur flood area for TLDD's Hacienda ponds) (Pers. comm. J. Seay, HT Harvey and Associates, February 25, 2014). Although no least tern nesting has been documented within WWD, the Service believes that the California least tern is reasonably certain to occur within the action area because of records of the animal within dispersal distance of the action area and the biology and ecology of the species.

As described in the BA for this action and information provided by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB; Pers. comm. A. Toto, 2010) there are at least two evaporation basins in the vicinity of WWD that receive at least some agricultural drainage water



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

originating from WWD: Stone Land Company (~210 acres) and Westlake Farms North (~260 acres). Avian monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Regional Water Board for the Stone Land Company (years 2003-3 and 2004-5; Palmer 2004, 2005) and Westlake Farms North (years 2011-12; HT Harvey and Associates 2012, 2013) evaporation ponds, documented no sightings of least terns. There is a third site at Lemoore Naval Air Station that disposes of at least some drainage water originating from WWD with sewage water in an evaporation basin (~90 acres). California least terns have been documented at the evaporation basins at Lemoore Naval Air Station, but are believed to be feeding elsewhere as the ponds are too saline to support fish (Pers. comm. J. Seay, HT Harvey and Associates, February 25, 2014). Further, selenium concentrations at the Lemoore evaporation ponds have been consistently below 2 µg/L, and as a result, the Regional Water Board revised Lemoore's Monitoring and Reporting Program associated with Waste Discharge Requirements Order R5-2002-0062 to revise avian monitoring requirements to dead bird monitoring only (W.W. Gross, CVRWQCB, *in litt.* 2012).

The San Luis Drain is approximately 85 miles long. Of that, 28 miles are used by the GBP to convey drainage to a six-mile stretch of Mud Slough (North) before the slough reaches the San Joaquin River at a location three miles upstream of the river's confluence with the Merced River. Approximately 55 miles of the SLD is within WWD and is no longer actively used to convey drainage water. However, sections of this unused portion of the SLD contain standing water. The source of this water is shallow contaminated groundwater, which enters the SLD by means of one-way valves that were installed to prevent groundwater pressure from compromising the integrity of the SLD. The USGS (Presser and Luoma, 2006, Appendix E) quantified the amount of sediment in the full 85 miles of the SLD as 177,900 cubic yards ranging from 5 to 190 ppm selenium on a dry weight basis, with selenium concentrations in water from the SLD in WWD ranging from 330-430 ppb (from Presser and Barnes 1985). It is unknown what wildlife use the SLD, or if the SLD is used by Federally-listed species such as the California least tern. However, the Service believes that the tern is reasonably likely to use wetted portions of the SLD because they are known to forage in canals and may nest on levees or other open areas within the SLD Right of Way, there are records of breeding in Kings County, portions of the SLD have mosquitofish (see GBP BiOp), and the potential is very high for selenium to bioaccumulate in the food chain organisms residing in or foraging from the SLD.

#### Giant Garter Snake

The environmental baseline for the giant garter snake in the GBP BiOp is incorporated here by reference. The GBP BiOp included an updated Status of the Species and Environmental Baseline on the threatened giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) in the Grasslands marshes and Mendota Pool vicinity. The Service found that the garter snake has been adversely affected by water management actions (i.e. water transfers/exchanges, and ground water pumping, which have contributed to changes in cropping patterns), limited availability of summer water habitat (e.g., level 4 refuge water supplies) and by degradation of water quality in the San Joaquin Valley. The GBP BiOp indicated that under current conditions in the Grasslands marshes water supply channels, *"dietary selenium concentrations in the South Grasslands still pose a risk to growth, reproduction and survival of giant garter snakes. Further, contamination in the food chain in the North Grasslands, specifically Mud Slough (North) could preclude re-establishment of the snake in the vicinity of this waterway."* The current baseline of the garter snake in the Grasslands marshes and Mendota Pool vicinity was determined to be experiencing significantly declining numbers, and reduced reproduction and distribution through this portion of its range.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Since the onset of the second Use Agreement of the San Luis Drain (Use Agreement) for the GBP in September 2001, there have been consistent short-term pulses of selenium inputs into the Grasslands marshes water supply channels that have resulted in exceedences of the 2 µg/L monthly mean selenium objective. Sources of ongoing selenium contamination in Grassland marshes include (1) continued contamination of the water supply in the Delta Mendota Canal; (2) unregulated and unmonitored discharges of agricultural subsurface drainwater from nearby farmland into local ditches and canals that feed into the Grassland marshes; (3) and large storm events that can overwhelm the GBP channel, requiring that uncontrollable storm runoff be diverted into wetland supply channels (Beckon *et al.* 2007; Paveglio and Kilbride 2007; Eppinger and Chilcott 2002). Typically, these exceedences of 2 µg/L are associated with heavy rainfall events, occur in the spring of each year (usually in March and/or April), but can also occur during periods of low flow in the wetland channels as depicted in Figure 2 below, Weekly Selenium Concentrations at GBP site L2 in the San Luis Canal, 1996-2007 (a wetland supply channel in the South Grasslands). As a result of exceedences of selenium water quality objectives and an existing TMDL for the Grassland wetland channels, the SWRCB included the Grasslands Marshes on the 2010 Integrated Report of impaired water bodies for California (SWRCB 2010).

Subsequent to the GBP BiOp on the third Use Agreement of the San Luis Drain in December 2009, a GBP monthly monitoring report identified elevated selenium concentrations at Station K, Agatha Canal, for the month of August 2009. Three of four weekly samples collected in August 2009 from Station K exceeded 2 µg/L, with the highest concentration of 26.4 µg/L selenium documented on August 10, 2009. Exceedences of the selenium water quality objective in the South Grasslands water supply channels continued into 2013, where site L2 exceeded 2 µg/L in three of four weeks sampled in March, and for the entire month of June, and three of the four weeks sampled in July (USBR *et al.* 2009-2013).

## **Effects of the Action**

### **Effects Overview**

This section includes a general overview of the effects to listed species or their habitats that are related to the use of the CVP water supply in the service areas under the proposed 24-month IRCs. It is assumed that all conservation measures and environmental commitments described in the Project Description of this BO will be implemented in the manner and schedule described previously in this document. We anticipate that effects will be similar in scope and significance as those analyzed in our recent evaluations of the previous IRCs (Service Files 12-F-0256, 08-F-0538, 06-F-0070, 04-F-0360, 02-F-0070, and 00-F-0056), GBP (09-F-1036) and in the programmatic biological opinion on implementation of the CVPIA (Service File 98-F-0124).


Impacts associated with Reclamation's implementation of drainage service for the SLU (including WWD) were considered in a biological opinion on SLDFR (Service File 06-F-0027). Any changes to drainage service not considered in the SLDFR Opinion will require separate section 7 consultation.

### **Direct Effects**

We address the effects of future implementation of IRCs, including the effects of interrelated and interdependent actions, as effects of the Federal action, not as part of the environmental baseline. The jeopardy analysis compares the environmental baseline that exists at the time of the Federal

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

**Figure 2. Weekly Selenium Concentrations at GBP site L2 in the San Luis Canal, 1996 – 2007 (from Chilcott and Schnagl, 2008)**



action to the adverse effects of the Federal action projected into the future, starting at the time the Federal action is taken, including the effects of interrelated and interdependent actions.

There will be no direct effects to listed species associated with the proposed execution of the interim contracts considered in this BiOp for the 24 month period beginning March 1, 2014, through February 29, 2016. The proposed Federal action will continue deliveries of water to WWD, as well as the Delta Division 3-way IRC allocated to SCVWD. No construction of new facilities, installation of new structures, or modification of existing facilities is required or planned. Delivery of Federal water from the six IRCs considered in this consultation, and from the contractors to the individual water users, will maintain the patterns of land use described above in the **Environmental Baseline**. Execution of the IRC's is the action that allows for the delivery of the Federal CVP water, and thus any effects anticipated would be indirect, rather than direct.

#### Indirect Effects

Indirect effects are effects caused by or result from the proposed action, will occur later in time, and are reasonably certain to occur, and would not occur "but for" the project. Indirect effects may also occur outside of the area directly affected by the action. Indirect effects to listed species or suitable habitat have likely occurred as a result of the delivery of CVP water to the

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

individual water districts or municipalities during the life of the existing water delivery contract. Many of these activities took place prior to implementation of the ESA in 1973 and prior to the listing of the species listed below and were not subject to the provisions of the ESA. Land use decisions subsequent to that time have continued to result in adverse effects to the species and suitable habitat and have not been authorized incidental take under section 9 or 10 of the ESA.

Conversions of native habitat to agricultural use may occur as a result of, or related to Federal water deliveries. The use of CVP water in the past destroyed, modified, fragmented, or degraded habitat for the species addressed in this BiOp (see Status of the Species and Environmental Baseline). The land conservation commitment in the EA for these IRCs is intended to preclude the conversion of existing natural habitat to agricultural or other purposes without additional consultation.

#### California Least Tern

Least terns are piscivorous, which places them at risk from waterborne contaminants that can enter the food web and bioaccumulate in their prey. Evaporation basins create artificial aquatic ecosystems, in which some semblance of an aquatic food web can develop in the selenium-contaminated drainwater. Depending on the salinity of the water, these large holding ponds may support a variety of aquatic micro- and macro-invertebrates, as well as some species of salinity-tolerant fish. As evaporation basins are generally not connected in any way to natural aquatic systems, any fish present in these ponds are either intentionally or accidentally introduced. Due to the highly bioaccumulative nature of selenium and the preternaturally high selenium concentrations found in evaporation basin water, any aquatic organisms living in these ponds are likely to develop high selenium body burdens. Similarly, any higher trophic level species that feeds on an evaporation basin's aquatic organisms is also likely to develop high body burdens, with the consequent risk for adverse effects of selenium toxicity.

The California least tern is one of three recognized geographic subspecies; the other two being from the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, and the West Indies (*S. a. antillarum*) or from the interior United States (*S. a. athalassos*) (Thompson *et al.* 1997). At the species level, least terns are known to be primarily piscivorous, but will also consume insects and aquatic crustaceans such as shrimp (Thompson *et al.* 1997).

Observations of nesting California least terns from around the Tulare Basin evaporation ponds suggests that these birds maintain their piscivorous behavior, even in the presence of abundant aquatic macro-invertebrates. California least terns were first noticed nesting around these evaporation ponds in 1998, with one known pair setting up a nest and producing a clutch of eggs (Pers. comm. J. Seay, HT Harvey and Associates, 2006). Since that time, least terns have continued to nest around these ponds in subsequent years, with the highest number of known nest pairs (3) occurring in 1999. The foraging behavior of these nesting terns has been observed each year, and the only food items ever seen were fish captured from open drainwater canals, nearby flood control reservoirs, and evaporation ponds. The types of fish captured and their origin in the drainage canals could not be readily determined, but at least one fish from the silversides family (Antheridae) was dropped by a foraging least tern and identified by a biologist, and *Gambusia* were known to have been established in canals by local mosquito abatement personnel (Pers. comm. J. Seay, HT Harvey and Associates, 2006).

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

As described in the **Environmental Baseline**, there are three evaporation basins in the vicinity of WWD known to receive at least some drainage originating from WWD. Based on information gathered during this consultation, the three evaporation basins in WWDs are not likely to adversely affect the least tern because the basins are too saline to support the fish populations that would serve as their prey base (Pers. comm. J. Seay, HT Harvey and Associates, February 25, 2014).

Sections of the 55 miles of the SLD in WWD contain standing water originating from the adjacent shallow groundwater aquifer. Information regarding the extent of wetted area, and water quality and food-chain contamination from the SLD was not available for this consultation. California least terns are known to prey on mosquitofish (Thompson *et al.* 1997), and sections of the SLD have mosquitofish (see GBP BiOp). Due to the highly bioaccumulative nature of selenium and other pollutants that may be present in the agricultural drainwater (*e.g.*, methylmercury), any least terns foraging from such a prey base are likely to be exposed to these contaminants. Therefore, in the absence of data, it is presumed that selenium contamination is likely to occur in a small number of least terns foraging from the SLD in WWD. Affected individuals would experience impaired reproduction, including nest failure and production of deformed young. The numbers of terns using the action area for foraging and nesting is expected to be low; the Service anticipates that not more than one nest per year would occur within the action area and could be adversely affected by drainage contamination from the SLD during the two-year duration of the IRC.

Kesterson Reservoir was an evaporation basin that received agricultural drainage conveyed through the SLD from WWD in the early to mid-1980s. Kesterson received drainage water containing 330 µg/L selenium over several years. Selenium concentrations at Kesterson Reservoir ranged from 20-110 mg/kg in benthic and water-column invertebrates, 170 mg/kg in mosquitofish (whole body), and about 10-70 mg/kg in bird eggs. About 40 percent of nests of ducks and other waterbirds contained one or more dead or deformed embryos and four species of waterbirds (American avocet, black-necked stilt, eared grebe, and American coot) experienced complete reproductive failure. Some adult birds also died, and many of these showed alopecia (loss of feathers), a classic symptom of acute selenium poisoning (Ohlendorf *et al.* 1986; Presser and Ohlendorf 1987; Ohlendorf *et al.* 1988; Ohlendorf 1989; Moore *et al.* 1990; Saiki and Ogle 1995; USDOJ 1998).

#### Giant Garter Snake

Giant garter snakes in the Grasslands marshes may be subject to harm as a result of contamination from subsurface movement of shallow groundwater originating in WWD. Although WWD does not discharge subsurface drainage directly to surface water channels or the San Joaquin River, several Reclamation NEPA documents (*i.e.*, San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation Final Environmental Impact Statement [SLDFR FEIS, USBR 2006a]; Draft Supplemental EIS SLU Long Term Contract Renewals [SLU DSEIS, USBR 2006b]; Broadview Water Contract Assignment Project Draft EA [Broadview DEA, USBR 2004b]) have documented there is a hydraulic connection of shallow groundwater contamination originating in WWD to downslope lands that do discharge to surface waters.

The SLDFR FEIS included a regional groundwater flow model for the SLDFR project area (which included agricultural lands in the SLU, Delta Mendota Canal Unit, and San Joaquin



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Exchange Contractors service areas) developed by Hydrofocus Inc. The SLDFR FEIS noted on page 6-26 that, *"Using the groundwater-flow model results, horizontal groundwater velocities were estimated at about 500 feet/year in the upper 50 feet of the saturated zone for the 1-foot/year seepage rate. Therefore, in 44 years groundwater with high salinity and constituent concentrations could travel about 20,000 feet downgradient from the evaporation basins. Results suggested significant water level increases could affect crop root zone salinity within 3,500 feet of the evaporation basins..."* The SLU DSEIS found that, *"The Westlands Subarea has no drainage discharge to the receiving waters of the State, therefore it is not directly affected by the current salinity and boron TMDL which limits discharge into the San Joaquin River. However, these actions have an indirect impact on the hydrology of the Basin owing to regional groundwater flow from Westlands into the Grasslands subarea..."* Further, the Broadview DEA (Reclamation 2004b) noted on page 4-2 that, *"...the Proposed Action would reduce the quantity of drainage water currently being discharged from the BWD [Broadview WD] to the San Joaquin River by approximately 2,600 acre-feet or 70 percent of water per year (Summers Engineering, 2003). More specifically, by fallowing the BWD lands and not applying CVP water for irrigation, the estimated reduction in drain water discharge from existing conditions (approximately 3,700 acre feet per year [afy]), will be reduced by approximately 1,100 afy. Most of these resulting flows are likely attributable to sub-surface flows originating from up-gradient locations to the south and west..."* and on page 4-12 that, *"Although irrigated agriculture would be discontinued within the BWD, under-land flow of groundwater from up-gradient locations would still contribute to drain water within BWD drainage canals."* In other words, the Broadview DEA estimated that about a third of the subsurface drainage below Broadview WD originated outside and upslope of district boundaries via lateral flow from agricultural lands in the south and west (i.e., WWD).

The SWRCB in their Water Rights Decision 1641 (SWRCB 2000) identified lands within the SLU which contribute to drainage water contamination to the San Joaquin River, *"...the SWRCB finds that the actions of the CVP are the principal cause of the salinity concentrations exceeding the objectives at Vernalis. The salinity problem at Vernalis is the result of saline discharges to the river, principally from irrigated agriculture, combined with low flows in the river due to upstream development. The source of much of the saline discharge to the San Joaquin River is from lands on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley which are irrigated with water provided from the Delta by the CVP, primarily through the Delta-Mendota Canal and the San Luis Unit."* Oppenheimer and Groeber (2004) in a draft staff report for the Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River, noted the following with respect to WWD effects to San Joaquin River water quality: *"The Grassland Subarea contains some of most [sic] salt-affected lands in the LSJR watershed. This subarea is also the largest contributor of salt to the LSJR (approximately 37% of the LSJR's mean annual salt load). Previous studies indicate that shallow groundwater in the LSJR watershed is of the poorest quality (highest salinity) in the Grassland Subarea (SJVDP, 1990). The Grassland Subarea drains approximately 1,370 square miles on the west side of the LSJR in portions of Merced, Stanislaus, and Fresno Counties. This subarea includes the Mud Slough, Salt Slough, and Los Banos Creek watersheds. The eastern boundary of this subarea is generally formed by the LSJR between the Merced River confluence and the Mendota Dam. The Grassland Subarea extends across the LSJR, into the east side of the San Joaquin Valley, to include the lands within the Columbia Canal Company [and including the Northern Portion of Westlands Water District]."*



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

In addition, Steve Deverel of Hydrofocus Inc., in written testimony for the SWRCB Bay-Delta Water Rights Hearing in 1998, described the effect of the shallow drainage problem upslope of the Firebaugh Canal WD and Central California Irrigation District (primarily in WWD) on drainage conditions within these districts (Deverel 1998). Relevant excerpts are provided below:

*"I have also been asked if I could quantify the load of salinity and selenium that enters along this boundary by downslope migration compared to the drainage load leaving Firebaugh Canal Water District as an example. Downslope migration does not explain all of the load but a part of it is from this shallow downslope flow, in the range of 20 to 40%..."*

*"...Elevations of groundwater in saturated areas in upslope areas are higher than elevation [sic] in lower areas. Although a particular particle of Water will take many years to migrate, in saturated soils pressure is very quickly transmitted to areas of lesser pressure. That is what is happening here. Pressure transmitted from high areas to low areas as an example will cause poor quality Water to show up in surface drain and be counted as load. A particle of poor quality Water may have originated from farming the downslope areas or migrated in the shallow geological features from farming the downslope areas or migrated in the shallow geological features from upslope, but the pressure causes it to rise into the tile drainage and surface drain and flow out."*

*"Pumping decreased substantially during the 1950's and 1960's as surface water was delivered and groundwater water levels rose. This rise in the groundwater levels continues to occur and has caused increases in pressures in downslope areas which have contributed to drainage flows."*

A comprehensive analysis of the effects of drainwater contamination to giant garter snake in the Grasslands marshes was provided in the GBP BiOp and is incorporated here by reference. The Service concluded in the GBP BiOp that *"under current baseline conditions, dietary selenium concentrations in the South Grasslands still poses a risk to growth, reproduction and survival of giant garter snakes. Further, contamination in the food chain in the North Grasslands, specifically Mud Slough (North) could preclude re-establishment of the snake in the vicinity of this waterway."*

Given that giant garter snakes forage on fish and tadpoles, and these taxa are the most selenium-impacted of the biota sampled in the south Grasslands marshes, it is reasonable to conclude that the giant garter snake is likely adversely affected by selenium in their diet. Among vertebrates, reproductive toxicity is one of the most sensitive endpoints; however birds and fish seem to have substantially lower thresholds for reproductive toxicity than placental mammals (USDOI 1998). Selenium is first and foremost a reproductive toxicant (both a gonadotoxicant and a teratogen); the degree of reproductive damage determines whether populations are adversely affected (Luoma and Presser 2009). It is assumed that for reptiles (such as the giant garter snake) reproductive impairment is among the most sensitive response variables to selenium contamination (USDOI 1998). Therefore, adverse effects to giant garter snakes from dietary exposure to selenium in the aquatic food chain of the south Grasslands marshes are likely to take the form of impaired reproduction.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

The renewal of IRCs for Westlands WD contributes to some unknown degree to selenium contamination and exceedences of water quality objectives in the Grasslands marshes and the San Joaquin River; other sources of selenium contamination are also present and contributing to contamination and exceedences of water quality objectives. However, it is unknown whether adverse effects are actually occurring to the garter snake from selenium contamination in the Grasslands marshes, and if so, how much the renewal of Westlands IRC CVP deliveries contributes to those effects.

### **Cumulative Effects**

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, Tribal, local or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological opinion. Future Federal actions unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. The discussion of cumulative effects in the 2000 (Service File 00-F-0056) and 2002 (Service File 02-F-0070) IRC BiOps is incorporated here by reference.

Many of the private actions that will occur as an indirect effect of receiving CVP contract supply would also occur without the Federal water deliveries. Those actions that will occur without Federal water deliveries from the proposed action will result in cumulative effects.

### **Summary of Effects**

#### **California least tern**

- Likely to be present and foraging in wetted portions of the SLD located within or adjacent to WWD that receive groundwater accretions from the District. Effect determination: May adversely affect as a result of harm through impaired reproduction.

#### **Giant garter snake**

- In the WWD, with the exception of a heavy rainfall occurrence where floodwater causes sheetflow over district lands, there is no surface discharge of subsurface agricultural drainage within or outside district boundaries. Contaminated shallow groundwater in WWD contributes to some degree to conditions that have the potential to result in adverse effects to giant garter snake downslope and out of the district. Subsurface agricultural drainage contamination impacts water quality in the Grasslands marshes and has the potential to contribute to adverse effects to an already impaired baseline for the snake. Effect determination: May adversely affect.

### **Conclusion**

**California least tern** - After reviewing the current status of the California least tern, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action, and the cumulative effects, it is the Service's biological opinion that the action, as proposed is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of this species. Our conclusion is based on the conservation measures and anticipated commitments provided in the project description, the short duration of the IRCs, CVP water allocations in the recent past as well as for the year 2014.

**Giant Garter Snake** - Giant garter snake habitat is present in the portion of the action area within the Grassland marshes. Based on the best available information the Service can obtain, we believe that the use of the CVP water supply authorized by renewal of the proposed IRCs will

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

contribute in some degree to degraded habitat conditions in the Grassland marshes. These degraded habitat conditions, in the form of elevated selenium concentrations in water and biota, periodically reach levels that are reasonably likely to result in adverse effects to any giant garter snakes that could be present at those times. However, these degraded habitat conditions likely result from multiple sources, and at the present time there is no way to determine the magnitude of the contribution resulting from the IRCs. To the extent that giant garter snakes are present during the times when selenium concentrations are elevated, they could be exposed through contaminated prey items.

While the potential exists that snakes could be adversely affected if exposed to these habitat conditions, we cannot determine that take will occur as a result of the proposed action. We have no ability to measure or even estimate the adverse effect of selenium from all sources, and no way to estimate the contribution of these IRCs. However, it is also our determination that although this potential exists, we believe that if these adverse effects are manifested from the fractional contribution from the IRCs, the magnitude of them would not be likely to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of giant garter snake. After reviewing the current status of the giant garter snake, the environmental baseline for the action area, and the potential effects of the proposed action, it is the Service's biological opinion that the action, as proposed is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of this species.

#### INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harass is defined by FWS regulations at 50 CFR 17.3 as an intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harm is defined by the same regulations as an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavior patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Incidental Take Statement.

The measures described below are non-discretionary, and must be undertaken by the (agency) so that they become binding conditions of any grant or permit issued to the (applicant), as appropriate, for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. The (agency) has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If the (agency) (1) fails to assume and implement the terms and conditions or (2) fails to require the (applicant) to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms that are added to the permit or grant document, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse. In order to monitor the impact of incidental take, the (agency or applicant) must report the progress of the action and its impact on the species to the Service as specified in the incidental take statement.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

[50 CFR §402.14(i)(3)]

#### **Amount or Extent of Take**

According to Service Policy, as laid out in the Section 7 Handbook, dated March 1998, some detectable measure of effect should be provided in an incidental take statement. For instance, the relative occurrence of the species in the local community or surrogate species in the community or amount of habitat utilized by the species, serve as a measure for take.

**California Least Tern** - California least terns that forage in wetted portions of the SLD in or adjacent to WWD are likely to be adversely affected by the proposed project. Incidental take of the California least tern is expected to be in the form of killing or harming of individual birds, resulting from contamination.

The Service is estimating the level of take as injury to all California least terns that may occur resulting from selenium exposure originating from foraging in the SLD in or adjacent to WWD during the 2-year period covered by this consultation. Based on the low numbers of California least terns currently expected to occur in the action area, the Service anticipates that the number of California least terns that would be taken is low and would not exceed one (1) California least tern nest confirmed annually to be killed, be harmed, or have produced failed to hatch eggs, resulting from selenium contamination.

#### **Effect of the Take**

The Service has determined that this level of anticipated take, from the renewal of WWD's and Delta Division 3-way IRCs, is not likely to result in jeopardy to the California least tern. The effects of these IRCs on California least tern are not anticipated to be significant at the population level due to the low numbers of individuals expected to be exposed.

#### **Reasonable and Prudent Measures**

The following reasonable and prudent measure is necessary and appropriate to minimize the impact of these IRCs on the California least tern:

- I. All conservation measures denoted in this BiOp shall be fully implemented and adhered to.
- II. Minimize the incidental take of California least terns resulting from terns foraging on selenium-contaminated prey in wetted sections of the SLD that receive contaminated groundwater from WWD.

#### **Terms & Conditions for the California Least Tern**

In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the Act, Reclamation must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the reasonable and prudent measures described above. These terms and conditions are nondiscretionary. The following terms and conditions implement the Reasonable and Prudent Measure I and II:

1. During the 2-year IRC period, Reclamation shall quantify the amount of wetted area in the SLD within or adjacent to WWD.
2. In order to monitor whether the amount or extent of incidental take anticipated from implementation of the proposed project is approached during the 2-year IRC period, Reclamation shall adhere to the following monitoring requirements:

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

- a. Establish and implement a bird survey program on and around the wetted portions of the SLD within or adjacent to WWD to determine the presence or absence of California least terns. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified, Service-approved avian biologist or ecologist, and should be initially conducted on a bi-weekly basis from approximately one month prior to the typical arrival time for reproductive adults until the end of typical least tern chick fledging period. After the fledging period, surveys shall be conducted on a weekly basis for one month in order to observe any terns that may be attempting a second nest. Any documented least tern sighting shall trigger an increased monitoring protocol, with parameters dependent on the when the sighting occurred.
  - b. If least terns are sighted during the typical breeding period, detailed censuses for nesting terns on the SLD and adjacent Right of Way shall be conducted in addition to the initial surveys described in 2a, above. Any least tern nests found shall be monitored for reproductive success, following Service-approved protocols. Any fail-to-hatch eggs will be collected, examined to determine egg status, and analyzed for total selenium by a Service-approved laboratory.
3. Reclamation shall provide annual reports by the end of the calendar year, documenting the results of monitoring conducted for California least tern.

#### **Disposition of Individuals Taken**

In the case of injured and/or dead California least terns or giant garter snakes, the Service shall be notified of events within one day and the animals shall only be handled by an Service-approved, permitted biologist. Injured California least terns or giant garter snakes shall be cared for by a licensed veterinarian or other qualified person. In the case of a dead animal, the individual animal shall be preserved, as appropriate, and held in a secure location until instructions are received from the Service regarding the disposition of the specimen or until the Service takes custody of the specimen. Reclamation must report to the Service within one calendar day any information about take or suspected take of Federally-listed species not exempted in this opinion. Notification must include the date, time, and location of the incident or of the finding of a dead or injured animal. The Service contacts are Mr. Thomas Leeman, San Joaquin Valley Division Chief, Endangered Species Program, Sacramento, at (916) 414-6600 and Ms. Rebecca Roca, the Resident Agent-in-Charge of the Service's Law Enforcement Division at (916) 414-6660.

Any contractor or employee who, during routine operations and maintenance activities inadvertently kills or injures a listed wildlife species must immediately report the incident to his representative at his contracting/employment firm and to Reclamation. This representative must contact the Service within one calendar day in the case of a Federally-listed species.

#### **CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

Section 7(a)(1) of the Act directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of the Act by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary agency activities that can be implemented to further the purposes of the Act, such as preservation of endangered species

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

habitat, implementation of recovery actions, or development of information and databases. We propose the following recommendations to promote the conservation status of the several Federally-listed species in the project area:

Continue monitoring and reporting water quality and flow at GBP sites L2 and M2 on a weekly basis. The Service recommends that Reclamation continue to monitor and report water quality and flow at GBP sites L2 and M2 at the same frequency as done by historically (weekly). These two monitoring stations have been monitored on a weekly basis since the mid-1990s and provide valuable baseline data for comparison. As there are numerous Reclamation actions being implemented in the vicinity of these monitoring stations that could have some effect on water quality or flow, the Service recommends that Reclamation continue to monitor and/or compile water quality and flow data at these stations.

Implement actions that benefit the recovery needs of the giant garter snake. Reclamation should work with the Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife to create, enhance and restore additional stable perennial (including summer) wetland habitat for giant garter snakes in the San Joaquin Valley so that they are less vulnerable to reductions in rice production in the vicinity of Grasslands marshes and Mendota Pool. Provision of clean, reliable, level 4 refuge water supplies could provide additional permanent wetland habitat that would benefit giant garter snakes in furtherance of recovery objectives for the species in the San Joaquin Valley. The CVPIA (b)(1) other and the Central Valley Project Conservation Program (CVPCP), conservation grant programs, may be appropriate for such work.

Reclamation should assist the Service in the implementation of recovery actions in the Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake (USFWS 1999). Priority 1 Recovery Actions from these plans include the following:

- a. Protect habitat on private lands in the North and South Grasslands marshes for giant garter snakes;
- b. Protect habitat on private lands in the Mendota area for giant garter snakes;
- c. Develop/update and implement management plans for Mendota, China Island, Los Banos, and Volta WAs for giant garter snakes.

Adopt a policy that maximizes land retirement (through all appropriate means) on drainage-impaired lands. To avoid and minimize risks and effects to listed species in the San Joaquin Valley, Reclamation should consider retiring from irrigation all drainage impaired lands in the SLU. This approach would maximize the elimination of drainage at its source and avoid associated adverse effects from drainage contamination in drainage reuse areas, in the Grasslands marshes, Mud Slough (North) and the San Joaquin River. The Service in the Coordination Act Report for the SLDFR recommended full land retirement of the 379,000 acres identified as drainage impaired lands in the SLDFR EIS, would be the best all-around solution to the agricultural drainage problem. It would maximize avoidance of adverse environmental effects (both lethal and sublethal), and help resolve the drainage problem in a balanced resource management approach. This land retirement alternative is compatible with CALFED and CVPIA goals and objectives by reducing project water demand, increasing available supplies, enhancing fish and wildlife habitat, and reducing contaminants reaching the Delta. It is an approach that appears most compatible with both the Service and Reclamation's respective missions, since the goal is to find a drainage solution for the study area which includes measures to preserve, protect, restore, and enhance fish and wildlife resources affected by water deliveries



Michael Jackson, Area Manager

to the SLU (USFWS 2006b).

Develop a plan to address selenium contamination in the Grasslands Marshes. As currently envisioned, the GBP project facilities will not be designed to capture and treat drainage generated from: (a) drainage contaminated runoff associated with heavy rainfall events; (b) the DMC sumps and check drains that discharge highly contaminated drainage water into the DMC, (c) and lands to the north of the GDA that still discharge drainage into the Grassland wetland supply channels within the (e.g., Poso and Almond Drain areas). Reclamation should develop and implement a plan on how to meet selenium objectives in the Grassland wetland supply channels. Compliance with these water quality objectives will likely benefit giant garter snake which forage in these waters.

Determine effects of selenium and mercury on giant garter snake. Reclamation, together with the Service and other appropriate agencies, should implement a study on the effects of contaminants (specifically selenium and mercury) on giant garter snake surrogate species within the Grassland wetlands, Grassland wetlands supply channels, and Mud Slough (North).

Develop a selenium budget for the San Joaquin River, Delta. Reclamation, together with the Service and other appropriate agencies, should complete the studies necessary to develop a selenium budget and to determine the sources, fate and impact of all selenium discharges in the San Joaquin River and Delta. This budget would include all presently impaired downstream water bodies used by listed species (e.g., giant garter snake, delta smelt, California clapper rail) including Mud Slough (North), the San Joaquin River, and the North Bay (e.g., Suisun Bay) and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

In order for the Service to be kept informed of actions minimizing or avoiding adverse effects or benefiting listed species and their habitats, the Service request notification of the implementation of any conservation recommendations and, in particular, if and when there are future consultations requests for IRCs and LTRC.

#### **REINITIATION – CLOSING STATEMENT**

This concludes formal consultation on the six IRCs. As provided in 50 CFR §402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been maintained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in this opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action.

If you have any questions on the biological opinion, please contact Joy Winckel, Senior Fish and Wildlife Biologist, or Thomas Leeman, Chief, San Joaquin Valley Division, at the letterhead address or at (916) 414-6600.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Attachment:

cc:

David Hyatt, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Shauna McDonald, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Rain Emerson, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Ned Gruenhagen, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Randy English, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Chris Eacock, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Fresno, CA  
Russ Grimes, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, CA  
Eugenia McNaughton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco, CA  
Theresa Presser, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA  
Kim Forrest, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, San Luis NWRC, Los Banos, CA  
Margaret Wong, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Rancho Cordova, CA  
David Sholes, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fresno, CA  
Julie Vance, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fresno, CA  
Rick Ortega, Grassland Water District, Los Banos, CA

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

### Literature Cited

- Beckon, W. N., Maurer, T. C., & Detwiler, S. J. 2007. *Selenium in the Ecosystem of the Grassland Area of the San Joaquin Valley: Has the Problem been Fixed?* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Nevada Operations Office, Sacramento, CA.
- (CDWR) California Department of Water Resources. 2004. Land use data, Geographic information systems data. Division of Planning and Local Assistance, CDWR, Sacramento, CA.
- Chilcott, J. and R. Schnagl. April 1, 2008. *Central Valley Selenium Control Program. Presentation to the North Bay Selenium Advisory Committee Meeting.* Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Sacramento, CA. 69 pp. Available at:  
[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/TMDLs/seleniumtmdl.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/TMDLs/seleniumtmdl.shtml)
- Conard, C. 2009. First Nesting Record by the Least Tern in Sacramento County. Central Valley Bird Club Bulletin 12(3): 63-71.
- Cypher, B. L., S. E. Phillips, and P. A. Kelly. 2007. Habitat suitability and potential corridors for San Joaquin kit fox in the San Luis Unit, Fresno, Kings, and Merced Counties. California. Prepared for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, South-Central California Area Office, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Species Program, Fresno, CA.
- Deverel, S. 1998. Written Testimony for the SWRCB Bay-Delta Water Rights Hearing, Phase 5. San Joaquin Exchange Contractor's, Exhibit 5(a), 37 pp.
- Eppinger and Chilcott. (2002). *Review of Selenium Concentrations in Wetlands Water Supply Channels in the Grassland Watershed (Water Years 1999 and 2000).* Staff Report of the California Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, Sacramento, CA, 31 pp. Available at:  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water\\_issues/water\\_quality\\_studies/SJR9900.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water_issues/water_quality_studies/SJR9900.pdf)
- HT Harvey and Associates. 2013. Westlake Farms Inc. Biannual Wildlife Monitoring Report, April 1, 2012-September 30, 2012. Prepared for Westlake Farms Inc., Stratford, CA, 25 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Westlake Farms Inc. Biannual Wildlife Monitoring Report, October 14, 2012-March 30, 2012. Prepared for Westlake Farms Inc., Stratford, CA, 8 pp.
- Luoma, S.N., and T.S. Presser. 2009. *Emerging Opportunities in Management of Selenium Contamination.* Environ. Sci. & Technol. 43 (22): 8483-8487.
- Marschalek, D.A. 2011. California Least Tern Breeding Survey 2010. California Department of Fish and Game, South Coast Region, San Diego, CA. 72 pp.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Moore, S.B., J. Winckel, S.J. Detwiler, S.A. Klasing, P.A. Gaul, N.R. Kanim, B.E. Kesser, A.B. DeBevec, K. Beardsley, and L.K. Puckett. 1990. *Fish and Wildlife Resources and Agricultural Drainage in the San Joaquin Valley, California*. Volume II: Sections 4-6. Prepared by the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, Sacramento, CA.

Ohlendorf, H.M. 1989. Bioaccumulation and effects of selenium in wildlife. In: L.W. Jacobs, ed., *Selenium in agriculture and the environment*. American Society of Agronomy and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, Wisconsin. Special Publication 23, p. 133-177.

Ohlendorf, H.M., D.J. Hoffman, M.K. Saiki, and T.W. Aldrich. 1986. Embryonic mortality and abnormalities of aquatic birds: Apparent impacts of selenium from irrigation drainwater. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 52:49-63.

Ohlendorf, H.M., R.L. Hothem, and T.W. Aldrich. 1988. Bioaccumulation of selenium by snakes and frogs in the San Joaquin Valley, California. *Copeia* 1988(3):704-710.

Oppenheimer, E.I. and L.F. Groeber. 2004. Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River. Draft Final Staff Report of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Joaquin River TMDL Unit, Sacramento, CA, 121 pp. Available at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/tmdl/central\\_valley\\_projects/vernal/salt\\_boron/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/tmdl/central_valley_projects/vernal/salt_boron/index.shtml)

Palmer, T.K. 2005. Wildlife Monitoring Program No. 98-229, Annual Report (October 1, 2004-September 30, 2005). Prepared for Stone Land Company, Stratford, CA, 30 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004. Wildlife Monitoring Program No. 98-229, Annual Report (October 1, 2003-September 30, 2004). Prepared for Stone Land Company, Stratford, CA, 32 pp.

Paveglio, F.L., and K.M. Kilbride. 2007. *Selenium in Aquatic Birds from Central California*. J. Wildl. Manage. 71(8): 2550-2555.

Phillips, S.E. 2006. In Progress Draft Environmental Baseline of the San Luis Unit Fresno, Kings and Merced Counties, California. California State University-Stanislaus, Endangered Species Recovery Program, Fresno, CA, 22 pp.

Presser, T.S., and I. Barnes. 1985. Dissolved constituents including selenium in the vicinity of the Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge and the west Grassland, Fresno and Merced Counties, California. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 85-4220, 73 pp.

Presser, T.S. and S. N. Luoma. 2006. *Forecasting Selenium Discharges to the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary: Ecological Effects of a Proposed San Luis Drain Extension*. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 00-416, 196 pp. Available at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/p1646/>

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

Presser, T.S., and H.M. Ohlendorf. 1987. Biogeochemical cycling of selenium in the San Joaquin Valley, California, USA. *Environ. Manage.* 11:805-821.

Saiki, M.K., and R.S. Ogle. 1995. Evidence of impaired reproduction by western mosquitofish inhabiting seleniferous agricultural drainwater. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 124:578-587.

(SWRCB) California State Water Resources Control Board. (1999). Final Environmental Impact Report for the Consolidated and Conformed Place of Use. Prepared by CH2MHill, Sacramento for SWRCB, Sacramento, CA for the Petitioner the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, CA, 2 Chapters and 3 Appendices.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Revised Water Right Decision 1641*. State Water Resources Control Board, California Environmental Protection Agency, Sacramento, CA. March 15, 2000. Available on the internet at:

<http://www.waterrights.ca.gov/hearings/Decisions/WRD1641.PDF>. Accessed March 31, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Final California 2010 Integrated Report(303(d) List/305(b). Available at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/tmdl/2010state\\_ir\\_reports/01657.shtml#7052](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/2010state_ir_reports/01657.shtml#7052).

Thompson, B.C., J.A. Jackson, J. Burger, L.A. Hill, E.M. Kirsch, and J.L. Atwood. Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum*). 1997. *The Birds of North America* 290: 1-32.

(USBR) U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2004a. Central Valley Project West San Joaquin Division, San Luis Unit, Biological Assessment Long-Term Water Service Contract Renewal. South Central California Area Office, Fresno, CA, 126 Pages.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. Broadview Water Contract Assignment Project Environmental Assessment/Draft Finding of No Significant Impact. Prepared by Environmental Science Associates for USBR, South Central California Area Office, Fresno, California, 4 chapters and 3 appendices.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006a. Final Environmental Impact Statement, San Luis Drainage Feature Reevaluation. Section Six, Groundwater Resources. Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, CA, 45 pp. Available at: [http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa\\_projdetails.cfm?Project\\_ID=61](http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=61)

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006b. Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, San Luis Unit Long Term Contract Renewals. USBR, South Central California Office, Fresno, CA, 9 pp. and 3 appendices. Available at: [http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa\\_projdetails.cfm?Project\\_ID=63](http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=63)

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Consolidated Place of Use Habitat Mitigation Plan and Monitoring and Reporting Program. Prepared for the State Water Resources Control Board by USBR, Mid-Pacific Regional Office, Sacramento CA, 20 pp. and appendices.

Michael Jackson, Area Manager

(USBR *et al.*) United States Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Geological Survey. (September 2009 to June 2013). *Grassland Bypass Project Monthly Reports*. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, CA. Compiled and distributed by San Francisco Estuary Institute and available at: <http://www.sfei.org/gbp/reports/monthly>

(USDOI) United States Department of the Interior - Bureau of Reclamation/Fish and Wildlife Service/Geological Survey/Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1998). *Guidelines for Interpretation of the Biological Effects of Selected Constituents in Biota, Water, and Sediment*. National Irrigation Water Quality Program Information Report No. 3. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, CO. 198 pp. Available at: <http://www.usbr.gov/niwqp/guidelines/index.html>

(USFWS) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. *Draft recovery plan for the giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas)*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 192 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006a. California least tern (*Sternula antillarum browni*) 5-Year Review. Available at: [http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five\\_year\\_review/doc775.pdf](http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five_year_review/doc775.pdf)

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006b. *San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, CA, 73 pp.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2009. California least tern Spotlight Species Action Plan. Available at: [http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/action\\_plans/doc3164.pdf](http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/action_plans/doc3164.pdf)

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Giant Garter Snake (*Thamnophis gigas*) 5-Year Review. Available at: [http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five\\_year\\_review/doc4009.pdf](http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five_year_review/doc4009.pdf)

### In litteris

Gross, Warren. 2012. Letter from CVRWQCB, Fresno, to Scott Tarbox, Lemoore Naval Air Station, updating wildlife monitoring requirements in Waste Discharge Requirements Order R5-2002-0062. March 9, 2012.

### Personal Communications

Seay, J. 2006. Senior Ecologist, HT Harvey and Associates, Fresno, CA.

Seay, J. 2014. Senior Ecologist, HT Harvey and Associates, Fresno, CA.

Toto, A.L. 2010. Water Resources Engineer, CVRWQCB, Fresno, CA.



**Appendix A. Federally threatened and endangered species and/or critical habitat potentially within the Action Area that Reclamation has determined would not be affected by the proposed action.**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Critical Habitat
Alameda whipsnake,	<i>Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus</i>	Endangered	Designated
bay checkerspot butterfly	<i>Euphydryas editha bayensis</i>	Threatened	Designated
beach layia	<i>Layia carnosa</i>	Endangered	None
Buena Vista Lake shrew	<i>Sorex ornatus relicus</i>	Endangered	Designated
California brown pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</i>	Endangered	None
California clapper rail	<i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i>	Endangered	None
California condor	<i>Gymnogyps californianus</i>	Endangered	Designated
California jewelflower	<i>Caulanthus californicus</i>	Endangered	None
California red-legged frog	<i>Rana draytonii</i>	Threatened	Designated
California sea blite	<i>Suaeda californica</i>	Endangered	None
California tiger salamander	<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>	Threatened	Designated
clover lupine	<i>Lupinus tidestromii</i>	Endangered	None
Conservancy fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>	Endangered	Designated
Contra Costa goldfields	<i>Lasthenia conjugens</i>	Endangered	Designated
coyote ceanothus	<i>Ceanothus ferrisiae</i>	Endangered	None
delta smelt	<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	Threatened	Designated
fisher	<i>Martes pennanti</i>	Candidate	N/A
fountain thistle	<i>Cirsium fontinale var. fontinale</i>	Endangered	None
Fresno kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys nitratoide exilis</i>	Endangered	Designated
giant kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys ingens</i>	Endangered	None
Greene's tuctoria	<i>Tuctoria greenei</i>	Endangered	Designated
hairy Orcutt grass	<i>Orcuttia pilosa</i>	Endangered	Designated
Hartweg's golden sunburst	<i>Pseudobahia bahiifolia</i>	Endangered	None
Hickman's potentilla	<i>Potentilla hickmanii</i>	Endangered	None
Hoover's spurge	<i>Chamaesyce hooveri</i>	Threatened	Designated

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Critical Habitat
Keck's checker-mallow (=checkerbloom)	<i>Sidalcea keckii</i>	Endangered	Designated
Lahontan cutthroat trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi</i>	Threatened	None
least Bell's vireo	<i>Vireo belli pusillus</i>	Endangered	Designated
longhorn fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta longiantenna</i>	Endangered	Designated
marbled murrelet	<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>	Threatened	Designated
Marin dwarf-flax	<i>Hesperolinon congestum</i>	Threatened	None
Mariposa pussy-paws	<i>Calyptridium pulchellum</i>	Threatened	None
Menzies's wallflower	<i>Erysimum menziesii</i> (includes spp. <i>yadonii</i> )	Endangered	None
Metcalf Canyon jewelflower	<i>Streptanthus albidus</i> spp. <i>albidus</i>	Endangered	None
mountain yellow-legged frog	<i>Rana muscosa</i>	Proposed	Proposed
Owens rui chub	<i>Gila bicolor snyderi</i>	Endangered	Designated
Paiute cutthroat trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki seleniris</i>	Threatened	None
palmete-bracted bird's-beak	<i>Cordylanthus palmatus</i>	Endangered	None
robust spinesflower	<i>Chorizanthe robusta</i> var. <i>robusta</i>	Endangered	Designated
salt marsh harvest mouse	<i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>	Endangered	None
San Benito evening-primrose	<i>Camissonia benitensis</i>	Threatened	None
San Francisco garter snake	<i>Thamnophis sirtalis retrataenia</i>	Endangered	None
San Joaquin adobe sunburst	<i>Pseudobahia peirsonii</i>	Threatened	None
San Mateo thornmint	<i>Acanthomintha duttonii</i>	Endangered	None
San Mateo woolly sunflower	<i>Eriophyllum lasilobum</i>	Endangered	None
Santa Clara Valley dudleya	<i>Dudleya serckellii</i>	Endangered	None
San Joaquin Valley Orcutt grass	<i>Orcuttia inaequalis</i>	Endangered	Designated
showy Indian clover	<i>Tifolium amoenum</i>	Endangered	None
Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep	<i>Ovis canadensis californiana</i>	Endangered	Designated
Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog	<i>Rana sierrae</i>	Proposed	Proposed

iii

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Critical Habitat
succulent owl's-clover	<i>Castilleja campestris</i> ssp. <i>succulenta</i>	Threatened	Designated
Tiburon paintbrush	<i>Castilleja affinis</i> ssp. <i>neglecta</i>	Endangered	None
tidewater goby	<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	Endangered	Designated
Tipton kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys nitratoides nitratoides</i>	Endangered	None
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle	<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	Threatened	Designated
vernal pool fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	Threatened	Designated
vernal pool tadpole shrimp	<i>Lepidurus packardii</i>	Endangered	Designated
western snowy plover	<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	Threatened	Designated
western yellow-billed cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	Proposed	None
Yosemite toad	<i>Bufo canorus</i>	Proposed	Proposed

## **Appendix B.**

### **Summarized Environmental Commitments from the CVPIA Biological Opinion (Service File 98-F-0124) and previous IRC consultations that are Relevant to the SLU and Delta Division 3-Way IRCs**

#### **Conservation Measures from Previous IRC Consultations**

As described in previous IRC consultations, Reclamation developed and implemented a short-term conservation program for IRC CVP Service Areas. The proposed action includes a commitment to develop and implement a long-term program to address the overall effects of the continued operation of the CVP on listed, proposed, and candidate species, and a short-term program to minimize the adverse effects on these species in any areas affected by CVP water deliveries, other than those effects addressed here.

The short-term program to minimize adverse effects of continued water delivery under the IRCs included the following measures:

- 1(a) Notify districts regarding ESA requirements (Completed);
- 1(b) Develop information on distribution and habitat of listed, proposed and candidate species (Ongoing);
- 1(c) Map and distribute information in 1(b) above (Ongoing);
- 1(d) Monitor land use changes and ongoing activities to ensure project water is not used in a manner that adversely affects listed, proposed or candidate species. Coordinate with the Service on any activities adversely affecting these sensitive species (Ongoing);
- 2(a) Work with the Service, CDPR and others to develop guidelines and information assessing the effects of pesticides on listed, proposed and candidate species (Completed);
- 2(b) Develop and distribute guidance on construction and maintenance activities (Completed);
- 2(c) Review District water conservation plans. (Completed);
- 2(d) Amend criteria for water conservation plans (Completed);
- 3(a) Identify lands critical to listed and proposed species (Ongoing);
- 3(b) Identify land and water use activities critically impacting listed and proposed species (Ongoing);
- 3(c) Develop and implement critical need plan (Ongoing);
- 4 Develop a long-term program to address overall effects of the CVP and Implementation of the CVPIA (Ongoing).

**2000 CVPIA BiOp****B. Commitments Associated with Long-term Renewal<sup>2</sup> of CVP Water Service Contracts**

1. Long-term contracts will be renewed, and Reclamation will complete tiered site specific consultations with the Service. No CVP water will be delivered or applied outside current contract service areas until either formal or informal consultation, as appropriate, is complete. Once formal site specific consultation has occurred that is in compliance with this opinion, it is assumed that changes in land-use practices, and impacts to listed and proposed species, in the districts have been addressed.
4. Reclamation and the Service will write a joint letter to the water districts, any member agencies, Planning Departments of cities or counties within the districts using CVP water, and other responsible parties regarding requirements under the ESA. The letter will include: (1) a discussion of Reclamation's need to ensure that CVP water is not used in a manner which could jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated *critical habitat*, and (2) an explanation of the prohibitions described under Section 9 of the ESA in regard to *take*. The letter will discuss the appropriate protection measures as described here and in subsequent contract renewal consultation and will be completed within 60 days of execution of long-term contracts.<sup>3</sup>
5. Conservation strategies will be in place for the districts or areas receiving CVP water. The types of strategies that could be accepted are: *Habitat Conservation Planning* as described in section 10(a) of the ESA; programmatic land management actions that include protection of listed and proposed species; requirements resulting from site specific Section 7 consultation; or an expansion of the existing CVP Conservation Program that adequately compensates for the direct and indirect effects of increased water delivery to an area.<sup>4</sup>
6. Reclamation will, subsequent to a determination of *may affect* to listed species and/or adverse modification to designated *critical habitat* in consultation with the Service's Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office (SFWO) Endangered Species Division, consult on all Federal actions that result in changes in purpose of use for CVP water contracts, including changes from Agriculture to Agriculture/Municipal and Industrial purposes.
7. The Service and Reclamation will work together to convey information to the water districts, and individual water users (as appropriate), on listed species needs. Reclamation will establish an outreach and education program, in collaboration with the Service, to help water users integrate implementation of the CVPIA and requirements of the contract renewal process as it relates to the ESA [Act].<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> These apply to interim contract renewals as well.

<sup>3</sup> Letters were already sent to CVCs and Priant Contractors, but an Environmental Commitment Program form would be used for the interim contract renewal that would inform districts of the required commitments.

<sup>4</sup> This would take the form of "requirements resulting from site specific Section 7 consultation" in this case.

<sup>5</sup> Addressed by the Environmental Commitment Program form.

8. Interior will work closely with the water users, providing them maps of listed species habitats within their service-areas and guiding them through the consultation process to address site specific effects. Reclamation may encourage CVP contractors to complete HCPs encompassing the affected areas.
10. Reclamation and CVP contractors will comply with all applicable opinions related to the CVP. Flow standards that form the environmental baseline of the 1995 OCAP biological opinion will be met, and Reclamation will take no discretionary actions (e.g. new contracts, contract amendments, facility construction) that would incrementally increase diversions and alter hydrologic and environmental conditions in the Delta until any required consultation is reinitiated and completed.
11. Contractors are required to conform with any applicable provisions of any biological opinions addressing contract renewal so as to prohibit the use of CVP water that results in unauthorized *take* or conversion of wildland habitat determined to have the potential to be occupied by listed species, or violation of any terms of the contracts pertaining to the conservation of listed species. All contracts (or related biological opinions) will also stipulate Reclamation will not undertake any discretionary action allowing the delivery of CVP water to native habitat for listed species depicted on the maps attached to the 18-month notices unless clearance pursuant to the ESA has been obtained from the Service.
13. Reclamation will make certain that applicable measures to ensure ESA compliance for the renewal of CVP water service contracts are provided within the text of new and/or amended long-term water contracts and related actions.
14. Reclamation will provide information related to proposed new water assignments of Project water to the Service's SFWO Endangered Species Division prior to execution of the assignment.

#### F. Commitments Associated with Conservation Programs

##### *Comprehensive Mapping and Land Use Monitoring and Reporting Program*

- Monitoring will be used to assess the condition and impacts of Reclamation actions on listed species. Reclamation and the Service are actively developing a monitoring strategy based on the comprehensive mapping program. The land cover database for year 2000, described in Phase III, will be revisited every 5 years for monitoring purposes.
- The Comprehensive Mapping Program will be implemented immediately to test and track, for the purpose of validating over the life of the project, the assumptions made in this biological opinion that the baselines of the species in Appendix B are stable or increasing.
- For any species affected by the CVP that are continuing to decline, the Service and Reclamation will immediately assess critical needs for the species and determine whether it is appropriate to expand the Conservation Program or implement other *conservation measures*. Any native habitat converted to agricultural or municipal/industrial use within the water service area without prior biological surveys, as required by Reclamation prior to the delivery of Reclamation water, will be evaluated to determine what mitigation measures will be required.



I. Service and Reclamation Strategy Statement to Ensure Compliance with the Endangered Species Act

7. CVP or CVPIA actions or parts of actions, which *may affect* listed species or for which there is not enough information available to estimate *take* or make a *not likely to adversely affect* determination, will receive future tiered analysis and consultation. Reclamation or the Service will provide to the Service's SFWO Endangered Species Division, dependent on lead agency status, clear descriptions of proposed CVP or CVPIA actions, specific areas that may be affected directly or indirectly by these actions, the manner in which the actions *may affect* any listed species or designated *critical habitat*, and other relevant reports and information. Reclamation and the Service will also identify any and all interrelated and interdependent actions and measures related to the proposed CVP or CVPIA action. In those situations where the lead agency, or the Service's SFWO Endangered Species Division, determines that an action *may affect* listed species or may adversely modify designated *critical habitat*, Reclamation and/or the Service will initiate informal or formal consultation as appropriate.
8. Reclamation and the Service will work together to develop means to more effectively facilitate ESA compliance through the coordination of activities and commitments discussed in this Project Description. This coordination will include establishment of a process within 3 months of this biological opinion that will provide necessary information to the Service's SFWO Endangered Species Division in situations where a determination of *no affect* has been made, sufficiently in advance, to enable the Service's review.
13. Reclamation will establish a tracking program to assure conditions necessary for compliance with ESA are met within areas affected by the delivery of CVP water. Where Reclamation and/or the Service believe there are *adverse affects* on listed species, a conservation strategy will be required to be in place for the district or area to receive the contract water. The types of strategies that could be accepted are: *Habitat Conservation Planning*, as described in Section 10(a) of the ESA; requirements resulting from a Section 7 consultation, programmatic land management actions that include protection of listed and proposed species, implementation of site specific *conservation measures*, or an expansion of the existing CVP Conservation Program that adequately compensates for the direct and indirect effects of increased water delivery to an area. Other actions that include components of the above strategies could also be accepted.

