

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

The **Water Forum**, a diverse group of water agencies, business groups, agricultural interests, environmentalists, citizen groups, and local governments (also known as stakeholders), has been working since the fall of 1993 evaluating future water needs and supplies in the Sacramento area, including parts of Sacramento, Placer and El Dorado counties. The Water Forum has formulated a **Water Forum Proposal** (WFP) for the effective long-term management of the region's water resources. This proposal is incorporated in the Water Forum Action Plan which is being circulated concurrently with this document. The WFP was formulated based on the two coequal objectives of the Water Forum: 1) provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region's economic health and planned development through the year 2030; and 2) preserve the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Lower American River.

The environmental analysis in this EIR is based on an evaluation of how environmental conditions would be expected to change as a result of implementing the WFP. As a first-tier, Program EIR of the WFP, the impact analysis addresses both the impacts resulting from the WFP and a cumulative evaluation of all the participating purveyors' water resource actions in the region, along with many other water management actions outside the region.

Public response to the Draft EIR will be important input for the Water Forum. Based on comments and final negotiations, the stakeholder representatives will finalize the Water Forum EIR and revise their recommendations for the WFP accordingly. These will be presented to stakeholder boards for their approval as a Memorandum of Understanding in the summer of 1999.

This section summarizes information contained in the **Draft Environmental Impact Report** on the WFP, including elements of the WFP, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives.

### 2.2 THE EIR PROCESS

The **Lead Agencies**, or public agencies that have responsibility for certifying the WFP EIR, are the City and County of Sacramento. Other public agency stakeholders may rely on the EIR when considering their approval of the WFP, and if so, are considered **Responsible Agencies**. The purpose of a Program EIR is to identify and assess the environmental impacts of a series of actions that comprise an overall program, such as the WFP. The EIR has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000, *et seq.*, and State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations §15000, *et seq.* It is anticipated that subsequent actions by Lead and Responsible Agencies to implement the WFP will be reviewed in light of the Program EIR to determine what additional environmental documentation must be prepared, pursuant to the tiering provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines (§15152).

The Draft EIR has been released for public review to receive comments from interested parties on its completeness and adequacy in disclosing the environmental effects of the WFP. Written responses to significant environmental points raised in the comments will be prepared and published. Together, the Draft EIR and the responses to comments will constitute the Final EIR, which will be forwarded to the Sacramento City Council and Sacramento County Board of Supervisors for certification with regard to CEQA adequacy.

## **2.3 SUMMARY OF THE WATER FORUM PROPOSAL**

### **2.3.1 Location of EIR Study Areas**

Water Forum stakeholders represent water-related interests in the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, Galt, and Citrus Heights; the County of Sacramento; the City of Roseville, South Placer County and western El Dorado County (see Exhibit 3-1). For purposes of the EIR, three study areas are considered: the direct effect study area, the indirect effect study area, and the water service study area.

Preservation of the Lower American River is one of the coequal objectives of the WFP. The direct effect study area, therefore, consists of those areas that would be directly affected by additional surface water diversions from the American River. Such diversions would occur above Folsom Reservoir, from Folsom Reservoir proper, Lake Natoma, and from the Lower American River, defined as the reach from Nimbus Dam to the confluence with the Sacramento River. Therefore, the direct effect study area consists of the in-stream and riparian areas of these surface water resources (see Exhibit 3-2).

The indirect effect study area is the broader geographic area that encompasses the surface water resources and facilities outside of the Lower American River that may be affected by the WFP. This area includes the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) systems both upstream of the confluence of the Sacramento and American rivers (exclusive of the direct effect study area), along with associated reservoirs and rivers, and downstream of the confluence, into and including the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (see Exhibit 3-3).

The water service study area consists of the communities served by Water Forum stakeholders, and is coincident with the boundaries of stakeholder purveyors in the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and Galt; County of Sacramento (excluding the Delta); the City of Roseville; South Placer County and western El Dorado County (refer to Exhibit 3-1).

### **2.3.2 Elements of the Water Forum Proposal**

To achieve the Water Forum's coequal objectives, a comprehensive package of linked actions has been developed to make more water available for consumption while protecting the natural resources of the Lower American River from environmental damage. This approach requires the support and participation of each of the Water Forum stakeholders. The WFP was developed

over a period of years by representatives of the Water Forum stakeholder groups, and includes seven elements:

Element

- I Increased Surface Water Diversions
- II Actions to Meet Customers' Needs While Reducing Diversion Impacts on the Lower American River in Drier Years
- III Support for an Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases from Folsom Reservoir
- IV Lower American River Habitat Management Element
- V Water Conservation
- VI Groundwater Management
- VII Water Forum Successor Effort

**Element I: Increased Surface Water Diversions**

This element provides for increased surface water diversions. These increased diversions will be needed to serve planned growth through the year 2030 even with the active conservation programs and the recommended sustainable use of the groundwater which are also part of the WFP. As part of the WFP, all signatory organizations would support the diversions agreed to for each supplier as summarized in Table 3-1. All signatory organizations would also support the facilities needed to divert, treat and distribute this water. Support for increased diversions is linked to the suppliers' endorsement and, where appropriate, participation in each of the seven elements.

**Element II: Actions to Meet Customers' Needs While Reducing Diversion Impacts on the Lower American River in Drier Years**

This element is to ensure that sufficient water supplies will be available to customers in dry years as well as wet years, and that suppliers continue to meet their customers' needs to the year 2030 while minimizing diversion impacts on the Lower American River in the drier and driest years. It is envisioned that Lower American River diversions above the H Street Bridge in average and wetter years will increase from the current level of about 216,500 acre-feet (AF) annually to about 481,000 AF annually. This represents a significant portion of the total annual flow of the American River which averages about 2.6 million AF with a range of less than 400,000 AF to greater than 6.3 million AF. Actions to meet customers' needs while reducing diversion impacts on the Lower American River in drier years include: conjunctive use of groundwater basins consistent with the sustainable yield objectives; utilizing other surface water resources; reoperation of reservoirs on the Middle Fork of the American River; increased conservation during drier and driest years; and reclamation. Some of these actions would also help reduce impacts outside of the American River watershed.

### **Element III: Support for an Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases from Folsom Reservoir**

This element supports needed assurances for continued implementation of a pattern of water releases from Folsom Reservoir that more closely matches the needs of anadromous fish, in particular fall run chinook salmon, which need more cool water in the fall and are not present in the American River in the summer.

Beginning in December 1994, the Water Forum convened a Fish Biologists' Working Session of fish experts with special knowledge of the Lower American River. Their charge was to develop recommendations for an improved pattern of releases from Folsom Reservoir. Participants included representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), and representatives from the Water Forum. The group came to general agreement regarding which fish species in the Lower American River should be given priority when there are constraints in water availability and developed an Improved Pattern by which available water can be released from Folsom Reservoir in a "fish friendly" manner consistent with the reservoir's flood control objectives.

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act was passed in 1992. This law authorized fish and wildlife restoration as an additional purpose of the Central Valley Project. It also required the federal government to develop an Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) plan including implementation of an improved pattern of fishery flow releases from Folsom Reservoir to benefit anadromous fish. The Water Forum recommendations were considered by the U.S. Department of the Interior when it developed its recommendations for AFRP flows for the Lower American River.

Since 1995 USBR, in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG, has attempted on a voluntary basis to release water from Folsom Reservoir in a manner consistent with the flow objectives for the Lower American River to the extent USBR's available water supply has permitted it to do so. Their AFRP flow objectives for the Lower American River are set forth in the November 20, 1997 "Department of the Interior Final Administrative Proposal on the Management of Section 3406 (b) (2) Water." They are essentially the same as the Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases developed by the Fish Biologists' Working Session which was convened by the Water Forum. It is recognized that as additional information becomes available in the future it could be beneficial to further refine this Improved Pattern.

For purposes of the Water Forum Proposal, the Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases is defined as the AFRP flow objective for the Lower American River as set forth in the November 20, 1997 "Department of the Interior Final Administrative Proposal on the Management of Section 3406 (b) (2) Water."

Signatories agree to recommend that the updated Lower American River standard be included in the USBR's permit for operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams. It will incorporate two of the Water Forum Proposal provisions:

- (1) Agreement on water diversions upstream of Nimbus Dam under varying hydrologic conditions; and
- (2) The Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases which would be implemented essentially the same as the AFRP Lower American River flow objectives in the November 20, 1997 Final Administrative Proposal.

#### **Element IV: Lower American River Habitat Management Element**

This element, combined with an "Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases from Folsom Reservoir" and "Actions to Meet Customers' Needs While Reducing Diversion Impacts on the Lower American River in the Drier Years," is included to mitigate the impacts of the increased diversions on the Lower American River. The Water Forum Habitat Management Element (HME) will be part of a coordinated multi-agency Lower American River ecosystem partnership established by a Memorandum of Understanding. Agencies expected to participate include: the Water Forum Successor Effort (legally administered by the City of Sacramento under the auspices of the City-County Office of Metropolitan Water Planning); the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA); CALFED (or its successor); USBR (responsible for administering the Central Valley Project [CVP] and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act [CVPIA]); USFWS; National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); CDFG; and the Sacramento County Parks Department (which administers the Lower American River Parkway Plan). The multi-agency program will contain four components that together will address flow, temperature, and physical habitat issues for the Lower American River:

- , Habitat Management Plan Development, Updating, and Technical Assistance;
- , Projects that benefit the Lower American River Ecosystem;
- , Monitoring and Evaluation Program; and
- , Project-Specific Mitigation (which will remain the responsibility of each supplier).

In addition, because summertime recreation flows in the Lower American River are expected to be adversely affected by increased diversions, the Water Forum Proposal also includes commitments to fund projects to mitigate recreational impacts.

#### **Element V: Water Conservation**

The Water Conservation Element of the WFP promotes more efficient use of limited water resources. This element is essential to meeting both of the coequal objectives of the Water Forum. Conserved water will be available to help supply the region's water needs and will

minimize the need for increased groundwater pumping and increased use of surface water, including water diverted from the American River.

Major components of the Water Conservation Element include: residential water meters; other water conservation programs similar to the Best Management Practices included in the statewide Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Urban Water Conservation; public involvement; water conservation plans; and agricultural water conservation. The water conservation practices in the element have been defined considering the specific circumstances of the Water Forum stakeholders. The element does not preclude implementing other, more aggressive conservation approaches to the extent additional, feasible measures become available in the future.

### **Element VI: Groundwater Management**

This element provides a framework by which the groundwater resource in Sacramento County can be protected and used in a sustainable manner and a mechanism for coordination with those adjacent counties that share the groundwater basin. A key provision of the element includes recommendations on "sustainable yield," which is the amount of water that can be safely pumped from the basin over a long period of time without damaging the aquifer. Estimated average annual sustainable yield recommendations for each of the three sub-areas of the basin are: North Area: 131,000 AF; South Area: 273,000 AF; and Galt Area: 115,000 AF. Recommendations for locally controlled groundwater management include monitoring groundwater withdrawal and "conjunctive use", or the planned use of surface water in conjunction with groundwater.

The Sacramento North Area Groundwater Management Authority was established in August, 1998 through adoption of a joint powers authority using the existing authority of the City of Sacramento, the City of Folsom, the City of Citrus Heights, and the County of Sacramento. The Authority will be charged with facilitating conjunctive use programs and maintaining long-term sustainable yield. Discussions about groundwater management in the South Area and the Galt Area will be undertaken by the Water Forum Successor Effort.

The groundwater management governance structure should facilitate participation by water agencies with specific and relevant interest in the groundwater governance structure outside of Sacramento County and encourage cooperation and collaboration with such agencies.

### **Element VII: Water Forum Successor Effort**

In order to ensure implementation of the WFP, a Water Forum Successor Effort will be created with membership consisting of those organizations signatory to the WFP. Its responsibilities will be to oversee, monitor, and report on implementation of the WFP. The Water Forum Successor Effort will not have any authority to govern or regulate.

### **2.3.3 Essential Actions to be Carried Out by Other Agencies**

Three projects anticipated to be carried out by other agencies are essential for the overall WFP:

- C Temperature Control Device for the urban water intake from Folsom Dam;
- C Optimal use of the cold water pool in Folsom Reservoir; and
- C Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases from Folsom Reservoir.

In the analysis of the WFP impacts, each of these projects is assumed to be in place in the future.

### **2.3.4 Process for Environmental Review and Adoption of the Water Forum Agreement**

The environmental review process and the WFP process are taking place concurrently in a manner that allows the integration of public and agency comments into the planning process. The public and agency review of the Draft EIR and the stakeholders' review of the Agreement will provide comments that will be used in refining the WFP. As the CEQA Lead Agencies, the City and County of Sacramento each have the authority to certify the Final EIR. After Final EIR certification, the stakeholders of the Water Forum will be asked to approve the Agreement and agree to participate in its implementation. If the public agency stakeholders rely on the EIR in deciding whether to approve the Agreement they will act as Responsible Agencies under CEQA. The Agreement will be implemented by the Water Forum Successor Effort representing the stakeholders who adopt the proposal.

After approval of the Agreement by the Water Forum stakeholders, the Final EIR will be forwarded to other agencies for their consideration in connection with (1) their responsibilities as State Trustee Agencies, as defined by State CEQA Guidelines §15386 and/or (2) separate, subsequent actions potentially needed for the plan's implementation. State Trustee Agencies and other affected state agencies include: California Department of Water Resources (DWR), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), State Lands Commission (S.C.), CDFG, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Federal agencies which may have separate, subsequent actions related to the plan's implementation include the USBR, USFWS, NMFS, and U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Final EIR will provide program-level technical analysis which may support environmental review of implementation actions and their project-level environmental documents.

### **2.3.5 Approach for Environmental Analysis Recognizing Mitigating Features of the Water Forum Proposal**

In reviewing the environmental impacts and mitigation measures described in this document, it is important to understand the context in which the WFP was developed. Because one of the Water Forum's coequal objectives is the preservation of the fishery, wildlife, recreational and aesthetic values of the Lower American River, the WFP is designed to minimize adverse environmental impacts to the extent feasible. The WFP contains seven elements, each integral

to the overall agreement. Element I, Increased Surface Water Diversions, provides for increased diversions from the Lower American River. The remaining six elements all, in one way or another, are intended to reduce the adverse impacts of those increased diversions. Therefore, the project itself reduces the impacts to the environment, through negotiated measures throughout the proposal.

For example, Element II, Actions to Meet Customers' Needs While Reducing Diversion Impacts on the Lower American River in Drier Years, contains provisions by which purveyors agree to reduce their diversions from the Lower American River by specified levels in defined drier years. These actions include extraordinary conservation during the driest years beyond that included in Element V of the WFP. These cutbacks will decrease the severity of the adverse impacts to the river in drier years. These reduced levels of diversions are an integral part of the WFP, and the modeling of impacts in this EIR assumes these reductions. In addition, in defined "driest" years (also known as "conference years"), the WFP signatories will meet and confer regarding diversions and river flows.

Similarly, Element III, Support for a Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases From Folsom Reservoir, provides for the operation of Folsom in a manner that more closely matches the needs of anadromous fish, particularly fall run chinook salmon. One of the essential requirements of the WFP is that this improved flow standard be incorporated into the long-term management of Folsom and Nimbus Dams.

Element IV, the Habitat Management Element (HME), provides for Water Forum participation and funding of a multi-agency Habitat Management Program (HMP) for the Lower American River. The WFP supports habitat improvements and other ecosystem-enhancing projects for the river, which are to be contained in the Implementation Plan of the HMP, described in more detail in Appendix B to this EIR. The HME also includes commitments to fund projects to mitigate adverse recreational impacts of the WFP identified in this Draft EIR.

However, because the details of the Water Forum Successor Effort's Implementation Plan for the Habitat Management Program are still being worked out, this Draft EIR, in identifying the adverse impacts of the WFP, does *not* include the benefits of the habitat improvement components of the HMP.

It does, however, assume the implementation of an Improved Pattern of Fishery Flow Releases, the Folsom Dam Temperature Control Device, and Folsom Reservoir Optimal Cold Water Pool Management all of which are necessary for the WFP to be effective. Therefore, this EIR describes aspects of the proposed HMP that will provide additional benefit to the Lower American River beyond what is the basis of impact analysis of the EIR.

Element V, the Water Conservation Element of the WFP, commits purveyors to specified water conservation programs. The diversions identified in the WFP reflect the reduced demand resulting from these conservation programs.

Element VI, the Groundwater Management Element, includes conjunctive use programs that provide for storing water in the wet years so that groundwater can safely be used in dry years, conserving surface water supplies.

Several of the elements in the WFP would reduce impacts on, CVP and State Water Project (SWP) water deliveries, CVP hydropower generation, Shasta Reservoir, and Folsom Reservoir. These elements of the WFP include Water Conservation, Groundwater Management, and some of the Actions That Meet Customers' Needs While Reducing Diversion Impacts on the Lower American River in Drier Years. The analysis on this Draft EIR reflects implementation of all of the elements.

Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, the impact assessment approach is focused on identifying potential impacts due to implementation of the WFP. It is important to note that there are numerous programs underway or planned to improve fishery conditions for Sacramento River Valley fisheries, particularly salmonid fisheries, including the AFRP of the CVPIA and the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

When implemented over the next several decades, these and other future programs are expected to improve fishery conditions. However, it is not possible at this time to quantify all the benefits of those programs. **This means that the quantitative analyses and impact determinations in the Water Forum Proposal EIR do not reflect anticipated benefits of those programs.**

The EIR identifies environmental impacts and additional mitigation measures, to further reduce adverse impacts, for consideration by the Water Forum stakeholders. As described below, certain impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

### **2.3.6 Response to Impacts on the Sacramento River and the Bay-Delta**

As discussed previously, the WFP already includes many provisions that would reduce impacts. These include potential aquatic impacts of increased diversions on the Sacramento River and the Bay-Delta. Even with these actions, unless additional water supplies are developed or diversions are reduced, there would still be remaining impacts on the Sacramento River and the Bay-Delta, especially under cumulative conditions, based on the scenario addressed in this EIR (refer to Table 2-3 and Chapter 6).

When purveyors in the American River watershed exercise area-of-origin water rights, it will reduce the amount of water available from Folsom Reservoir for use by USBR in meeting Sacramento River and Bay-Delta environmental and water delivery obligations. The USBR will have to operate its entire system, including Shasta and Folsom Reservoirs, differently in order to meet those obligations. Unless additional supplies are developed or diversions are reduced, this would result in impacts on the Sacramento River, above and below the American River, and the Bay-Delta.

The USBR will be involved in almost all of the diversion projects included in the WFP. In some cases the USBR needs to issue a contract for a new water supply. In other cases, it has to sign a Warren Act agreement or grant a right-of-way.

In order to take any of these actions, the USBR is required to consult with the resource agencies under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In addition to Water Forum actions, the consultation will also cover the USBR's entire Operational Criteria and Plan (OCAP) for the CVP.

Under the ESA, the USBR is prohibited from taking any actions that will jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species. Resource agencies participate in the ESA process by developing biologic objectives for species listed or proposed for listing. Biological objectives serve as specific performance criteria which are included in the biological opinions under the ESA. The USBR is required by the ESA to operate the CVP in a way that meets the biologic objectives set for each species listed or proposed for listing.

Because resource agencies are in the process of developing these biological objectives, it is impossible to specify performance criteria at this time. That uncertainty is combined with uncertainty over the extent and effectiveness of several future actions to protect Sacramento River and Bay-Delta resources. Therefore, it is impossible at this time to formulate specific mitigation measures for Sacramento River or Bay-Delta aquatic impacts or to assign responsibility for the mitigation.

The Water Forum Proposal EIR is a Program EIR and it is recognized that individual projects included in the WFP will need to comply with CEQA and, where applicable, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the state and federal Endangered Species Acts. Compliance with the state and federal Endangered Species Acts may result in diversion restrictions or other conditions beyond those that are included in the WFP.

## **2.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Table 2-1, beginning on page 2-13 contains a list of WFP impacts by issue. Table 2-2, beginning on page 2-16, contains a more detailed summary of environmental impacts identified in the EIR, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation. Key impact conclusions are summarized below.

### **2.4.1 Lower American River and Folsom Reservoir Impacts**

As described above, the WFP includes features that help preserve the values of the Lower American River, and also serve to reduce impacts on other resources, including Folsom Reservoir. These features, such as water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, revised pattern of releases for fisheries, and conjunctive use of surface and groundwater, reduce many environmental impacts of proposed diversions; however, they cannot entirely avoid significant

effects. The environmental analysis of the direct effect study area identified significant and potentially significant impacts within the Lower American River and Folsom Reservoir, including effects to certain fisheries recreational opportunities, and cultural resources.

Effects to fisheries include flow-related impacts to chinook salmon in the Lower American River which are proposed as threatened under the federal ESA. These impacts are considered potentially significant and mitigation is suggested as a part of the Habitat Mitigation Element. Potentially significant effects to Sacramento splittail of the Lower American River also occur.

In Folsom Reservoir, a potentially significant effect to warmwater fisheries is expected because of the reduction of littoral habitat and spawning success caused by more frequent declines in lake levels; mitigation measures to improve littoral habitat are identified. Coldwater fisheries in the reservoir are not significantly affected.

Effects to recreation opportunities include more frequent periods of inadequate recreation flows in the Lower American River during the summer which affects rafting and boating. In Folsom Reservoir, more frequent lake level declines result in significant impacts to boat ramp operations, use of marina wet slips, and opportunities for swimming at designated beaches.

The EIR also identifies adverse effects on cultural resources of Folsom Reservoir due varying water levels and increased cycles of inundation and exposure of cultural resources sites.

Potential mitigation is identified for each of these impacts. These and other impacts to the Lower American River and Folsom Reservoir identified in this EIR are presented in Tables 2-1 and 2-2.

#### **2.4.2 Out-of-Area Impacts**

The Draft EIR identifies that, under future (2030) conditions which include the WFP and other potential future system-wide actions (e.g., 2030 out-of-basin CVP/SWP demands, increased Sacramento Valley demands, and increased Trinity River flows), impacts outside the American River system would occur. These include impacts to water supply, water quality, and power supply.

The USBR may have to operate the CVP differently under a revised CVP-OCAP in the future when purveyors in the Water Forum exercise their water entitlements including water rights and CVP-contracted entitlements. DWR may also need to modify operation of the SWP, and, together with the USBR, may revise their Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA) in response to these changing conditions. The changed operation could affect their ability to meet their environmental and water supply obligations, including protection of the Sacramento River and Bay-Delta. For instance, deliveries to some CVP contractors, including some Water Forum purveyors, could be subject to greater and more frequent deficiencies being imposed by the USBR. It is also recognized that under some conditions, and depending on certain operational assumption, the analysis might indicate that there is an over-allocation of specific CVP resources.

CVP and SWP contractors north and south of the Delta would be affected to varying degrees. Modeling analysis of 2030 conditions with the WFP diversions showed reduced water available for delivery to municipal and industrial, and agricultural contractors north and south of the Delta, in some years and in varying magnitudes. Statutory and policy protections for the areas of origin, however, allow for implementation of the WFP (see Section 4.3, Water Supply). The assumptions on which these modeling results are based are explained in Appendix G.

Potentially significant impacts to Sacramento River and Delta water quality were also identified due to reduced flows in the Sacramento River in some years with implementation of the WFP. Reduced flows could cause seasonal elevations in river water temperatures and increased pollutant concentrations due to reduced dilution capacity.

Minor power supply impacts would also occur as a result of implementation of the WFP. Modeling indicates an overall reduction of less than 1% of annual average CVP energy production.

### **2.4.3 Water Service Study Area Impacts**

Implementation of the WFP would not directly alter land uses in the water service study area. It would, however, allow water purveyors in the Sacramento region to provide a safe and reliable water supply for the region's planned development through the year 2030. Land use decisions would continue to be made by city and county government decision-makers. The WFP would accommodate substantial development, however, as it would remove water supply as an obstacle to growth. Therefore, the WFP is considered to be growth inducing in the water service study area, as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines.

This EIR cannot assess the precise impacts of the regional growth that may be facilitated by the WFP because of the many variables involved. With respect to land use designations already approved in adopted general plans, environmental analysis has already been completed in the general plan EIRs. Under the provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines (§15152[b]), the analysis in already certified general plan EIRs need not be repeated in a later EIR. For future development projects, more project-specific environmental review and analysis of impacts and mitigation measures will be required before such projects are approved.

**Table 2-1  
Water Forum Proposal Impact Summary**

Resource Category	WFP Impact After Mitigation
<b>GROUNDWATER RESOURCES</b>	
Groundwater Quality	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Movement of Groundwater Contaminants	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Land Subsidence	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Efficiency of Wells	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>WATER SUPPLY</b>	
Decrease in Deliveries to SWP Customers	SIGNIFICANT
Decrease in Deliveries to CVP Customers	SIGNIFICANT
<b>WATER QUALITY</b>	
Lower American River and Folsom Reservoir Water Quality	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Sacramento River and Delta Water Quality	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT
<b>FISHERIES RESOURCES AND AQUATIC HABITAT</b>	
Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to the Warmwater and Coldwater Fisheries of Lake Natoma	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Temperature Impacts to Nimbus Fisheries Hatchery Operations and Fish Production	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Fall-run Chinook Salmon	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT
Lower American River Steelhead	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to Splittail (February Through May)	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT
Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to American Shad (May and June)	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to the Striped Bass Sport Fishery (May and June)	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Trinity Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Trinity Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Impacts to Keswick Reservoir Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Flow-related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Temperature-Related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries Resources	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Delta Fish Populations	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

**Table 2-1  
Water Forum Proposal Impact Summary**

Resource Category	WFP Impact After Mitigation
<b>FLOOD CONTROL</b>	
Ability to Meet Flood Control Diagrams of CVP/SWP Reservoirs	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Increased Stress on Lower American River Flood Control Structures	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Increased Exposure to Flood Hazards	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Substantial Change in Floodplain Characteristics	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Changes in River Channel Geometry or Gradients Leading to Changes in Bank Erosion, Aggradation, Segradation, or Meander Processes	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>HYDROPOWER SUPPLY</b>	
CVP Hydropower Capacity and Generation	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Increased Energy Requirements for Diverters Pumping From Folsom Reservoir	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT (ECONOMICALLY SIGNIFICANT)
<b>VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE</b>	
Lower American River Riparian Vegetation	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Lower American River Backwater Ponds	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Vegetation Associated With Reservoirs	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Vegetation Associated With the Upper Sacramento River	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Vegetation Associated With the Lower Sacramento and the Delta	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Special-Status Species of Riparian and Open Water Habitats	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Special-Status Species Dependent on Lower American River Backwater Pond/Marsh Habitats	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Elderberry Shrubs and Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Habitats of Special-Status Species (Non-fish)	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>RECREATION</b>	
Reduced Rafting and Boating Opportunities on the Lower American River	SIGNIFICANT
Lake Natoma Recreation Opportunities	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Reduced Folsom Reservoir Boating Opportunities	SIGNIFICANT
Reduced Availability of Folsom Reservoir Swimming Beaches	SIGNIFICANT
Shasta Lake Recreational Opportunities	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Trinity Reservoir Recreation Opportunities	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Recreation Opportunities on Whiskeytown and Keswick Reservoirs	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Recreation Impacts on the Upper Sacramento River	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

<b>Table 2-1 Water Forum Proposal Impact Summary</b>	
<b>Resource Category</b>	<b>WFP Impact After Mitigation</b>
Lower Sacramento River Recreation Opportunities	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Delta Recreation Opportunities	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Consistency With the American River Parkway Plan	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Consistency With the Lower American River's Recreational River Designations	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>LAND USE AND GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS</b>	
Land Use Impacts on Direct and Indirect Effect Study Areas	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Land Use and Growth-Inducing Impact in the Water Service Study Area	SIGNIFICANT
Consistency With General Plan	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Consistency With General Plan Water Supply and Conservation Policies	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>AESTHETICS</b>	
Aesthetic Value of the Lower American River	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Aesthetic Value of the Upper Sacramento River, Lower Sacramento River, and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Aesthetic Value of Lake Natoma, Whiskeytown, and Keswick Reservoirs	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Aesthetic Value of Folsom Reservoir	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Aesthetic Value of Trinity and Shasta Reservoirs	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>	
Effect of Varying Water Levels on Cultural Resources in Folsom Reservoir	SIGNIFICANT
Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower American River Bank Near Nimbus Dam	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower American River Bank Near the Mouth	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower American River Bank Near Freeport	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
<b>SOILS AND GEOLOGY</b>	
Changes in Geologic Substructures	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Exposure to Major Geologic Hazards	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Increased Soil Erosion by Wind or Water	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT
Loss of Soil Cover	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>GROUNDWATER (Section 4.2)</b>		
<p><b>4.2-1: Groundwater Quality.</b> Further lowering of groundwater levels is anticipated to occur until the elevation of the groundwater table would stabilize under the groundwater yield recommendations of the WFP. This lowering may result in continued deterioration of groundwater quality in the South Sacramento and Galt areas due to up-rising of poorer quality water from the lower aquifer zone. In the future, elevated manganese and iron levels may occur in groundwater but at levels that would represent an aesthetic, rather than health-related impact. Continued treatment of manganese and iron is expected for municipal wells in the future. Additionally, arsenic levels are not anticipated to exceed current Title 22 standards, and those for radon have yet to be established. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.2-2: Movement of Groundwater Contaminants.</b> Further lowering of the groundwater levels is anticipated to occur until the elevation of the groundwater table would stabilize under the groundwater yield recommendations of the WFP. This lowering would result in no substantial increase in the rate of groundwater contaminant movement. This is a less-than-significant impact because of the small magnitude of increase expected and because the contaminated sites are currently undergoing remediation.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.2-3: Land Subsidence.</b> Further lowering of groundwater levels is anticipated to occur until the elevation of the groundwater table would stabilize under the groundwater yield recommendations of the WFP. This lowering of groundwater levels is unlikely to result in substantial land subsidence. Historical data on subsidence in relation to past groundwater decline indicate that the area is not susceptible to substantial land subsidence given the anticipated level of groundwater level decline in the future. The range of land</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>subsidence estimated to occur with the projected groundwater decline is 0.13 to 0.35 feet, and would occur over the course of several decades. Since no substantial land subsidence is expected to occur, this would be considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.2-4: Efficiency of Wells.</b> Further lowering of groundwater elevations is anticipated to occur until the elevation of the groundwater table stabilizes under the recommended sustainable yields of the WFP. This further lowering may result in reduced efficiency of existing groundwater wells due to the need to: 1) deepen many existing wells, and 2) increase pumping at deepened wells. This reduced efficiency, however, would translate into an economic, rather than environmental impact, as the volume of groundwater available and its quality are not anticipated to be substantially affected following well deepening or increased pumping. The economic effects would be the increased costs associated with the implementation of these actions. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>WATER SUPPLY (Section 4.3)</b></p>		
<p><b>4.3-1: Decrease in Deliveries to SWP Customers.</b> Implementation of the WFP could result in decreased water deliveries to SWP customers in 6 years of the 70-year record, ranging between 15 and 173 thousand acre-feet. This would represent a significant impact.</p>	<p>Development of additional water supplies by the SWP could reduce impacts to SWP deliveries.</p>	<p>significant</p>
<p><b>4.3-2: Decrease in Deliveries to CVP Customers.</b> Implementation of WFP could result in a decrease in water deliveries to CVP customers in up to 27 years of the 70-year record, depending on the type of CVP contractor. This would represent a significant impact.</p>	<p>Development of additional water supplies by the CVP could reduce impacts to CVP deliveries.</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (Section 4.4)</u></b>		
<p><b><u>4.4-1: Seasonal Changes to Water Quality in Folsom Reservoir, Lake Natoma, and the Lower American River.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would directly result in seasonal reductions in Folsom Reservoir storage and Lower American River flows during most years, but would have little effect on the volume of water maintained in Lake Natoma. Volume reductions in Folsom Reservoir and the Lower American River would be expected to alter water temperatures and could increase concentrations/levels of nutrients, pathogens, TDS, TOC, turbidity, and/or priority pollutants due to reduced dilution capacity. With the exception of water temperature (see Section 4.5.3, Fisheries Resources and Aquatic Habitat, for a discussion of temperature impacts to these waterbodies), program-level assessment indicated that any direct impacts to water quality in these waterbodies resulting from seasonal reductions in Folsom Reservoir storage and/or Lower American River flows would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</p>	No mitigation measure are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>4.4-2: Seasonal Changes to Sacramento River and Delta Water Quality.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in seasonal reductions in Shasta Reservoir storage and Sacramento River flow during some years. Such hydrologic changes would be expected to cause seasonal elevations in river water temperatures in some years, and could increase concentrations/levels of nutrients, pathogens, TDS, TOC, turbidity, and/or priority pollutants in the Sacramento River due to reduced dilution capacity. Reduced river flows would reduce Delta inflow which, if sufficiently large, could alter various water quality parameters in portions of the Delta. With the possible exception of water temperature (see Section 4.5, Fisheries Resources and Aquatic Habitat, for a discussion of temperature impacts to the Sacramento River), program-level assessments indicated that any direct impacts to Sacramento River or Delta</p>	<p>Changes to Sacramento River and Delta water quality would be an indirect impact of increased urban development facilitated, in part, by the additional diversions of surface and groundwater defined in the WFP. Water quality mitigation measures will be developed for specific projects as they occur in the future. Responsibility for this mitigation lies with the land use planning authorities and individual project proponents, and is beyond the Water Forum's control. Water quality mitigation anticipated to occur with planned growth is addressed in the Sacramento County and other regional General Plans. In addition, the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District, which operates the SRWTP, is currently updating its Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment</p>	potentially significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>water quality, resulting from seasonal reductions in Sacramento River flow associated with the WFP, would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>Plan Master Plan, and plans to update this document every 5 years in the future.</p>	
<p><b><u>FISHERIES RESOURCES and AQUATIC HABITAT (Section 4.5)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>4.5-1: Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries.</u></b>            Additional diversions from Folsom Reservoir under the WFP would reduce reservoir storage by 10% or more, relative to the Base Condition, infrequently during the period April through August and occasionally during the period September through November. However, anticipated reductions in reservoir storage would not be expected to adversely affect the reservoir's coldwater fisheries because: 1) coldwater habitat would remain available within the reservoir during all months of all years; 2) physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations; and 3) anticipated seasonal reductions in storage would not be expected to adversely affect the primary prey species utilized by coldwater fishes. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-2: Impacts to Folsom Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries.</u></b>            Additional diversions from Folsom Reservoir under the WFP would frequently reduce reservoir storage (and thus water levels) during the critical spawning and rearing period (i.e., March through September), which could reduce the availability of littoral (nearshore) habitat containing vegetation. Modeling output indicates that long-term average reductions in littoral habitat availability of up to 34% could occur in September. Average reductions in littoral habitat availability of this magnitude could result in increased predation on young-of-the-year warmwater fishes, thereby reducing initial year-class strength of warmwater fishes in many years. Unless willows and other nearshore vegetation</p>	<p>Through plantings and related activities, encourage existing willow and other terrestrial vegetative communities to become established at lower reservoir elevations. Doing so would provide greater availability of physical structure for warmwater fish spawning and rearing in the future when spring reservoir elevations are lower than under current conditions.</p> <p>Artificial habitat structures (e.g., artificial synthetic structures, submerged brush and debris, fish cribs, etc.) would provide structure in littoral habitats used by warmwater fishes for spawning and early lifestage rearing. Because the majority</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>become established at lower reservoir elevations in the future in response to seasonal reductions in water levels, population declines for largemouth bass and other warmwater species could be expected to occur. Reduced littoral habitat availability would be a potentially significant impact to Folsom Reservoir warmwater fisheries.</p>	<p>of the reservoir's warmwater fishes spawn in shallow water habitats (i.e., generally less than 10 feet deep), artificial structures would be placed at reservoir elevations that would likely be used by these fishes for spawning and rearing. The location and number of artificial structures placed within the reservoir would increase in proportion to the loss of littoral habitat over time. Implementing habitat structures would help minimize the effects to Folsom Reservoir's warmwater fisheries that would be expected to result from increased diversions and resultant reduced water surface elevations in Folsom Reservoir.</p>	
	<p>While acknowledging operational constraints due to flood control, power production and diversions, work cooperatively with USBR operators to minimize the frequency with which reservoir elevation changes potentially resulting in nest flooding/dewatering events would occur. Monthly/weekly rates of reservoir elevation change will be documented. This information will be compared to timing and average depth of spawning for key nest-building warmwater species in Folsom Reservoir to estimate probabilities of nest flooding/dewatering events.</p>	
	<p>This measure will be implemented to the degree reasonable and feasible based on its integration into the Habitat Management Program.</p>	
	<p>Place artificial structures in the reservoir to compensate for loss of littoral habitats containing natural structure (e.g., inundated willows). The abundance of representative warmwater species will be monitored periodically through creel surveys and/or through catch-per-unit effort (CPUE) rates for tournament anglers to determine the extent to which warmwater fish utilize the structures. The extent to which</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.5-3: Impacts to The Warmwater and Coldwater Fisheries of Lake Natoma.</b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would have minimal, if any, impact to Lake Natoma's seasonal storage, rates of elevation fluctuation, or temperature. Any changes to these lake parameters that could occur under the WFP would be expected to be minor and, therefore, would not adversely affect the lake's warmwater or coldwater fisheries. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>this mitigation is to be implemented will be based on the results of these surveys. Frequency and timing of potential nest flooding/dewatering events that facilitate meeting current and future warmwater fish management goals will be determined by CDFG reservoir biologists. More specific performance criteria will be developed in the Habitat Management Program Plan.</p> <p>All three activities described above would, to the degree reasonable and feasible, be implemented, monitored, and maintained throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.5-4: Temperature Impacts to Nimbus Fish Hatchery Operations and Fish Production.</b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would generally have little effect on May temperatures below Nimbus Dam, and would typically result in equivalent or colder temperatures during the June through September period, relative to the Base Condition. Improved water temperatures would result from a Folsom Dam urban water intake structure temperature control device, and optimal coldwater pool management. On a long-term basis, the frequent and substantial temperature reductions that would occur during the June through September period (when hatchery temperatures reach seasonal highs annually) would more than offset the less frequent adverse</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>impacts that would occur in some years. This would potentially benefit hatchery operations and resultant fish production in most years. Overall, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>The following actions would be implemented as part of the HME, which will be adopted as an integral component of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>
<p><b>4.5-5: Fall-run Chinook Salmon.</b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would result in periods of reduced flows in the lower American River during the October through December spawning period, when flows under the Base Condition would be 2,500 cfs or less. Further flow reductions occurring at already low flow levels could result in increased redd superimposition and eventual lower year-class strength. Improved water temperatures (resulting from a Folsom Dam urban water intake structure temperature control device and optimal coldwater pool management) and improved early life-stage survival, will benefit chinook salmon spawning success, as well as other life-stages. However, because of the broad, programmatic nature of the WFP, the extent to which these actions (combined with other future actions such as spawning gravel management, revised flow ramping rate criteria, etc.) will interact to counterbalance flow reductions is uncertain, as is the manner in which these actions will be implemented, managed, and coordinated. Consequently, the overall effects of the WFP on chinook salmon year-class strength also is uncertain, and therefore, is considered to represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation.</u> The Water Forum Successor Effort and the USBR would work together with Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and the USFWS to augment Lower American River flows, particularly during the spawning period during years when impacts would occur. This measure would be implemented (within the constraints of water availability) during dry and critically dry years. The primary source of water for augmenting flows would be the purchase of American River water from upstream reservoirs operated by PCWA.</p> <p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria.</u> Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of chinook salmon due to redd dewatering (fall and winter) and fry and juvenile stranding (winter and spring), especially during periods of low flow. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving spawning and incubation success, which, in turn, would lead to an overall increase in annual production of chinook salmon. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to chinook salmon.</p>	

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Restore wetland/slough complexes occurring within habitat transitional zones between river channels, shoreline, and upland habitats. Restoration would involve grading areas for the appropriate elevations and hydrology, as well as planting appropriate vegetation, to achieve desired habitat characteristics. Because wetland/slough complexes are used by juvenile chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration, restoration and maintenance of these complexes would increase the quantity, and possibly the quality, of rearing habitat available to juvenile chinook salmon. Thus, this action could improve juvenile rearing success prior to emigration, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of chinook salmon. This action would off-set, in part, potential temperature-related impacts to juvenile steelhead.</p>	
	<p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Most large woody debris has been, and continues to be, removed from the Lower American River by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to reduce potential hazards to recreationists. Discontinuation of this action in select reaches of the river would allow woody debris to accumulate. Instream woody cover is important for juvenile chinook salmon rearing as it provides structure that can be utilized to escape fish and avian predators. It also provides microhabitats with reduced current velocities where juvenile chinook salmon can feed more effectively. Increasing the amount of instream woody debris at specific sites could improve juvenile rearing success prior to emigration, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management.</u> SRA habitat can be restored along the Lower American River by constructing terraces along shorelines and planting terraces with appropriate herbaceous and woody vegetation. SRA habitat provides feeding and holding areas, escape cover, and local temperature refugia for juvenile chinook salmon. Development and implementation of a shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management program would facilitate improving rearing habitat. Thus, protecting and restoring SRA habitat could improve juvenile rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	
	<p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management/Maintenance.</u> Improve spawning habitat in the Lower American River by breaking up and redistributing coarse subsurface deposits and reducing compaction and embeddedness which reduces gravel permeability. Development and implementation of a gravel management program for the Lower American River would facilitate improving spawning habitat for chinook salmon and reducing the deterioration of existing spawning gravel. This habitat improvement would be expected to increase the amount of available spawning habitat, thereby contributing to higher overall spawning and incubation success, and therefore chinook salmon production, annually. This action would off-set, in part, flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	
	<p>Performance Criteria: a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation.</u> Increase flows particularly during the period during dry and critically dry years to the maximum extent feasible, relative to non-augmented conditions. To assess whether flow augmentation is reducing</p>	

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>flow-related impacts, flows would be monitored in the Lower American River.</p> <p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Reduce the frequency of large, rapid flow-reduction events throughout the year, particularly during the fall spawning and incubation period.</p> <p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Increase the amount of wetland/slough complex habitat in the Lower American River that is used by early life stages of chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration.</p> <p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Increase the amount of woody debris within areas of the Lower American River channel that is used by early life stages of chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration.</p> <p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. Protect existing, and increase to the extent feasible, the amount of shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the Lower American River.</p> <p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management</u>. Restore armored gravels to conditions that will encourage chinook salmon to use restored areas for spawning.</p> <p>Timing:</p> <p>a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation</u>. Flow augmentation would occur during the spawning period October through December, during dry and critically dry years. This measure would be implemented, as necessary, throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.5-6: Lower American River Steelhead.</b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would, on a long-term average basis, measurably reduce river temperatures during all months of the June through September rearing period. Reductions in the 69-year average temperature at Watt Avenue of 0.5EF would occur during June, August, and September, with a reduction of 0.8EF expected during July. This would provide significant thermal</p>	<p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Flow fluctuation criteria would be developed and implemented for the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Wetland/Slough complex restoration/management would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement, as warranted by the success of initial projects to be initiated during the first two years of the Agreement.</p> <p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Instream cover (woody debris) would be allowed to accumulate in the Lower American River throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. Shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement, as warranted by the success of initial projects to be implemented within the first two years of the Agreement.</p> <p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management</u>. Spawning habitat management would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>benefits to steelhead over-summering in the Lower American River during most years. Conversely, flow reductions of 20% or greater, when flows under the Base Condition would be at or below the maximum AFRP requirement for the month, would occur approximately 4% to 33% of the time during one or more months of the April through September period. Such flow reductions could reduce the quantity and/or quality of juvenile rearing habitat in some of these years. Because steelhead in the Lower American River are believed to be more limited by over-summering temperatures than flows, the frequent and substantial temperature reductions would be expected to offset the flow reductions, on a long-term basis. Consequently, the combined temperature and flow changes under the WFP would not be expected to adversely affect the long-term population trends of steelhead in the Lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>The following actions would be implemented as part of the HME, which will be adopted as an integral component of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>a) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Restore wetland/slough complexes occurring within habitat transitional zones between river channels, shoreline, and upland habitats. Restoration would involve grading areas for the appropriate elevations and hydrology, as well as planting appropriate vegetation, to achieve desired habitat characteristics. Because wetland/slough complexes are used by splittail for spawning, restoration and maintenance of these complexes would increase the quantity, and possibly the quality, of spawning habitat available to splittail. Wetland/slough complex restoration/maintenance would reduce flow-related impacts to splittail spawning.</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-7: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to Splittail (February through May)</u></b>. Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would typically reduce, to some degree, the amount of riparian vegetation inundated between RM 8 and 9 (which serves as an index for the lower portion of the river) under the Base Condition. However, with few exceptions, substantial amounts of inundated riparian vegetation would remain under the WFP in years when such habitat would occur under the Base Condition. In addition, flow changes under the WFP would have little effect on the availability of in-channel spawning habitat availability, or the amount of potential spawning habitat available from the mouth up to RM 5 - the reach of the river influenced by Sacramento River stage. Also, the frequency with which suitable temperatures for splittail spawning below Watt Avenue would not change substantially under the WFP, relative to the Base Condition. Given the uncertainty as to the magnitude and extent of splittail spawning in the Lower American River, and the actual amount of potential spawning habitat at a specific flow rates</p>		

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>throughout the river, the effects of flow reductions from the February through May period also are uncertain and, therefore, represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>b) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. SRA habitat can be restored along the Lower American River by constructing terraces along shorelines and planting terraces with appropriate herbaceous and woody vegetation. SRA habitat provides spawning and rearing areas for splittail. Development and implementation of a shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management program would facilitate increasing splittail spawning and rearing habitat availability within the Lower American River. Thus, protecting and restoring SRA habitat could improve splittail spawning and juvenile rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p> <p>c) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of splittail due to fry and juvenile stranding during the February through May period. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving early life-stage rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p> <p>Performance Criteria:</p> <p>a) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Increase the amount of wetland/slough complex habitat in the Lower American River that is used by splittail for spawning and rearing.</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.5-8: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to American Shad (May and June).</b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would increase the frequency with which mean monthly flows at the mouth would be below the target attraction flow of 3,000 cfs by 3% in May and 4% in June. Because American shad spawn opportunistically where suitable conditions are found, potentially attracting fewer adult spawners into the Lower American River in a few years would not be expected to adversely impact annual American shad production within the Sacramento River system. Flow reductions under the WFP in May and June could reduce the number of adult shad attracted into the river during some years. Because annual production of American shad within the Sacramento River system would not be affected, and because direct impacts to the Lower American River sport fishery would be less than substantial in most years, any flow-related impacts to American shad are considered to be less than significant. In addition, because the frequency with which suitable</p>	<p>b) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management.</u> Protect existing, and increase to the extent feasible, the amount of shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the Lower American River.</p> <p>c) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria.</u> Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of splittail due to fry and juvenile stranding during the February through May period. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving early life-stage rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>temperatures for American shad spawning would not differ substantially between the WFP and the Base Condition, and because river temperatures under the WFP would nearly always remain suitable for American shad rearing, temperature-related impacts to American shad also are considered to be less than significant. Overall, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-9: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to the Striped Bass Sport Fishery (May and June).</u></b> Operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir under the WFP would increase the frequency with which mean monthly flows at the mouth would be below the target flow of 1,500 cfs by 1% in May and 10% in June. Because flows at the mouth that are believed to be sufficient to maintain the striped bass fishery would be met or exceeded in most years during both May and June, and because substantial changes in the strength of the striped bass fishery would not be expected to occur in all years when mean May and/or June flows fall below 1,500 cfs, flow-related impacts to the striped bass fishery that could potentially occur under the WFP are considered to be less than significant. In addition, because the frequency with which suitable temperatures for juvenile striped bass rearing in the Lower American River would differ little between the WFP and the Base Condition during May and June, temperature-related impacts to juvenile striped bass rearing are also considered to be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-10: Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries.</u></b> Hydrologic conditions with the WFP would not result in substantial reductions in reservoir storage throughout the April through November period of the year. Because changes to Shasta Reservoir storage would not be substantial, because physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations within the reservoir, and because anticipated changes in seasonal storage would not be expected to result in substantial adverse effects on the primary prey base utilized</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>by the reservoir's coldwater fish populations, seasonal reductions in storage expected to occur under WFP would have less-than-significant impacts to Shasta Reservoir's coldwater fisheries.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-11: Impacts to Trinity Reservoir's Coldwater Fisheries.</u></b> Hydrologic conditions with the WFP would not result in substantial reductions in reservoir storage throughout the April through November period of the year. Because changes to Trinity Reservoir storage would not be substantial, because physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations within the reservoir, and because anticipated changes in seasonal storage would not be expected to result in substantial adverse effects on the primary prey base utilized by the reservoir's coldwater fish populations, seasonal reductions in storage expected to occur under WFP would have less-than-significant impacts to Trinity Reservoir's coldwater fisheries.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-12: Impacts to Shasta Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries.</u></b> Seasonal changes in reservoir surface elevation under the WFP could result in substantial reductions in reservoir littoral habitat availability in a few years during the period March through September. However, seasonal changes in reservoir surface elevation under the WFP would generally not result in substantial reductions in long-term average reservoir littoral habitat availability during the period March through September (which are the primary spawning and initial rearing months for the reservoir's warmwater fishes of management concern). Thus, these reductions would not be of sufficient magnitude to substantially reduce long-term, average initial year-class strength of the warmwater fish populations of management concern. Consequently, seasonal reductions in littoral habitat availability would constitute a less-than-significant impact to Shasta Reservoir's warmwater</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>Fisheries. Because the frequency with which potential nest dewatering events could occur in Shasta Reservoir under the WFP would not change during any month of the March through July warmwater fish spawning period, impacts to warmwater fish nesting success under the WFP are considered to be less than significant. Overall, this would constitute a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-13: Impacts to Trinity Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries.</u></b> Under the WFP, substantial reductions in littoral habitat availability would occur infrequently throughout the March through September period. Similarly, the potential for nest dewatering events to occur in Trinity Reservoir would not change under the WFP during the March through July spawning period. Thus, additional surface water diversions under the WFP would result in less-than-significant impacts to the spawning and initial rearing success of Trinity Reservoir's nest-building, warmwater fishes. Based on these findings, implementation of the WFP would result in less-than-significant impacts to Trinity Reservoir warmwater fisheries.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-14: Impacts to Keswick Reservoir Fisheries.</u></b> Hydrologic conditions with the WFP would have little, if any, effect on seasonal storage, elevation, and temperature of Keswick Reservoir. Any minor changes in storage, elevation, or temperature that could occur would constitute a less-than-significant impact to Keswick Reservoir fishery resources.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.5-15: Flow-Related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries.</u></b> Flow reductions of more than 20% would not occur during any month under the WFP, relative to the Base Condition. Measurable reductions in the 70-year average flows released from Keswick Dam would not occur during any month of the year. In addition, flows released from Keswick Dam would never be below the 3,250 cfs minimum stipulated in the NMFS Biological Opinion for</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>winter-run chinook salmon during the period October through March under the WFP. These findings indicate that flow changes below Keswick Dam that would occur under the WFP would result in less-than-significant impacts to upper Sacramento River fisheries resources. Under the WFP, substantial reductions in lower Sacramento River Flows at Freeport would occur infrequently during all months of the year. Consequently, any flow-related impacts to lower Sacramento River fisheries or migrating anadromous fishes that could occur under WFP are considered to be less than significant. Overall, this constitutes a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.5-16: Temperature-Related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries Resources.</b> Hydrologic conditions with the WFP would not result in substantial changes to the 69-year average temperature at Keswick Dam or Bend Bridge for any month of the year. There would also be no change in the number of years exceeding 56EF at Keswick Dam under the WFP during the April through September period. Conversely, increases in water temperatures would result in temperatures at Bend Bridge to exceed 56EF in one additional year during September. However, there would be no change in winter-run chinook salmon early lifestage survival during this year. In addition, there would be no substantial decreases in annual early lifestage survival of fall-run, late fall-run, winter-run, or spring-run chinook salmon in any individual year under the WFP, relative to that under the Base Condition. Therefore, the temperature changes that would occur would not be expected to result in substantial adverse impacts to chinook salmon, or other fish species using the upper Sacramento River. Temperatures in the lower Sacramento River would not be expected to change substantially under the WFP. The number of years that mean monthly temperatures at this location would exceed 56EF, 60EF, and 70EF would be similar under the WFP and the Base Condition during the period March through November.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>Thus, potential impacts to fish species within the lower Sacramento River would be considered less than significant. Overall, this would be considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>		
<p><b>4.5-17: Delta Fish Populations.</b> Under the WFP, substantial reductions in Delta outflow would occur infrequently during the February through June period. Likewise, under the WFP, substantial upstream shifts in the mean monthly position of X2 also would occur infrequently during this period. Finally, Delta export to inflow ratios under the WFP would not exceed the maximum export limits for either the February through June (35% of Delta inflow) or the July through January periods (65% of Delta inflow). Overall this is considered to be a less-than-significant impact to Delta fish populations.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>FLOOD CONTROL (Section 4.6)</b></p>		
<p><b>4.6-1: Ability to Meet Flood Control Diagrams of CVP/SWP Reservoirs.</b> The USBR is obligated to meet the flood control diagram for Folsom and Shasta reservoirs and the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has the similar responsibility for Oroville Reservoir. Any reduction in the ability of either the USBR or DWR to meet their flood control obligations for these reservoirs would constitute a significant impact. Since implementation of the Water Forum Proposal would increase water diversions from Folsom Reservoir, thereby allowing Folsom Reservoir to start the flood control season with less water in storage than under existing conditions, and since the integrated nature of CVP/SWP operations would also result in lowered reservoir storage in Shasta and Oroville reservoirs, none of the flood control diagrams for these reservoirs would be compromised. This is considered to represent a less-than-significant impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>4.6-2: Increased Stress on Lower American River Flood Control Structures.</b> Increased releases from Nimbus Dam and hence, flows in the Lower American River, during the flood control season could affect the stability of flood control structures on the Lower American River. Higher flows could increase stress on levees and other flood control structures. However, under the Water Forum Proposal, 70-year average mean monthly flows would always be lower than the Base Condition. Therefore, downstream structures on the Lower American River would remain unaffected. This is a less than significant impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.6-3: Increased Exposure to Flood Hazards.</b> Implementation of the Water Forum Proposal would not compromise the flood protection provided by Folsom Dam or structures along the Lower American River. Future projects, undertaken by Water Forum stakeholders, and their associated construction activities, may, however, affect local flood control efforts and/or structures. New projects having the potential to affect flood control structures will have to conduct flood control analysis and comply with flood control regulations before approval. Since these future projects are not part of the Water Forum Proposal, specific project-level analysis for flood control protection would be undertaken prior to their approval, and the fact that the flood control protection provided by Folsom Dam would not be compromised, increased exposure to flood hazards is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.6-4: Substantial Change in Floodplain Characteristics.</b> No specific construction activities are associated with the Water Forum Proposal, which would affect Sacramento or American River floodplain characteristics. Any new future projects requiring construction of facilities would be required to evaluate their specific and individual impacts on flood control in a project-level study. Since the Water Forum Proposal does not include implementation of specific projects, impacts to floodplain</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>characteristics as a result of the Water Forum Proposal are considered to be less than significant.</p>		less-than-significant
<p><b><u>4.6-5: Changes in River Channel Geometry or Gradients Leading to Changes in Bank Erosion, Aggradation, Segradation, or Meander Processes.</u></b> While the Water Forum Proposal does not contain construction or improvement of instream structures, future projects might include such actions. These types of actions could ultimately affect the structural integrity of levees. Any such impacts would be addressed in future design plans and, therefore, are considered to represent a less-than-significant impact under the Water Forum Proposal.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>POWER SUPPLY (Section 4.7)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>4.7-1: Reduced CVP Hydropower Capacity and Generation.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would not result in reduced capacity for use by WAPA's preference customers or reduce average annual surplus capacity available for WAPA's sale. Although under the WFP, WAPA's capacity peak maximum of 1,152 megawatts would not be met in 41 of the 828 months studied, the Base Condition would also fall short of the maximum in 42 of the 828 months. Implementation of the WFP would reduce average annual CVP energy production, however. With the WFP, an average annual reduction of 30 Gwh would occur, as compared to the Base Condition. This reduction when compared to the annual average CVP energy production of 3,650 Gwh is considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>4.7-2: Increased Energy Requirements for Diverters Pumping From Folsom Reservoir.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in changes in pumping requirements for those who pump water from Folsom Reservoir. Under the WFP, it is anticipated that an increase in average annual pumping energy would be required.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less than significant (economically significant)

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>While this impact would be environmentally less than significant, it represents an economically significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>VEGETATION and WILDLIFE (Section 4.8)</b></p>		
<p><b>4.8-1: Lower American River Riparian Vegetation.</b> Compared to existing conditions, the WFP would result in lower mean monthly flows below Nimbus Dam and at the H Street bridge during the critical growing season months of April through July; however, these flows would not be reduced with sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing riparian vegetation dependent on flows in the Lower American River. Also, the higher flows needed for seed dispersal would occur with sufficient frequency to maintain the riparian forest community. For example, during a majority of the growing season months (April - July), flows would be above the minimum flow requirement of 1765 cfs between 61% and 83% of the time, depending on the month. Because WFP conditions would not result in the thinning of the riparian corridor, or the loss of valuable border zone vegetation and habitat, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.8-2: Lower American River Backwater Ponds.</b> Compared to existing conditions, the WFP would result in lower mean monthly flows below Nimbus Dam and the H Street bridge during the summer; however, these flows would not be reduced with sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing backwater habitats dependent on the Lower American River flows. For example, the overall effects of the WFP would result in a greater number of years during the 70-year hydrologic record that flows are within the minimum/optimum range of 1,300 to 4,000 cfs (between 2 and 14 years, more often in the 70-year record between March and September, depending on the month). Because flows high enough to promote recharge of the ponds would continue during</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>the winter and/or spring, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.8-3: Vegetation Associated with Reservoirs.</b> Compared to existing conditions, the WFP would result in lower mean monthly flows and, in many years, lower surface water elevations of reservoirs; however, because the draw down zone is vegetated with non-native herbaceous plants and scattered willow shrubs that do not form a contiguous riparian community, are not considered of high wildlife value, and will likely reestablish as water levels fluctuate, important habitat values are not adversely affected. For these reasons, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.8-4: Vegetation Associated with the Upper Sacramento River.</b> Compared to existing conditions, the WFP would result in some years with higher and some years with lower mean monthly flows on the Upper Sacramento River during the spring and summer growing season for riparian vegetation; in years with lower flows, they would not be reduced by sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing riparian vegetation dependent on the Upper Sacramento River flows. For example, spring and summer flows on the Upper Sacramento River, under WFP conditions, vary from base conditions by less than one percent. Consequently, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.8-5: Vegetation Associated with the Lower Sacramento River and the Delta.</b> Compared to existing conditions, Lower Sacramento River flows would be reduced during the growing season months of some years. However, in years with lower flows, they would not be reduced by sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing riparian habitats dependent on the Lower Sacramento River flows and Delta inflows. For example, average decreases in mean monthly flows during the peak growing</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>season (March-July) between the base and WFP conditions range from 159.9 cfs to 492.0 cfs. As it relates to riparian vegetation effects, these reductions in flow are not considered substantial. This impact would less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.8-6: Special-Status Species of Riparian and Open Water Habitats.</u></b> As discussed in Impacts 4.8-1 and 4.8-5, when compared to existing conditions, the WFP would result in reduced mean monthly flows during certain periods in the year. However, these flows would not be reduced by sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing riparian vegetation dependent on the Lower American River. Because cottonwood forest vegetation would not be adversely affected and open water (river) habitat would be available, the special-status species dependent on riparian habitat would not be expected to be adversely affected; therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.8-7: Special-Status Species Dependent on Lower American River Backwater Pond/Marsh Habitats.</u></b> As discussed in Impact 4.8-2, when compared to existing conditions the WFP would result in reduced mean monthly flows during certain times of the year. However, these flows would not be reduced by sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing backwater habitats dependent on the Lower American River. Because backwater habitats would not be adversely affected, the special-status species dependent on these habitats would not be expected to be adversely affected; therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>and frequency to significantly alter existing water fluctuations (pond levels) and vegetation dependent on these ponds. For these reasons, elderberries dependent on these habitats are not expected to be adversely affected. This impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.8-9: Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Habitats of Special-Status Species (Non-Fish).</u></b> As discussed in Impact 4.8-6, when compared to existing conditions the WFP would result in reduced mean monthly flows in the Sacramento River during certain times of the year. However, these flows would not be reduced by sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing habitats dependent on the Delta. Because Delta habitats would not be adversely affected, the special-status species dependent on these habitats would not be expected to be adversely affected; therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>		
<p><b><u>RECREATION (Section 4.9)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>4.9-1: Reduced Rafting and Boating Opportunities on the Lower American River.</u></b> Compared to base conditions, additional diversions under the WFP would result in reduced summertime mean monthly flows below Nimbus Dam with a sufficient magnitude and frequency to diminish flows available for Lower American River rafting and boating during some high rafting and boating use months of the year (June, July, and September). For instance, in these months, flows would be within the minimum/maximum flow range for rafting and boating between 3 to 4 fewer years of the 70-year record. Reduced flows would result in a significant effect to rafting and boating opportunities on the Lower American River.</p>	<p>The WFP includes features intended to lessen potential environmental impacts to the American River, consistent with the coequal objective to protect its natural values. These mitigating features include water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, and conjunctive use of ground water and surface water. Adoption of the WFP with these features would reduce flow effects on Lower American River recreation opportunities. In addition, improvements to recreation facilities in the American River Parkway are identified to compensate for the reduction in quality of and opportunity for rafting/boating on the Lower American River. Actions would occur in cooperation with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation and could include one or both of the following: (A) contributing to the purchase and development of the Uruttia property to provide</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<p>water-dependent recreation opportunities and (B) developing recreation facilities to improve water-dependent and water-enhanced recreation opportunities in the American River Parkway. The improvements would involve projects that are consistent with the American River Parkway Plan, or that would be implemented subject to an amendment to the parkway plan by Sacramento County.</p> <p>The measures described below could be implemented in cooperation with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation, the agency responsible for implementing the American River Parkway Plan. The measures could be part of the Habitat Management Plan adopted by the Water Forum participants as an implementation tool for the Habitat Management Element of the Water Forum Proposal. Funding for the recreation measures may include money from within or outside the Water Forum Successor Effort. Because activities by a number of agencies are underway to restore and enhance the Lower American River, this recreation mitigation should be coordinated with the broader ecosystem partnership efforts. Other agencies involved in the Lower American River may participate in funding and/or implementation of recreation mitigation, as appropriate, to promote a well-coordinated program of restoration and enhancement of the river.</p> <p>a) <u>Uruttia Property</u>. The Uruttia Property, located on the north side of the Lower American River near CalExpo, could be acquired and/or developed to provide public access, opportunities for water-dependent recreation activity related to the river (such as canoe and kayak use and instruction), and enhanced environmental values which can provide opportunities for water-enhanced recreation, such as sightseeing and nature study. The property and facilities would be incorporated into the</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<p>American River Parkway and reflected by amendment in the American River Parkway Plan.</p>	
	<p>b) <u>Recreation Facility Improvements to the American River Parkway.</u> The American River Parkway Plan describes in several Area Plans the resources and facilities intended to provide for water-dependent and water-enhanced recreation, including river access, trails, parking, swimming areas, and other facilities. The facilities could include improvement of river access for rafting/boating in the less intensively used sections of the river, such as downstream of Goethe Park; trail improvements to increase the opportunity for water-enhanced recreation, such as a linkage between the Fairbairn plant and the Sutter’s Landing Park site; or interpretive resources to improve water-enhanced nature study and appreciation of the Parkway.</p> <p>c) <u>Update of the American River Parkway Plan.</u> The update could consider the flow regime resulting from the WFP and appropriate actions to take in the Parkway to support improvement of both recreation opportunities and riparian habitat.</p> <p>d) <u>Enhancement of the Condition and Quality of Existing Recreation Facilities.</u> Past and current budget constraints have limited the County’s ability to maintain some existing recreation facilities. Enhancement of the condition and quality of existing facilities could improve the attraction of the Parkway for both water-dependent and water-enhanced recreation activity.</p>	
	<p>The improvements to recreation facilities in the American River Parkway would accomplish the following criteria:</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.9-2: Lake Natoma Recreation Opportunities.</b> Additional diversions under the WFP would not result in a different pattern of lake elevation fluctuations than under base conditions, because Lake Natoma would continue to serve as a regulating reservoir below Folsom Dam. Typically, lake elevation fluctuation stays within a range of 4 to 7 feet and does not substantially affect recreation. Therefore, effects on Lake Natoma recreation opportunities would be less than significant.</p>	<p>C Facilities would improve opportunities for water-dependent recreation, particularly rafting/boating, such that the river is made more accessible when flows are appropriate and/or the quality of rafting/boating is improved; or facilities would improve opportunities for water-enhanced recreation, such that the quality and visitation associated with recreation activity in the Parkway is increased.</p> <p>C Improvements would be consistent with the American River Parkway Plan.</p> <p>The final selection of facilities for improvement would occur during the 18-month preparation period of the Habitat Management Plan. Facilities would be developed as soon as feasible after completion of that plan, recognizing the need to assemble funding, secure facility approvals, and prepare designs.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.9-3: Reduced Folsom Reservoir Boating Opportunities.</b> Compared to base conditions, additional diversions by purveyors taking water from Folsom Reservoir and downstream under the WFP conditions would result in lower elevations of Folsom Reservoir. The declines would occur in more years than under base conditions, reducing the availability of boat ramps and marina wet</p>	<p>The WFP includes features intended to lessen potential environmental impacts on the Lower American River, which would also serve to decrease environmental effects to other resources. These mitigating features include water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, and conjunctive use of ground water and surface water. Adoption of the WFP</p>	significant

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>slips more often during the primary boating season (March - September). For instance, lake levels would decline below the 412-foot elevation necessary for marina wet slips 4 to 6 more years of the 70-year record in the summer (June through September), depending on the month. More frequently reduced lake elevations would result in a significant effect to boating opportunities on Folsom Reservoir.</p>	<p>with these features would reduce water surface elevation effects on Folsom Reservoir recreation. In addition, boating facility improvements would enhance boating access during periods of higher water to compensate for reduced availability of boat ramp and marina facilities from Water Forum Proposal diversions. Actions would occur in cooperation with the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) and would be consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (CDPR, 1978). Mitigation should also be consistent with the objectives of CDPR proposals for measures to mitigate lower lake levels from flood storage reoperation (Kranz, 1997). The actions could be added into the recreation section of the Habitat Management Plan as a means to implement them.</p> <p>One or more of the following recreation measures described below could be implemented in cooperation with the CDPR. Funding for the recreation measures may include money from within or outside the Water Forum Successor Effort. A number of agencies are involved in water resources and recreation facility decisions affecting Folsom Reservoir, so this recreation mitigation should be coordinated with other actions, as appropriate. Consequently, other agencies involved in Folsom Reservoir may participate in funding and/or implementation of recreation mitigation.</p> <p>e) <u>Boating Facilities to Increase Access and Use During Higher Water Periods</u>. Construction of boating facilities, consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area would increase boating access and use of the reservoir during higher water periods. To compensate for reduced availability of boating facilities during lower water periods, this measure would improve boating facilities for use when higher water conditions allow for</p>	

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>high-quality water recreation and the greater reservoir surface area availability; at higher water levels, visitation can be increased when the larger reservoir surface area can support more intensive use. Examples of potential boating facility improvements suggested by CDPR staff include boat parking and shore facilities at Dyke 8 or a launch ramp and dock at New York Cove (on the east side of the reservoir, north of Brown's Ravine). The final selection of facilities would occur in cooperation between the Water Forum Successor Effort and the CDPR.</p>	
	<p>f) <u>Improvement to the Marina Area.</u> Construction of facility improvements in the Brown's Ravine area would enhance the operation of the marina. Improvements would be consistent with the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan. The intent of these improvements would be to help enhance marina operations during periods of sufficiently high water to offset the reduced availability of wet slips. The final selection of facilities would occur in cooperation between the Water Forum Successor Effort, the operator of the marina, and the CDPR.</p>	
	<p>The improvements to recreation facilities on Folsom Reservoir will accomplish the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C Facilities serving higher water conditions will increase boating visitation to Folsom Reservoir when the surface area is large enough to support the increased use.</li> <li>C Marina facility improvements will help enhance operation of the marina when water level is high enough to support the wet slips.</li> <li>C Improvements are consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.</li> </ul>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>4.9-4: Reduced Availability of Folsom Reservoir Swimming Beaches.</b> Compared to the base conditions, additional diversions under the WFP would result in more frequent declines in lake elevation below useable swim beach levels during most of the primary swimming season (June, August, September). For example, in those months lake elevations remain within the 420 to 455-foot range where swim beaches are usable in 2 to 4 fewer years of the 70-year period with the WFP. Although the availability of beaches during the remaining months of the swim season (May and July) would not be affected, the overall effect of reduced lake elevations on the availability of Folsom Reservoir swim beaches would be significant.</p>	<p>The final selection of facilities for improvement would occur during an period following adoption of the Water Forum Proposal. Facilities would be developed as soon as feasible after completion of that plan, recognizing the need to assemble funding, secure facility approvals, and prepare designs.</p> <p>The WFP includes features intended to lessen potential environmental impacts on the Lower American River, which would also serve to decrease environmental effects to other resources. These mitigating features include water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, and conjunctive use of ground water and surface water. Adoption of the WFP with these features would reduce lake level effects on shoreline recreation and swimming. In addition, improvements to swimming or other shore recreation facilities that attract increased visitation to landside recreation areas around the reservoir should be implemented. Actions would occur in cooperation with the CDPR and would be consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area. Mitigation should also be consistent with the objectives of CDPR proposals for measures to mitigate lower lake levels for flood storage reoperation (Krantz, 1997). The actions could be added into the recreation section of the Habitat Management Plan as a means to implement them.</p> <p>One or more of the following landside recreation measures described below could be implemented in cooperation with the CDPR. Funding for the recreation measures may include money from within or outside the Water Forum Successor Effort. A number of agencies are involved in water resources and recreation facility decisions affecting Folsom Reservoir, so this recreation mitigation would be coordinated with other</p>	<p>significant</p>

---

---

**Table 2-2**  
**SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

---

**Impact Before Mitigation**

**Potential Mitigation Measures**

**Significance After Mitigation**

---

actions, as appropriate. Consequently, other agencies involved in Folsom Reservoir may participate in funding and/or implementation of recreation mitigation.

- a) Impoundments for Swimming. Construction of earthen dams at approximately 450 feet elevation at Beal's Point, Dyke 8, and/or Granite Bay would impound water for swimming opportunities close to day-use parking and concessionaires regardless of reservoir elevation. The CDPR has considered this concept as a way to provide dependable swimming opportunities throughout the summer. Water would need to be drained and replenished by pumps weekly. Because this concept would involve considerable engineering and construction, it could cause environmental effects and would be subject its own environmental review. The impoundments would also have to comply with health regulations for water contact use. As such, it is not yet certain whether this concept could be feasibly implemented at Folsom Reservoir.
  
- b) Landside Recreation Improvements. Construction of landside facilities supporting other recreation uses would help offset reduction in swimming opportunities. Facilities could include a bicycle trail connection included in the General Plan between Beal's Point and Granite Bay. Construction of this three-mile paved trail connection would substantially increase bicycle use, and therefore visitation, regardless of reservoir level, according to CDPR staff. The bicycle trail would improve access to shore facilities and remote beach areas. Also, the Water Forum Successor Effort could contribute to other shoreline recreation facility improvements, such as temporary parking, beach areas, or concession facilities

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>for low-water access or other facilities consistent with the General Plan.</p> <p>c) <u>Update of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area General Plan.</u> With changes in future reservoir levels, the General Plan could be updated to reflect the expected pattern of reservoir elevations. This could help update the recreation area's approach to attract and serve local and non-local recreation users. This effort would need to be led by CDPR with support of the Water Forum Successor participants.</p> <p>The improvements to landside recreation facilities on Folsom Reservoir would accomplish the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C Facilities could provide opportunities for swimming in low-water conditions below an elevation of 435 feet (approximate optimum swimming beach level); or facilities would increase landside recreation visitation to Folsom Reservoir with activities.</li> <li>C Improvements would be consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.</li> <li>C Recreation facility improvements would not conflict with habitat enhancement actions of the Habitat Management Plan.</li> </ul> <p>The final selection of facilities for improvement would occur during a period following adoption of the Water Forum Proposal. Facilities would be developed as soon as feasible after completion of that plan, recognizing the need to assemble funding, secure facility approvals, and prepare designs.</p>	

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>4.9-5: Shasta Lake Recreation Opportunities.</b> Compared to the base conditions, additional diversions under the WFP would result in some more frequent declines in lake elevation during the summer recreation season (May - September) which would decrease shoreline recreation use more often in late summer (August and September); however, the declines would not substantially reduce boat ramp availability or hinder boat-in camping activities. For instance, the number of years when all boat ramps are available would not be changed in any of the summer recreation season months. Altogether, the effect of WFP conditions on recreation opportunities of Shasta Lake during the May - September season are less than significant, compared to base conditions.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.9-6: Trinity Reservoir Recreation Opportunities.</b> Compared to the base conditions, additional diversions under the WFP would result in minimal declines in lake elevations in Trinity Reservoir during the summer recreation season (May - September). For example, reductions in mean monthly lake elevations would be no greater than 0.1 to 0.2 feet, depending on the month, which would not affect the availability of boat ramps at the reservoir. Consequently, with the minimal changes in lake elevations resulting from WFP diversions, no significant effect on Trinity Reservoir's recreation opportunities would occur.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.9-7: Recreation Opportunities on Whiskeytown and Keswick Reservoirs.</b> Whiskeytown and Keswick Reservoirs serve as regulating reservoirs, so while releases under WFP conditions would differ from base conditions, these differences would not substantially alter the existing seasonal pattern of lake elevations. Therefore, no substantial changes in recreation opportunities on Whiskeytown and Keswick Reservoirs would occur, resulting in a less-than-significant effect.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b><u>4.9-8: Recreation Impacts on the Upper Sacramento River.</u></b>            Compared to base conditions, in most years additional diversions under the WFP would not result in decreased flows in the upper Sacramento River during the summer recreation season (May through September). For example, during these months, flow downstream of Keswick Reservoir would be equal to or greater than the base condition in 59, 55, 41, 59, and 66 years of the 70-year record in May, June, July, August, and September, respectively. In years when flows are less than base conditions in these months, the difference would be insufficient to substantially reduce recreation opportunities. Therefore, changes in flow on the upper Sacramento River during summer recreation season would result in a less-than-significant effect on recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.9-9: Lower Sacramento River Recreation Opportunities.</u></b>            Compared to base conditions, in most years additional diversions under the WFP would not result in decreased flows in the lower Sacramento River during the summer recreation season (May through September). For example, during these months, flows at Freepoint would be equal to or greater than the base condition in 40, 38, 43, 51, and 48 years of the 70-record in May, June, July, August, and September, respectively. In years when flows are less than base conditions in these months, the reduction in flow would seldom be more than 1.0 percent, which would be insufficient to substantially reduce recreation opportunities. Also, substantial flow would remain in the river and tidal action would diminish the influence of the reduced flows on boating, fishing, and other water-dependent recreation activities. Therefore, changes in flow on the lower Sacramento River during summer recreation season would result in a less-than-significant effect on recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.9-10: Delta Recreation Opportunities.</u></b> Compared to base conditions, in most years additional diversions under the WFP</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>would not result in decreased inflows in the Delta during the summer recreation season (May through September). For example, during these months, flows at Freeport would be equal to or greater than the base condition in 40, 38, 43, 51, and 48 years of the 70-record in May, June, July, August, and September, respectively. In years when inflows are less than base conditions in these months, the reduction in flow would seldom be more than 1.0 percent, which would be insufficient to substantially reduce recreation opportunities. Also, substantial inflow to the Delta would remain and tidal action would diminish or overshadow the influence of the reduced flows on boating, fishing, and other water-dependent recreation activities. Therefore, changes in inflow to the Delta during summer recreation season would result in a less-than-significant effect on recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.9-11: Consistency with the American River Parkway Plan.</u></b> The WFP would be consistent with the American River Parkway Plan and no significant environmental impact related to conflict with plans and policies for the avoidance of environmental effects would occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.9-12: Consistency with Lower American River's Recreational River Designations.</u></b> While the WFP conditions would reduce flows available for recreation on the Lower American River during the summer months in a some additional years, adopting Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 would minimize the effect on recreation opportunities for rafting or boating during high recreation use periods. The Lower American River would retain substantial recreation value. The recreation values of the Lower American River would be protected to the maximum extent feasible and the WFP would be consistent with the State and Federal recreational river designations, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>LAND USE and GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS (Section 4.10)</b>		
<p><b>4.10-1: Land Use Impacts on Direct and Indirect Effect Study Areas</b> (i.e., in-stream and adjacent areas of Folsom Reservoir, Lake Natoma, the Lower American River, and water bodies on the CVP and SWP systems). The WFP does not define specific projects (e.g., diversion or conveyance structures, treatment facilities) that would affect land uses in the direct or indirect effect study areas. It does identify a list of projects (some of which are conceptual) required to implement the WFP, and these projects will be subject to independent project and environmental review. The WFP would not grant land use authority, nor does the Water Forum possess any power over land use decisions. Therefore, adoption of the WFP would result in less-than-significant land use impacts <i>within the direct and indirect effect study areas</i>.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.10-2: Land Use and Growth-Inducing Impact in the Water Service Study Area.</b> Implementation of the WFP would not directly alter land uses in the water service study area. The WFP is intended to provide a safe and reliable water supply for the region's economic health and planned development through the year 2030. Land use decisions would continue to be made by city and county government decision-makers with guidance provided by adopted General Plans. The WFP would accommodate substantial development, however, as it would remove water supplies as an obstacle to growth. Therefore, the WFP is considered to be growth-inducing, as defined by CEQA, and the resulting land use and growth impacts would be significant.</p>	<p>The water supply included in the WFP has been determined considering the planned growth for each jurisdiction within the water service study area; as such, the WFP is consistent with the growth parameters described each city and county General Plan. The General Plan of each jurisdiction includes policies and programs for the protection of the environment and, to the extent feasible, the avoidance or mitigation of significant effects on the environment from planned growth and development. During the normal course of each jurisdiction's implementation of its General Plan policies, feasible mitigation of significant impacts from planned growth and development would occur. Because mitigation of growth-related environmental impacts is in the purview of each city and county, through their existing land use authority, and because the Water Forum itself has no such authority, the WFP cannot feasibly provide for additional mitigation of</p>	significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>4.10-3: Consistency with General Plan Agricultural Land Use Policies.</b> The WFP would not result in the reduction or forfeiture of existing surface water entitlements, the reduction or diminution of any existing groundwater rights, nor would it provide water purveyors, the Water Forum, or the Water Forum Successor Effort with any land use authority. Water Forum Proposal would not alter (i.e., reduce) agricultural lands within the jurisdictions of the water service study area and, consequently, would result in a less-than-significant impact to agriculture.</p>	<p>growth-related land use and development environmental impacts.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	less-than-significant
<p><b>4.10-4: Consistency with General Plan Water Supply and Conservation Policies.</b> The Water Forum Proposal would not conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of local jurisdictions, as stated in their general plans and community plans. Rather, the WFP implements many of the General Plan policies directed at the provision of water within the water service study area jurisdictions. Consequently, the WFP would result in less-than-significant impacts to adopted environmental plans and goals of local jurisdictions.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>AESTHETICS (Section 4.11)</b>		
<p><b>4.11-1: Aesthetic Value of the Lower American River.</b> Compared to existing conditions, diversions accommodated by the WFP would not result in substantially reduced flows such that adverse visual impacts would occur. Nor would flows be reduced below that necessary to support riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat within the Lower American River corridor. Because WFP conditions would not result in the thinning of the riparian corridor, or the loss of valuable border zone vegetation and habitat, the</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>aesthetic effects of WFP conditions on the Lower American River are considered less than significant.</p>		
<p><b><u>4.11-2: Aesthetic Value of the Upper Sacramento River, Lower Sacramento River, and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.</u></b>            Compared to existing conditions, additional diversions under the WFP would not result in a substantial reductions in water flows such that adverse visual impacts would occur. Nor would flows be reduced below that necessary to support riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat within the upper and lower Sacramento River and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. For example, reductions in Sacramento River flows, under WFP conditions, would vary from base conditions by approximately 3% or less during the growing season months (March - October). Consequently, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.11-3: Aesthetic Value of Lake Natoma, Whiskeytown, and Keswick Reservoirs.</u></b> Compared to existing conditions, implementation of the WFP would not result in substantial changes in the frequency or magnitude of surface water elevation changes at these reservoirs. Consequently, the aesthetic quality of these reservoirs would not be expected to change substantially, relative to existing conditions. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>4.11-4: Aesthetic Value of Folsom Reservoir.</u></b> Compared to existing conditions, implementation of the WFP would result in mean monthly surface water elevation decreases of greater than 10 feet at Folsom Reservoir. However, because the frequency of such reductions would be minimal (less than 3 percent during a seventy year hydrologic cycle),the aesthetic effect of the WFP's reduction in surface water elevations at Folsom Reservoir is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b><u>4.11-5: Aesthetic Value of Trinity and Shasta Reservoirs.</u></b>            Compared to existing conditions, implementation of the WFP would result in mean monthly surface water elevation decreases of less than 10 feet at Trinity and Shasta reservoirs. For example, during the 70-year hydrologic period of record, surface water elevation reductions would range from 3.3 to 4.8 feet at Trinity Reservoir and from 2.6 to 4.6 feet Shasta Reservoir. Because reduction in surface water elevations at Trinity and Shasta Reservoirs would be less than 10 feet, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>CULTURAL RESOURCES (Section 4.12)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>4.12-1: Effect of Varying Water Levels on Cultural Resources in Folsom Reservoir.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in some variation in Folsom Reservoir elevations as compared to the Base Condition. This variation would not result in increased reservoir levels of sufficient magnitude to cause either <u>inundation</u> of previously exposed areas, or <u>exposure</u> of previously inundated sites, beyond that which is occurring under the Base Condition. However, implementation of the WFP would result in significantly more cycles of inundation and drawdown in the area between 360 and 395 ft msl; this increase would constitute a significant impact to sites within that zone.</p>	<p>The WFP hydrologic modeling data indicates that the project would have a significant impact on cultural sites and features within the reservoir pool, especially those located between the 360 ft msl and 395 ft msl elevations. Significant impacts would include the potential exposure of previously submerged sites to increased vandalism, recreation use, wave action, and the effects of repeated inundation and drawdown. Many prehistoric and historic sites have been recorded within the reservoir basin, most of which remain unevaluated. Only about half of the reservoir has been surveyed, and many other sites undoubtedly exist in the unsurveyed areas.</p> <p>In 1994, Far Western and JRP Historical Consultants prepared a Research Design as part of SAFCA's Folsom Re-operation Study. That document included all of the reservoir basin between the 390-foot and the 466-foot contours. The Research Design provides, among other components, summaries of the known cultural resources within the study area; research issues applicable to those resources; and recommendations for evaluating the sites, protecting them from further damage, and mitigating unavoidable impacts.</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b><u>4.12-2: Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower American River Bank Near Nimbus Dam.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in American River flows downstream of Nimbus Dam that differ somewhat from those under the Base Condition. For nearly all months of the year, mean monthly river flows under the WFP would be lower than under the Base Condition, meaning that no new areas of the riverbank would be inundated. Because no significant sites are expected to have survived within the riverbed itself, these lower flows would not expose previously submerged (and intact) cultural resources. Therefore, changes in river flows from the WFP would have a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources along the river near Nimbus Dam.</p>	<p>Checklists are included for evaluation of various types of sites. All unevaluated sites within the reservoir that fall within the direct impact zone of the WFP could be given additional study, using this Research Design as a guideline. Also, unsurveyed portions of the direct impact zone could be surveyed for cultural resources, as water levels permit; any additional sites and features also may require evaluation and mitigation. The appropriate agencies (i.e., Bureau of Reclamation, US Army Corp of Engineers, and the State Office of Historic Preservation) could decide that evaluation and mitigation of a <i>representative sample</i> of the sites is sufficient, although this cannot be determined without comprehensive consultation with those agencies. Recent conversations with archaeologists at the Bureau of Reclamation's Sacramento office suggest that such sampling would be acceptable to that agency.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>4.12-3: Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower American River Near the Mouth.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in American River flows</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>at the mouth that differ somewhat from those under the Base Condition. For nearly all months of the year, mean monthly river flows under the WFP would be the same as or lower than under the Base Condition, meaning that no new areas of the riverbank would be submerged. Because no significant sites are expected to have survived historically within the riverbed itself, these lower flows would not expose previously submerged (and intact) cultural resources. Therefore, changes in river flows from the WFP would have a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources along the river near the mouth.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>4.12-4: Effect of Varying Flows/River Stage on Cultural Resources Along the Lower Sacramento River Bank Near Freeport.</u></b> Implementation of the WFP would result in Sacramento River flows at Freeport that differ slightly from those under the Base Condition. However, these variations are not of sufficient frequency or magnitude to cause either significant <u>exposure</u> or <u>inundation</u> of cultural resources and thus represent a less-than-significant impact to cultural resources.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b><u>SOILS and GEOLOGY (Section 4.13)</u></b>		
<p><b><u>4.13-1: Changes in Geologic Substructures.</u></b> While the WFP itself would not require ground disturbing activities, implementation of the WFP over time, has the potential to substantially change geologic substructures through future construction activities associated with new water facilities (i.e., river intakes, water treatment plants, pump stations, well fields and conveyance pipelines). With the construction of these facilities, potential changes to subsurface geology could affect human safety. However, development and planning of future water facilities projects would consider geotechnical studies and implement design recommendations, as appropriate, in order to minimize any hazardous geologic changes to the underlying substrata. Therefore,</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-2  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>changes in geologic substructures are considered less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.13-2: Exposure to Major Geologic Hazards.</b> While implementation of the WFP would not result in any undue exposure to major geologic hazards, construction of future projects associated with the implementation of the WFP, has the potential to expose people or property to major geologic hazards, including unstable slopes, ground failure, subsidence, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. Given the relative stability of the geologic subsurface environment in the greater Sacramento area, and the necessary geotechnical/soils studies and proper design practices that would be required in all future projects, exposure to geologic hazards is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.13-3: Increased Soil Erosion by Wind or Water.</b> The WFP itself would not involve any construction activities that would disturb surface soils and thereby induce either wind or water erosion. However, construction activities related to future water projects associated with the implementation of the WFP could lead to short-term soil disturbing activities. With the availability of project-specific siting investigations, soils/geotechnical studies and the implementation of any necessary project-specific mitigation measures, and increased soil erosion is considered to represent a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>4.13-4: Loss of Soil Cover.</b> While the WFP itself would not include activities that would promote soil loss, future projects could result in land conversion and subsequent soil loss. Certain project facilities where situated in open terrain, may result in the permanent loss of some soil cover. However, future projects would have to evaluate potential soil loss impacts and mitigate for any identified significant effects. Soil loss associated with the WFP is considered to represent a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

## 2.5 summary of CUMULATIVE impacts

An analysis of cumulative impacts considers the combined effects of the proposed project, other past and present projects, and “reasonably foreseeable probable future projects” (State CEQA Guidelines §15355). In the case of the Water Forum Proposal, this involves attempting to foresee related projects occurring over the long-term future. The Water Forum Proposal would be implemented over the next three decades. During this same time period, it is expected that many other actions will be implemented that will affect the environmental conditions of the project’s direct and indirect study areas.

### 2.5.1 ANALYSIS OF ONE FUTURE SCENARIO FOR CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

A large degree of speculation and uncertainty exists when attempting to characterize the study area 30 years into the future, particularly recognizing the dynamic nature of decisions about water supply and resource protection in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River system. Therefore, it is difficult to define any one scenario as the reasonably foreseeable probable future. Nonetheless, to fulfill the requirements of State CEQA Guidelines §15355 to address future cumulative conditions, the programmatic analysis of this WFP uses one scenario as a good faith effort to assess future cumulative potential effects. The scenario was developed after a year of extensive discussions between the Water Forum technical consultants and the USBR and USFWS. Given all of the competing demands for water and water resource limitations, one outcome that is not speculative is the occurrence of significant impacts of some type in the future.

The future scenario for this EIR consists of past, present, and possible future projects producing related or cumulative impacts. The cumulative condition, therefore, is defined for this EIR as the WFP and three other possible future actions or sets of actions that could be quantified, including:

***Increased Trinity River Flows.*** For modeling and analysis purposes, the Water Forum EIR assumes that Trinity River flows will be increased in accordance with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation’s (USBR) recent policy direction. Flows are proposed to be increased from existing levels to 390,000 acre-feet per year in drier years to 750,000 acre-feet per year in wetter years, thereby reducing exports to the Sacramento River.

***East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) Supplemental Water Supply Project.*** EBMUD’s proposed project, for this analysis includes diversion of up to 112,000 acre-feet per year of American River water subject to deficiencies imposed by the Central Valley Project.

***Increased Water Demands.*** For modeling and analysis purposes, the Water Forum EIR assumes that increased water demands by State Water Project (SWP) contractors, Central Valley Project (CVP) contractors, and other Sacramento Valley water users will occur. Increased demand volumes are based on projections by USBR and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR).

The WFP EIR does not serve as the environmental document for the above actions. The impacts of each of these actions would be evaluated in project-specific environmental documentation and, where appropriate, alternatives and mitigation measures recommended to reduce significant effects.

### **2.5.2 UNQUANTIFIABLE ASPECTS OF FUTURE CONDITIONS**

In addition to uncertainty surrounding the volume of diversions in the future (i.e., 2030), many efforts are currently underway to address unfavorable conditions in the Sacramento River and Bay-Delta that cannot currently be quantified. Populations of fish species such as Delta smelt, steelhead and winter-run chinook salmon have declined over the past decades to the point that they have been listed as threatened or endangered, and other species such as fall-run and spring-run chinook salmon have been proposed for listing. At the same time, variable water availabilities, and environmental requirements have resulted in water delivery deficiencies imposed on SWP and CVP on water contractors.

For these reasons the state and federal governments, in cooperation with local organizations, have begun implementing environmental restoration programs to reverse these biological declines. Since 1996, approximately \$100 million has been expended on restoration projects, such as improving fish screens and restoring habitat. Over the next 30 years over \$1.5 billion will be spent on additional improvements.

Programs underway or planned to improve Sacramento River system and Bay-Delta fisheries and habitats include the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP), and Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

The effectiveness of these programs to improve Sacramento River and Bay-Delta conditions, however, is not guaranteed. In addition, there could be future environmental stressors that cannot be predicted. For instance, introduction of non-native species into aquatic habitats could have additional adverse impacts. It is not possible to speculate in the analysis how any of these considerations could affect cumulative impacts.

### **Prospects for Additional or Reallocated Water Supply**

Section 3406(b)(3) of the CVPIA directs the Department of the Interior to acquire additional water supplies. Specific options identified in that section include: improvements in or modifications to the operations of the project; water banking; conservation; transfers; conjunctive use; and temporary and permanent land fallowing, including purchase, lease, and option of water rights, and associated agricultural land. In addition, water bank operations can reallocate water in drier years to alleviate water delivery and environmental impacts. It is speculative at this time to predict the success of projects to acquire additional or reallocate existing water resources. It is also recognized that in the future USBR and other agencies outside the Water Forum will make numerous operational decisions based on conditions existing at the time. Therefore, the cumulative impacts analyses in this EIR are based on one set of assumptions

as to how USBR would operate CVP facilities if no additional water supply is developed, and no water is reallocated.

### **Insufficiency of Water Supply for Cumulative Future Needs**

The cumulative impact analysis indicates that unless new water is developed or water is reallocated, there will be insufficient water for USBR to meet some of its contractual and environmental obligations in the future.

The decrease in Shasta Reservoir storage and reduction in flow below Keswick Dam is a surrogate for the volume of additional water that would have to be available in the future for environmental purposes to approximate Base Conditions. A decrease in Shasta Reservoir storage results in a reduced flow requirement below Keswick Dam, because flow requirements are based on Shasta Reservoir storage levels. Over the simulated 70-year hydrologic period Shasta Reservoir carryover storage was reduced by about 75,000 AF and flow below Keswick Dam was reduced by about 30,000 AF on an average annual basis. Combined, this represents an approximate average annual deficit of 105,000 AF, relative to the Base Condition. During the 1928 to 1934 critical period, Shasta Reservoir storage declined an average of 75,000 AF per year, resulting in a total critical period storage deficit of about one-half million AF. As a consequence of lower storage, the future cumulative simulation prescribes an average annual reduction in flow volume below Keswick Dam of about 15,000 AF, or about 100,000 AF over the critical period. Combined, the decrease in Shasta Reservoir storage and reduction in flow volume below Keswick Dam represent an annual average water deficit of about 90,000 AF and a total deficit approximating 600,000 AF for the future cumulative critical period relative to the Base Condition.

Due to the increased overall demands on the system, future cumulative condition hydrologic modeling indicates that lower deliveries to all categories of CVP contractors could occur in the future, and be most significant in the dry and driest years. Compared to the Base Condition, less water would be delivered to CVP contractors in about 30% of the years, and to SWP contractors in about 30% of the years.

CVP and SWP contract demands associated with future development will be higher than current demands. Even under the Base Condition full demands frequently are not met. One method to generally illustrate the water supply deficit to water contractors under the future cumulative condition is to estimate the amount of water associated with future delivery deficiencies if the same percentage of full demand was delivered in the future as was delivered under the Base Condition. This estimation indicates that over the 70-year hydrologic period simulated, combined CVP/SWP water delivery deficits could exceed 400,000 AF on an average annual basis. During the 1928 to 1934 critical period, combined CVP/SWP water delivery deficits approach an average of nearly 400,000 AF per year, representing a total critical period deficit of nearly 2½ million AF.

USBR remains committed to taking all necessary actions that will allow water delivery and environmental obligations to be met. The Water Forum does not recommend or advocate not meeting any environmental or water delivery obligations. Again, the analysis in this EIR is based

on a reasonable set of assumptions as to how the system would be operated if no additional water supply is developed or no water is reallocated. The EIR discusses potential cumulative effects, given the uncertainties recognized above.

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>GROUNDWATER (Section 6.2)</b>		
<b>6.2-1: Groundwater Quality.</b> Because groundwater pumping within Sacramento County does not change between the two comparative future conditions, the impacts identified with the implementation of the WFP do not change from those described in Section 4.2. Under the future cumulative condition, deterioration of groundwater quality would represent a less-than-significant impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>6.2-2: Movement of Groundwater Contaminants.</b> Under the future cumulative condition, movement of groundwater contaminants would not increase beyond that described for the WFP. This would be a less-than-significant cumulative effect.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>6.2-3: Land Subsidence .</b> Under the future cumulative condition, land subsidence would not occur beyond that described for the WFP. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>6.2-4: Reduced Efficiency of Wells.</b> Under the future cumulative condition, efficiency of wells would not change beyond that described for the WFP. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>WATER SUPPLY (Section 6.3)</b>		
<b>6.3-1: Decrease in Deliveries to SWP Customers.</b> Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that increased deliveries to SWP customers of between 20,000 and 1,240,000 acre-feet would occur in about 49 years; and, decreased water deliveries to SWP customers of between 110,000 and 1,210,000 acre-feet would occur in about 20 years of the 70-year record. Average annual SWP	Development of additional water supplies by the SWP could reduce impacts to SWP deliveries.	significant

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>deliveries would increase by about 350,000 acre-feet. The delivery reduction in 20 years would represent a significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>Development of additional water supplies by the CVP could reduce impacts to CVP deliveries.</p>	<p>significant</p>
<p><b>6.3-2: Decrease in Deliveries to CVP Customers.</b> Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that increased deliveries to CVP contractors of up to 670,000 acre-feet would occur in about 49 years of the 70-year record; and, decreased water deliveries of between 10,000 and 520,000 acre-feet in about 20 years of the 70-year record. Average annual CVP deliveries would increase by about 110,000 acre-feet. The delivery reduction in 20 years would represent a <b>significant cumulative impact</b>.</p>		
<p><b>WATER QUALITY (Section 6.4)</b></p>		
<p><b>6.4-1: Seasonal Changes to Water Quality in Folsom Reservoir, Lake Natoma, and the Lower American River.</b> Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that Folsom Reservoir storage and Lower American River flows would be reduced more frequently and/or by greater magnitudes as compared to the WFP alone, while constituent loading to these waterbodies would be expected to increase somewhat. Project-level urban runoff and stormwater discharge mitigation measures pursuant to federal, state, and local regulations are expected to continue to be required for new growth to occur. With the exception of water temperature (see Section 6.5.3), program-level assessment indicated that any impacts to water quality from reduced dilution and increased constituent loading would be minor, and would not be expected to cause State or federal water quality standards, objectives or criteria to be more frequently exceeded, relative to existing conditions. This would be a <b>less-than-significant cumulative impact</b>.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>6.4-2: Seasonal Changes to Sacramento River and Delta Water Quality.</b> Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that Sacramento River flows would be reduced more frequently and/or by greater magnitudes compared to that which would occur due to the additional diversions under the WFP alone, and constituent loading to the Sacramento River also would be expected to increase. Project-level water quality mitigation and ongoing water quality management plans and programs are expected to continue to be required such that State and federal water quality standards, objectives and criteria would not be exceeded on a more frequent basis than under existing conditions. However, substantial uncertainty exists with regard to seasonal changes in Sacramento River flow, constituent loading, and the extent and effectiveness of project-level water quality mitigation and management measures in the future, all of which are beyond the Water Forum’s control. Because the potential for degradation of water quality in the future depends on uncertain future policy decisions and actions, this would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>Changes to Sacramento River and Delta water quality would be an indirect impact of increased urban development facilitated, in part, by the additional diversions of surface and groundwater defined in the WFP. Water quality mitigation measures will be developed for specific projects as they occur in the future. Responsibility for this mitigation lies with the land use planning authorities and individual project proponents, and is beyond the Water Forum’s control. Water quality mitigation anticipated to occur with planned growth is addressed in the Sacramento County and other regional General Plans. In addition, the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District, which operates the SRWTP, is currently updating its Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plan Master Plan, and plans to update this document every 5 years in the future.</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>
<p><b>FISHERIES RESOURCES AND AQUATIC HABITAT (Section 6.5)</b></p>		
<p><b>6.5-1: Impacts to Folsom Reservoir’s Coldwater Fisheries</b> The cumulative impacts analysis is based on a set of assumptions about future cumulative conditions and does not assume any development of additional Sacramento River water supplies. Under this set of assumptions, the analysis indicates that Folsom Reservoir storage would be reduced by 10% or more, relative to the Base Condition, occasionally during some months of the April through November period. However, anticipated reductions in reservoir storage would not be expected to adversely affect the reservoir’s coldwater fisheries because: 1) coldwater habitat would remain</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>available within the reservoir during all months of all years; 2) physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations; and 3) anticipated seasonal reductions in storage would not be expected to adversely affect the primary prey species utilized by coldwater fishes. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>Through plantings and related activities, encourage existing willow and other terrestrial vegetative communities to become established at lower reservoir elevations. Doing so would provide greater availability of physical structure for warmwater fish spawning and rearing in the future when spring reservoir elevations are lower than under current conditions.</p>	<p><b>potentially significant</b></p>
<p><b>6.5-2: Impacts to Folsom Reservoir’s Warmwater Fisheries.</b> Under the set of assumptions used for the cumulative impacts analysis, Folsom Reservoir storage (and thus water levels) could frequently be reduced during the critical warmwater fish spawning and rearing period (i.e., March through September), which could reduce the availability of littoral (nearshore) habitat containing vegetation. Modeling output indicates that long-term average reductions in littoral habitat availability of up to approximately 50% could occur in September. Reductions in littoral habitat availability of this magnitude could result in increased predation on young-of-the-year warmwater fishes, thereby reducing long-term initial year-class strength of warmwater fishes. Unless willows and other nearshore vegetation become established at lower reservoir elevations in the future in response to seasonal reductions in water levels, long-term year class production of warmwater fishes would be reduced. Reduced littoral habitat availability would be a potentially significant future cumulative impact to Folsom Reservoir warmwater fisheries.</p>	<p>Artificial habitat structures (e.g., artificial synthetic structures, submerged brush and debris, fish cribs, etc.) would provide structure in littoral habitats used by warmwater fishes for spawning and early lifestage rearing. Because the majority of the reservoir’s warmwater fishes spawn in shallow water habitats (i.e., generally less than 10 feet deep), artificial structures would be placed at reservoir elevations that would likely be used by these fishes for spawning and rearing. The location and number of artificial structures placed within the reservoir would increase in proportion to the loss of littoral habitat over time. Implementing habitat structures would help minimize the effects to Folsom Reservoir’s warmwater fisheries that would be expected to result from increased diversions and resultant reduced water surface elevations in Folsom Reservoir.</p>	<p><b>potentially significant</b></p>
<p>While acknowledging operational constraints due to flood control, power production and diversions, work cooperatively with USBR operators to minimize the frequency with which</p>	<p><b>potentially significant</b></p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.5-3: Impacts to The Warmwater and Coldwater Fisheries of Lake Natoma.</b> Under the specific set of cumulative assumptions, the analysis indicates that operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir</p>	<p>reservoir elevation changes potentially resulting in nest flooding/dewatering events would occur. Monthly/weekly rates of reservoir elevation change will be documented. This information will be compared to timing and average depth of spawning for key nest-building warmwater species in Folsom Reservoir to estimate probabilities of nest flooding/dewatering events.</p> <p>This measure will be implemented to the degree reasonable and feasible based on its integration into the Habitat Management Program.</p> <p>Place artificial structures in the reservoir to compensate for loss of littoral habitats containing natural structure (e.g., inundated willows). The abundance of representative warmwater species will be monitored periodically through creel surveys and/or through catch-per-unit effort (CPUE) rates for tournament anglers to determine the extent to which warmwater fish utilize the structures. The extent to which this mitigation is to be implemented will be based on the results of these surveys. Frequency and timing of potential nest flooding/dewatering events that facilitate meeting current and future warmwater fish management goals will be determined by CDFG reservoir biologists. More specific performance criteria will be developed in the Habitat Management Program Plan.</p> <p>All three activities described above would, to the degree reasonable and feasible, be implemented, monitored, and maintained throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>would have minimal, if any, impact to Lake Natoma’ s seasonal storage, rates of elevation fluctuation, or temperature. Any changes to these lake parameters that could occur under the future cumulative condition would not adversely affect the lake’ s warmwater or coldwater fisheries. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>6.5-4: Temperature Impacts to Nimbus Fish Hatchery Operations and Fish Production.</b> Under the specific set of cumulative assumptions, the analysis indicates that operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir would generally have little effect on May temperatures below Nimbus Dam, but would typically result in equivalent or colder temperatures during the June through September period, relative to the Base Condition. On a long-term basis, the frequent and measurable temperature reductions that would occur during the June through September period (when hatchery temperatures reach seasonal highs annually) would more than offset the infrequent adverse impacts resulting from increased temperature. This would potentially benefit long-term hatchery operations and resultant fish production. Overall, this would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>6.5-5: Fall-run Chinook Salmon.</b> The cumulative impacts analysis is based on a set of assumptions about future cumulative conditions and does not assume any development of additional Sacramento River water supplies. Under this set of assumptions, operations of Folsom Dam and Reservoir would result in periods of reduced flows in the lower American River during the October through December spawning period, when flows under the Base Condition would be 2,500 cfs or less. Further flow reductions occurring at already low flow levels could result in increased redd superimposition and eventual lower year-class strength. Improved water temperatures (resulting from a Folsom Dam urban water intake structure and optimal coldwater pool management) and</p>	<p>The following actions would be implemented as part of the HME, which will be adopted as an integral component of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation.</u> The Water Forum Successor Effort and the USBR would work together with Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and the USFWS to augment Lower American River flows, particularly during the spawning period during years when impacts would occur. This measure would be implemented (within the constraints of water availability) during dry and critically dry years. The primary source of water for augmenting flows would be the</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>improved early lifestage survival will benefit chinook salmon spawning success, as well as other lifestages. However, because of the broad, programmatic nature of the WFP, the extent to which these actions (combined with other future actions such as spawning gravel management, revised flow ramping rate criteria, etc.) will interact to counterbalance flow reductions is uncertain, as is the manner in which these actions will be implemented, managed and coordinated without a comprehensive Habitat Management Program Plan for the Lower American River. Consequently, the overall effect of 2030 w/ WFP on chinook salmon year-class strength also is uncertain and, therefore, is considered to represent a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>purchase of American River water from upstream reservoirs operated by PCWA.</p> <p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of chinook salmon due to redd dewatering (fall and winter) and fry and juvenile stranding (winter and spring), especially during periods of low flow. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving spawning and incubation success, which, in turn, would lead to an overall increase in annual production of chinook salmon. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to chinook salmon.</p> <p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Restore wetland/slough complexes occurring within habitat transitional zones between river channels, shoreline, and upland habitats. Restoration would involve grading areas for the appropriate elevations and hydrology, as well as planting appropriate vegetation, to achieve desired habitat characteristics. Because wetland/slough complexes are used by juvenile chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration, restoration and maintenance of these complexes would increase the quantity, and possibly the quality, of rearing habitat available to juvenile chinook salmon. Thus, this action could improve juvenile rearing success prior to emigration, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of chinook salmon. This action would off-set, in part, potential temperature-related impacts to juvenile steelhead.</p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Most large woody debris has been, and continues to be, removed from the Lower American River by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to reduce potential hazards to recreationists. Discontinuation of this action in select reaches of the river would allow woody debris to accumulate. Instream woody cover is important for juvenile chinook salmon rearing as it provides structure that can be utilized to escape fish and avian predators. It also provides microhabitats with reduced current velocities where juvenile chinook salmon can feed more effectively. Increasing the amount of instream woody debris at specific sites could improve juvenile rearing success prior to emigration, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	
	<p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u> SRA habitat can be restored along the Lower American River by constructing terraces along shorelines and planting terraces with appropriate herbaceous and woody vegetation. SRA habitat provides feeding and holding areas, escape cover, and local temperature refugia for juvenile chinook salmon. Development and implementation of a shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management program would facilitate improving rearing habitat. Thus, protecting and restoring SRA habitat could improve juvenile rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	
	<p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management/Maintenance</u>. Improve spawning habitat in the Lower American River by breaking up and redistributing coarse subsurface deposits and reducing compaction and embeddedness which reduces gravel</p>	

**Table 2-3**  
**SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>permeability. Development and implementation of a gravel management program for the Lower American River would facilitate improving spawning habitat for chinook salmon and reducing the deterioration of existing spawning gravel. This habitat improvement would be expected to increase the amount of available spawning habitat, thereby contributing to higher overall spawning and incubation success, and therefore chinook salmon production, annually. This action would off-set, in part, flow-related impacts to juvenile chinook salmon.</p>	
	<p>Performance Criteria:</p> <p>a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation</u>. Increase flows particularly during the period during dry and critically dry years to the maximum extent feasible, relative to non-augmented conditions. To assess whether flow augmentation is reducing flow-related impacts, flows would be monitored in the Lower American River.</p> <p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Reduce the frequency of large, rapid flow-reduction events throughout the year, particularly during the fall spawning and incubation period.</p> <p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Increase the amount of wetland/slough complex habitat in the Lower American River that is used by early life stages of chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration.</p> <p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Increase the amount of woody debris within areas of the Lower American River channel that is used by early life stages of chinook salmon for rearing prior to emigration.</p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. Protect existing, and increase to the extent feasible, the amount of shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the Lower American River.</p>	
	<p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management</u>. Restore armored gravels to conditions that will encourage chinook salmon to use restored areas for spawning.</p>	
	<p>Timing:</p>	
	<p>a) <u>Dry Year Flow Augmentation</u>. Flow augmentation would occur during the spawning period October through December, during dry and critically dry years. This measure would be implemented, as necessary, throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	
	<p>b) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Flow fluctuation criteria would be developed and implemented for the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	
	<p>c) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u>. Wetland/Slough complex restoration/management would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement, as warranted by the success of initial projects to be initiated during the first two years of the Agreement.</p>	
	<p>d) <u>Instream Cover (woody debris)</u>. Instream cover (woody debris) would be allowed to accumulate in the Lower American River throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p>	
	<p>e) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. Shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management</p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.5-6: Lower American River Steelhead.</b> Under the cumulative analysis set of assumptions, flow reductions anticipated to occur during the April through September period would reduce the amount of juvenile rearing habitat in most years. The analysis also indicates that the 69-year average temperature at Nimbus Dam and Watt Avenue for the May through September period would decrease up to about 1 °F. Although measurable temperature increases could occur in up to 10% of the years during this period, measurable temperature decreases could occur from over 30% to 95% of the time during some months of this period. Because steelhead in the Lower American River are believed to be more limited by summer rearing temperatures than flows, the frequent and substantial temperature reductions would be expected to offset the flow reductions. Consequently, the combined temperature and flow changes under the 2030 w/ WFP would not be expected to adversely affect the long-term population trends of steelhead in the Lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement, as warranted by the success of initial projects to be implemented within the first two years of the Agreement.</p> <p>f) <u>Spawning Habitat Management.</u> Spawning habitat management would be conducted throughout the effective period of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	less-than-significant
<p><b>6.5-7: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to Splittail (February through May).</b> Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, the 2030 w/ WFP would typically reduce, to some degree, the amount of riparian vegetation inundated between RM 8 and 9 (which serves as an index for the lower portion of the river) under the Base Condition. However, with few exceptions,</p>	<p>The following actions would be implemented as part of the HME, which will be adopted as an integral component of the Water Forum Agreement.</p> <p>a) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u> Restore wetland/slough complexes occurring within habitat</p>	potentially significant

**Table 2-3**  
**SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>substantial amounts of inundated riparian vegetation would remain under the 2030 w/WFP in years when such habitat would occur under the Base Condition. In addition, flow changes under the 2030 w/WFP would have little effect on the availability of in-channel spawning habitat availability, or the amount of potential spawning habitat available from the mouth up to RM 5 – the reach of the river influenced by Sacramento River stage. The analysis also indicates that the frequency with which suitable temperatures for splittail spawning below Watt Avenue would not change substantially under the 2030 w/WFP, relative to the Base Condition. Given the uncertainty as to the magnitude and extent of splittail spawning in the Lower American River, and the actual amount of potential spawning habitat at specific flow rates throughout the river, the effects of flow reductions from the February through May period also are uncertain and, therefore, represent a potentially significant impact. This would be a potentially significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>transitional zones between river channels, shoreline, and upland habitats. Restoration would involve grading areas for the appropriate elevations and hydrology, as well as planting appropriate vegetation, to achieve desired habitat characteristics. Because wetland/slough complexes are used by splittail for spawning, restoration and maintenance of these complexes would increase the quantity, and possibly the quality, of spawning habitat available to splittail. Wetland/slough complex restoration/maintenance would reduce flow-related impacts to splittail spawning.</p> <p>b) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u>. SRA habitat can be restored along the Lower American River by constructing terraces along shorelines and planting terraces with appropriate herbaceous and woody vegetation. SRA habitat provides spawning and rearing areas for splittail. Development and implementation of a shaded riverine aquatic habitat protection/management program would facilitate increasing splittail spawning and rearing habitat availability within the Lower American River. Thus, protecting and restoring SRA habitat could improve splittail spawning and juvenile rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p> <p>c) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of splittail due to fry and juvenile stranding during the February through May period. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving early life-stage rearing</p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.5-8: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to American Shad (May and June).</b> Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, flow reductions anticipated to occur during the May through June period would increase the frequency with which mean monthly flows at the mouth would be below the target attraction flow of 3,000 cfs by about 3 to 4%. Flow reductions under the 2030 w/WFP in May and June could reduce the number of adult shad</p>	<p>success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p> <p>Performance Criteria:</p> <p>a) <u>Wetland/Slough Complex Restoration/Maintenance</u> Increase the amount of wetland/slough complex habitat in the Lower American River that is used by splittail for spawning and rearing.</p> <p>b) <u>Shaded Riverine Aquatic Habitat Protection/Management</u> Protect existing, and increase to the extent feasible, the amount of shaded riverine aquatic habitat within the Lower American River.</p> <p>c) <u>Flow Fluctuation Criteria</u>. Develop and implement flow fluctuation (i.e., ramping) criteria for the operation of Folsom and Nimbus dams that would reduce the frequency with which rapid flow fluctuations occur in the river. Reducing the occurrence of large, rapid flow reductions would help to minimize losses of splittail due to fry and juvenile stranding during the February through May period. Flow fluctuation criteria would contribute to improving early life-stage rearing success, thereby contributing to an overall increase in annual production of splittail. This action would off-set, in part, potential flow-related impacts to splittail.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>attracted into the river during a few years. However, because American shad spawn opportunistically where suitable conditions are found, potentially attracting fewer adults spawners into the Lower American River in some years would not be expected to adversely impact annual American shad production within the Sacramento River system. Furthermore, direct impacts to the Lower American River sport fishery would be less than substantial in most years. In addition, the frequency with which suitable temperatures for American shad spawning would exist would not differ substantially between the 2030 w/WFP and the Base Condition. Consequently, the combined flow and temperature changes under 2030 w/WFP would not be expected to adversely affect the long-term population trends of American shad in the Lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>6.5-9: Flow- and Temperature-Related Impacts to the Striped Bass Sport Fishery (May and June).</u></b> Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, flow reductions anticipated to occur during the May through June period would increase the frequency with which mean monthly flows at the mouth would be below the target attraction flow of 1,500 cfs by about 1 to 10%. However, flows at the mouth that are believed to be sufficient to maintain the striped bass fishery would be met or exceeded in most years during this period. The frequency with which suitable temperatures for juvenile striped bass rearing in the Lower American River would differ little between the 2030 w/ WFP and the Base Condition during May and June. Consequently, the combined temperature and flow changes under the 2030 w/ WFP would not be expected to adversely affect the long-term of the striped bass fishery in the lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b><u>6.5-10: Impacts to Shasta Reservoir' s Coldwater Fisheries.</u></b>            Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, substantial reductions in reservoir storage would occur occasionally throughout the April through November period of the year. However, because physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations within the reservoir, and because anticipated changes in seasonal storage would not be expected to result in substantial adverse effects on the primary prey base utilized by the reservoir's coldwater fish populations, seasonal reductions in storage expected to occur under 2030 w/ WFP would not significantly affect Shasta Reservoir's coldwater fisheries. This would represent a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>6.5-11: Impacts to Trinity Reservoir' s Coldwater Fisheries.</u></b>            Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, substantial reductions in reservoir storage would occur occasionally throughout the April through November period of the year. However, because physical habitat availability is not believed to be among the primary factors limiting coldwater fish populations within the reservoir, and because anticipated changes in seasonal storage would not be expected to result in substantial adverse effects on the primary prey base utilized by the reservoir's coldwater fish populations, seasonal reductions in storage expected to occur under 2030 w/ WFP would not substantially affect Trinity Reservoir's coldwater fisheries. This would represent a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>6.5-12: Impacts to Shasta Reservoir' s Warmwater Fisheries</u></b>            Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, the 70-year average amount of littoral habitat available to warmwater fishes would be reduced by about 11 to 36% during the July through September period (which are the initial rearing months for the reservoir's warmwater fishes of management concern), with even more substantial reductions in reservoir littoral habitat availability in some years during these months. Rates of elevation fluctuation</p>	<p>No feasible measures are available. It is beyond the purview of the Water Forum to independently mitigate this impact. The degree of impact will largely depend on future CVP operations. As such, the ability to mitigate lies with the USBR and will depend on those future operations.</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>would not change substantially under the 2030 w/ WFP, relative to the Base Condition. However, seasonal changes in 70-year average reservoir littoral habitat under the 2030 w/ WFP would be of sufficient magnitude to potentially affect long-term, average initial year-class strength of the warmwater fish populations of management concern. Reduced littoral habitat availability would be a potentially significant future cumulative impact to Shasta Reservoir warmwater fisheries.</p>	<p>No feasible measures are available. It is beyond the purview of the Water Forum to independently mitigate this impact. The degree of impact will largely depend on future CVP operations. As such, the ability to mitigate lies with the USBR and will depend on those future operations.</p>	<p><b>potentially significant</b></p>
<p><b>6.5-13: Impacts to Trinity Reservoir's Warmwater Fisheries</b> Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, littoral habitat availability would be reduced by about 10 to about 20% during the March through September period, with substantial reductions in littoral habitat availability occurring frequently throughout period. On the average, the 70-year average littoral habitat would be reduced by nearly 20% from July through September. The potential for nest dewatering events to occur in Trinity Reservoir would not change substantially under the 2030 w/ WFP during the March through July spawning period. However, changes in the availability of littoral habitat under the 2030 w/ WFP would potentially result in adverse affects to the initial establishment of warmwater fish year-classes. Reduced littoral habitat availability would be a potentially significant future cumulative impact to Trinity Reservoir warmwater fisheries.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p><b>less-than-significant</b></p>
<p><b>6.5-14: Impacts to Keswick Reservoir Fisheries.</b> Under the cumulative impact assumptions, hydrologic conditions with the 2030 w/ WFP would have little, if any, effect on seasonal storage, elevation, and temperature of Keswick Reservoir. Any minor changes in storage, elevation, or temperature that could occur would not substantially affect the reservoir's fishery resources. This would constitute a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p><b>less-than-significant</b></p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b><u>6.5-15: Flow-Related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries.</u></b>            Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, the 70-year average flows released from Keswick Dam would not be substantially reduced during any month of the year. The analysis indicates that flow reductions of more than 10% would occur occasionally during some months and infrequently during others under 2030 w/ WFP, relative to the Base Condition. The analysis also indicates that the 3,250 cfs minimum flow objective for Keswick Reservoir stipulated in the NMFS Biological Opinion for the protection of winter-run chinook salmon rearing and downstream passage between 1 October and 31 March would not be violated in any month of this period under either the 2030 w/ WFP or the Base Condition. Flow changes below Keswick Dam that would occur under the 2030 w/ WFP would result in less-than-significant impacts to upper Sacramento River fisheries resources. The analysis for the lower Sacramento River indicates that the 70-year average flows under 2030 w/ WFP would not be substantially reduced relative to the Base Condition. The analysis also indicates that flow reductions of more than 20% would occur occasionally during August and infrequently during all other months of the year. Consequently, any flow-related impacts to lower Sacramento River fisheries or migrating anadromous fishes that could occur under 2030 w/ WFP are considered to be less than significant. Overall, this constitutes a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>6.5-16: Temperature-Related Impacts to Sacramento River Fisheries Resources.</u></b>            Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, the 69-year average temperature at Keswick Dam would increase up to approximately one-half °F during the period August through November. Mean monthly temperatures at Keswick Dam would exceed the 56°F threshold stipulated in the NMFS Biological Opinion for winter-run chinook salmon about 1% more often in September, and would exceed the 60°F threshold stipulated for October in the NMFS Biological Opinion for winter-run chinook</p>	<p>No feasible measures are available. It is beyond the purview of the Water Forum to independently mitigate this impact. The degree of impact will largely depend on future CVP operations. As such, the ability to mitigate lies with the USBR and will depend on those future operations.</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>salmon 1% more often under the 2030 w/ WFP, relative to the Base Condition. Mean monthly temperatures at Bend Bridge would exceed the 56°F threshold stipulated in the NMFS Biological Opinion for winter-run chinook salmon approximately 1% more often in April, and approximately 3% more often in May, June, and August. Although there would be no substantial change in the 69-year average early lifestage salmon survival for fall-, late fall-, winter-, and spring- run chinook salmon, substantial reductions in annual early-lifestage survival could be expected to occur under the 2030 w/ WFP, relative to annual survival estimates under the Base Condition, approximately 6% more often for winter-run and approximately 1 to 3% more often for spring-run. Substantial changes in average lower Sacramento River temperatures would not be expected over the 69-year period simulated, although individual months could exhibit substantial temperature increases.. Overall changes in water temperatures represent a significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No feasible measures are available. It is beyond the purview of the Water Forum to independently mitigate this impact. The degree of impact will largely depend on future CVP operations. As such, the ability to mitigate lies with the USBR and will depend on those future operations.</p>	<p><b>potentially significant</b></p>
<p><b>6.5-17: Delta Fish Populations.</b> Under the cumulative analysis assumptions, reductions in Delta outflow of more than 10% would occur occasionally during some months of the February through June period considered important for Delta fisheries resources. The analysis also indicates that upstream shifts of the position of X2 of 1 km or more would also occur occasionally during some months. Finally, the analysis indicates that Delta export to inflow ratios under the 2030 w/ WFP would not exceed the maximum export limits for either the February through June (35% of Delta inflow) or the July through January periods (65% of Delta inflow). Although the project would not cause X2 or Delta outflow standards to be violated, the project could result in reductions in outflow and upstream shifts in the position of X2, which could be considered a potentially significant impact to Delta fisheries resources.</p>		

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>FLOOD CONTROL (Section 6.6)</b>		
<p><b>6.6-1: Ability to Meet Flood Control Diagrams of CVP/SWP Reservoir.</b> Increased diversions from CVP/SWP reservoirs under the future cumulative condition would result in reduced storage during the flood control season, increasing the ability to meet flood control needs. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b>POWER SUPPLY (Section 6.7)</b>		
<p><b>6.7-1: Reduced CVP Hydropower Capacity and Generation -</b> Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that no substantial reduction in average annual surplus capacity or capacity for use by WAPA’ s preference customers would occur. Under the future cumulative condition, WAPA’ s capacity peak maximum of 1,152 megawatts would not be met in about 47 of the 828 months studied, as compared to 42 months for the Base Condition. However, under the future cumulative condition average annual CVP energy production would be reduced. by about 225 Gwh compared to the Base Condition. This change in annual average CVP energy production which is roughly equivalent to a 5% percent reduction, is considered a significant cumulative impact.</p>	No feasible mitigation measures are available.	significant
<p><b>6.7-2: Changes in Pumping Requirements for Diversers at Folsom Reservoir</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that energy requirements for those who pump water from Folsom Reservoir would increase by about 140% over existing conditions. Although not a significant environmental effect, this represents a significant cumulative economic impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant (economically significant)

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b>VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE (Section 6.8)</b>		
<p><b><u>6.8-1: Special Status Species, Riparian Vegetation, and Backwater Ponds Associated with the Lower American River</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that the range of flows within the minimum/optimal range of 1,300 to 4,000 cfs would vary by 3 or fewer years during the 70-year period of record, in comparison to base conditions. As a result, reduced flows under future cumulative conditions would not result in an adverse effect to the special-status species (including the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle) that are dependent on riparian vegetation and backwater ponds associated with Lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>6.8-2: Special Status Species and Riparian Vegetation Associated with the Sacramento River and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that flows in the lower American River would be further reduced. However, during the critical growing season months of April through July, the number of occurrences in which mean monthly flows of the lower American River would be within the minimum/optimal flow range of 1,300 to 4,000 cfs would vary by 3 or fewer years during the 70-year period of record, in comparison to base conditions. As a result, reduced flows under future cumulative conditions would not result in an adverse effect to the special-status species (including the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle) that are dependent on riparian vegetation and backwater ponds associated with Lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<p><b><u>6.8-3: Vegetation Associated with Reservoirs</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>impact analysis indicates that, in comparison to base conditions, mean monthly surface water elevations at Folsom, Shasta, and Trinity reservoirs would be reduced by less than 1% during the months of the growing season (March-October). Because the draw down zones at these reservoirs are vegetated with non-native plants that do not form a contiguous riparian community, minor fluctuations in surface water elevations would not adversely affect important habitat values at these reservoirs. Consequently, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>The WFP includes features intended to lessen potential environmental impacts to the American River, consistent with the coequal objective to protect its natural values. These mitigating features include water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, and conjunctive use of ground water and surface water. Adoption of the WFP with these features would reduce flow effects on Lower American River recreation opportunities. In addition, improvements to recreation facilities in the American River Parkway are identified to compensate for the reduction in quality of and opportunity for rafting/boating on the Lower American River. Actions would occur in cooperation with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation and could include one or both of the following: (A) contributing to the purchase and development of the Uruttia property to provide water-dependent recreation opportunities and (B) developing recreation facilities to improve water-dependent and water-enhanced recreation opportunities in the American River Parkway. The improvements would involve projects that are consistent with the American River Parkway Plan, or that would be implemented subject to an amendment to the parkway plan by Sacramento County.</p>	<p>significant</p>

**RECREATION (Section 6.9)**

**6.9-1: Cumulative Impacts on the Lower American River Recreation Opportunities** - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that flows in the lower American River would be even further reduced. For example, during the months of May through September, the number of occurrences in which mean monthly flows of the lower American River would be reduced below the minimum threshold of 1,750 cfs would increase by as much as 40%, in comparison to base conditions. The WFP would contribute to this cumulative impact. This would be a significant cumulative impact.

---

**Table 2-3**  
**SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

---

**Impact Before Mitigation**

**Potential Mitigation Measures**

**Significance After Mitigation**

---

The measures described below could be implemented in cooperation with the Sacramento County Department of Parks and Recreation, the agency responsible for implementing the American River Parkway Plan. The measures could be part of the Habitat Management Plan adopted by the Water Forum participants as an implementation tool for the Habitat Management Element of the Water Forum Proposal. Funding for the recreation measures may include money from within or outside the Water Forum Successor Effort. Because activities by a number of agencies are underway to restore and enhance the Lower American River, this recreation mitigation should be coordinated with the broader ecosystem partnership efforts. Other agencies involved in the Lower American River may participate in funding and/or implementation of recreation mitigation, as appropriate, to promote a well-coordinated program of restoration and enhancement of the river.

- a) Uruttia Property. The Uruttia Property, located on the north side of the Lower American River near CalExpo, could be acquired and/or developed to provide public access, opportunities for water-dependent recreation activity related to the river (such as canoe and kayak use and instruction), and enhanced environmental values which can provide opportunities for water-enhanced recreation, such as sightseeing and nature study. The property and facilities would be incorporated into the American River Parkway and reflected by amendment in the American River Parkway Plan.
  
- b) Recreation Facility Improvements to the American River Parkway. The American River Parkway Plan describes in several Area Plans the resources and facilities intended to provide for water-dependent and water-enhanced

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>recreation, including river access, trails, parking, swimming areas, and other facilities. The facilities could include improvement of river access for rafting/boating in the less intensively used sections of the river, such as downstream of Goethe Park; trail improvements to increase the opportunity for water-enhanced recreation, such as a linkage between the Fairbairn plant and the Sutter’ s Landing Park site; or interpretive resources to improve water-enhanced nature study and appreciation of the Parkway.</p>	
	<p>c) <u>Update of the American River Parkway Plan</u>. The update could consider the flow regime resulting from the WFP and appropriate actions to take in the Parkway to support improvement of both recreation opportunities and riparian habitat.</p>	
	<p>d) <u>Enhancement of the Condition and Quality of Existing Recreation Facilities</u>. Past and current budget constraints have limited the County’ s ability to maintain some existing recreation facilities. Enhancement of the condition and quality of existing facilities could improve the attraction of the Parkway for both water-dependent and water-enhanced recreation activity.</p>	
	<p>The improvements to recreation facilities in the American River Parkway would accomplish the following criteria:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities would improve opportunities for water-dependent recreation, particularly rafting/boating, such that the river is made more accessible when flows are appropriate and/or the quality of rafting/boating is improved; or facilities would improve opportunities for water-enhanced recreation, such that the quality and</li> </ul>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.9-2: Cumulative Impacts to Folsom Reservoir Recreation Opportunities</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that, in comparison to base conditions, surface water elevations at Folsom Reservoir would be further reduced. For example, during the recreational use period of the year (primarily May-September), the number of occurrences in which lake levels would decline below the minimum 412-foot elevation for use of marina wet slips would increase by more than 10%, in comparison to base conditions. Reduced lake levels under the cumulative condition would also adversely affect swimming beaches. The WFP would contribute to this cumulative condition and it would be a significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>visitation associated with recreation activity in the Parkway is increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements would be consistent with the American River Parkway Plan.</li> </ul> <p>The final selection of facilities for improvement would occur during the 18-month preparation period of the Habitat Management Plan. Facilities would be developed as soon as feasible after completion of that plan, recognizing the need to assemble funding, secure facility approvals, and prepare designs.</p> <p>The WFP includes features intended to lessen potential environmental impacts on the Lower American River, which would also serve to decrease environmental effects to other resources. These mitigating features include water conservation, dry-year diversion restrictions, and conjunctive use of ground water and surface water. Adoption of the WFP with these features would reduce water surface elevation effects on Folsom Reservoir recreation. In addition, boating facility improvements would enhance boating access during periods of higher water to compensate for reduced availability of boat ramp and marina facilities from Water Forum Proposal diversions. Actions would occur in cooperation with the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) and would be consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (CDPR, 1978). Mitigation should also be consistent with the objectives of CDPR proposals for measures to mitigate lower lake levels from flood storage reoperation (Kranz, 1997). The actions could be added into the recreation section of the Habitat Management Plan as a means to implement them.</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>One or more of the following recreation measures described below could be implemented in cooperation with the CDPR. Funding for the recreation measures may include money from within or outside the Water Forum Successor Effort. A number of agencies are involved in water resources and recreation facility decisions affecting Folsom Reservoir, so this recreation mitigation should be coordinated with other actions, as appropriate. Consequently, other agencies involved in Folsom Reservoir may participate in funding and/or implementation of recreation mitigation.</p>	
	<p>e) <u>Boating Facilities to Increase Access and Use During Higher Water Periods.</u> Construction of boating facilities, consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area would increase boating access and use of the reservoir during higher water periods. To compensate for reduced availability of boating facilities during lower water periods, this measure would improve boating facilities for use when higher water conditions allow for high-quality water recreation and the greater reservoir surface area availability; at higher water levels, visitation can be increased when the larger reservoir surface area can support more intensive use. Examples of potential boating facility improvements suggested by CDPR staff include boat parking and shore facilities at Dyke 8 or a launch ramp and dock at New York Cove (on the east side of the reservoir, north of Brown’ s Ravine). The final selection of facilities would occur in cooperation between the Water Forum Successor Effort and the CDPR.</p>	
	<p>f) <u>Improvement to the Marina Area.</u> Construction of facility improvements in the Brown’ s Ravine area would enhance the operation of the marina. Improvements would be consistent with the Folsom Lake State</p>	

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b><u>6.9-3: Sacramento River and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Recreation Opportunities Under Future Cumulative Conditions</u></b>            - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that during the critical growing season months of April through July mean monthly flows in the Sacramento River would be reduced by approximately 3%, in comparison to base conditions. Flows would not be reduced with sufficient magnitude and frequency to adversely affect recreational opportunities associated with the Sacramento River</p>	<p>Recreation Area General Plan. The intent of these improvements would be to help enhance marina operations during periods of sufficiently high water to offset the reduced availability of wet slips. The final selection of facilities would occur in cooperation between the Water Forum Successor Effort, the operator of the marina, and the CDPR.</p> <p>The improvements to recreation facilities on Folsom Reservoir will accomplish the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities serving higher water conditions will increase boating visitation to Folsom Reservoir when the surface area is large enough to support the increased use.</li> <li>• Marina facility improvements will help enhance operation of the marina when water level is high enough to support the wet slips.</li> <li>• Improvements are consistent with the General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.</li> </ul> <p>The final selection of facilities for improvement would occur during a period following adoption of the Water Forum Proposal. Facilities would be developed as soon as feasible after completion of that plan, recognizing the need to assemble funding, secure facility approvals, and prepare designs.</p>	less-than-significant

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>6.9-4: Lake Natoma, Whiskeytown, Keswick, Shasta, and Trinity Reservoirs Recreation Opportunities Under Future Cumulative Conditions</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that, in comparison to base conditions, mean monthly surface water elevations at Shasta and Trinity reservoirs would be reduced by less than 1% during the recreational use period of the year (primarily May-September), which would not substantially diminish recreation opportunities. Because Lake Natoma, Whiskeytown, and Keswick reservoirs serve as regulating reservoirs, the pattern of surface water elevations changes at these reservoirs is not expected to change substantially under cumulative conditions. This would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b><u>LAND USE AND GROWTH-INDUCING (Section 6.10)</u></b></p>	<p>The water supply included in the WFP has been determined considering the planned growth for each jurisdiction within the water service study area; as such, the WFP is consistent with the growth parameters described each city and county General Plan. The General Plan of each jurisdiction includes policies and programs for the protection of the environment and, to the extent feasible, the avoidance or mitigation of significant effects on the environment from planned growth and development. During the normal course of each jurisdiction's implementation of its General Plan policies, feasible mitigation of significant impacts from planned growth and development would occur. Because mitigation of growth-related environmental impacts is in the purview of each city and county, through their existing land use authority, and because the Water Forum itself has no such authority, the</p>	<p>significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b><u>AESTHETICS (Section 6.11)</u></b>	WFP cannot feasibly provide for additional mitigation of growth-related land use and development environmental impacts.	
<b><u>6.11-1: Aesthetic Value of the Lower American River</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that flows in the lower American River would be further reduced. However, during the critical growing season months of April through July, the number of occurrences in which mean monthly flows of the lower American River would be within the minimum/optimal flow range of 1,300 to 4,000 cfs would vary by 3 or fewer years during the 70-year period of record, in comparison to base conditions. As a result, reduced flows under future cumulative conditions would not result in an adverse effect to riparian vegetation and habitat and, as such, would not result in an adverse affect to the aesthetic quality of the lower American River. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant
<b><u>6.11-2: Aesthetic Value of the Sacramento River and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta</u></b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that mean monthly flows in the Sacramento River would be reduced by approximately 3%, in comparison to base conditions, during the critical growing season months of April through July. Flows would not be reduced with sufficient magnitude and frequency to significantly alter existing riparian vegetation dependent on Sacramento River flows and Delta inflows. As a result, the aesthetic quality of the Sacramento River and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta would not be adversely affected. This would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	less-than-significant

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.11-3: Aesthetic Value of Reservoirs</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that mean monthly surface water elevations at Folsom, Shasta, and Trinity reservoirs would be reduced by less than 5 feet, in comparison to base conditions. In addition, because Lake Natoma, Whiskeytown, and Keswick Reservoir serve as regulating reservoirs, future surface water elevations at these reservoirs are not expected to change substantially. Consequently, this would be a less-than-significant future cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (Section 6.12)</b></p>		
<p><b>6.12-1: Physical Deterioration of Cultural Resource Sites in Folsom Reservoir</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that Folsom Reservoir water surface elevations would be reduced more frequently and/or by greater magnitudes compared to that occurring solely as a result of the WFP. Future reductions in 70-year monthly average water surface elevation would approximate 2 to 4 ft, relative to existing elevations. Such reductions would result in a lowered zone where water-level fluctuations would be the most pronounced. The effect of this lowered fluctuation zone on cultural resources would be to expose sites that historically had experienced a higher degree of protection from erosion and other physical destructive forces. Under the future cumulative condition, this would be a significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>The WFP hydrologic modeling data indicates that the project would have a significant impact on cultural sites and features within the reservoir pool, especially those located between the 360 ft msl and 395 ft msl elevations. Significant impacts would include the potential exposure of previously submerged sites to increased vandalism, recreation use, wave action, and the effects of repeated inundation and drawdown. Many prehistoric and historic sites have been recorded within the reservoir basin, most of which remain unevaluated. Only about half of the reservoir has been surveyed, and many other sites undoubtedly exist in the unsurveyed areas.</p> <p>In 1994, Far Western and JRP Historical Consultants prepared a Research Design as part of SAFCA' s Folsom Re-operation Study. That document included all of the reservoir basin between the 390-foot and the 466-foot contours. The Research Design provides, among other components, summaries of the known cultural resources within the study area; research issues applicable to those resources; and recommendations for evaluating the sites, protecting them from further damage, and mitigating unavoidable impacts.</p>	<p>potentially significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Checklists are included for evaluation of various types of sites. All unevaluated sites within the reservoir that fall within the direct impact zone of the WFP could be given additional study, using this Research Design as a guideline. Also, unsurveyed portions of the direct impact zone could be surveyed for cultural resources, as water levels permit; any additional sites and features also may require evaluation and mitigation. The appropriate agencies (i.e., Bureau of Reclamation, US Army Corp of Engineers, and the State Office of Historic Preservation) could decide that evaluation and mitigation of a <i>representative sample</i> of the sites is sufficient, although this cannot be determined without comprehensive consultation with those agencies. Recent conversations with archaeologists at the Bureau of Reclamation's Sacramento office suggest that such sampling would be acceptable to that agency.</p>	
<p><b>6.12-2: Inundation or Exposure of Cultural Resource Sites in the Lower American River</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis indicates that river flows in the Lower American River would be reduced more frequently and/or by greater magnitudes compared to the WFP alone. With overall reductions in 70-year monthly average river flows (up to 11 percent, but generally about 5 percent), the potential for inundation of cultural resource sites along the Lower American River would be less than that existing today. Such reductions, however, would also not exceed those historically recorded, thereby avoiding further exposure of any cultural remains which are presently submerged. This would represent a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>6.12-3: Inundation or Exposure of Cultural Resource Sites in the Lower Sacramento River</b> - Under the set of assumptions for future conditions used in the EIR, the cumulative impact analysis</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Impact Before Mitigation	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>indicates that flows in the Lower Sacramento River could be reduced more frequently and/or by greater magnitudes compared to that occurring solely as a result of the WFP. Such reductions on a 70-year monthly average, however, are anticipated to be generally less than 4 percent, relative to existing flow conditions. These reductions would be small enough that exposure of submerged cultural resources would be highly unlikely. Moreover, any cultural resources within the river banks and floodplain would not be affected since flows would, on average, be lower and it is assumed that the existing levee system would continue to provide channelized protection of the floodplain areas. This would be considered to represent a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>		
<p><b>SOILS AND GEOLOGY (Section 6.13)</b></p>		
<p><b>6.13-1: Changes in Geologic Substructures</b> – In the future, it is anticipated that development will continue throughout the region. Associated with this anticipated development, ground disturbing activities of new construction efforts have potential to substantially change geologic substructures. With major construction projects, potential changes to subsurface geology could affect human safety. However, development and planning of future projects would consider geotechnical studies and implement design recommendations, as appropriate, in order to minimize any hazardous geologic changes to the underlying substrata. Therefore, cumulative changes in geologic substructures are considered less than significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>6.13-2: Exposure to Major Geologic Hazards</b> – In the future, it is recognized that major capital improvement and construction projects will occur with the potential to expose people or property to major geologic hazards. Given the relative stability of the geologic subsurface environment in the greater Sacramento area, exposure to geologic hazards is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>

**Table 2-3  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

<b>Impact Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Potential Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>6.13-3: Increased Soil Erosion by Wind or Water</b> – Future development activities could disturb surface soils and thereby induce either wind or water erosion. This, however, would be highly localized and temporary, potentially occurring only during construction periods. Future compliance and adherence to project-specific siting investigations, soils/geotechnical studies and the implementation of any necessary project-specific mitigation measures, would avoid long-term soil erosion. This is considered to represent a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>less-than-significant</p>
<p><b>6.13-4: Loss of Soil Cover</b> – In the future, increasing development across the region will undoubtedly result in a loss of soil cover. Certain projects, depending on their scale and location, may result in permanent loss of some soil cover. Protection against loss of valuable soils (for farmland purposes) is provided through the State mapping and identification system and avoided and/or mitigated through CEQA mitigation of project-specific actions. Future soil loss represents a less-than-significant cumulative impact.</p>		<p>less-than-significant</p>

## **2.6 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE WATER FORUM PROPOSAL**

Pursuant to §15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the environmental impact report includes an analysis of a range of alternatives that could feasibly attain its basic objectives (i.e., the coequal objectives), plus three “no project” alternatives. Seven alternatives to the WFP are considered: 1) Increased Sacramento River Diversions; 2) Increased Groundwater Pumping; 3) Increased Water Reclamation; 4) More Frequent Reductions in Surface Water Diversions; 5) No Project Alternative—Independent Actions; 6) No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water and Groundwater; and 7) No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water, Unconstrained Groundwater.

### **2.6.1 Alternative 1 - Increased Sacramento River Diversions**

Alternative 1, Increased Sacramento River Diversions, would involve transferring up to 78,000 AF of surface water diversions considered in the WFP from the Lower American River to the Sacramento River with the aim of reducing impacts on the American River. In order to reach end users, water diversion, pumping, treatment and transmission facilities would be required.

This alternative assumes water diversions from two locations on the Sacramento River: a new surface water diversion at Freeport, approximately 10 miles downstream of the confluence of the Sacramento and American rivers and a new diversion near Elkhorn, approximately 10 miles north of the confluence. New facilities would include but not be limited to water diversions and treatment plants at Freeport and Elkhorn, treated water pipelines to Folsom and Northridge Water District, a canal from Freeport to the South County area, and to the Folsom South Canal.

This alternative would result in reduced impacts on American River fisheries and recreation opportunities. Impacts related to power supply would be increased due to the cost of pumping water diverted from the Sacramento River to the service areas. Impacts of Alternative 1 on Sacramento River fisheries, water quality, flood control, vegetation and wildlife, aesthetics, cultural resources, and soils and geology would be the same, or not substantially different from impacts of the proposed WFP.

### **2.6.2 Alternative 2 - Increased Groundwater Pumping**

Alternative 2 would involve meeting a larger portion of future demands through additional groundwater pumping. This alternative assumes that local groundwater from three subareas of the groundwater basin in the County would be extracted to meet projected growth in Sacramento County through the year 2030. An Integrated Groundwater - Surface Water Model (IGSM) was used to assess groundwater use in 2030 (assuming buildout of the County’s Urban Policy Area) with the provision that a larger portion of water demand would be met from groundwater (Sacramento County Water Agency 1997).

Under this analysis, groundwater use is projected to increase from approximately 497,000 AF/Yr in the base condition, to approximately 612,000 AF/Yr in 2030. Most of the increase would occur in the South Sacramento area where substantial urban growth is planned. This alternative would reduce somewhat adverse impacts to fisheries, recreation, and other flow-related impacts

including water supply, power supply, vegetation and wildlife, and aesthetics. Groundwater, however, would be maintained at lower levels. This would increase the yield of the aquifer system, but could result in land subsidence, increased pumping costs, in-migration of poorer-quality water from the deep aquifer system or adjacent areas, decline in well productivity, and increased rate of movement of groundwater contamination.

### **2.6.3 Alternative 3 - Increased Water Reclamation**

Alternative 3 would involve increased use of reclaimed water to offset new surface water diversions and groundwater pumping for non-potable consumptive uses such as irrigation, industrial use, and wetlands management. Specifically, reclamation studies for the County of Sacramento, the City of Roseville, and the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), are considered in the definition of Alternative 3.

Results of the Sacramento County reclamation study concluded that the potential demand for agricultural use of reclaimed water could increase over time from approximately 150,000 AF in 1993 to approximately 263,000 AF in the year 2010, with out-of-county export of approximately 14,600 AF after 2005 due to insufficient in-County demand south of the American River (Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District 1994). Non-agricultural reclaimed water users in the County (primarily irrigators of parks, schools, roadway rights-of-way and medians, cemeteries, and golf courses) would generate a demand for 33,000 AF of reclaimed water per year, approximately 15,400 AF of which would be south of the American River. Under this alternative, reclaimed water use in Sacramento County would total approximately 263,000 AF. Conveyance, storage, and distribution facilities for reclaimed water would include pump stations, storage tanks, reservoirs, pipelines and canals. The Clay Station Reservoir site on Laguna Creek would need to be developed as the site for a 170,000 AF reclaimed water reservoir. This alternative also assumes increased reclamation in the City of Roseville and in the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID).

With these three sources of reclaimed water totaling approximately 300,000 AF/Yr by 2010, Alternative 3 considers substantially reduced groundwater pumping with some reductions in surface water diversions on the American and Sacramento rivers. Use of reclaimed water after 2010 would be expected to increase, but estimation of volume would be speculative.

Use of reclaimed water to meet some of Sacramento County's non-potable water demand would reduce groundwater pumping and some diversions from the Lower American and Sacramento River. Impacts to fisheries and recreation on the Lower American River would be somewhat reduced under Alternative 3. Impacts with regard to water quality and flood control would be the same or slightly reduced than under the WFP. Impacts with regard to water quality would be substantially reduced. This alternative would reduce return flows below the Sacramento River wastewater treatment plant. Treated effluent diverted for reclaimed water use (and thus not discharged to the Sacramento River) would decrease Delta outflows by a like amount. Therefore out-of-area water supply impacts could be substantially greater than those of the WFP.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would reduce demands on surface and groundwater resources in the project area. However, constraints to reclamation on the scale contemplated in Alternative 3 are many, and lend uncertainty to its ultimate implementation. Such constraints include regulatory permits and approvals, institutional agreements between producers of reclaimed water and other agencies; identification of markets for the resource; public health questions; and construction of treatment, storage, and conveyance facilities. Alternative 3 could not entirely substitute for any element of the WFP in any case, however, due to the limited uses of reclaimed water. Provision for additional surface water supplies to meet growing demands for potable water would still be required.

#### **2.6.4 Alternative 4 - More Frequent Reductions in Surface Water Diversion**

Under the WFP most purveyors that divert upstream of Nimbus Dam would limit their increased diversions or take other measures to reduce the impacts of diversions in about 18% of the years (i.e., years in which the projected March through November unimpaired inflow to Folsom Reservoir is less than 950,000 AF.)

Under Alternative 4, those purveyors would limit their increased diversions or take other measures to reduce the impacts of diversions in about 43% of the years (i.e., years in which March through November unimpaired inflow to Folsom Reservoir is below 1,600,000 AF). It would allow diversions similar to those described in the WFP in the remaining years.

Requiring drier year cutbacks in a greater percentage of years would result in reduced diversions from the Lower American River. Alternative 4 would result in somewhat reduced impacts to fisheries resources. Other flow-related impacts would be the same or slightly reduced, including recreation opportunities, vegetation and wildlife, water quality, power supply, visual resources, and flood control. Impacts on groundwater could be substantial as purveyors turn to groundwater in a greater number of years to make up for the shortfall in surface water supplies. This could result in impacts similar to those described under Alternative 2, Increased Groundwater Pumping, including land subsidence, increased pumping costs, in-migration of poor quality water, decline in well productivity, and increased rate of movement of groundwater contamination. Some purveyors without access to alternative sources would not have sufficient water supply to meet projected demand.

#### **2.6.5 Alternative 5 - No Project Alternative—Independent Actions**

Under Alternative 5, No Project Alternative—Independent Actions, it is assumed that purveyors would continue to pursue water supply projects. This alternative represents a condition that could occur in the year 2030 if the WFP is not implemented, and purveyors develop their own projects to meet their anticipated demands, without dry year delivery reductions, water conservation programs or Lower American River Habitat Management Element negotiated as part of the WFP. All other assumptions (e.g., 2030 out-of-basin CVP/SWP demands and increased Sacramento Valley demands, and increased Trinity River flows) will be used for comparative purposes for the Future Cumulative Condition simulation.

Implementation of Alternative 5 would result in more surface water diversions from the Lower American River, with no Water Forum-negotiated dry year restrictions, although there would be other external limitations on water availability (e.g., CVP-imposed deficiencies). On the Lower American River, impacts on fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead would be somewhat worse. Other flow related impacts would also be somewhat worse than under the WFP, including Lower American River and Folsom Reservoir recreation opportunities, water quality, flood control, CVP and SWP deliveries, visual resources, and Sacramento River fisheries.

#### **2.6.6 Alternative 6 - No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water and Groundwater**

Under Alternative 6, No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water and Groundwater, represents a condition at 2030 that could occur if diversions and groundwater pumping by Water Forum purveyors were constrained to the lesser of future demands, existing capacity, or existing water entitlements. All other assumptions (e.g., 2030 out-of-basin CVP/SWP demands and increased Sacramento Valley demands, and increased Trinity River flows) will be set at the same levels established for the Future Cumulative Condition simulation.

This alternative would not have sufficient water supply to provide for projected demand in the water service study area. Because a lower volume of water would be diverted from Folsom Reservoir, the Lower American River, and the Sacramento River as compared to the WFP, impacts on fisheries, recreation, vegetation and wildlife, CVP and SWP water deliveries, water quality, visual resources, and power supply would be reduced.

#### **2.6.7 Alternative 7 - No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water, Unconstrained Groundwater**

Under Alternative 7, No Project Alternative—Constrained Surface Water, Unconstrained Groundwater, represents a condition at 2030 that could occur if diversions by Water Forum purveyors were constrained to the lesser of future demands, existing capacity, or existing water entitlements. All other assumptions (e.g., 2030 out-of-basin CVP/SWP demands and increased Sacramento Valley demands, and increased Trinity River flows) will be used for comparative purposes for the Future Cumulative Condition simulation. This alternative assumes that future demands would be met through groundwater pumping where groundwater is available. As such, the impacts of this alternative are similar to Alternative 2, Increased Groundwater Pumping. The reader is referred to Section 2.6.2 for a summary of impacts of Alternative 2.

#### **2.6.8 Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Consideration**

Several additional alternatives were considered during the planning process, but were eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR, because they cannot feasibly attain the objectives of the proposed WFP for financial, legal, technological, and/or environmental reasons. These alternatives include Auburn Dam, Feather River diversions, and additional conservation beyond Best Management Practices.

## **Auburn Dam**

Auburn Dam would require federal authorization and appropriation. As detailed in the American River Water Resources Investigation (ARWRI), USBR studied Auburn Dam as an alternative for meeting the region's water supply needs (SMWA/USBR, 1996; SMWA/USBR, 1997), and for regional flood control (USACE/DWR, 1991). In May 1998, USBR issued its Record of Decision regarding the proposed action for the ARWRI. The ARWRI is the subject of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), ARWRI, California (FES 97-36, dated November 27, 1997), developed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The adopted decision is as follows:

“Reclamation has not identified a Federal role for meeting the future water needs of the ARWRI study area; therefore, a Federal program is not being selected.

While no Federal action will be initiated to meet the water needs of the local area, USBR will, as appropriate, cooperate with local agencies as specific water management activities are proposed and implemented. USBR would exercise its statutory authorities, such as that afforded by the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, to provide assistance in implementation and cooperate in the process with local lead officials. Such cooperation may involve individual actions on the part of USBR that constitute “major Federal actions”, and as such would require that USBR comply with the NEPA and other Federal statutes. Under those circumstances, USBR would prepare the required additional documentation.”

## **Feather River Diversions**

Diversions from the Feather River were considered for Placer County and parts of Sacramento County to reduce the need for American River diversions. A fatal flaw analysis was prepared to examine the feasibility of diverting water at a rate of 200 mgd (310 cfs) from the Feather River to help meet the 2030 demands of South Placer and north Sacramento counties. Based on this analysis, it was determined that several fish species would be exposed to the diversion at their most sensitive life stages (i.e., eggs, larvae, and juveniles) during downstream migration. Because this level of diversion from the Feather River would likely have significant impacts to fisheries, and a new diversion could involve a lengthy and uncertain permit process, this alternative was eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR.

## **Additional Conservation Beyond Best Management Practices**

The WFP includes a Water Conservation Element which sets forth the water purveyors' programs for implementing water conservation measures, or best management practices (BMPs), including residential water meter retrofit. The majority of these BMPs are similar to those identified in the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Urban Water Conservation in California (Urban Water Conservation Council, 1994). It is assumed that by the year 2030 all water purveyors will have fully implemented all BMPs. The WFP Water Conservation Element is expected to achieve an overall conservation level of approximately 25%. Although additional conservation measures were considered, they would not be able to feasibly meet the WFP's

objectives by themselves at this time due to cost or health-related reasons. The WFP does not preclude the opportunity to implement other, more aggressive conservation approaches as they become feasible and available in the future. As a result, it is possible that enhanced conservation could occur. For instance, the California Urban Water Conservation Council continues to explore more BMPs. Although this was eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR as an alternative to the WFP, the potential for enhanced conservation is understood by the Water Forum stakeholders.

[RETURN TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)