Final
Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement
for the
Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord

PREPARED FOR:

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES · STATE OF CALIFORNIA

YUBA COUNTY WATER AGENCY · 1959

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR · BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PREPARED BY:

HDR | SWRI Surface Water Resources, Inc.

OCTOBER 2007

Final
Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
for the
Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord

(State Clearinghouse (SCH) No: 2005062111)

CEQA Lead Agency: Yuba County Water Agency
NEPA Lead Agency: United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation
CEQA Responsible Agencies: California Department of Water Resources, California Department of Fish and Game, the State Water Resources Control Board, Brophy Water District, Browns Valley Irrigation District, Ramirez Water District, South Yuba Water District, and Wheatland Water District
NEPA Cooperating Agencies: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs

The Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) and the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) have jointly prepared this Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord (Proposed Yuba Accord). The Proposed Yuba Accord represents an effort on the part of Yuba River stakeholders to find a solution to the challenges of competing interests by providing water for fisheries, developing new tools to ensure local water supply reliability, crafting a revenue stream to pay for the Yuba Accord Alternative, and providing additional water for out-of-county environmental and consumptive uses. These various objectives would be met through implementation of the Yuba Accord Alternative, which includes the "*Principles of Agreement for Proposed Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement*" (Fisheries Agreement), the "*Principles of Agreement for Proposed Conjunctive Use Agreements*" (Conjunctive Use Agreements), and the "*Principles of Agreement for Proposed Long-term Transfer Agreement*" (Water Purchase Agreement).

The EIR/EIS analyzes the potential impacts of implementing the Proposed Project/Action or an alternative that would be expected to occur on various resources, including: surface water supply and management, groundwater resources, power production and energy consumption, flood control, water quality, fisheries and aquatic resources, terrestrial resources, recreation, visual resources, cultural resources, air quality, land use, socioeconomics, growth inducement, environmental justice and Indian Trust Assets. Alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS include the No Action Alternative, the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project/Action (Yuba Accord Alternative), and the Modified Flow Alternative. The EIR/EIS also addresses the potential effects of implementing the Proposed Yuba Accord in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, thus analyzing cumulative impacts.

For CEQA purposes, YCWA will consider certifying this document as an EIR on October 23, 2007. If YCWA certifies this document as an EIR, then this document will be a final, certified EIR under CEQA.

For NEPA purposes, the closing date for comments on this document will be 30 days after the date of publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Please send any written comments on this document for NEPA purposes to Ms. Dianne Simodynes, HDR|Surface Water Resources, Inc., 1610 Arden Way, Suite 175, Sacramento, CA 95815-4041. Reclamation will consider making a decision on the alternatives evaluated in this EIR/EIS, and, if it decides to approve an alternative, Reclamation will issue a Record of Decision some time after this closing date for comments under NEPA.

For Further Information Contact:

Mr. Curt Aikens
Yuba County Water Agency
1220 F Street
Marysville, CA 95901
(530) 741-6278
caikens@ycwa.com

Mr. Tim Rust
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 978-5516
trust@mp.usbr.gov

Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

Section Page

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Table of Contents (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

List of Acronyms

AF	acre-feet
B	Beneficial
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BO	Biological Opinion
CALFED	CALFED Bay-Delta Program
CCR	Code of California Regulations
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQ	President's Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
cfs	cubic feet per second
CID	Cordua Irrigation District
CVP	Central Valley Project
CWA	Clean Water Act
DCMWC	Dry Creek Mutual Water Company
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
DOACT	Dobbins/Oregon House Action Committee
DOC	dissolved organic carbon
DSWG	Delta Smelt Working Group
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
E/I	export-to-inflow ratio
EIR/EIS	Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
EWA	Environmental Water Account
FA	Federal Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FPA	Federal Power Act
GCM	Global Circulation Model
GFDL	Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Lab model
GMP	Groundwater Management Program
I	Individual
Interior	U.S. Department of the Interior
km	kilometer

List of Acronyms (Continued)

LA	Local Agency
LSM	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated
LTS	Less Than Significant
M&I	municipal and industrial
MMRP/ECP	Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Plan
NA	Not Applicable
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGO	non-governmental organization
NI	No Impact
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOD	Notice of Determination
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NP	Non-Profit Organizations
NR	None Required
NRDC	National Resources Defense Council
NRDC v. Kempthorne	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) *et al*. v. Kempthorne *et al*.
NUA	Not Unreasonably Affect
OCAP	Operations Criteria and Plan
PCM	Parallel Climate Model
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PH	Public Hearing
POD	pelagic organism decline
ppt	parts per thousand
Proposed Yuba Accord	Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord
PS	Potentially Significant Impact (no mitigation identified)
RD	Revised Decision
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
ROD	Record of Decision
S	Significant Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation feasible at this time)
SA	State Agency
SWP	State Water Project
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

List of Acronyms (Continued)

TAF	thousand acre-feet
TBI	The Bay Institute
TU	Trout Unlimited
UA	Unreasonably Affect
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Western	Western Area Power Administration
X2	2 parts per thousand (ppt) salinity unit isohaline at one meter above the bottom of the Sacramento River Channel
YCWA	Yuba County Water Agency
YCWA Board	Yuba County Water Agency Board of Directors
Yuba Project	Yuba River Development Project

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) has been prepared to respond to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord (Proposed Yuba Accord), which would resolve instream flow issues associated with operation of the Yuba River Development Project (Yuba Project) in a way that would protect and enhance lower Yuba River fisheries and local water supply reliability. Additionally, the Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) has a goal to provide revenues for local flood control and water supply projects, and the United States Department of the Interior (Interior) Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) have a goal to obtain water for the CALFED Bay/Delta Program (CALFED) to use for protection and restoration of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) fisheries and for improvements in statewide water supply reliability, including supplemental water for the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP). This Final EIR/EIS has been prepared on behalf of YCWA and Reclamation in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). YCWA is the lead agency under CEQA and Reclamation is the lead agency under NEPA.

The Draft EIR/EIS for the Proposed Yuba Accord was distributed for public review and comment on June 25, 2007. The Draft EIR/EIS evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project/Action (i.e., the Yuba Accord Alternative), the Modified Flow Alternative, the No Project Alternative (as defined by CEQA) and the No Action Alternative (as defined by NEPA). To provide the public with opportunities to submit verbal and written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, two public hearings were held at YCWA's offices in Marysville, California on August 1, 2007. Three verbal comments and one written comment were received during the afternoon hearing that was held from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm, and no comments were received during the second hearing that was held from 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm. The public comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS closed on August 24, 2007. At the request of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EPA's comment deadline was extended to September 7, 2007. Written comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, and individuals (see Chapter 4).

CEQA and NEPA require the lead agencies to respond to comments on the Draft EIR/EIS that are received during the public comment period (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 and President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA Section 1503.4). This document has been prepared pursuant to these requirements. YCWA and Reclamation have considered all of the comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, and determined that none of the changes to the Draft EIR/EIS, the comments received, or responses provided result in a change to the substantive conclusions presented in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The Final EIR/EIS consists of: (1) the entire Draft EIR/EIS (see Appendix L); (2) introductory sections and a description of project updates that have occurred since publication of the Draft EIR/EIS (Chapters 1 though 3); (3) the comments and responses to comments (Chapter 4); (4) revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS (Chapter 5); (5) a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Plan (MMRP/ECP) (Chapter 6); (6) references (Chapter 7); and (7) a list of preparers (Chapter 8).

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EIR/EIS

Both CEQA and NEPA require a lead agency that has completed a Draft EIR or EIS to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the proposed action, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR or EIS. This Final EIR/EIS has been prepared to respond to comments received from agencies and members of the public on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Proposed Yuba Accord.

1.2 CEQA AND NEPA REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS

CEQA requires that the lead agencies evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare written responses. The written responses must describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). Additionally, if the lead agency's position varies from the recommendations and objections raised in the comments, then these major environmental issues must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15088).

NEPA requires that the Final EIS include and respond to all substantive comments received on the Draft EIS (40 CFR 1503.4). Lead agency responses may include the need to:

- Modify the Proposed Action or alternatives;
- Develop and evaluate new alternatives;
- Supplement, improve, or modify the substantive environmental analyses;
- Make factual corrections to the text, tables, or figures contained in the Draft EIS; or
- Explain why no further response is necessary.

Additionally, the Final EIS must discuss any responsible opposing view that was not adequately discussed in the Draft EIS and must indicate the lead agency's response to the issues raised.

1.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION AND FUTURE STEPS IN THE PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS

The Final EIR/EIS is an informational document that must be used by the YCWA Board of Directors (YCWA Board) and by Reclamation when considering approval of the Proposed Project/Action (i.e., Yuba Accord Alternative) or an alternative.

Following completion of the Final EIR/EIS, the YCWA Board will hold a public meeting to consider certification of the Final EIR and to decide whether or not to approve the Proposed Project or an alternative. For CEQA purposes, the YCWA Board must certify that:

- The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.
- The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR before approving or denying the project; and
- The Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

If the YCWA Board approves the Proposed Project or an alternative, it will prepare and adopt written findings of fact for each significant environmental impact identified in the Final EIR/EIS, which will be accompanied by an explanation of the rationale for each finding pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15091. Any significant impacts identified in the Final EIR/EIS that cannot be avoided or substantially lessened will be addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if needed. For those impacts found to be less than significant with mitigation, the YCWA Board also will adopt an MMRP/ECP to ensure that the mitigation measures and monitoring activities identified to reduce or avoid potential impacts will be implemented. If the YCWA Board approves the project, then a Notice of Determination (NOD) will be filed with the Office of Planning and Research and with the county clerks in the counties in which the project will be located.

Typically, Reclamation's project approval process under NEPA would involve circulation of the Final EIS for 30 days prior to taking action on the project and issuing a Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD would describe the decision, alternatives considered, the environmental preferable alternative, relevant factors considered in the decision, and mitigation and monitoring. However, for this project, Reclamation has decided to temporarily defer the completion of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation on the Proposed Yuba Accord (see Chapter 3). Because the ESA consultation must be completed prior to approving the Final EIS and issuing a ROD, Reclamation will not participate immediately in the Proposed Yuba Accord. Reclamation anticipates that it will complete its ESA- and NEPA-related approval processes for the project and may begin to participate in the Yuba Accord after the litigations between the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) *et al*. v. Kempthorne *et al*. (*NRDC v. Kempthorne*) and Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations (PCFFA), *et al*. v. Gutierrez, *et al*. (*PCFFA v. Gutierrez*) regarding the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) 2005 Biological Opinion (BO) and the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) 2004 BO, respectively, on the CVP and SWP Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) and the ESA re-consultations for the OCAP are completed. It is anticipated that these issues may be resolved by mid-to-late 2008. At that time, Reclamation may decide to complete the ESA consultation and determine whether or not to approve the Proposed Yuba Accord. Because the exact timing of these activities is unknown at this time, there also is a possibility that, for NEPA purposes, supplemental environmental documentation may be required as part of Reclamation's future approval process.

Based on the information available, the Yuba Accord Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative for CEQA purposes. Subject to the preceding paragraph, the Yuba Accord Alternative also is selected as the environmentally preferred alternative for NEPA purposes.

1.4 ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF THE FINAL EIR/EIS

The chapters of this Final EIR/EIS are organized as follows:

- **Chapter 1 – Introduction** – Describes the purpose and content of the Final EIR/EIS.
- **Chapter 2 – Public Outreach Process** – Describes the scoping process and schedule for the public hearings and comments.
- **Chapter 3 – Project Updates Since Publication of the Draft EIR/EIS** – Describes the proposed phasing of the Yuba Accord Alternative, an additional sensitivity analyses

conducted to investigate the potential effects of phasing, and the effects of the interim remedies order in the *NRDC v. Kempthorne* litigation on the Yuba Accord Alternative.

- **Chapter 4 – Comments and Responses** – Contains a list of all agencies and persons who submitted comments on the Draft EIR/EIS during the public review period, copies of the comment letters received, and responses to the comments.
- **Chapter 5 – Revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS** – Presents revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS text based on issues raised by new developments, comments, clarifications, or corrections.
- **Chapter 6 – Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Plan** – Describes the mitigation measures and environmental commitments identified for the project. The MMRP/ECP also includes monitoring details such as the implementing party, that agency responsible for monitoring, the timing of implementation, reporting requirements and standards of success.
- **Chapter 7 – References** – Lists the sources of information used in completing the responses to comments and other sections of this Final EIR/EIS
- **Chapter 8 – List of EIR/EIS Preparers** – Identifies the individuals who prepared this document
- **Appendices**

  Appendix L – Draft EIR/EIS (DVD)

  Appendix M – Updated Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord Agreements (CD)

  M1 – Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement

  M2 – Yuba Accord Water Purchase Agreement

1.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The tables that are presented in this section provide a summary of how the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives could affect the natural, physical, and social environments. The tables describe each potential impact that was evaluated in the EIR/EIS and state whether the impact would be potentially significant or less than significant. For the water-rights comparisons, the tables state whether or not the Proposed Project/Action and other action alternatives would unreasonably affect these environments.

Table 1-1 lists the potential resource-specific impacts that were determined to be less than significant in the Draft EIR/EIS. **Table 1-2** lists potentially significant impacts to environmental resources identified in the Draft EIR/EIS, which can be reduced to less than significant levels by incorporating mitigation measures. **Table 1-3** provides a summary of the potentially significant unavoidable impacts that were identified in the Draft EIR/EIS. **Table 1-4** provides a summary of the potential cumulative impacts that were identified for the Proposed Project/Action and action alternatives. The impacts are presented by resource category/chapter.

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Supply and Management (Chapter 5)								
Yuba Region	Surface water allocations and deliveries to YCWA Member Units	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Deliveries to CVP Contractors	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Deliveries to SWP Contractors	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	YCWA Sales to Environmental Water Account (EWA)	B	B	B	LTS	LTS	B	B
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	X2 Location	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Delta Excess Water Conditions	NUA	NUA	NI	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS
	South Delta Water Levels	NUA	NUA	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Export Service Area	San Luis Reservoir Storage	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Groundwater Resources (Chapter 6)								
Yuba Region	Reductions in local groundwater levels and storage to either affect long-term overdraft conditions in the basin or result in short-term adverse third party impacts	B	NUA	B	LTS	LTS	B	LTS
	Changes in groundwater pumping that could affect surface water and groundwater interactions and result in reduced instream flows in local rivers and streams	B	NUA	B	LTS	LTS	B	LTS
	Changes in groundwater quality that could degrade conditions and result in exceedance of regulatory or agricultural water quality standards, or result in adverse effects to designated beneficial uses of groundwater	B	NUA	B	LTS	LTS	B	LTS
	Increases in groundwater pumping to cause groundwater level reductions that result in permanent land subsidence	B	NUA	B	LTS	LTS	B	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Power Production and Energy Consumption (Chapter 7)								
Yuba Region	Decreases in long-term average annual hydropower generation at New Colgate, Narrows I and Narrows II powerhouses; at the Oroville-Thermalito Complex, or at the San Luis Pumping-Generating Plant	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Decreases in long-term average annual hydropower generation at New Colgate, Narrows I and Narrows II powerhouses; at the Oroville-Thermalito Complex, or at the San Luis Pumping-Generating Plant	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Decreases in long-term average annual or shift in long-term average monthly hydropower generation at the Oroville-Thermalito Complex	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Increases in long-term average annual power consumption at the Banks Pumping Plant, the Jones Pumping Plant, the O'Neill Forebay Pumping Plant and the San Luis Pumping-Generating Plant	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Decreases in long-term average annual or shift in long-term average monthly hydropower generation at the San Luis Pumping-Generating Plant	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Increases in long-term average annual power consumption at the Banks Pumping Plant, the Jones Pumping Plant, the O'Neill Forebay Pumping Plant and the San Luis Pumping-Generating Plant	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Flood Control (Chapter 8)								
Yuba Region	Increases in New Bullards Bar Reservoir end-of-month storage volumes that could affect flood control releases	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Increases in Oroville Reservoir end-of-month storage volumes that could affect flood control releases	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9)								
Yuba Region	Decreases in New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean water temperatures in the lower Yuba River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Decreases in Oroville Reservoir storage that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Feather River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Changes in monthly mean water temperatures in the Feather River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean water temperatures in the Sacramento River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Changes to the monthly mean location of X2 that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes to monthly mean Delta outflow that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes to monthly mean export-to-inflow (E/I) ratios that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Salinity changes in the San Joaquin River at Airport Way Bridge (Vernalis) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9) (continued)								
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region (continued)	Salinity changes in the San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Salinity changes in Middle River near Old River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Salinity changes in Old River at Tracy Road Bridge that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in dissolved organic carbon (DOC) concentrations at Old River at Highway 4 (CCWD Los Vaqueros Intake) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in DOC concentrations at Old River at Rock Slough (CCWD Intake) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in DOC concentrations at West Canal at the mouth of Clifton Court Forebay (SWP Banks Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in DOC concentrations at the Delta-Mendota Canal at the Jones Pumping Plant (CVP Jones Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9) (continued)								
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region (continued)	Changes in monthly mean flows in Old River at Bacon Island that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Middle River at Middle River that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Middle River at Mowry Bridge that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Decreases in San Luis Reservoir storage that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10)								
Yuba Region	Decreases in New Bullards Bar Reservoir water surface elevations during the spawning/nesting season could affect warmwater fish	B	B	LTS	LTS	LTS	B	LTS
	Decreases in New Bullards Bar Reservoir storage could reduce the coldwater pool and thereby affect coldwater fish	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect steelhead	NUA	NUA	B	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10) (continued)								
Yuba Region (continued)	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect green sturgeon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect American shad	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect striped bass	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Decreases in Oroville Reservoir water surface elevations during the spawning/nesting season could affect warmwater fish	NUA	NUA	LTS/B	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Decreases in Oroville Reservoir storage could reduce the coldwater pool and thereby affect coldwater fish	NUA	NUA	LTS/B	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect spring-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect fall-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect steelhead	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect green sturgeon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect American Shad	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect striped bass	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Feather River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect Sacramento splittail	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect winter-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect spring-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect fall-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect late fall-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect steelhead	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect green sturgeon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect American shad	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect striped bass	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the Sacramento River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect Sacramento splittail	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) and salvage estimates could affect winter-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) and salvage estimates could affect spring-run Chinook salmon	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) and salvage estimates could affect steelhead	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10) (continued)								
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region (continued)	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) and salvage estimates could affect striped bass	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) could affect other Delta fisheries resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Delta habitat evaluation parameters (i.e., X2 locations, Delta outflows and E/I ratios) and salvage estimates could affect delta smelt	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	PS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Decreases in San Luis Reservoir water surface elevations during the spawning/nesting season could affect warmwater fish	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Decreases in San Luis Reservoir storage could reduce the coldwater pool and thereby affect coldwater fish	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Terrestrial Resources (Chapter 11)								
Yuba Region	Changes in New Bullards Bar Reservoir water surface elevations during the March through September period that could degrade continuous strands of native vegetation of relatively high to moderate wildlife value	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in the New Bullards Bar Reservoir fishery during the April through July period that could degrade piscivorous bird forage quantity or quality	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in lower Yuba River flow during the March through September period that could degrade the growth, maintenance, and reproductive capacity of riparian vegetation	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Terrestrial Resources (Chapter 11) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Changes in Oroville Reservoir water surface elevations during the March through September period that could degrade continuous strands of native vegetation of relatively high to moderate wildlife value	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in the Oroville Reservoir fishery during the April through July period that could degrade piscivorous bird forage quantity or quality	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in lower Feather River flow during the March through September period that could degrade the growth, maintenance, and reproductive capacity of riparian vegetation	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in lower Sacramento River flow during the March through September period that could degrade the growth, maintenance, and reproductive capacity of riparian vegetation	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Changes in San Luis Reservoir water surface elevations during the March through September period that could degrade continuous strands of native vegetation of relatively high to moderate wildlife value	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in the San Luis Reservoir fishery during the April through July period that could degrade piscivorous bird forage quantity or quality	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Recreation (Chapter 12)								
Yuba Region	Decreases in New Bullards Bar Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in reduced boat ramp and swimming beaches availability	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Decreases in lower Yuba River flows that could result in reduced boating opportunities	NUA/B	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Consistency with Yuba County General Plan recreation policies	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Decreases in Oroville Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in reduced boat ramp availability	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Decreases in Oroville Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in reduced camping and swimming beaches availability	NUA/B	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Orville Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in reduced recreation opportunities	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Feather River flows that could result in reduced boating and fishing opportunities	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Consistency with Feather River recreation policies	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Sacramento River flows that could result in reduced Sacramento River boating, hunting, and fishing opportunities	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Recreation (Chapter 12) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Consistency with Sacramento River recreation policies	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Changes in Delta inflows that could result in reduced recreation opportunities in the Delta	NUA/B	NUA/B	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Consistency with Delta recreation policies	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Decreases in San Luis Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in reduced boat ramp availability	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Visual Resources (Chapter 13)								
Yuba Region	Changes in New Bullards Bar Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in lower Yuba River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Change in surface water conditions that could result in adverse impacts to the landscape character and the attractiveness of Class A and B resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Changes in Oroville Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Visual Resources (Chapter 13) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Changes in Feather River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Sacramento River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Change in surface water conditions that could result in adverse impacts to the landscape character and the attractiveness of Class A and B resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Changes in monthly mean Delta inflows that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Change in surface water conditions that could result in adverse impacts to the landscape character and the attractiveness of Class A and B resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Changes in San Luis Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in adverse impacts to the visual character of the landscape	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Change in surface water conditions that could result in adverse impacts to the landscape character and the attractiveness of Class A and B resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Cultural Resources (Chapter 14)								
Yuba Region	Changes in New Bullards Bar Reservoir water surface elevations that could result in adverse impacts to sensitive cultural resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Alteration of the character of New Bullards Bar Reservoir site setting that could affect eligibility for site inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in lower Yuba River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to sensitive cultural resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Alteration of the character of the lower Yuba River site setting that could affect eligibility for site inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in surface water or groundwater conditions that could result in adverse impacts to a federally reserved water right	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in surface water or groundwater conditions that could result in adverse impacts to the health of Tribes	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in surface water conditions that could result in adverse impacts to a federally reserved hunting, fishing, or gathering right	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Changes in Oroville Reservoir monthly mean water surface elevations that could result in adverse impacts to sensitive cultural resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Cultural Resources (Chapter 14) (continued)								
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region (continued)	Alteration of the character of Oroville Reservoir site setting that could affect eligibility for site inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Feather River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to sensitive cultural resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Alteration of the character of the Feather River site setting that could affect eligibility for site inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in Sacramento River monthly mean flows that could result in adverse impacts to sensitive cultural resources	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Alteration of the character of the Sacramento River site setting that could affect eligibility for site inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Air Quality (Chapter 15)								
Export Service Area	Increases in emissions associated with groundwater pumping that could result in potential impacts to air quality by lowering the attainment status, conflicting with adopted air quality policies and programs, or violating approved standards	NUA	NUA	LTS/B	LTS	LTS	LTS/B	LTS
Land Use (Chapter 16)								
Yuba Region	Changes in annual surface water deliveries that could result in potential impacts to existing land use designations	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Land Use (Chapter 16) (continued)								
Yuba Region (continued)	Changes in annual water deliveries and instream flow conditions that could result in potential impacts to the compatibility with surrounding land uses and regional character	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in annual water deliveries that could result in potential impacts to farmland and agricultural acreage	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in annual water deliveries that could result in potential impacts to the conversion of lands to protected lands	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Changes in annual water deliveries and instream flow conditions that could result in potential impacts to local and regional planning objectives	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Agricultural Impacts Resulting from Changes in Water Temperature	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Socioeconomics (Chapter 17)								
Yuba Region	Decreases in cumulative net revenues that could result in adverse impacts to the annual income of local growers	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	PS	LTS	LTS
Growth Inducement (Chapter 18)								
Yuba Region	Potential local growth-inducing considerations in the Yuba Region Potential local growth-inducing considerations in the Yuba Region	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Export Service Area	Potential regional growth-inducing considerations in the Export Service Area	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	Increases in water deliveries to CVP contractor service areas that could remove an impediment to growth or contribute to growth inducement in the Export Service Area	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table 1-1. Summary of Potential Less-than-Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[(a)]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[(a)]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[(b)]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[(b)]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[(b)]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[(b)]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[(b)]
Growth Inducement (Chapter 18) (continued)								
	Increases in water deliveries to SWP contractor service areas that could remove an impediment to growth or contribute to growth inducement in the Export Service Area	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Environmental Justice (Chapter 19)								
Yuba Region	Changes in the natural or physical environment that would result in a proportionately high or adverse impact on a minority or low-income population	NUA	NUA	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Indian Trust Assets (Chapter 20)								
Yuba Region	Potential for environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets	NI						
CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	Potential for environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets	NI						
Delta Region	Potential for environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets	NA						

Notes:

Alternative Comparisons:
1 - CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
2 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
3 – CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
4 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
5 – CEQA No Project Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
6 – NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)
7 – NEPA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)

[(a)]Level of Effect (Water Rights)
NUA = Not Unreasonably Affect
UA = Unreasonably Affect

Notes:
NR = None Required
NA = Not Applicable

[(b)]Level of Significance (CEQA/NEPA)
B = Beneficial
NI = No Impact
LTS = Less Than Significant Impact
LSM = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated
PS = Potentially Significant Impact (no mitigation identified)
SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation feasible at this time)

Table 1-2. Summary of Less than Significant Impacts, With Mitigation Measures Incorporated, Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9)								
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region	Salinity changes in the Sacramento River at Emmaton that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Salinity changes in the San Joaquin River at Jersey Point that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Salinity changes in Old River at Highway 4 (CCWD Los Vaqueros Intake) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Salinity changes at CCWD Pumping Plant #1 that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Salinity changes in the West Canal at the mouth of Clifton Court Forebay (SWP Banks Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Salinity changes in the Delta-Mendota Canal at the Jones Pumping Plant (CVP Jones Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LTS

Table 1-2. Summary of Less than Significant Impacts, With Mitigation Measures Incorporated, Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9) (continued)								
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region (continued)	Salinity changes at Middle River at Victoria Canal that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LTS
	Salinity changes at the Stockton Intake that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LTS
	Changes in chloride concentrations in Old River at Highway 4 (CCWD Los Vaqueros Intake) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Changes in chloride concentrations in CCWD Pumping Plant #1 (Rock Slough) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Changes in chloride concentrations in Old River at Rock Slough (CCWD Intake) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Changes in chloride concentrations in West Canal at the mouth of Clifton Court Forebay (SWP Banks Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM

Table 1-2. Summary of Less than Significant Impacts, With Mitigation Measures Incorporated, Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[a]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[b]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[b]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[b]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[b]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[b]
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9) (continued)								
Sacramento -San Joaquin Delta Region (continued)	Changes in chloride concentrations in Delta Mendota Canal at the Jones Pumping Plant (CVP Jones Pumping Plant) that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Changes in chloride concentrations in Middle River at Victoria Canal that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS	LSM	LSM
	Changes in chloride concentrations at the Stockton Intake that could result in degraded water quality conditions or adverse effects to designated beneficial uses in the Delta	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	LTS	LSM	LSM
Air Quality (Chapter 15)								
Yuba Region	Increases in emissions associated with groundwater pumping that could result in potential impacts to air quality by lowering the attainment status, conflicting with adopted air quality policies and programs, or violating approved standards	NUA	NUA	LSM	LSM	PS/SU	LTS	LTS

Notes:

Alternative Comparisons:
1 - CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
2 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
3 – CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
4 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
5 – CEQA No Project Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
6 – NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)
7 – NEPA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)

[a]Level of Effect (Water Rights)
NUA = Not Unreasonably Affect
UA = Unreasonably Affect

Notes:
NR = None Required
NA = Not Applicable

[b]Level of Significance (CEQA/NEPA)
B = Beneficial
NI = No Impact
LTS = Less Than Significant Impact
LSM = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated
PS = Potentially Significant Impact (no mitigation identified)
SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation feasible at this time)

Table 1-3. Summary of Potentially Significant Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS

Potential Impacts Evaluated for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS		Alternatives Comparisons						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		CEQA Accord vs. No Project[(a)]	CEQA Modified vs. No Project[(a)]	CEQA Accord vs. Existing[(b)]	CEQA Modified vs. Existing[(b)]	CEQA No Project vs. Existing[(b)]	NEPA Accord vs. No Action[(b)]	NEPA Modified vs. No Action[(b)]
Power Production and Energy Consumption (Chapter 7)								
Yuba Region	Shift in long-term average monthly hydropower generation at New Colgate, Narrows I and II powerhouses	NUA	NUA	LTS	PS	PS	LTS	LTS
	Increases in long-term average annual power consumption for groundwater pumping within YCWA Member Units service areas	UA	NUA	PS	PS	PS	PS	LTS
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10)								
Yuba Region	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect spring-run Chinook salmon	NUA	UA	B	LTS	LTS	LTS	PS
	Changes in monthly mean flows in the lower Yuba River, or changes in monthly mean water temperatures, could affect fall-run Chinook salmon	NUA	UA	B	LTS	LTS	LTS	PS

Notes:

Alternative Comparisons:
1 - CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
2 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Water Rights)
3 – CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
4 – CEQA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
5 – CEQA No Project Alternative Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (CEQA)
6 – NEPA Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)
7 – NEPA Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the NEPA No Action Alternative (NEPA)

[(a)]Level of Effect (Water Rights)
NUA = Not Unreasonably Affect
UA = Unreasonably Affect

Notes:
NR = None Required
NA = Not Applicable

[(b)]Level of Significance (CEQA/NEPA)
B = Beneficial
NI = No Impact
LTS = Less Than Significant Impact
LSM = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated
PS = Potentially Significant Impact (no mitigation identified)
SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation feasible at this time)

Table 1-4. Summary of Potential Cumulative Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS

Potential Cumulative Impacts for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS	Yuba Accord Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition	Modified Flow Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition
Beneficial/Less-than Significant Impacts		
Groundwater Resources (Chapter 6)		
Potential for cumulative groundwater resources impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Flood Control (Chapter 8)		
Potential for cumulative flood control impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative flood control impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative flood control impacts within the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative flood control impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9)		
Potential for cumulative water quality impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative water quality impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10)		
Potential for cumulative fisheries and aquatic resources impacts within the Yuba Region	B	B
Potential for cumulative fisheries and aquatic resources impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Terrestrial Resources (Chapter 11)		
Potential for cumulative terrestrial resources impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative terrestrial resources impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Recreation (Chapter 12)		
Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Visual Resources (Chapter 13)		
Potential for cumulative visual resources impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative visual resources impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative visual resources impacts within the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative visual resources impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Cultural Resources (Chapter 14)		
Potential for cumulative cultural resources impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative cultural resources impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative cultural resources impacts within the Delta Region	LTS	LTS
Potential for cumulative cultural resources impacts within the Export Service Area	LTS	LTS
Land Use (Chapter 16)		
Potential for cumulative land use impacts within the Yuba Region	LTS	LTS

Table 1-4. Summary of Potential Cumulative Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Cumulative Impacts for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS	Yuba Accord Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition	Modified Flow Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition
Beneficial/Less-than Significant Impacts (continued)		
Socioeconomics (Chapter 17)		
Potential for cumulative socioeconomic impacts within the Yuba Region	NI	NI
Growth Inducement (Chapter 18		
Potential for cumulative growth inducing impacts within the Yuba Region	NA	NA
Environmental Justice (Chapter 19)		
Potential for cumulative environmental justice impacts within the Yuba Region	NI	NI
Indian Trust Asses (Chapter 20)		
Potential for cumulative environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets within the Yuba Region	NI	NI
Potential for cumulative environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	NI	NI
Potential for cumulative environmental impacts on Indian Trust Assets within the Delta Region	NA	NA
Less than Significant Impacts With Mitigation Measures Incorporated		
Air Quality (Chapter 15)		
Potential for cumulative air quality impacts within the Yuba Region	LSM	LSM
Potentially Significant Impacts		
Surface Water Supply and Management (Chapter 5)		
Potential for cumulative surface water supply and management impacts within the Yuba Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative surface water supply and management impacts within the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative surface water supply and management impacts within the Export Service Area	PSU	PSU
Power Production and Energy Consumption (Chapter 7)		
Potential for cumulative hydropower impacts within the Yuba Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative hydropower impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative hydropower impacts within the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative hydropower impacts within the Export Service Area	PSU	PSU
Surface Water Quality (Chapter 9)		
Potential for cumulative water quality impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative water quality impacts within the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Chapter 10)		
Potential for cumulative fisheries and aquatic resources impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative fisheries and aquatic resources impacts within the Delta Region	PSU	PSU

Table 1-4. Summary of Potential Cumulative Impacts Identified in the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord EIR/EIS (continued)

Potential Cumulative Impacts for the Resources Addressed in the EIR/EIS	Yuba Accord Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition	Modified Flow Alternative Cumulative Condition vs. Existing Condition
Potentially Significant Impacts (continued)		
Terrestrial Resources (Chapter 11)		
Potential for cumulative terrestrial resources impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Recreation (Chapter 12)		
Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region	PSU	PSU
Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the Delta Region	PSU	PSU

Level of Significance (CEQA/NEPA)
B = Beneficial
NI = No Impact
LTS = Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact
PSU = Potentially Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact
LSM = Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated
NA = Not Applicable

CHAPTER 2
PUBLIC OUTREACH PROCESS

This chapter describes the scoping and public outreach process that was followed for the Proposed Yuba Accord EIR/EIS. The public outreach efforts were conducted in accordance with both CEQA and NEPA to determine the focus and content of this EIR/EIS.

2.1 PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS

Numerous outreach efforts were undertaken to inform stakeholders about the Proposed Yuba Accord and to solicit their input. These efforts are described here.

2.1.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION/NOTICE OF INTENT

YCWA and Reclamation circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP)/Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a joint EIR/EIS for the Proposed Yuba Accord on July 20, 2005.

The NOP was filed with the California State Clearinghouse, the NOI was published in the Federal Register, and both notices were published in several local newspapers, including the Sacramento Bee and the Marysville Appeal Democrat. Additionally, a separate notice of scoping meetings was distributed to over 800 individuals on the Yuba Accord mailing/distribution list.

Although there is not a specific time period during which scoping begins and ends, scoping activities for the Proposed Yuba Accord were formally initiated with the release of the NOP and NOI on June 20, 2005.

2.2 SCOPING PROCESS

NEPA requires a formal scoping process for the preparation of an EIS (40 CFR 1501.7). Scoping is a less formalized process under CEQA, but is encouraged as part of early public consultation for a project.

Scoping is used under both CEQA and NEPA to determine the focus and content of an EIR or EIS. The main objective of the scoping process is to provide the public and potentially affected resource agencies with information on the proposed project and to solicit public input regarding the issues and concerns that should be evaluated in the environmental documentation. The scoping process is generally intended to provide the lead agencies with information regarding the range of actions, alternatives, resource issues, and mitigation measures that are to be analyzed in depth in the EIR/EIS and to eliminate from detailed study those issues found not to be significant. The scoping process for the Proposed Yuba Accord was designed to elicit comments from public agencies, other interested organizations and the public on the scope of the potential environmental effects and issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

2.2.1 SCOPING MEETINGS

Reclamation and YCWA held four public scoping meetings over two days: two on July 19, 2005 in Sacramento, California, and two on July 20, 2005 in Marysville, California. Attendees at the meetings included various federal, state, and local agency representatives, non-governmental

organization (NGO) representatives, and local residents. The first portion of each meeting was an informal discussion and display session. Four information stations were set up around the meeting room, displaying information related to the three agreements comprising the Proposed Yuba Accord and explaining the EIR/EIS process. Lead agency representatives and consultant team members answered questions related to the Proposed Yuba Accord and EIR/EIS process, and collected public comments. A brief slide presentation of the history and overview of the Proposed Yuba Accord was made. At the conclusion of the slide presentation, meeting attendees were given the opportunity to make verbal comments. The meetings concluded with additional time for meeting attendees to view, ask questions, and comment upon the information display stations and meeting materials. Questions and comments were taken throughout each meeting and attendees were encouraged to provide their comments to the lead agencies in writing.

As a result of the solicitation of verbal and written comments, various federal, state, and local agencies and private citizens submitted comments and letters that identified several issues which were either evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS or were determined to be out of the scope of the Proposed Yuba Accord EIR/EIS. A summary of the comments received during the public scoping period is provided in the Scoping Summary Report, which was distributed in March 2006.

Although the comment period for scoping purposes ended on August 5, 2005, the lead agencies continued to keep the public and stakeholders informed at key milestones throughout the EIR/EIS process, including providing the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, which was released to the public for review on June 25, 2007.

2.3 DRAFT EIR/EIS AVAILABILITY

Pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, the Draft EIR/EIS was developed by YCWA, Reclamation, and DWR and was made available for a 60-day public review and comment period which commenced on June 25, 2007 and extended until August 24, 2007. As described in Chapter 1, the EPA requested an extension for the EPA review period, which was granted, and EPA's comment deadline was extended to September 7, 2007.

A notice of availability of the Draft EIR/EIS published in the Federal Register, filed with the California State Clearinghouse, and published in local newspapers, including the Sacramento Bee, the Marysville Appeal Democrat, and the Grass Valley Union. The purpose of the notice was to inform interested parties of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS document for public review and comment. A separate notice of public hearings was distributed by Reclamation to all agencies and individuals on the Yuba Accord mailing/distribution list.

Also, copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were made available for public review at the following locations:

- Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825
- Yuba County Water Agency, 1220 F Street, Marysville, CA 95901
- Department of Water Resources, Division of Environmental Services, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
- Sacramento Public Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
- Yuba County Library, 303 2nd Street, Marysville, CA 95901

2.4 PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE DRAFT EIR/EIS

As part of the CEQA/NEPA process, two public hearings were held, which allowed individuals an opportunity to provide verbal or written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. The hearings occurred from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm and from 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm on Wednesday, August 1, 2007 in Marysville, California. Three verbal comments and one written comment were received during the afternoon hearing and no comments were made during the evening hearing.

2.5 OUTREACH EFFORTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE COMPLETION AND THE CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR/EIS

CEQA (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15088 (b)) requires that, "…*The lead agency shall provide a written proposed response to a public agency on comments made by that public agency at least 10 days prior to certifying an environmental impact report*."

The public agencies that provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS are:

- Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Department of Energy, Western Area Power Association
- California Department of Water Resources
- State Water Resources Control Board
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Cordua Irrigation District
- Contra Costa Water District
- Dry Creek Mutual Water Company

YCWA provided written proposed responses to each public agency listed above and provided each agency with a minimum of 10 days to review the proposed responses before certification of the Final EIR/EIS. Separate packages were sent to each of the public agencies that provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. These packages contained: (1) a transmittal letter; (2) a scanned copy of that agency's original comment letter (with specific comments labeled), and (3) the proposed written responses to each of the comments identified in the agency's letter. Each comment was addressed in detail, and rationale explaining why specific comments and suggestions were or were not accepted was included as part of the response. The 10-day review period for all public agencies listed above ended on October 14, 2007.

YCWA will provide one additional opportunity for members of the public to make comments about the Proposed Yuba Accord during the YCWA Board Meeting/Public Hearing that will occur when the YCWA Board will decide whether or not to certify the Final EIR/EIS and approve the Proposed Project. The YCWA Board Meeting/Public Hearing is scheduled for 8:30 am on October 23, 2007 at the Yuba County Government Center, 915 8th Street, Board Chambers, Marysville, California.

CHAPTER 3
CHANGES IN PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSES OF PROJECT IMPACTS SINCE PUBLICATION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 10.1.4.1 on pages 10-31 through 10-36 of the Draft EIR/EIS discusses the recent decline of pelagic fish species in the Delta, the Pelagic Fish Action Plan and Reclamation's decision to re-initiate ESA consultations regarding the OCAP with USFWS and NMFS. On page 10-35, the Draft EIR/EIS "acknowledges that there are numerous issues surrounding the pelagic organism decline, and recognizes that future Delta operations and management will differ from the operations and management that have been in place under the CEQA Existing Condition and the NEPA Affected Environment."

The Draft EIR/EIS was issued on June 25, 2007. Just over two months later, on August 31, 2007, the court in *NRDC v. Kempthorne* issued its draft interim remedies order, which directs Reclamation and DWR to take several actions, including some substantial curtailments in Delta exports by the CVP and SWP during late December through June of each year. This order has caused two significant changes to the Proposed Project/Action.

First, as a result of this order, Reclamation has decided to delay completion of its ESA compliance for the Proposed Project/Action, and to wait to complete its ROD for the Proposed Project/Action until the ESA re-consultations for OCAP are completed. Until Reclamation issues its ROD, the Yuba Accord Alternative therefore would be implemented with just YCWA and DWR being parties to the Water Purchase Agreement. During this first phase, DWR and Reclamation would not execute the Tier 2 Agreement that is described on pages 3-14 to 3-16 of the Draft EIR/EIS, and Reclamation would not execute the Tier 3 Agreements that are described on pages 3-16 to 3-17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The same amount of Component 1 water still would go to the Environmental Water Account (EWA) Program. For Components 2, 3 and 4 water, DWR still would execute Tier 3 Agreements with SWP contractors, and DWR also may execute water-purchase agreements with interested CVP contractors.

After Reclamation issues its Record of Decision, Reclamation would consider joining the Water Purchase Agreement. If Reclamation were to decide to join the Water Purchase Agreement, then, during this second phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, YCWA, DWR and Reclamation all would be parties to the Water Purchase Agreement, DWR and Reclamation would execute the Tier 2 Agreement, and Reclamation and CVP contractors would execute their Tier 3 Agreements, as contemplated in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Second, as a result of the court's interim remedies order in *NRDC v. Kempthorne*, the times of the year during which the additional water that would flow into the Delta under the Yuba Accord Alternative may be exported from the Delta, and the amounts of such water that may be exported from the Delta, would be more limited than under the Yuba Accord Alternative that is described and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Even with the proposed phasing of the Yuba Accord Alternative, and even with the court's interim remedies order in *NRDC v. Kempthorne*, the Fisheries Agreement and YCWA's obligations to maintain the lower Yuba River flows that are specified by the Fisheries Agreement under the Yuba Accord would not change. The Yuba Project operations and lower Yuba River flows that are described and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS for the Yuba Accord Alternative would change slightly as a result of this proposed phasing and the court's interim

remedies order, because of some small changes in the amounts of groundwater substitution pumping. The amount of groundwater substitution pumping in any particular year would be partly determined by the available capacity at the Banks and Jones pumping plants during the months of July, August, and September. Increased CVP or SWP pumping of CVP and SWP water during these months to offset reduced pumping of CVP and SWP water during the winter and spring, as a result of the court's interim remedies order, could reduce available capacity at these pumping plants for Yuba Accord transfer water, and therefore could reduce or shift the amounts of groundwater substitution pumping in some years. These changes in groundwater-substitution transfers, and the associated impacts of groundwater substitution pumping under the Yuba Accord Alternative would be relatively small, and would not change the conclusions in the impact analyses discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The proposed phasing of the Yuba Accord Alternative and the court's interim remedies order in *NRDC v. Kempthorne* could change the amounts and timing of CVP and SWP exports from the Delta, the storage of Yuba Accord transfer water in Oroville Reservoir, and the amounts of Yuba Accord transfer water available in the Export Service Area. The phasing of the Yuba Accord Alternative and the effects of this phasing on the Yuba Accord Alternative's potential environmental impacts in the Delta Region and the Export Service Area are discussed in Section 3.2. The effects of the court's interim remedies order on the Yuba Accord Alternative's potential environmental impacts in the Delta Region and the Export Service Area are discussed in Section 3.3.

3.2 EFFECTS OF PHASING THE YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE

The first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, under which YCWA and DWR would be the only parties to the Water Purchase Agreement, could result in two major changes in the analyses in the Draft EIR/EIS. First, the proportions of Yuba Accord transfer water pumped at the Banks and Jones pumping plants could change, if Yuba Accord transfer water could not be pumped at the Jones Pumping Plant at the rates analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Second, while the amounts of Yuba Accord transfer water that go to the EWA Program would not change, there could be some changes in the amounts of Yuba Accord transfer water that go to CVP and SWP contractors in drier years. These changes are discussed respectively in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

3.2.1 POTENTIAL CHANGES IN THE RATES OF PUMPING OF YUBA ACCORD TRANSFER WATER AT BANKS AND JONES PUMPING PLANTS DURING THE FIRST PHASE OF THE YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE

As discussed in Section 5.6 of the Modeling Technical Memorandum, Appendix D of the Draft EIR/EIS, on page D-30, the CVP (Jones Pumping Plant) has little surplus capacity, except under drier hydrologic conditions, and the SWP (Banks Pumping Plant) has greatest surplus capacity in dry and critical years, less under average conditions, and some in wetter years. For modeling purposes, it therefore was assumed that: (a) in wet and above normal years, all exports of Yuba Accord transfer water would be through the Banks Pumping Plant until all capacity, including the dedicated EWA capacity, is used; then any remaining transfers would be exported through the Jones Pumping Plant, to the extent that it has capacity for such transfers; and (b) in below normal, dry and critical years, exports of Yuba Accord transfer water would be split evenly between the Banks and Jones pumping plants; once either plant reached capacity, any remaining exports would be through the remaining capacity at the other pumping plant.

It is possible that, under the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, Yuba Accord transfer water still could be exported through both the Banks and Jones pumping plants. However, to determine the maximum potential changes in the mix of exports through these two pumping plants, it was assumed for the following analysis that all Yuba Accord transfer water under the Yuba Accord Alternative would be pumped only through the Banks Pumping Plant during this first phase, and only when there was capacity available at the Banks Pumping Plant for this purpose.

This analysis used the previous model results, and post-processed them with the restriction that export pumping of Yuba Accord transfer water could occur only at the Banks Pumping Plant. Other modeling assumptions, impact assessment methodologies, impact indicators and evaluation guidelines are the same as those that are described in Appendix D, and on pages 10-63 through 10-65, of the Draft EIR/EIS. **Table 3-1** shows the changes in pumping rates that would result from this pumping restriction.

Table 3-1. Simulated Average Annual Exports Through Banks and Jones Pumping Plants During the First Phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative and the Draft EIR/EIS Yuba Accord Alternative (TAF)

	First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative		Draft EIR/EIS Yuba Accord Alternative		Change (First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative Minus Draft EIR/EIS Yuba Accord Alternative)	
Water Year Type	Banks Pumping Plant	Jones Pumping Plant	Banks Pumping Plant	Jones Pumping Plant	Banks Pumping Plant	Jones Pumping Plant
Average All Years	3,264	2,300	3,245	2,322	19	-22
Wet	4,029	2,606	4,028	2,610	1	-4
Above Normal	3,713	2,566	3,712	2,566	0	-1
Below Normal	3,486	2,447	3,468	2,464	18	-17
Dry	2,882	2,163	2,842	2,212	40	-49
Critical	1,805	1,553	1,762	1,598	43	-45

Notes:
Sacramento Valley Index Water Year Types as defined in State Water Resources Control Board Revised Decision 1641
TAF = thousand acre-feet

As indicated in this table, there normally would be slightly lower exports from Jones Pumping Plant, and slightly higher exports from Banks Pumping Plant, during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, relative to the Yuba Accord Alternative analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. On an average annual basis, total exports would be 3 TAF lower during this first phase. Average annual exports would be lower under the first phase during all water-year types except for below-normal years, during which total exports would be slightly higher.

These changes in export pumping of Yuba Accord transfer water were subsequently used to determine the changes in the differences in salvage estimates for fish in the Delta for the following two comparisons of alternatives: (1) Yuba Accord Alternative compared to the CEQA Existing Condition; and (2) Yuba Accord Alternative compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative.

Table 3-2 lists the estimated differences in salvage of the fish species listed in the table for the Yuba Accord Alternative compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (Scenario 3 vs. Scenario 1) under the first phase (during which all Yuba Accord transfer water would be exported through the Banks Pumping Plant), and the estimated differences in salvage of these species for this same comparison in the Draft EIR/EIS (during which Yuba Accord transfer water would be exported through both the Banks Pumping Plant and the Jones Pumping Plant).

This table shows that there could be some slight changes in the numbers of fish salvaged as a result of this phasing, but that the percent differences in average salvage and salvage by water year for these species under this first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition, generally would not change from the results presented in the Draft EIR/EIS for the comparison of these two scenarios. The greatest percent increase in salvage differences under this first phase would be for delta smelt during critical years. For delta smelt in critical years, the percentage reduction in salvage under the Yuba Accord Alternative, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition, would change from -0.6 percent (Draft EIR/EIS) to -0.4 percent (First Phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative). Although this salvage estimate therefore would be higher than the salvage estimate that is presented in the Draft EIR/EIS for this scenario, species and water-year type, the change from the CEQA Existing Condition to the First Phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative still would be negative, that is, fewer fish would be salvaged under the Yuba Accord Alternative than under the CEQA Existing Condition. Thus, even though there would be some slight changes in the salvage estimates for the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, the Yuba Accord Alternative still would not have any significant impacts on these fish species, relative to the CEQA Existing Condition.

Table 3-3 lists the estimated differences in salvage of these fish species under the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative (Scenario 3 vs. Scenario 2), and the estimated differences in salvage of these species for this same comparison in the Draft EIR/EIS.

This table shows that there could be some slight changes in the numbers of fish salvaged as a result of this phasing, but that the percent differences in long-term average salvage and salvage by water year for these species under this first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, relative to the CEQA No Project Alternative, generally would not change compared to the results presented in the Draft EIR/EIS. The greatest percent increase in salvage differences under this first phase would be for delta smelt during critical years. For delta smelt in critical years, the percentage reduction in salvage under the Yuba Accord Alternative, relative to the CEQA No Project Condition, would change from -5.3 percent (Draft EIR/EIS) to -5.1 percent (First Phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative). Although this salvage estimate therefore would be higher than the salvage estimate that is presented in the Draft EIR/EIS for this scenario, by species and water-year type, the change from the CEQA No Project Alternative to the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative still would be negative, that is, fewer fish would be salvaged under the Yuba Accord Alternative than under the CEQA No Project Alternative. Thus, even though there would be some slight changes in the salvage estimates for the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, the Yuba Accord Alternative still would not have any significant impacts on these fish species, relative to the CEQA No Project Alternative.

Table 3-2. Salvage Estimates for the First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative (Exports Only at Banks Pumping Plant) Compared to the CEQA Existing Condition (Scenario 3 vs. Scenario 1)

Year Type	First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative Total: CVP and SWP		Draft EIR/EIS Yuba Accord Alternative Total: CVP and SWP	
	Difference in Average Salvage	Percent Difference in Average Salvage	Difference in Average Salvage	Percent Difference in Average Salvage
Winter-run Chinook Salmon Salvage Projections				
All Years	-41	-0.3	-15	-0.1
Wet	-13	-0.1	-6	0.0
Above Normal	-23	-0.2	0	0.0
Below Normal	-38	-0.2	0	0.0
Dry	-118	-0.9	-87	-0.7
Critical	-15	-0.2	16	0.2
Spring-run Chinook Salmon Salvage Projections				
All Years	-80	-0.2	-79	-0.2
Wet	-62	-0.1	-61	-0.1
Above Normal	-41	-0.1	-38	-0.1
Below Normal	0	0.0	-2	0.0
Dry	-295	-1.3	-293	-1.3
Critical	-1	0.0	-2	0.0
Steelhead Salvage Projections				
All Years	-18	-0.5	-5	-0.1
Wet	-18	-0.4	-8	-0.2
Above Normal	-28	-0.5	-1	0.0
Below Normal	-9	-0.3	-2	-0.1
Dry	-26	-1.0	-16	-0.6
Critical	-7	-0.4	3	0.2
Delta Smelt Salvage Projections				
All Years	-353	-0.5	-376	-0.5
Wet	-214	-0.2	-213	-0.2
Above Normal	-859	-1.0	-847	-0.9
Below Normal	-164	-0.2	-228	-0.3
Dry	-359	-0.6	-347	-0.6
Critical	-169	-0.4	-244	-0.6
Striped Bass Salvage Projections				
All Years	-42,417	-1.3	-34,796	-1.1
Wet	-68,808	-1.6	-66,197	-1.5
Above Normal	-65,636	-1.6	-65,198	-1.6
Below Normal	-33,415	-0.9	-32,982	-0.9
Dry	-26,404	-0.9	-4,712	-0.2
Critical	-17,822	-1.2	-4,892	-0.3

Table 3-3. Salvage Estimates for the First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative (Exports Only at Banks Pumping Plant) Compared to CEQA No Project Alternative (Scenario 3 vs. Scenario 2)

Year Type	First Phase of Yuba Accord Alternative Total: CVP and SWP		Draft EIR/EIS Yuba Accord Alternative Total: CVP and SWP	
	Difference in Average Salvage	Percent Difference in Average Salvage	Difference in Average Salvage	Percent Difference in Average Salvage
Winter-run Chinook Salmon Salvage Projections				
All Years	-30	-0.2	-4	0.0
Wet	1	0.0	8	0.1
Above Normal	-23	-0.2	0	0.0
Below Normal	-27	-0.2	11	0.1
Dry	-105	-0.8	-74	-0.6
Critical	5	0.1	36	0.4
Spring-run Chinook Salmon Salvage Projections				
All Years	-56	-0.1	-56	-0.1
Wet	-1	0.0	0	0.0
Above Normal	-3	0.0	0	0.0
Below Normal	3	0.0	1	0.0
Dry	-284	-1.3	-282	-1.3
Critical	4	0.0	3	0.0
Steelhead Salvage Projections				
All Years	-15	-0.4	-2	-0.1
Wet	-10	-0.2	0	0.0
Above Normal	-27	-0.5	0	0.0
Below Normal	-7	-0.2	0	0.0
Dry	-24	-0.9	-14	-0.5
Critical	-7	-0.4	3	0.2
Delta Smelt Salvage Projections				
All Years	-747	-1.0	-770	-1.0
Wet	158	0.1	159	0.1
Above Normal	81	0.1	93	0.1
Below Normal	12	0.0	-52	-0.1
Dry	-1,836	-3.0	-1,824	-3.0
Critical	-2,151	-5.1	-2,226	-5.3
Striped Bass Salvage Projections				
All Years	-46,221	-1.4	-38,600	-1.2
Wet	48,864	1.2	51,475	1.2
Above Normal	37,344	1.0	37,782	1.0
Below Normal	-18,874	-0.5	-18,441	-0.5
Dry	-116,390	-3.9	-94,698	-3.2
Critical	-182,047	-11.4	-169,117	-10.6

As shown in Table 3-1, there potentially would be less Yuba Accord transfer water exported during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative than under the Yuba Accord Alternative discussed and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. If less Yuba Accord transfer water were exported while the same amounts of Yuba Accord water would flow into the Delta, then potential changes in other Delta parameters like X2 and Delta outflows under the Yuba Accord Alternative, compared to the bases of comparison, also would be lower than the corresponding changes that were discussed and evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS. For this reason, the environmental impacts associated with these parameters that are discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS are greater than or equal to the corresponding environmental impacts that would occur under the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, and no further analyses of these impacts are necessary here.

3.2.2 POTENTIAL CHANGES IN ALL ALLOCATIONS OF YUBA ACCORD TRANSFER WATER DURING THE FIRST PHASE OF THE YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE

As discussed in Section 3.2.1.3 on pages 3-14 to 3-15 of the Draft EIR/EIS, for the analyses in the Draft EIR/EIS it was assumed that Component 1 water would be supplied to the EWA Program, and that Components 2, 3, and 4 water normally would be shared equally by Reclamation and DWR and conveyed to CVP and SWP contractors. However, page 3-15 of the Draft EIR/EIS also noted that there could be years during the Yuba Accord Alternative in which up to 100 percent of the Components 2, 3, and 4 water would go to either the CVP contractors or the SWP contractors.

Although Reclamation would not be a party to the Water Purchase Agreement during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, the Component 1 water still all would be supplied to the EWA Program. Also, it is anticipated that DWR would enter into contracts with interested CVP contractors under which DWR would supply Components 2, 3, and 4 water to such contractors. The range of allocations of Components 2, 3, and 4 water that are discussed and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS therefore probably would not change significantly during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative.

Moreover, even if there were some differences in these allocations during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative, deliveries of Components 2, 3 and 4 water to SWP contractors still would not cause the total deliveries of water to any SWP contractor to exceed its Table A amount, and the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative would not have a long enough duration to result in any permanent new water supplies to any SWP contractor. The changes in the Yuba Accord Alternative caused by the proposed phasing, therefore, still would not have any growth-inducing impacts. For this reason, and because the exports of Yuba Accord transfer water during the first phase of the Yuba Accord Alternative would be less than or equal to corresponding exports that were discussed and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS, no further analyses of environmental impacts in the Export Service Area are necessary.

3.3 EFFECTS OF THE INTERIM REMEDIES ORDER IN *NRDC V. KEMPTHORNE*

As described in Section 3.1, the U.S. District Court issued its draft interim remedies order in the *NRDC v. Kempthorne* litigation on August 31, 2007. Although the court has yet not issued its final interim remedies order in that case, it is anticipated that the court's final interim remedies order will be very similar to the draft order, and therefore will significantly reduce the amounts of water that Reclamation and DWR may pump from the Delta during December through June of each year.

Tables 5-26 and 5-27 on pages 5-46 and 5-47 of the Draft EIR/EIS list the estimated annual amounts of stored-water and groundwater-substitution transfers that would be likely to occur under the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives. Because the monthly transfer amounts are important for the following discussion, the following Tables 3-4 and 3-5 list the estimated monthly stored-water and groundwater-substitution transfer volumes for the Yuba Accord Alternative, and the percentages of the total transfers that would occur during each month.

Table 3-4. YCWA Stored-Water Transfer Volumes, Yuba Accord Alternative, Average All Years

Month	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Total
Annual Transfer Volume (TAF)	6.7	3.3	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.0	-0.4	0.0	27.1	21.6	3.8	63.5
Percent of Annual Transfer Volume.	10.6	5.2	1.2	0.0	0.6	0.4	0.0	-0.7	0.0	42.7	33.9	6.0	100
Percent of Transfer Volume by Period	15.7		1.6							82.7			100

Table 3-5. YCWA Groundwater-Substitution Transfer Volumes, Yuba Accord Alternative, Average All Years

Month	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Total
Annual Transfer Volume (TAF)	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	10.5	2.4	24.5
Percent of Annual Transfer Volume	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.1	43.0	9.7	100
Percent of Transfer Volume by Period	0.4		0.0							99.6			100

These tables show that relatively small percentages of the stored-water transfers and none of the groundwater-substitution transfers under the Yuba Accord Alternative are predicted to occur during December though June. Because lower Yuba River flows would not change, the net effect of the court's interim remedies order in *NRDC v. Kempthorne* on the Yuba Accord Alternative would be to slightly reduce exports of Yuba Accord transfer water, and to slightly increase Delta outflows, during these months. These changes are not anticipated to result in any new significant environmental impacts as a result of operations of the Yuba Accord Alternative under the interim remedies that were not already analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

These tables also show that the majority of the stored-water and groundwater-substitution transfers under the Yuba Accord Alternative are predicted to occur during July through September, and that some additional transfers are predicted to occur during October and November. Because the court's interim remedies order would not significantly affect CVP or SWP exports during these months, and because the lower Yuba River flows and associated Delta inflows under the Yuba Accord Alternative would not significantly change as a result of the court's interim remedies order, it is unlikely that this order would significantly affect exports of Yuba Accord transfer water, or any of the other Delta parameters that are analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS, during these months.

For these reasons, the environmental impact analyses in the Draft EIR/EIS do not have to be changed because of the court's interim remedies order in *NRDC v. Kempthorne*.