4 Revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS

Changes to the text of the Draft EIR/EIS that are made in response to comments are shown with a line through the text that has been deleted (~~strikeout~~) or *italics* where new text has been added.

4.1 Volume I

Section 4.2, Delta Water Resources

Tables

Seven tables in Section 4.2, "Delta Water Resources," contained a few minor rounding and calculating errors. These changes, while shown below for completeness (in highlight), have no bearing on the analysis, statements, or conclusions reached in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Table 4.2-16
Simulated Percent Changes in Average Monthly Electrical Conductivity under the Proposed Action

Existing Conditions												
	Jan	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**
Chipps	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Collinsville	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.2
Jersey Point	0.3	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.7
Emmaton	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.2	-0.4	-0.2	-0.1	0.4
Rock Slough	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.6
Future Conditions												
	Jan	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**
Chipps	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Collinsville	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Jersey Point	0.2	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.5
Emmaton	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2
Rock Slough	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.5

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-17
Simulated Salinity Changes at Specific Delta Diversion Locations under the Proposed Action (Existing Conditions)

Delta Diversion	Long-term (16 yr) Daily Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)	Maximum Monthly Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)	Number of Months (out of 192) in which the Monthly Average Increase Exceeded 3%
Tracy Pumping Plant	2.5 µS/cm EC (0.4%)	16 µS/cm EC (2.6%)	1
Clifton Court Forebay	2.7 µS/cm EC (0.5%)	22 µS/cm EC (4.0%)	1
Proposed Stockton Intake Location	0.6 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	13 µS/cm EC (3.0%)	1
Middle River at Victoria Canal	0.7 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	16 µS/cm EC (3.4%)	1
Old River near Tracy Road Bridge	0.5 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	7 µS/cm EC (0.6%)	0
Old River at Middle River	0.2 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	5 µS/cm EC (0.7%)	0
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge	0.0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	1 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	0
Future Conditions			
Delta Diversion	**Long-term (16 yr) Daily Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Maximum Monthly Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Number of Months (out of 192) in which the Monthly Average Increase Exceeded 3%**
Tracy Pumping Plant	2.7 µS/cm EC (0.4%)	25 µS/cm EC (3.4%)	1
Clifton Court Forebay	3.5 µS/cm EC (0.6%)	26 µS/cm EC (3.4%)	3
Proposed Stockton Intake Location	0.6 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	9 µS/cm EC (2.1%)	0
Middle River at Victoria Canal	0.8 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	8 µS/cm EC (1.7%)	0
Old River near Tracy Road Bridge	2.9 µS/cm EC (0.4%)	25 µS/cm EC (3.1%)	1
Old River at Middle River	1.1 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	16 µS/cm EC (3.2%)	1
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge	-0.1 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	0

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-18
Percent Differences in Monthly Average EC Values for Clifton Court Forebay ([Proposed Action – Existing Base]/Existing Base)

Water Year	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
1976	0.3	-0.1	0.3	0.9	1.4	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.7	1.6
1977	0.8	0.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.1	0.4	1.1	2.1
1978	1.6	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.3	1.1
1979	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.4	1.3
1980	0.7	0.4	0.9	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.3	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.9
1981	1.0	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.7	1.4	1.5
1982	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4
1983	-0.2	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1984	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.2
1985	1.0	0.6	0.3	-0.3	-2.3	-1.1	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.4	1.5
1986	0.8	0.4	1.3	2.0	0.1	-0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.4	0.1
1987	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.7	1.4
1988	0.7	0.1	2.2	4.0	1.4	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.1	2.0	1.3
1989	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.6	1.6	2.0
1990	0.8	0.1	0.6	0.6	-0.7	-0.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.9	1.9
1991	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.7	1.1	1.7
Average	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.7	1.2
W	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4
AN	1.2	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.0
BN	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.4	1.3
D	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.4	-0.2	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.3	1.6
C	0.8	0.4	1.2	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.8	1.1	1.7

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling")
Notes:
W = wet
AN = above normal
BN = below normal
D = dry
C = critical
Positive values represent a salinity increase from base case; negative values represent a salinity decrease from base case.
* January 1988 increase in salinity is caused by an operational change under the Proposed Action that is probably unrealistic and an artifact of monthly operational decisions being analyzed using a daily time-step model.

Table 4.2-23
Simulated Percent Changes in Average Monthly Electrical Conductivity under Alternative 3 and Existing Conditions

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Chipps	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Collinsville	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.2
Jersey Point	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.7
Emmaton	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.2	-0.4	-0.2	-0.1	0.4
Rock Slough	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.6

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-24
Simulated Salinity Changes at Specific Delta Diversion Locations under Alternative 3 and Existing Conditions

Location	Long-term (16 yr) Daily Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)	Maximum Monthly Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)	Number of Months (out of 192) in Which the Monthly Average Increase Exceeded 3%
Tracy Pumping Plant	2.5 µS/cm EC (0.4%)	15 µS/cm EC (3.5%)	1
Clifton Court Forebay	2.6 µS/cm EC (0.5%)	14 µS/cm EC (2.8%)	0
Proposed Stockton Intake Location	0.6 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	8 µS/cm EC (2.1%)	0
Middle River at Victoria Canal	0.6 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	10 µS/cm EC (2.0%)	0
Old River near Tracy Road Bridge	0.5 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	7 µS/cm EC (0.7%)	0
Old River at Middle River	0.2 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	5 µS/cm EC (0.7%)	0
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge	0.0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	1 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	0

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-29
Simulated Percent Changes in Average Monthly Electrical Conductivity under Alternative 4

Existing Conditions												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Chipps	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Collinsville	-0.3	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	-0.1
Jersey Point	-0.9	-0.6	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.5
Emmaton	-0.5	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	-0.1
Rock Slough	-0.6	-0.4	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	-0.3
Future Conditions												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Chipps	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Collinsville	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Jersey Point	-0.6	-0.5	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3
Emmaton	-0.4	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
Rock Slough	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	-0.1

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-30
Simulated Salinity Changes under Alternative 4 at Specific Delta Diversion Locations

Existing Conditions			
Location	**Long-term (16 yr) Daily Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Maximum Monthly Average Increase in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Number of Months (out of 192) in Which the Monthly Average Increase Exceeded 1%**
Tracy Pumping Plant	-0.2 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	4 µS/cm EC (0.7%)	0
Clifton Court Forebay	-0.4 µS/cm EC (-0.1%)	3 µS/cm EC (0.4%)	0
Proposed Stockton Intake Location	-0.3 µS/cm EC (-0.1%)	2 µS/cm EC (0.6%)	0
Middle River at Victoria Canal	-0.1 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	3 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
Old River near Tracy Road Bridge	0.0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	1 µS/cm EC (0.1%)	0
Old River at Middle River	0.1 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	2 µS/cm EC (0.2%)	0
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge	0.0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	0 µS/cm EC (0.01%)	0
Future Conditions			
Location	**Long-term (16 yr) Daily Average Change in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Maximum Monthly Average Increase in Salinity (and Percent Change)**	**Number of Months (out of 192) in Which the Monthly Average Increase Exceeded 1%**
Tracy Pumping Plant	-0.2 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	6 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
Clifton Court Forebay	-0.3 µS/cm EC (-0.1%)	6 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
Proposed Stockton Intake Location	-0.3 µS/cm EC (-0.1%)	3 µS/cm EC (0.7%)	0
Middle River at Victoria Canal	-0.1 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	5 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
Old River near Tracy Road Bridge	-0.2 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	6 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
Old River at Middle River	-0.1 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	4 µS/cm EC (0.8%)	0
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge	0.0 µS/cm EC (0.0%)	3 µS/cm EC (0.3%)	0

Source: CCWD (see Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," for detailed modeling results)

Table 4.2-33
Long-Term (16-year) Daily Average Cumulative Change in Salinity (µS/cm EC) (and percent change from existing base case) Due to Alternative 4

Delta Location	Cumulative Change from Base Case without Alt 4	Cumulative Change from Base Case with Alt 4	Incremental Change from Base Case due to Alt 4 (% Change from Cumulative Change without Alt 4)
Jersey Point	52 (11%)	49 (11%)	-3 (0%)
Old River at Rock Slough	30 (8%)	29 (8%)	-1 (0%)
Tracy Pumping Plant	31 (8%)	31 (8%)	0 (0%)
Clifton Court Forebay	26 (7%)	26 (7%)	0 (0%)
Proposed Stockton intake	15 (6%)	14 (6%)	0 (0%)
Middle River at Victoria Canal	7 (2%)	7 (2%)	0 (0%)

Page 4.2-47

The fourth paragraph on page 4.2-47 has been corrected to accurately reflect the discussion of cumulative impacts in Section 4.2, "Delta Water Resources":

> For the purposes of this analysis, a cumulative impact is defined as a *considerable* ~~substantial~~ contribution to a significant adverse cumulative effect on Delta water resources (water supply, water quality, and/or water level).

Page 4.2-53

The second paragraph on page 4.2-53 has been corrected to accurately reference the source:

> A recent report by DWR, *Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources* ~~*Climate Change Impacts on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta*~~ (DWR 2006), suggests that climate change could adversely affect Delta resources through several mechanisms including:

Section 4.3, Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Page 4.3-8

Table 4.3-2, "Special-status fish species of Interest for the Alternative Intake Project," on page 4.3-8 has been corrected to accurately reflect the designation of critical habitat for delta smelt. "Critical Habitat" has been added to the "Designated Habitat" column for delta smelt.

Section 4.6, Terrestrial Biological Resources

Page 4.6-39

The third bullet on page 4.6-39 has been corrected to accurately reflect Mitigation Measure 4.6-a (Alternative1), "Minimize Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the

United States and Loss of Sensitive Habitat, and Compensate for Unavoidable Impacts," (this correction has been made in response to verbal input from USFWS):

- ~~If the Proposed Action results in the loss of jurisdictional wetlands, a conceptual wetlands mitigation plan, including an agreed upon replacement ratio of wetlands with USACE, will be developed by a qualified biologist. The mitigation plan shall quantify the total jurisdictional acreage lost, describe creation/replacement ratios for acres filled, annual success criteria, mitigation sites, and monitoring and maintenance requirements. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified wetland biologist pursuant to, and through consultation with, USACE. Implementation of the plan would compensate for any loss of wetland resulting from project construction activities and result in no net loss of wetlands.~~ *To mitigate for permanent impacts to wetlands and other waters of the United States, CCWD proposes to use an existing USACE-approved mitigation bank to fully compensate for the acreage that is determined to be permanently affected by the Proposed Action on Victoria Island/Byron Tract, using standard and appropriate mitigation ratios. All jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, would be mitigated to achieve a no-net-loss ratio as required by USACE.*

Page 4.6-40 to 4.6-41

The fifth bullet on page 4.6-40 and subsequent paragraph on page 4.6-41 have been corrected to accurately reflect Mitigation Measure 4.6-b (Alternative 1), "Minimize Potential Effects on Special-status Plants, and Mitigate for Loss if Required" (this correction has been made in response to verbal input from DFG and USFWS):

- If special-status plant populations cannot be avoided, consultations with DFG ~~and/or USFWS~~ would be required. ~~If needed,~~ CCWD shall develop a mitigation plan to compensate for the loss of Mason's lilaeopsis and rose-mallow *at a 3:1 ratio*. ~~The plan would detail appropriate replacement ratios determined through consultation with the resource agencies, methods for implementation, success criteria, monitoring and reporting protocols, and contingency measures that would be implemented should the initial mitigation fail.~~ Because CCWD would not own the land outside the project facility footprint, mitigation through replacement is likely to be impractical at the project site and would need to be achieved at an appropriate off-site location. ~~The plan shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies prior to beginning construction activities in the area of concern.~~

  If mitigation is required, CCWD shall maintain and monitor the mitigation area for 3 years following the completion of construction and restoration activities *with the goal of an 80% survival rate at the end of 3 years*. Monitoring reports documenting the restoration effort should be submitted to DFG ~~and/or USFWS~~ upon the completion of the restoration implementation and 3 years after the restoration implementation. Monitoring reports should include photo-documentation, when restoration was completed, a description of materials that were used, specified plantings, and justifications of any substitutions to the

mitigation plan. Implementation of this measure would result in no adverse effects to special-status plants.

Page 4.6-42

The fourth bullet on page 4.6-42 has been corrected to accurately reflect Mitigation Measure 4.6-c (Alternative 1), "Implement Measures as Needed to Minimize Potential Effects on Giant Garter Snake":

- No plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar erosion control matting that could entangle snakes will be placed on the project site when working within 200 feet of potential snake habitat ~~during their active period of April 1 until October 1~~.

Section 4.8, Agriculture

Page 4.8-11

Mitigation Measure 4.8-a (Alternative 1), "Preserve the Agricultural Productivity of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to the Extent Feasible," was modified by adding the following measures (Master Response 7: Agricultural Analysis):

Mitigation Measure 4.8-a (Alternative 1): Preserve the Agricultural Productivity of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to the Extent Feasible.
To support the continued productive use of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance at the proposed project site on Victoria Island and Byron Tract, CCWD shall ensure that the following measures are taken, to the extent feasible and practicable, in the design and implementation of the project:

- To the extent feasible, ensure that existing drainage systems at the proposed project site that are needed for agricultural uses are functioning as necessary so that agricultural uses are not disrupted.

- Minimize the disturbance of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, and continuing agricultural operations, during construction by locating construction access and staging areas in areas that are fallow and using existing roads to access construction areas to the extent possible.

- Perform soil density monitoring during backfill and ripping to minimize excessive compaction and minimize effects on future agricultural land use. Remove topsoil prior to excavation in fields and return it to top of fields to avoid detrimental inversion of soil profiles. Avoid excessive compaction of trench backfill. Rip excessively compacted soils to prevent adverse compaction effects. Control compaction to minimize changes to lateral groundwater flow which could affect both irrigation and internal drainage.

- Coordinate construction scheduling as feasible and practicable so as to minimize disruption of agricultural operations.

Additionally, to further minimize effects on future farming atop the proposed new pipeline, CCWD shall ensure that the following measures are implemented:

- *The soils over the new pipeline will be replaced in a manner that will minimize any negative impacts on crop productivity. The surface and subsurface soil layers will be stockpiled separately and returned in their appropriate locations in the soil profile.*
- *To avoid over-compaction of the top layers of soil, the project will include monitoring of pre-construction soil densities and returning the surface soil (approximately the top 3 feet) to within 5% of original density.*
- *Where necessary, the top soil layers will be ripped to achieve the appropriate soil density. Ripping may also be used in areas where vehicle and equipment traffic have compacted the top soil layers, such as the construction staging areas.*
- *CCWD will avoid working or traveling on wet soil to minimize compaction and loss of soil tilth. Moisture content, above which work should not occur, is to be determined in conjunction with geotechnical testing prior to construction. Where working or driving on wet soil cannot be avoided, roadways will be capped with spoils that will be removed at the end of construction and/or ripped and amended with organic material as needed.*
- *During dewatering, CCWD will monitor soil moisture in adjacent crop fields to assure adequate crop moisture and to assist with irrigation scheduling.*
- *CCWD will remove all construction-related debris from the soil surface. This will prevent rock, gravel and construction debris from interfering with agricultural activities.*

This mitigation would reduce the impact of the proposed conversion of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Page 4.8-12

A reference in the second full paragraph on page 4.8-12 was corrected to accurately reference the intended mitigation measure:

> This mitigation measure is described above under Mitigation Measure 4.*8*~~10~~-a (Alternative 1).

Section 4.9, Transportation and Circulation

Page 4.9-1

The following sentence was deleted from the first paragraph on page 4.9-1 to accurately reflect where potential project effects on emergency vehicle access and response are addressed:

This section describes the traffic and circulation characteristics of the existing transportation corridors in the vicinity of the proposed project site and Desalination Alternative project sites, and analyzes the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives on traffic circulation and transportation systems. ~~Potential project effects on emergency vehicle access and response are discussed in Section 4.12, "Utilities and Service Systems."~~

Page 4.9-12

The first full paragraph on page 4.9-12 has been revised to reflect updated estimates of the distribution of construction-related truck trips anticipated during project construction. The total number of truck trips would remain the same (about 14,000 during the 36-month construction period). No transportation and circulation or air quality impact conclusions would change as a result of this revision.

It is anticipated that approximately 50 to 75 truck round trips would be required to transport the contractor's equipment to the site. A similar number of round trips would be needed to remove the equipment from the site as the work is completed. About 200–300 highway truck trips would be needed to bring the riprap and an additional 1,000–1,500 trips would be needed to bring aggregate surfacing to the site from the quarry of origin. *About 550–1,200 trips would be needed to bring crushed rock and pipe to the site for pipeline construction.* About 300–400 concrete loads, transported by transit mixer truck, are also likely. About 150 trailer truck loads would be required to bring other permanent materials, such as geogrid, fish screens, sheet piles, masonry, piping, structural steel, utility poles, and ancillary equipment, to the site. In addition, about 50 highway truckloads may be needed to carry construction debris and waste dump materials to a suitable landfill. As described in Section 3.4.3, "Project Construction," borrow materials could be obtained from either on-site or off-site sources. If on-site borrow is used, the hauling of borrow material would be mostly contained within Victoria Island. However, if off-site borrow is needed, potential borrow areas have been identified within 20 miles of the project site, which would add to construction-period traffic volumes on area roadways; up to an estimated *10,200* ~~11,500~~ trips may be needed. No restrictions in road access, such as lane closures or roadway blockages, are expected to be required in relation to the delivery of materials and equipment.

Section 4.10, Air Quality

Page 4.10-5

A sentence was added to the fifth full paragraph on page 4.10-5 to indicate that CCWD will comply with SJVAPCD's Regulation VIII (Comment SJVAPCD-4):

Project construction activities in San Joaquin County must comply with all applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations, including SJVAPCD Regulation II (Permits) and Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM_{10}). The purpose of Regulation VIII is to reduce ambient concentrations of fine particulate matter by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate anthropogenic fugitive dust emissions (SJVAPCD 2004). *CCWD will comply with SJVAPCD's Regulation VIII-Fugitive Dust*

Prohibitions and implement all applicable control measures, as required by law (refer to Appendix F-2 for a complete copy of Regulation VIII).

Page 4.10-16

A sentence was added to the second full paragraph on page 4.10-16 to indicate that Impact 4.10-d (Alternative 1), "Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants," which is a less-than-significant impact, could be further reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-a (Alternative 1) (Comment SJVAPCD-2):

> Any generators associated with the project would be consistent with the Air District's permitting guidelines. Therefore, there would be no significant effects associated with this portion of the project. As a result, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air emissions from the Proposed Action would be less than significant. *Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-a (Alternative 1) would further reduce the effects of Impact 4.10-d (Alternative1).*

Page 4.10-17

Mitigation Measure 4.10-a (Alternative 1), "Implement SJVAPCD and BAAQMD Measures to Control Construction-Generated Air Pollution Emissions," was modified by deleting the text as follows and adding the text shown above for Page 4.10-5, which replicates the deleted text (Comment SJVAPCD-2):

> ~~**SJVAPCD Basic Mitigation Measures.** CCWD shall implement the following applicable measures to reduce construction-related air quality impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level for PM_{10} emissions in San Joaquin County (SJVAPCD 2002):~~
>
> - ~~All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, and covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.~~
> - ~~All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizers/suppressant.~~
> - ~~All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.~~
> - ~~When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.~~
> - ~~The construction contractor shall be responsible for limiting the accumulation of project-generated mud or dirt on SR 4. Actions may include using wheel-washers or installing gravel beds at exit points from unpaved roads onto SR 4 to remove soil buildup on tires and reduce track-out. This measure has been~~

~~discussed with SJVAPCD and it has been determined that implementation of this measure would reduce track-out on paved access roads and would provide a sufficient substitute for the standard required measure of washing of the roadway to remove accumulation of mud and dirt from the pavement (Kolozsvari, pers. comm., 2005).~~

- ~~Following the addition of material to, or the removal of material from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.~~

- ~~Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and trackout.~~

SJVAPCD Enhanced Mitigation Measures. To further reduce PM_{10} emissions, CCWD shall implement the following measures to the extent feasible:

- ~~Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.~~

- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1%.

SJVAPCD Additional Mitigation Measures. The SVAPCD strongly recommends that the following additional emissions control measures be implemented at large construction sites. CCWD shall implement these measures to the extent feasible:

- ~~Wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.~~

- ~~To control wind-generated fugitive dust, suspend outdoor construction, excavation, and other earth-moving activities that disturb the soil whenever the visible dust emissions exceed 20% opacity.~~

- Limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

Chapter 8, References

Page 8-3

A reference has been added to page 8-3:

California Department of Water Resources. 2006 (July). Progress on Incorporating Climate Change into Management of California's Water Resources.

4.2 Volume II

Appendix C-4, DSM2 Delta Modeling

Tables

Several tables in Appendix C-4, "DSM2 Delta Modeling," contained a few minor rounding and calculating errors. These changes have no bearing on the analysis, statements, or conclusions reached in the Draft EIR/EIS. The revised tables are included in Appendix B of this document with the changes highlighted.

Appendix E-1, Action Specific Implementation Plan

Page 1-10

Table 1.3-1 on page 1-10 has been corrected to accurately reflect the designation of critical habitat for delta smelt and the listing status for greater sandhill crane. "Critical Habitat" has been added to the "Designated Habitat" column for delta smelt. "FT" has been replaced with "--" in the "USFWS Listing Status" column for greater sandhill crane.

Page 5-13

The first bullet on page 5-13 has been corrected to accurately reflect Conservation Measure 4.6-a, "Minimize Potential Fill of Jurisdictional Waters of the United States and Loss of Sensitive Habitat, and Compensate for Unavoidable Impacts," (this correction has been made in response to verbal input from USFWS):

- ~~If the Proposed Action results in the loss of jurisdictional wetlands, a conceptual wetlands mitigation plan, including an agreed upon replacement ratio of wetlands with USACE, will be developed by a qualified biologist. The mitigation plan shall quantify the total jurisdictional acreage lost, describe creation/replacement ratios for acres filled, annual success criteria, mitigation sites, and monitoring and maintenance requirements. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified wetland biologist pursuant to, and through consultation with, USACE. Implementation of the plan would compensate for any loss of wetland resulting from project construction activities and result in no net loss of wetlands.~~ *To mitigate for permanent impacts to wetlands and other waters of the United States, CCWD proposes to use an existing USACE-approved mitigation bank to fully compensate for the acreage that is determined to be permanently affected by the Proposed Action on Victoria Island/Byron Tract, using standard and appropriate mitigation ratios. All jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, would be mitigated to achieve a no-net-loss ratio as required by USACE.*

Page 5-14

The fourth bullet and subsequent paragraph on page 5-14 have been corrected to accurately reflect Conservation Measure 4.6-b, "Minimize Potential Effects on Special-status Plants, and Mitigate for Loss if Required" (this correction has been made in response to verbal input from DFG and USFWS):

- If special-status plant populations cannot be avoided, consultations with DFG ~~and/or USFWS~~ would be required. ~~If needed,~~ CCWD shall develop a mitigation plan to compensate for the loss of Mason's lilaeopsis and rose-mallow *at a 3:1 ratio*. ~~The plan would detail appropriate replacement ratios determined through consultation with the resource agencies, methods for implementation, success criteria, monitoring and reporting protocols, and contingency measures that would be implemented should the initial mitigation fail.~~ Because CCWD would not own the land outside the project facility footprint, mitigation through replacement is likely to be impractical at the project site and would need to be achieved at an appropriate off-site location. ~~The plan shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies prior to beginning construction activities in the area of concern.~~

If mitigation is required, CCWD shall maintain and monitor the mitigation area for 3 years following the completion of construction and restoration activities *with the goal of an 80% survival rate at the end of 3 years*. Monitoring reports documenting the restoration effort should be submitted to DFG ~~and/or USFWS~~ upon the completion of the restoration implementation and 3 years after the restoration implementation. Monitoring reports should include photo-documentation, when restoration was completed, a description of materials that were used, specified plantings, and justifications of any substitutions to the mitigation plan. Implementation of this measure would result in no adverse effects to special-status plants.

Page 5-16

The third bullet on page 5-16 has been corrected to accurately reflect Conservation Measure 4.6-c, "Implement Measures as Needed to Minimize Potential Effects on Giant Garter Snake":

- No plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar erosion control matting that could entangle snakes will be placed on the project site when working within 200 feet of potential snake habitat ~~during their active period of April 1 until October 1~~.

4.3 Volume III

Appendix F-2, Air Quality Modeling Analyses

SJVAPCD's Regulation VIII was added to the back of Appendix F-2, "Air Quality Modeling Analyses" (Comment SJVAPCD-4). This text is shown in Appendix A of this document.