

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

(Revised June 11, 2020)

The City of Sacramento, California, a municipal corporation, does hereby prepare, declare, and publish this Negative Declaration for the following described project:

2020 Temporary Groundwater Substitution Water Transfer - The City of Sacramento is participating with five other regional water agencies in a regional water transfer project to provide up to 18,500 acre-feet of water to Buyers in 2020. As part of a regional water transfer led by the City, Golden State Water Company (GSWC) will temporarily transfer up to 2,500 acre-feet of its pre-1914 water rights water supplies that have been quantified and are made available on a perpetual basis by the United States Bureau of Reclamation under a contract. The water demands that would otherwise be served by GSWC's delivery of this surface water to its customers will instead be satisfied by increased groundwater pumping by GSWC. That pumping will occur within existing historical baselines and the requirements of an existing groundwater management plan administered by the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA). The transfer water will be exported by DWR using existing State Water Project (SWP) facilities during the summer and fall of 2020. However, the transfer water may be temporarily stored in San Luis Reservoir for later delivery to an individual Buyer's service area.

The City of Sacramento provides wholesale and retail water service within the City of Sacramento's water rights place of use. Dudley Ridge Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, County of Kings, Palmdale Water District, and Alameda County Water Agency (collectively the "Buyers") manage and operate facilities for the distribution of State Water Project (SWP) water to customers in each respective agency's service area. Transfer water will be made available in the Lower American River, conveyed to the southern Delta via the American and Sacramento Rivers, pumped into the California Aqueduct through the Department of Water Resources' Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, and delivered to the Buyers via State Water Project facilities

The Lead Agency is the City of Sacramento. The City of Sacramento, Community Development Department, has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project as identified in the attached Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. An Environmental Impact Report is not required.

This Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations), the Sacramento Local Environmental Regulations (Resolution 91-892), and the Sacramento City Code.

A copy of this document and all supportive is available on the City's EIR Webpage at:
<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Environmental/Impact-Reports>

Due to the current emergency, the document is not available for review in printed form. If you need assistance in reviewing the document please contact Scott Johnson, Senior Planner at (916) 808-5842 or sjohnson@cityofsacramento.org.

Environmental Services Manager, City of Sacramento,
California, a municipal corporation

By: _____

City of Sacramento

Revised (6-11-2020) Initial Study Environmental Checklist

Revisions have been made based upon comments received during the public review process. Revisions consisting of additions to the discussion are shown in underline text and any deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough text~~. All revisions made, have been made based upon comments received that merely clarify, amplify, or make insignificant modifications and do not require recirculation pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15073.5(c).

1. Project Title: 2020 Temporary Groundwater Substitution Water Transfer to Dudley Ridge Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, County of Kings, Palmdale Water District, and Alameda County Water Agency

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Sacramento
Community Development Department
300 Richards Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95835

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Scott Johnson, Senior Planner
(916) 808-5842
srjohnson@cityofsacramento.org

4. Project Location: The City of Sacramento provides wholesale and retail water services within the City of Sacramento's water rights place of use. Dudley Ridge Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, County of Kings, Palmdale Water District, and Alameda County Water Agency (collectively the "Buyers") manage and operate facilities for the distribution of water to customers in each respective agency's service area, including water purchased by each agency from the State Water Project (SWP). Transfer water will be made available in the Lower American River, conveyed to the southern Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta (Delta) via the American and Sacramento Rivers, pumped into the California Aqueduct through the Department of Water Resources' Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, and delivered to the Buyers via State Water Project facilities.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Sacramento
Department of Utilities
1395 35th Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95822

6. Description of Project: The City of Sacramento is participating with five other regional water agencies in a regional water transfer project to provide up to 18,500 acre-feet of water to Buyers in 2020. As part of a regional water transfer led by the City, Golden State Water Company (GSWC) will temporarily transfer up to 2,500 acre-feet of water based on its pre-1914 water rights, which have been quantified and are delivered to GSWC on a perpetual

basis by the United States Bureau of Reclamation under a contract. The water demands that would otherwise be served by GSWC's distribution of this surface water to its customers will instead be satisfied by temporarily increased groundwater pumping by GSWC. That temporary pumping will occur within existing historical baselines and the parameters of an existing groundwater management plan administered by the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority (SCGA). The transfer water will be exported by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) using existing State Water Project (SWP) facilities during the summer and fall of 2020. However, the transfer water may be temporarily stored in San Luis Reservoir for later delivery to an individual Buyer's service area. The Buyers and the American River water agencies, through the auspices of the Regional Water Authority, have entered into an agreement to undertake the regional transfer, including the GSWC component described in this initial study.

7. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings): GSWC provides retail water service to approximately 15,300 customer connections in Sacramento County, California. The service area is primarily urban and suburban. The Buyers include agricultural water suppliers in Tulare, Kings, and Kern Counties; an urban purveyor supplying the municipal needs of several non-contiguous communities in the Antelope Valley in northeastern Los Angeles County; and an urban purveyor serving urban and suburban demands in Alameda County.

8. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The Buyers: Dudley Ridge Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, County of Kings, Palmdale Water District, and Alameda County Water Agency and DWR (for a conveyance agreement to use SWP facilities). Sacramento County will also need to approve of the project.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribe Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

III. DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR OR NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Scott Johnson
 Signature
 Scott Johnson

May 6, 2020
 Date

Printed Name
Scott Johnson
 Signature

For
June 11, 2020
 Revision Date

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Introduction

The following Checklist contains the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. Included in each discussion are project-specific mitigation measures recommended as appropriate as part of the proposed project.

For this checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Less-Than-Significant Impact: Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA relative to existing standards.

No Impact: The project would not have any impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-d. The proposed project entails water being left in the American River below GSWC's point of diversion during July, August September, October and November of 2020, rather than being diverted into GSWC's intake. The Buyers will accept delivery of up to 2,500 acre-feet of transfer water at GSWC's point of diversion on the American River and control the water as it flows down the American River to the Sacramento River and across the Delta to the SWP's Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, where DWR will pump the water into the California Aqueduct for subsequent delivery to the various Buyers' service areas in Tulare, Kings, Kern, Alameda and Los Angeles Counties. This project will be implemented by operation of existing facilities, and does not involve construction of any additional structures or facilities. The proposed project would not affect views to or from a scenic vista or a State scenic highway, there would be no changes to the visual character of the area, and the project would not create any new sources of light and glare. The volume of water would add approximately 10 to 15 cubic feet per second (cfs) to flows in the lower American River during the transfer period. Typical flow rates in the lower American River during the summer and fall months exceed 1,650 cfs on average. This flow rate represents a less than one percent (1%) increase in flows and would not be aesthetically noticeable. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-e. The water GSWC is transferring to the Buyers does not currently serve prime farmland or any other agricultural lands of significance. The transfer of water to the Buyers will aid in the retention of agricultural uses by helping to provide adequate water for existing agriculture serviced by water supplies that have been reduced to Dudley Ridge Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, and the County of Kings. The project will not conflict with agricultural zoning or existing Williamson Act properties. The project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use as the transfer water does not serve forest land and the water will, in part, be used on existing agricultural lands. The water use will not cause changes to existing farmlands and will help preserve farmlands for continued use where 2020 water supplies would otherwise be limited. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. The project does not involve any changes to current air district regulations or plans. Water will be transferred from GSWC to the Buyers using existing SWP facilities and is intended to help mitigate water supply shortages being experienced by the Buyers during 2020. No additional infrastructure will be required to accomplish this goal and use of SWP facilities to transport the water will still result in less use of such facilities than if the Buyers had adequate SWP supplies available for delivery in 2020. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- b-c. The project is a temporary transfer of surface water that would otherwise be diverted by GSWC and delivered to its customers for domestic and municipal uses. The project would result in a decrease of GSWC's electrical energy use in delivering surface water, with resulting commensurate decreases in emissions from sources of power supplied to the California electricity grid. The reduction will be achieved because GSWC will not need to pump the water from the Folsom South Canal at GSWC's water diversion facility to the water treatment plant and then repump the water into the distribution system. The project does involve temporarily increased pumping of groundwater, with related use of electricity to power GSWC's municipal groundwater wells. Emission increases associated with that temporarily increased pumping and the electricity required to power the pumping will generally be offset by emission decreases associated with GSWC's temporarily reduced surface water diversions and are thus not expected to cause any air quality standard violations. The project will not have an effect on air quality standards, criteria pollutants, or sensitive receptors. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- d. The project involves the movement of water from its usual point of delivery at GSWC's intake to the Buyers' service areas via the SWP. Objectionable odors will not be created due to the incremental increase in water amounts flowing from the point of delivery to the new temporary place of use. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. The project involves the temporary transfer of water from GSWC via bypass of Folsom South Canal, down the American River and Sacramento River, through the Delta, to State Water Project (SWP) facilities, and eventual delivery to the Buyers' respective service areas. This water will be transferred consistent with all regulatory requirements the SWP must currently satisfy, including requirements of salmonid and smelt biological opinions and Decision 1641 applicable to Delta operations, and in compliance with all applicable existing regulatory requirements pertaining to American River flow requirements. The volume of water would add approximately 10 to 15 cubic feet per second (cfs) to flows in the lower American River during the transfer period. Typical flow rates in the lower American River during the summer and fall months exceed 1,650 cfs on average. This flow rate represents a less than one percent (1%) increase in flows and would not impact fisheries, habitat, or any other plan, policy or regulation related to the Lower American River, Sacramento River, and Delta. The regional Water Forum Agreement provides guidance to managing flow and fisheries in the Lower American River. The minimal augmented flows related to this project are within the operational flow criteria – both rate and temperature – established for the Lower American River. The project does not impact the key parameters of the Water Forum Agreement or flow operational criteria. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- b, c. This project will not cause disturbance of any riparian or sensitive habitat as no changes to the current riparian environment will occur as a result of the project. No wetlands will be disturbed as a result of this project. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- d. All environmental regulations that specify minimum flow requirements and operational constraints for listed fish and other considerations will be met. The transferred water will be in addition to and thus augment flows already provided to satisfy operational requirements in place for the lower American River during July, August, September, October and November.

To the extent that there is any perceptible change, the minor increase in flows downstream of Folsom Dam (less than 1% of the average monthly flow) may provide an incremental benefit to fisheries and wildlife in the Lower American River, Sacramento River and Delta, and may result in a small net positive effect to water users between Folsom Dam and the Banks pumping plant in the south Delta. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

- e, f. The project will not interfere with any established Habitat Conservation Plan or conflict with local policies. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-c. CEQA provides that a project may cause a significant environmental effect where the project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1). CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource to mean physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be “materially impaired” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[b][1]). The project involves the temporary transfer of water through existing waterways and existing man-made canals. No disturbance to paleontological resources, archaeological resources, or human remains will occur as there will be no ground disturbance. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-b. The project will not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy in furtherance of the project because the water transferred under this project will meet the critical need of the Buyers and the energy needed to deliver the water is a necessary component of the project. Relevant plans include the State’s 2019 Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) and Senate Bill (SB) 100, which focus on energy efficiency, demand response, renewable energy, and energy provisioning reliability and infrastructure (CEC 2020). Policies regarding these areas relate to commercial and residential energy use or electricity and natural gas provisioning and are not directly applicable to public services like water transfers. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-f. The proposed temporary water transfer would involve the forbearance of water diversion at Folsom South Canal and delivery of water into existing waterways and existing SWP conveyance facilities. Groundwater to replace the transferred surface water will be pumped on a temporary basis from existing GSWC municipal wells that have been constructed to meet all required standards and will be operated within historical baseline pumping amounts in accordance with SCGA’s existing groundwater management plan. In addition, the transfer will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature as no new facilities are involved with this temporary transfer. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-b. No construction-related activities are proposed and no GHG emissions would be directly generated by the proposed project. Agriculture and M&I operations generate GHG emissions yet, given that the purpose of the proposed project is to provide the Buyers with water to offset shortages due to a reduced allocation of SWP water for uses south of the Delta, the proposed project would not increase normal farming or M&I activities and would not increase GHG emissions compared to baseline conditions. For these same reasons, the project would not conflict with any plan, policy or regulation. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-c,

f-g. The project involves only the temporary transport and pumping of water through existing facilities, waterways and canals. No hazardous chemicals will be utilized as a result of the project. No construction would ensue that may accidentally create any hazard to the public or environment. The project will not expose people or structures to risk due to wildfires. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

d. The project is not located on a site that is listed with hazardous materials under Government Code section 65962.5. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

e. The project is not located within two miles of a school. Mather Air Field is located within two miles of GSWC's service area but the project would not change routine operations of GSWC's water system in any way that would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. This project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and appropriate SWP monitoring will be incorporated in the implementation of this project.

Groundwater in the vicinity of GSWC's wells has been historically contaminated by industrial activities on a site owned by Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. (AR) to the east of GSWC's service area. That site is subject to compliance orders by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Regional Water Quality Control Board. GSWC has consulted with AR in preparing for the project, and AR has determined that the project is consistent with AR's groundwater extraction and treatment (GET) requirements, would not exacerbate existing groundwater contamination plumes, and would not result in substantial degrading of groundwater quality. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- b,e The proposed temporary groundwater pumping by GSWC to replace the transferred surface water will use locally available groundwater resources consistent with regional groundwater management and conjunctive use planning. Existing municipal wells that have been installed to help the region conjunctively manage surface and groundwater supplies to meet long-term water reliability goals will pump water in quantities consistent with the Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority's Groundwater Management Plan ("SCGA GMP"), which was adopted pursuant to Water Code section 10753.7 on November 8, 2006. The proposed temporary pumping by GSWC to support the transfer of surface water is consistent with the SCGA GMP's basin management objectives and would not adversely impact the groundwater basin. Pursuant to the SCGA GMP, GSWC conjunctively uses surface water and groundwater, which has helped stabilize groundwater levels in the South American

Subbasin. Since the mid-1990s, groundwater elevations in the Basin have stabilized due to these regional efforts and, in some cases, elevations have increased and are continuing to increase. By limiting the overall quantity of groundwater pumped based on conjunctive use, GSWC has helped maintain groundwater quality in its service area.

As described above, GSWC's proposed 2020 water transfer would comply with Water Code section 1745.10 because GSWC's temporary pumping of groundwater is consistent with the SCGA GMP. In addition, the proposed transfer complies with Water Code Section 1745.11 because the groundwater used to serve customer demands in order to make transferrable surface water available to the Buyers is groundwater generated by recharge through GSWC's operation of its conjunctive use program. Only wells that have been approved by DWR will be used to pump groundwater and make surface water available for the proposed temporary transfer. Identification of the approved wells, in addition to baseline groundwater pumping conditions, and appropriate stream flow depletion factors, will be included in a DWR Conveyance agreement that will govern GSWC transfer activities. GSWC is participating in a regional groundwater monitoring, reporting, and mitigation plan for the water transfer, approved by DWR, which will ensure that the transfer does not result in any unreasonable and adverse impacts to the groundwater basin or third parties. Furthermore, notification has been provided to SCGA – the Groundwater Sustainability Agency organized for SGMA compliance – of the project. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- c, d. The project will not alter existing drainage patterns on any property or area. The project will increase flows in the lower American River and Sacramento River averaging about 10 to 15 cfs during July, August, September, October and November. This flow rate is less than one percent (1%) of the flow rate in the American River under existing flow management requirements. No noticeable alteration to the river will occur as a result of this project, and the project will not result in substantial erosion, increase of surface run-off, exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems, or have any effect on flood flows. The project will not require additional storm water facilities to be constructed. Furthermore, neither the GSWC nor the Buyers' service areas are located within an area that would be affected by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, and the project will not contribute to an increased risk of same. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-b. The project would not divide an established community due to the fact that no changes to the built environment will occur. No conflict will occur with any land use plan or habitat conservation plan since water will be routed through the American River, the Sacramento River, the Delta, and existing SWP pumping facilities, canals and pipelines. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, b. The project will utilize the existing water conveyance, American River, Sacramento River, Delta, and SWP facilities; no known mineral resources of regional, State, or local importance will be affected by implementation of this project. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-c. No construction will occur as part of the project. Noise levels would remain consistent with current levels occurring during operations of GSWC’s municipal wells, DWR’s SWP facilities in the south Delta, San Joaquin Valley, and southern California, and within each Buyers’ respective service area. Mather Air Field is located within two miles of GSWC’s service area but the project would not change routine operations of GSWC’s water system in any way that would result in excessive noise. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-b. The temporary transfer of water is part of a larger regional transfer of water from other American River water agencies to the Buyers to aid the Buyers during water shortage conditions in 2020 resulting from drier than normal hydrological conditions reducing their allocations of imported surface water provided by the SWP. The temporary transfer is not anticipated to contribute to population growth in the receiving region due to the fact that no additional construction will occur and the Buyers will be using the temporary supply to mitigate shortages in their SWP water supply to serve existing needs. The temporary supply provided by GSWC and other sellers is not a reliable supply that could serve as a basis for long-term water needs planning and management by the Buyers. Infrastructure already exists for the project, so no persons or housing will be displaced. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
• Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a. The water supplies provided by GSWC and other sellers are being transferred to Buyers as a dry-year supplemental supply and do not represent an increase in the amount of water supplies or capacity in the SWP normally available to Buyers. As a result, no change is required to the built environment to accomplish the project. For the same reasons, additional police patrols, fire services, schools or parks will not be required to accomplish the transport of water. No public facilities will be affected. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a, b. The project does not include, and would not contribute to the increased use of, recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-d. The project will not affect traffic or transportation in any manner. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)?	YES			
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-b. ~~No Tribal Cultural Resources have been identified in the project area, and no ground-disturbing activities are proposed with the project. In addition, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource given that changes in streamflow levels as a result of the water transfer would be within historical ranges, water would be transferred using existing waterways and infrastructure, and water delivered to the Buyers would be used to maintain existing agricultural activities and supply existing M&I water users. Due to the nature of the project, the transfer of water using existing facilities, there would be no impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources. In compliance with AB 52, the City has reached out to Native American tribes that have requested to receive such notices and will consult as necessary if requested. At the time of preparation of this documentation, no tribes have responded. Subsequently, staff has received input and comments from several tribes and made some minor revisions to the initial study. These changes do not identify new potential effects and do not require recirculation.~~

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a, c. Water temporarily transferred to the Buyers' service areas will be used to meet agricultural and urban demands that otherwise would have insufficient water supplies available in 2020 due to a dry winter and consequent reduction in available SWP supplies. For instances where the transferred water is treated and served to municipal customers, the generation of wastewater will result. This wastewater, however, would be consistent with expected flows under normal water supply conditions for each Buyer and would not require the expansion of capacity in any water or wastewater treatment plant. All existing wastewater facilities will continue to be operated by the Buyers consistent with all wastewater treatment standards and requirements. The temporary pumping of additional groundwater by GSWC to make surface water available for temporary transfer will use existing municipal wells routinely used by GSWC as part of its normal water system operations. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- b. GSWC possesses sufficient pre-1914 water right water supplies to accommodate this transfer. GSWC possesses other rights and entitlements sufficient to also meet its own demands. GSWC will temporarily pump groundwater within historic and planned sustainable operations of the groundwater subbasin, and has existing appropriate rights to pump groundwater. The temporary transfer will not be used as a long-term water supply. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.
- d, e. The project will not utilize solid waste disposal or alter state or local waste regulations. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
Has Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X

Discussion

a-d. The water transfer would not require construction of any new structures and will be using existing facilities to transfer water. The project would not alter any emergency evacuation routes or impair an adopted emergency plan. There would be no new project occupants related to this project that could be exposed to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. No other infrastructure (such as roads, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment are proposed. The proposed project does not have the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from post-fire flooding, landslides, or slope instability.

Public Trust Resources

Under the public trust doctrine, certain resources are held to be the property of all citizens and subject to continuing supervision by the State. Public Trust Resources may include, but are not limited to, fish, wildlife, other aquatic dependent species, riparian areas, and recreation. This Initial Study evaluates potential impacts from the proposed water transfer on Public Trust Resources. The proposed project has no environmental impact. No mitigation measures are required because the water transfer has been proposed according to existing laws and regulations and no impacts (direct, indirect, or cumulative) were found to be significant or potentially significant. The ability to transfer water from a user with temporary water supplies to another user in need of additional water supplies has been recognized and encouraged by the State of California. The proposed project can be implemented without causing any unreasonable impacts to fish, wildlife, and other instream beneficial uses. Therefore, the proposed project is compatible with and complies with the public trust doctrine.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a-c. The project would not result in significant impacts associated with the CEQA mandatory findings of significance. Based on the analysis provided in this Initial Study, the temporary water transfer between GSWC and the Buyers would not substantially degrade or reduce wildlife species or habitat, result in significant cumulative impacts, or cause adverse effects on humans.