# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

The Yuba River Basin drains approximately 1,339 square miles of the western Sierra Nevada slope, including portions of Sierra, Placer, Yuba, and Nevada counties. The Yuba River has been the subject of controversy since the 1850s, when hydraulic mining and other destructive mining techniques during the Gold Rush took a significant toll on the river. Debris from these activities clogged the river, damaged salmon and steelhead spawning beds, and led to later flooding in nearby communities. In the late 1960s, to reduce the risk of flooding in Yuba County, the Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) financed and built the Yuba River Development Project (Yuba Project), which includes New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, several small dams, diversion tunnels, and hydroelectric generating facilities located above and below Englebright Dam. Today, the Yuba River is one of California's most important rivers because it provides habitat for some of the Central Valley's last wild, native Chinook salmon and steelhead runs. Conflicting roles related to fisheries resources, water supply reliability, flood concerns, and surface and groundwater management associated with the Yuba River have resulted in ongoing water rights litigation between environmental and water supply interests.

YCWA and the United States Department of the Interior (Interior) Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), as lead agencies under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), respectively, have jointly prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for implementation of the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord (Proposed Yuba Accord or Yuba Accord Alternative). 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.

The Yuba Accord Alternative (also referred to as the "Proposed Project/Action") includes three separate but interrelated proposed agreements that would protect and enhance fisheries resources in the lower Yuba River, increase local supply reliability, and provide Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) with increased operational flexibility for protection of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) fisheries resources through the Environmental Water Account (EWA) Program, and provision of supplemental dry-year water supplies to state and federal water contractors. These proposed agreements, which are in Appendix B and discussed in detail in Chapter 3 are the:

- *Principles of Agreement for Proposed Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement* (Fisheries Agreement);
- *Principles of Agreement for Proposed Conjunctive Use Agreements* (Conjunctive Use Agreements); and
- *Principles of Agreement for Proposed Long-term Transfer Agreement* (Water Purchase Agreement).

The Fisheries Agreement was developed by state, federal, and consulting fisheries biologists, fisheries advocates, and policy representatives. Compared to the interim flow requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Revised Water Right Decision 1644

(RD-1644), the Fisheries Agreement would establish higher minimum instream flows during most months of most water years.

To assure that YCWA's water supply reliability would not be reduced by the higher minimum instream flows, YCWA and its participating Member Units[1] would implement the Conjunctive Use Agreements. These agreements would establish a comprehensive conjunctive use program that would integrate the surface water and groundwater supplies of the local irrigation districts and mutual water companies that YCWA serves in Yuba County. Integration of surface water and groundwater would allow YCWA to increase the efficiency of its water management.

Under the Water Purchase Agreement, Reclamation and DWR would enter into an agreement with YCWA to purchase water from YCWA for use in the EWA Program or an equivalent program as long as operational and hydrological conditions allow. Additional water purchased by Reclamation and DWR would be available for the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP) in drier years. The EWA Program would take delivery of water in every year; the CVP/SWP would receive additional water in the drier years.

The Fisheries Agreement is the cornerstone of the Yuba Accord Alternative. To become effective, however, all three agreements (Fisheries, Conjunctive Use, and Water Purchase) must undergo CEQA and NEPA review and be fully approved and executed by the individual parties to each agreement. Also, implementation of the Yuba Accord Alternative would require appropriate SWRCB amendments of YCWA's water-right permits and RD-1644.

## PROJECT STUDY AREA

The project study area includes those regions that might benefit from or potentially be affected by implementation of a project that changes water management of the lower Yuba River. The study area includes: (1) Yuba Project facilities and the lower Yuba River; (2) the YCWA Member Units and their service areas; (3) local groundwater basins; (4) CVP and SWP storage reservoirs and rivers downstream of these reservoirs; and (5) the Delta. Additionally, San Luis Reservoir and areas served by downstream CVP/SWP water users (the Export Service Area) are considered. Therefore, the geographic areas influenced by implementation of the Proposed Project/Action or an alternative are described and evaluated in the following four primary regions:

- Yuba Region
- CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region
- Delta Region
- Export Service Area

A general overview of the four regions evaluated in this EIR/EIS is provided below; detailed descriptions are included in Section 2.1, Project Study Area.

[1] The Member Units are the water districts, irrigation districts, and mutual water companies that obtain water from YCWA for deliveries to end-users.

**YUBA REGION**

The Yuba Region encompasses the lower Yuba River Basin, including: storage and hydropower facilities located in the basin; the riparian corridor along the North Yuba River downstream of New Bullards Bar Dam; the lower Yuba River downstream of Englebright Dam to the confluence with the Feather River; the YCWA Member Unit water service areas; the local groundwater basin; and lands overlying the groundwater basin. Waterbodies, water supply facilities, and associated land areas in this region include the following:

- Reservoirs, including instream and riparian areas
  - New Bullards Bar Reservoir
- Yuba River, including instream and riparian areas
- YCWA Member Unit service areas
  - Brophy Water District
  - Browns Valley Irrigation District
  - Cordua Irrigation District
  - Dry Creek Mutual Water Company
  - Hallwood Irrigation Company
  - Ramirez Water District
  - South Yuba Water District
  - Wheatland Water District
- Yuba Groundwater Basin
  - North Yuba Subbasin
  - South Yuba Subbasin

**CVP/SWP UPSTREAM OF THE DELTA REGION**

The CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region includes the reservoirs, rivers, and components of the CVP and SWP that may be affected by integrated operation of the CVP/SWP system under the Proposed Project/Action or an alternative. These facilities include the following:

- Reservoirs, including instream and riparian areas
  - Oroville Reservoir
- River systems below reservoirs, including instream and riparian areas
  - Sacramento River (from the confluence with the Feather River downstream to the Delta)
  - Feather River (from Oroville Dam to the confluence with the Sacramento River)

Several features and facilities (e.g., Shasta and Folsom reservoirs) within the project study area have been eliminated from further analytical consideration because the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives would not affect these water bodies (see Section 4.2).

#### SACRAMENTO/SAN JOAQUIN DELTA REGION (DELTA REGION)

This region is defined as the Delta at and in the vicinity of the confluence of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River and includes the CVP Jones Pumping Plant and the SWP Banks Pumping Plant in the south Delta (export pumps).

#### EXPORT SERVICE AREA

The Export Service Area is defined as those lands that receive, store or use CVP and SWP water pumped from the Delta. For the purposes of this EIR/EIS, this area includes San Luis Reservoir, the San Joaquin Valley and CVP/SWP customers in the Bay Area, south central California Coast, and southern California.

## OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the Proposed Yuba Accord is to resolve instream flow issues associated with operation of the Yuba Project in a way that protects and enhances lower Yuba River fisheries and local water supply reliability. Also, YCWA has a goal to provide revenues for local flood control and water supply projects. Reclamation and DWR have a goal to obtain water for the CALFED Bay/Delta Program (CALFED) to use for protection and restoration of Delta fisheries and for improvements in statewide water supply reliability, including supplemental water for the CVP and SWP. As a state agency party to the Proposed Yuba Accord, DWR also would be involved in the purchase of Yuba Project water for use in the EWA Program or an equivalent program[2] and for SWP contractor supplies. Along with the lead agencies, DWR representatives participated in the oversight, development, and review of project documentation to ensure that this EIR/EIS satisfies DWR's CEQA requirements.

Related to the purpose and need for this project, the Proposed Project/Action or an alternative is intended to accomplish the following objectives:

***Yuba County (Yuba Region)***

- Implement a level of protection for lower Yuba River fisheries equivalent to or greater than the level of protection under SWRCB RD-1644.
- Improve Yuba County water supply management and reliability to meet local service area needs.
- Provide revenue to YCWA to fund: (1) a comprehensive conjunctive use program; (2) Yuba County flood control improvements; and (3) implementation of the Yuba Accord, including long-term fisheries monitoring, studies, and enhancement programs and other YCWA activities.

[2] The purposes of the existing EWA Program are to: (1) protect the at-risk fish species affected by SWP/CVP operations and facilities, (2) contribute to the recovery of these species, (3) allow timely water-management responses to changing environmental conditions and changing fish protection needs, (4) provide reliable water supplies to water users in CVP/SWP export areas, and (5) not result in uncompensated water loss to users (Reclamation 2003). In the future, a long-term EWA Program or a program equivalent to the EWA may be implemented. Although future operations associated with an equivalent program may or may not be similar to those under the existing EWA Program, it is assumed that such a program in the future would provide a level of protection equivalent to that which is provided by the existing EWA Program.

***CVP/SWP System (CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region, Delta Region and Export Service Area)***

- Continue to provide water for use by the EWA Program or an equivalent program.
- Improve CVP and SWP water supply reliability.

Meeting the objectives of protecting and enhancing the Yuba River fisheries also is intended to resolve all or almost all of the pending litigation challenging RD-1644.

Various signatories and participants in the Proposed Yuba Accord, as a consequence of their various authorities, may prioritize the above objectives differently. For example, Reclamation and DWR are seeking to enable a long-term acquisition of water for the Delta, for use in the EWA Program or an equivalent program, and to improve water supply reliability for state and federal water contractors. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) are seeking to protect and enhance lower Yuba River fisheries resources and aquatic habitat. YCWA and its participating Member Units are seeking to: (1) protect local water supply reliability; (2) protect the Yuba River fisheries in a way that will settle the litigation challenging RD-1644; and (3) provide a revenue stream to support needed flood control and water-resource improvements in Yuba County.

## PROPOSED PROJECT/ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Under CEQA and NEPA, an EIR/EIS should consider a range of reasonable alternatives that could feasibly attain the purpose and need and most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project. CEQA and NEPA also require analysis of a "No Project" alternative and a "No Action" alternative, respectively.

Potential alternatives were considered in two forums. First, a wide variety of alternatives were considered during the collaborative development of the Proposed Project/Action Alternative, as described in Section 3.4, Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Evaluation. Second, variations on the Proposed Project/Action Alternative were considered during the public scoping process for this EIR/EIS. Reasons describing why these variations on the Proposed Project/Action Alternative are not analyzed in this EIR/EIS are presented in Section 3.4.

The EIR/EIS evaluates four alternatives:

- Yuba Accord Alternative (Proposed Project/Action)
- Modified Flow Alternative
- No Project Alternative (as defined by CEQA)
- No Action Alternative (as defined by NEPA)

The Proposed Project/Action would implement the Yuba Accord Alternative, including its three primary proposed elements: (1) Fisheries Agreement; (2) Conjunctive Use Agreements; and (3) Water Purchase Agreement.

### *YUBA ACCORD ALTERNATIVE*

The Yuba Accord Alternative is the result of over two years of work and discussions by Yuba River stakeholders to resolve the controversy regarding RD-1644. The comprehensive proposal contained in the Fisheries Agreement, which is the cornerstone of the Yuba Accord Alternative, was developed by YCWA, South Yuba River Citizens League, Trout Unlimited, The Bay Institute, Friends of the River, CDFG, USFWS, and NMFS. The Fisheries Agreement contains proposed new minimum instream flows for the lower Yuba River that are intended to maintain or increase protection of the river's fisheries resources. In addition to the best available science and data, the comments of the participating state, federal, and local fisheries biologists, fisheries advocates, and policy representatives were considered during development of the Yuba Accord Alternative. A fundamental precept of the Yuba Accord Alternative is the provision of instream flows during specified periods of the year that are higher than the interim instream flow requirements of RD-1644.

To help provide these flows, YCWA proposes to implement the Conjunctive Use Agreements, which would establish a comprehensive conjunctive use program that would provide for comprehensive management of the surface water and groundwater supplies within Yuba County, in coordination with the local irrigation districts and mutual water companies that YCWA serves in the county and that agree to participate in the program.

### *MODIFIED FLOW ALTERNATIVE*

While the No Project and No Action alternatives (described below) include future flow regimes based on RD-1644, the Modified Flow Alternative represents a scenario in which RD-1644 would not remain in effect. Instead, instream flow requirements would be based on YCWA's voluntary implementation of the RD-1644 Interim flows (which are similar to the flows in a minimum flow proposal made by YCWA during the RD-1644 hearings), modified to include a Conference Year concept for the driest one percent of water years.

### *NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE*

The No Project Alternative describes current environmental conditions plus potential operational and environmental conditions that may occur in the near-term foreseeable future (2007 through 2025) if the Proposed Project/Action or other alternative is not implemented. For CEQA purposes, the No Project Alternative is characterized by conditions that would be different from the Existing Condition.

The two primary differences between the Existing Condition and the No Project Alternative are:

- The instream flow schedule of the No Project Alternative would be the RD-1644 Long-term requirements rather than the RD-1644 Interim requirements, which are included in the Existing Condition.
- The Wheatland Canal would be operational under the No Project Alternative, increasing annual diversions at Daguerre Point Dam by approximately 40 thousand acre-feet (TAF) over the amounts in the Existing Condition, thereby increasing annual in-lieu groundwater recharge in Yuba County by a similar volume.

These two changes would significantly affect the ability of YCWA to continue to transfer stored surface water and therefore to generate a revenue stream for continued investment in flood control and water supply projects and for projects to protect and enhance lower Yuba River fisheries.

### *NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE*

The key elements and activities (e.g., implementation of the RD-1644 Long-term instream flow requirements and implementation of the Wheatland Project) described above for the No Project Alternative also are included in the No Action Alternative. However, as required by NEPA, the No Action Alternative assumes that 2025 conditions would be in place, which would be different from the 2007 conditions assumed for the CEQA No Project Alternative. Although implementation of the RD-1644 Long-term instream flow requirements would occur under both the No Project and No Action alternatives, the resultant model outputs for both scenarios are different because of variations in the way existing and future YCWA, Reclamation, and DWR operations are characterized (see Appendix D for further information). Additional differences between the No Project Alternative and the No Action Alternative involve the number of other reasonably foreseeable future projects that are on the planning horizon, which are included in the analytical assumptions used for modeling purposes in the No Action Alternative, but not in the No Project Alternative.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/CONSEQUENCES

This EIR/EIS presents information pertinent to, and describes, the potential impacts of the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives on the environment, in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. This EIR/EIS includes analytical sections for the following 17 resource categories: surface water supply and management, groundwater resources, power production and energy consumption, flood control, surface 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.

To address the analytical requirements of CEQA and NEPA, as well as those of interest to the SWRCB, a suite of comparative scenarios has been developed to characterize the modeling assumptions used to represent conditions under the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives, relative to the bases of comparison. For CEQA impact assessment purposes, the alternatives (i.e., Yuba Accord, Modified Flow, and No Project) are compared to the Existing Condition. For NEPA impact assessment purposes, the alternatives (i.e., Yuba Accord, Modified Flow) are compared to the No Action Alternative. Although not required by CEQA or NEPA, the alternatives (i.e., Yuba Accord and Modified Flow) also are compared to the No Project Alternative. These latter two comparisons are made to provide the SWRCB and interested parties with additional information that is relevant to water-rights issues.

CEQA and NEPA have different legal and regulatory standards that require slightly different assumptions in the modeling runs used to compare the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives to the appropriate CEQA and NEPA bases of comparison in the impact assessments. Although only one project (the Yuba Accord Alternative) and one other action alternative (the Modified Flow Alternative) are evaluated in this EIR/EIS, it is necessary to use separate NEPA and CEQA modeling scenarios for the Proposed Project/Action, alternatives and bases of comparisons to make the appropriate comparisons. As a result, the scenarios compared in the impact assessments have either a "CEQA" or a "NEPA" prefix before the name of the alternative being evaluated. Additional details regarding specific modeling assumptions for each simulation are presented in Appendix D.

While the CEQA and NEPA analyses in this EIR/EIS refer to "potentially significant," "less than significant," "no", and "beneficial" impacts, the first two comparisons (CEQA Yuba Accord Alternative compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative and CEQA Modified Flow Alternative compared to the CEQA No Project Alternative) presented in the columns in Table ES-1 below instead refer to whether or not the proposed change would "unreasonably affect" the evaluated parameter. This is because these first two comparisons are made to determine whether the action alternative would satisfy the requirement of Water Code Section 1736 that the proposed change associated with the action alternative "*would not unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other instream beneficial uses*."

**Table ES-1** presents a summary of how the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives could affect the natural, physical, and social environments. The table describes each effect and states whether the effect would be potentially significant or less than significant. For the water-rights comparisons, the table states whether or not the Proposed Project/Action and other action alternatives would unreasonably affect these environments.

**Table ES-2** presents a qualitative overview and comparison of the alternatives evaluated to satisfy NEPA requirements. Based on the effects assessments presented in each of the resource chapters, and based on the level of significance (i.e., significance determination) presented in the resource chapters and summarized in Table ES-1, it was determined that several types of resources would not be significantly affected by any of the action alternatives and, thus, are not summarized in Table ES-2. These resources are: flood control, terrestrial, recreation, visual, cultural, land use, growth inducement, environmental justice, and Indian trust assets. Table ES-2 contains brief discussions and summaries for the following resources: surface water supply and management, groundwater, power production and energy consumption, surface water quality, fisheries, air quality and socioeconomics. For full evaluations and descriptions of the alternatives' effects on these resources, please refer to the analyses presented in the individual resource chapters (Chapters 5 through 20).

**Table ES-3** presents a summary of how the Proposed Project/Action and other action alternatives could cumulatively affect the natural, physical, and social environments. The table describes each potential cumulative impact and states whether the effect would be potentially significant or less than significant.

The following tables describe the level of effect (for the water-rights comparisons) and the level of significance (for the CEQA/NEPA comparisons) that the Proposed Project/Action and alternatives could be expected to have on the natural, physical, and social environments. In Table ES-1, the levels of effect/significance are described as:

- Not Unreasonably Affect (NUA)
- Unreasonably Affect (UA)
- Beneficial (B)
- No Impact (NI)
- Not Applicable (NA)
- Less Than Significant Impact (LTS)
- Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated (LSM)
- Potentially Significant Impact (PS)
- Significant Unavoidable Impact (SU)

The level of significance terminology described above also generally applies to the results of the cumulative analyses, which are presented in Table ES-3 (e.g., less than significant [LTS] would represent a less than significant cumulative impact), with the additional level-of-significance determination of:

- Potentially Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impact (PSU)

**Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Impacts for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord**

| 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 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 ES-1 (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 |
| | 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 |
| 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| 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 |
| **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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| 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 |
| | 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 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| | Changes in 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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)** | | | | | | | | |
| 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 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 delta smelt | NUA | NUA | LTS | LTS | PS | LTS | LTS |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| **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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| | 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 |
| **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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| 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 |
| | 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)** | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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] |
| 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 |
| | 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 |

**Table ES-1 (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)** | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| | 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 | | | | | | |

**Table ES-1 (Continued)**

## 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 ES-2. Comparison of the Alternatives Evaluated to Satisfy NEPA Regulatory Compliance Requirements**

| Resource Topic | Affected Environment [a] | No Action Alternative | Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] | Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Surface Water Supply and Management** | | | | |
| **Yuba Region** | | | | |
| Local Water Supply Demand | Wet and above normal years - approximately 305 TAF<br>Below normal, dry and critical years - about 311 TAF | Wet and above normal years - approximately 338 TAF<br>Below normal, dry and critical years - about 344 TAF | Wet and above normal years - approximately 338 TAF<br>Below normal, dry and critical years - about 344 TAF | Wet and above normal years - approximately 338 TAF<br>Below normal, dry and critical years - about 344 TAF |
| YCWA Water Transfers | Average of about 100 TAF during water transfer years | No stored water transfers; potential for groundwater substitution transfers | 60 TAF per year to EWA; up to an additional 140 TAF in drier years | Stored water and groundwater substitution transfers, as possible |
| **CVP/SWP System** | | | | |
| Delta Exports | Base Delta Exports (Accounting baseline) Average of 5,927 TAF | Additional 18 TAF of total exports, on average | Additional 89 TAF of total exports, on average | Additional 70 TAF of total exports, on average |
| EWA | Purchases water for environmental actions average 250 TAF/yr, up to 120 TAF + from YCWA | Continue as-available purchases to meet needs, little or no water available from YCWA | Long-term source of supply 60 TAF + annual from YCWA | Continue as-available purchases to meet needs, water from YCWA available as conditions permit |
| **Groundwater Resources** | | | | |
| Groundwater Pumping | 19 TAF of annual groundwater pumping on average.<br>Wet, above normal, and below normal years - no pumping<br>Dry and critical years - average annual groundwater pumping of 50 and 52 TAF, respectively | 27 TAF of annual groundwater pumping on average<br>Wet and above normal years - no pumping<br>Below normal, dry, and critical years - average annual groundwater pumping of 10, 60, 58 TAF, respectively | Additional 4 TAF of pumping, on average<br>Wet, dry, and critical years - additional groundwater pumping of up to 13 TAF<br>Below normal years - decrease in groundwater pumping by 5 TAF | Decrease in groundwater pumping by 2 TAF, on average<br>Below normal and critical years - decrease in groundwater pumping by up to 5 TAF<br>Dry years - Additional 1 TAF groundwater pumping |

**Table ES-2 (Continued)**

| Resource Topic | Affected Environment [a] | No Action Alternative | Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] | Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Groundwater Resources (Continued)** | | | | |
| Groundwater Storage and Aquifer Levels | 11 TAF of annual groundwater storage increase on average<br>Wet, above normal, and below normal years - average annual 30 TAF groundwater storage increase due to natural recharge<br>Dry and critical years - average annual groundwater storage decline of up to 22 TAF | 3 TAF of annual groundwater storage increase, on average<br>Wet, above normal, and below normal years - up to 30 TAF of increase in groundwater storage<br>Dry and critical years - groundwater storage decline of up to 30 TAF | Decrease in groundwater storage by 4 TAF<br>Wet, dry, and critical years - decrease in groundwater storage by up to 13 TAF<br>Below normal years - increase in groundwater storage by 5 TAF | Increase in groundwater storage by 2 TAF, on average<br>Below normal and critical years - increase in groundwater storage by up to 5 TAF<br>Dry years - decrease in groundwater storage by 1 TAF |
| **Power Production and Energy Consumption** | | | | |
| **Yuba Region** | | | | |
| Hydropower Generation | Generation dictated by instream & agricultural releases, power contract, nominal annual generation 1,590 gigawatthours | Slight shift in month-to-month generation pattern due to change in regulatory requirement, nominal annual generation 1,595 gigawatthours | Slight shift in month-to-month generation pattern due to change in regulatory requirement, nominal annual generation 1,601 gigawatthours | Very slight shift in month-to-month generation pattern due to change in regulatory requirement, nominal annual generation 1,596 gigawatthours |
| Power Consumption | Energy consumption for groundwater pumping for deficiencies or transfer, 287 - 4,213 MWh per year depending on conditions | Likely some increase in pumping load due to deficiency pumping, 361 - 5,288 MWh per year depending on conditions | More pumping resulting from additional groundwater transfers, 401 - 5,879 MWh per year depending on conditions | Less pumping resulting from less groundwater transfer potential, 332 - 4,866 MWh per year depending on conditions |
| **CVP/SWP System** | | | | |
| Hydropower Generation | Generation largely dictated by release requirements, nominal 37,762 gigawatthours per year average | Generation largely dictated by release requirements, nominal 37,692 gigawatthours per year average | Slight shift in month-to-month generation pattern due to change water availability, nominal 37,681 gigawatthours per year average | Slight shift in month-to-month generation pattern due to change water availability, nominal 37,689 gigawatthours per year average |
| Power Consumption | Pumping dictated by availability of water for export, environmental constraints on pumping, nominal 1,659 gigawatthours per year average | Generally increasing demands for exports and more stringent environmental constraints, nominal 1,677 gigawatthours per year average | Minor increase in power consumption results from additional exports of groundwater, nominal 1,677 gigawatthours per year average | Minor increase in power consumption results from additional exports, nominal 1,671 gigawatthours per year average |

**Table ES-2 (Continued)**

| Resource Topic | Affected Environment [a] | No Action Alternative | Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] | Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Surface Water Quality** | | | | |
| Yuba Region Water Quality | Monthly mean water temperatures in the lower Yuba River at the Marysville Gage vary from 47.9°F in January to 62.6°F in September | Water temperatures in the lower Yuba River are similar to the Affected Environment | Reduction in mean monthly water temperature for the months of July, August, September and October by 0.6°F to 2.1°F | Reduction in mean monthly water temperature for the months of July, August, September and October by 0.4°F to 1.5°F |
| Delta Water Quality (EC) | Delta water quality standards established by SWRCB WQCP and E/I standard typically control Delta operations from June to October<br>Chloride concentration at Old River at Los Vaqueros Intake used as water quality indicator | Increase in chloride concentration at Old River at Los Vaqueros Intake during the fall and winter months | Increase in mean monthly chloride concentration at Old River at Los Vaqueros Intake from May to August by 0.2 to 4.3 mg/l | Increase in mean monthly chloride concentration at Old River at Los Vaqueros Intake from April to September by 0.1 to 5.2 mg/l |
| **Fisheries and Aquatic Resources** | | | | |
| Yuba River Instream Flows | RD-1644 Interim Flow Requirements<br>Current conditions | RD-1644 Long-term Flow Requirements<br>Generally equivalent or improved conditions for some lifestage considerations, except:<br>*Spring-run Chinook salmon*<br>– Less suitable water temperatures during the summer rearing period<br>*Fall-run Chinook salmon*<br>– Less suitable water temperatures during adult immigration<br>– Lower spawning habitat availability<br>– Less suitable embryo incubation water temperatures<br>*Steelhead*<br>– Less suitable immigration and holding water temperatures<br>– Lower spawning habitat availability | Yuba Accord Flow Schedules<br>Generally equivalent or improved conditions for some lifestage considerations, specifically:<br>*Spring-run Chinook salmon*<br>– More suitable water temperatures during adult immigration and holding<br>– More suitable spawning water temperatures<br>– More suitable embryo incubation water temperatures<br>– More suitable over-summer/early fall juvenile rearing water temperatures<br>– Higher flows during drier years for smolt emigration | RD-1644 Interim with Conference Year Provisions<br>Generally equivalent or improved conditions for some lifestage considerations, except:<br>*Spring-run Chinook salmon*<br>– Less suitable water temperatures during adult immigration and holding<br>– Lower spawning habitat availability<br>– Generally equivalent or less suitable water temperatures during the juvenile rearing and emigration lifestages |

**Table ES-2 (Continued)**

| Resource Topic | Affected Environment [a] | No Action Alternative | Yuba Accord Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] | Modified Flow Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative [b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (continued)** | | | | |
| Yuba River Instream Flows (continued) | | | *Fall-run Chinook salmon*<br>– More suitable water temperatures during adult immigration and holding<br>– More suitable spawning water temperatures<br>– More suitable embryo incubation water temperatures<br>– Higher flows during drier years for juvenile rearing and emigration<br>*Steelhead*<br>– More suitable water temperatures during adult immigration and holding<br>– Higher spawning habitat availability<br>– More suitable over-summer/early fall juvenile rearing water temperatures<br>*Green Sturgeon*<br>– More suitable over-summer juvenile rearing and emigration water temperatures | *Fall-run Chinook salmon*<br>– Less suitable water temperatures during adult immigration and holding<br>– Lower flows during drier years for juvenile rearing and outmigration<br>– Less suitable water temperatures during juvenile rearing and outmigration<br>*Steelhead*<br>– Lower flows under drier conditions during smolt emigration |
| CVP/SWP System Fisheries | Current conditions | Generally equivalent habitat conditions | Slightly improved habitat conditions due to more suitable water temperatures during summer in the lower Feather River | Generally equivalent or improved habitat conditions |
| Delta Fisheries | Current conditions | Generally equivalent or potentially less suitable conditions due to changes in X2 location, Delta outflow, E/I ratio and salvage of species of management concern | Generally equivalent conditions due to relatively minor changes in X2 location, Delta outflow and E/I Ratio, and overall decreases in long-term average salvage of species of management concern | Generally equivalent conditions due to relatively minor changes in X2 location, Delta outflow and E/I ratio, and overall decreases or equivalent long-term average salvage of species of management concern |
| **Air Quality** | | | | |
| Criteria Pollutant Emissions | Current conditions | Slight increase due to deficiency pumping during drier years | No net increase with mitigation measures incorporated | Similar to Affected Environment |
| **Socioeconomics** | | | | |
| Cumulative Net Revenues | Current conditions | Slight decrease due to increased groundwater pumping and potential land fallowing | Increase in total net revenues to growers | Slight increase in total net revenues to growers |

[a] For the purposes of this EIR/EIS, the CEQA Existing Condition is the same as the NEPA Affected Environment. See Chapter 2 for additional detail.
[b] See Chapter 3 for additional details.

**Table ES-3. Summary of Potential Cumulative Impacts for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord**

| 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 |
|---|---|---|
| **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 |
| **Groundwater Resources (Chapter 6)** | | |
| Potential for cumulative groundwater resources impacts within the Yuba Region | LTS | LTS |
| **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 |
| **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 CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| Potential for cumulative water quality impacts within the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| 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 CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| Potential for cumulative fisheries and aquatic resources impacts within the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| 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 CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| 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 CVP/SWP Upstream of the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the Delta Region | PSU | PSU |
| Potential for cumulative recreation impacts within the Export Service Area | LTS | LTS |

**Table ES-3 (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 |
|---|---|---|
| **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 |
| **Air Quality (Chapter 15)** | | |
| Potential for cumulative air quality impacts within the Yuba Region | LSM | LSM |
| **Land Use (Chapter 16)** | | |
| Potential for cumulative land use impacts within the Yuba Region | LTS | LTS |
| **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 Assets (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 |

**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

## MITIGATION MEASURES/ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

The proposed mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts of the Proposed Project/Action or an alternative to a less than significant level are summarized below.

**Water Quality**

- Mitigation Measure 9-1: Carriage water will be used to maintain salinity and chloride concentrations in the Delta.
- Mitigation Measure 9-2: YCWA operational flexibility will be utilized to ensure that refilling of the reservoir will not adversely affect water quality in the Delta and export service areas south of the Delta.

**Fisheries and Aquatic Resources**

- Mitigation Measure 10.2.9-3: Annual scheduling of flow regimes for the Modified Flow Alternative to avoid impacts to spring-run Chinook salmon.
- Mitigation Measure 10.2.9-4: Annual scheduling of flow regimes for the Modified Flow Alternative to avoid impacts to fall-run Chinook salmon.

**Air Quality**

- Mitigation Measure 15-1: Provide certification documentation to Reclamation and DWR indicating that groundwater pumping sources would not increase emissions, to ensure that no net impacts to air quality would occur.

Additional details regarding specific mitigation measures are included in the resource-specific discussions presented in the individual chapters of this EIR/EIS.

## PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 1502.14(e) requires federal agencies to identify an agency-preferred alternative which would best meet the purpose of and need for the action, as defined in the environmental documentation. As stated in Reclamation's NEPA Handbook (Reclamation 2000), "…defining the preferred alternative does not define Reclamation's final decision. However, it is intended to provide the public with notification of what the agency considers to be the best alternative, based on the information available" (Reclamation 2000).

Reclamation has determined that the Yuba Accord Alternative is the preferred alternative due to: (1) the lower environmental impacts of the Proposed Project/Action; and (2) its ability to best achieve the project's purpose and need. The environmental impacts associated with the Yuba Accord Alternative and the other action alternatives considered in this EIR/EIS are summarized in Table ES-1 of the Executive Summary and are detailed in the individual resource chapters (see Chapters 5 through 20). Section 1.1 presents an overview of the project objectives and purpose and need, and **Table ES-4** presents a summary of the Proposed Project/Action and the alternatives' ability to meet the project objectives and purpose and need for the project. Based on consideration of this information and the analyses presented in this EIR/EIS, Reclamation has determined that the Yuba Accord Alternative is the preferred alternative.

**Table ES-4. Comparison of the Alternatives' Ability to Meet the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need**

| | No Project Alternative | No Action Alternative | Proposed Project/Action Alternative | Modified Flow Alternative |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yuba County Water Agency Project Objectives** | | | | |
| Provide a level of protection for lower Yuba River fisheries equivalent to or greater than the requirements of SWRCB RD-1644 | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Improve Yuba County water supply management and reliability through the implementation of a comprehensive conjunctive use program and water use efficiencies | No | No | Yes | Limited |
| Provide revenues to fund Yuba Accord actions (e.g., conjunctive use, River Management Team) and Yuba County flood control, water supply and other projects, including but not limited to, constructing a new fish screen at the South Canal Diversion | No | No | Yes | Limited |
| Implement a lower Yuba River long-term fisheries monitoring, studies and enhancement program | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Bureau of Reclamation Purpose and Need** | | | | |
| Protection of Delta fisheries (through acquisition of EWA Program assets via the Water Purchase Agreement) | No | No | Yes | Limited |
| Improve federal water contractor water supply reliability | No | No | Yes | Limited |
| **California Department of Water Resources Project Objectives[a]** | | | | |
| Provide assets for the EWA program to assist in the protection and recovery of listed Delta-dependent fish species | No | No | Yes | Limited |
| Improve state water contractor water supply reliability | No | No | Yes | Limited |

[a] DWR is participating as a cost-share agency in the preparation of environmental compliance documentation and would rely upon the analyses in this EIR/EIS for purposes of decision-making related to the agency's decisions regarding execution of the Water Purchase Agreement with YCWA and separate agreements with Reclamation and State Water Contractors (Tier 2 and Tier 3 agreements, respectively).

## ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR OR PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the California Code of Regulations state that CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative, and specify that if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. CEQ regulations (40 CFR §1505.2(b)) for implementing NEPA requires that, in cases where an EIS has been prepared, the decision-making document (i.e., Record of Decision) must specify the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative that best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural and natural resources (Council on Environmental Quality Website 2007). Defining the environmentally

preferable alternative in this Draft EIR/EIS does not define YCWA's and Reclamation's final decision-making for the project, but it is intended to provide the public with notification of what the agency considers to be the environmentally preferable alternative, based on the information available (Reclamation 2000).

YCWA, as the CEQA lead agency, and Reclamation, as the NEPA lead agency, have both determined that the Yuba Accord Alternative is environmentally superior to the Modified Flow Alternative and the No Project Alternative, based on the CEQA/NEPA analyses of each of the alternatives' potentially significant environmental impacts, which are summarized above in Table ES-1 and presented in the individual resource chapters.