

Table of Contents

Volume 1

Executive Summary	ES-1
Chapter 1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Project Description	1-1
1.2 Plan Area	1-1
1.3 Background	1-2
1.4 State Water Board Authorities	1-4
1.4.1 Porter-Cologne Act	1-4
1.4.2 Water Rights	1-5
1.5 State Water Board Actions	1-6
1.5.1 Lower San Joaquin River Flows	1-6
1.5.2 Southern Delta Water Quality	1-9
1.5.3 Related Litigation	1-12
1.6 References Cited	1-13
Chapter 2 Water Resources	2-1
2.1 Overview	2-1
2.1.1 San Joaquin River Basin	2-1
2.1.2 Delta.....	2-4
2.1.3 San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin	2-5
2.1.4 Water Supply and Use	2-6
2.2 Upper San Joaquin River	2-8
2.2.1 Basin Overview	2-8
2.2.2 Water Diversion and Use	2-8
2.2.3 Flow Requirements.....	2-9
2.2.4 Hydrology.....	2-9
2.3 Merced River.....	2-10
2.3.1 Basin Overview	2-10
2.3.2 Water Diversion and Use	2-11
2.3.3 Flow Requirements.....	2-12
2.3.4 Hydrology.....	2-13
2.4 Tuolumne River	2-16
2.4.1 Basin Overview	2-16
2.4.2 Water Diversion and Use	2-17
2.4.3 Flow Requirements.....	2-19

2.4.4	Hydrology.....	2-21
2.5	Stanislaus River	2-24
2.5.1	Basin Overview	2-24
2.5.2	Water Diversion and Use	2-25
2.5.3	Flow Requirements.....	2-29
2.5.4	Hydrology.....	2-31
2.6	Lower San Joaquin River	2-33
2.6.1	Basin Overview	2-33
2.6.2	Water Diversion and Use	2-33
2.6.3	Flow Requirements.....	2-34
2.6.4	Hydrology.....	2-35
2.7	Southern Delta	2-37
2.7.1	Lower San Joaquin River and Tidal Conditions	2-37
2.7.2	Water Diversions.....	2-38
2.7.3	Return Flows	2-40
2.7.4	Water Quality and Water Quality Objectives	2-42
2.8	San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin	2-42
2.8.1	Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Subbasin.....	2-43
2.8.2	Modesto Groundwater Subbasin.....	2-44
2.8.3	Turlock Groundwater Subbasin	2-45
2.8.4	Merced Groundwater Subbasin.....	2-45
2.9	References Cited	2-46
Chapter 3	Alternatives Description.....	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.2	Purposes and Goals.....	3-2
3.3	Lower San Joaquin River (LSJR) Alternatives	3-3
3.3.1	Attributes of LSJR Flow Objectives	3-4
3.3.2	LSJR Alternatives Considered.....	3-8
3.3.3	Adaptive Implementation.....	3-10
3.3.4	LSJR Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.....	3-13
3.3.5	LSJR Alternative 2.....	3-14
3.3.6	LSJR Alternative 3.....	3-15
3.3.7	LSJR Alternative 4.....	3-16
3.3.8	Common Elements of LSJR Alternatives	3-16
3.3.9	LSJR Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Evaluation	3-20
3.3.10	LSJR Flow Objectives and Program of Implementation.....	3-20
3.4	Southern Delta Water Quality (SDWQ) Alternatives	3-34

3.4.1	Attributes of the SDWQ Objectives	3-35
3.4.2	SDWQ Alternatives Considered	3-39
3.4.3	SDWQ Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	3-40
3.4.4	SDWQ Alternative 2	3-40
3.4.5	SDWQ Alternative 3	3-40
3.4.6	SDWQ Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Evaluation.....	3-41
3.5	References Cited	3-47
Chapter 4	Introduction to Analysis	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Recirculated SED	4-1
4.2.1	Hydrologic Modeling.....	4-1
4.2.2	Dry Year Evaluation.....	4-3
4.2.3	Antidegradation Analysis	4-4
4.2.4	Fish Benefits Analyses.....	4-4
4.2.5	Fish Impact Analyses.....	4-5
4.2.6	Groundwater Effects and Agricultural Resource Modeling.....	4-5
4.2.7	City and County of San Francisco Water Operations and Supply Analyses.....	4-6
4.2.8	Effects of the Flow Proposal on Municipal Water Supplies.....	4-6
4.2.9	Economic Analyses.....	4-6
4.2.10	Plan Area	4-7
4.2.11	Alternatives, Adaptive Implementation, and Analysis.....	4-8
4.3	Analytical Framework	4-11
4.3.1	Impacts Associated with LSJR Alternatives.....	4-12
4.3.2	Impacts Associated with SDWQ Alternatives	4-14
4.4	Chapter Organization.....	4-17
4.4.1	Resource Chapters.....	4-17
4.4.2	No Project Alternative Impacts.....	4-18
4.4.3	Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions.....	4-18
4.4.4	Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts	4-20
4.5	Terminology	4-20
4.6	Scope of Analysis	4-21
4.7	Baseline	4-22
4.8	Modeling and Technical Analysis.....	4-23
4.8.1	Peer-Reviewed Scientific Basis Report	4-23
4.8.2	Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling	4-24
4.8.3	Agricultural and Economic Modeling.....	4-25
4.8.4	SalSim.....	4-25

4.8.5	Salt Tolerance of Crops in the Southern Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta	4-26
4.8.6	Hydropower Modeling	4-26
4.9	References Cited	4-26
Chapter 5	Surface Hydrology and Water Quality	5-1
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Environmental Setting	5-5
5.2.1	San Joaquin River Basin and Southern Delta Hydrology and Water Quality	5-6
5.2.2	Upper San Joaquin River	5-14
5.2.3	Merced River	5-17
5.2.4	Tuolumne River	5-21
5.2.5	Stanislaus River	5-26
5.2.6	Lower San Joaquin River	5-29
5.2.7	Extended Plan Area	5-32
5.2.8	Southern Delta	5-32
5.3	Regulatory Background	5-50
5.3.1	Federal	5-50
5.3.2	State	5-51
5.4	Impact Analysis	5-53
5.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	5-53
5.4.2	Methods and Approach	5-54
5.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	5-83
5.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	5-104
5.5	Cumulative Impacts	5-105
5.6	References Cited	5-105
5.6.1	Printed References	5-105
5.6.2	Personal Communications	5-108
Chapter 6	Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion	6-1
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Environmental Setting	6-4
6.2.1	Overview of the Bay-Delta and Central Valley Basin	6-5
6.2.2	Lower San Joaquin River, Delta, and Tributaries	6-5
6.2.3	Extended Plan Area	6-18
6.3	Regulatory Background	6-19
6.3.1	Federal	6-19
6.3.2	State	6-19
6.3.3	Regional or Local	6-20
6.4	Impact Analysis	6-20

6.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	6-20
6.4.2	Methods and Approach	6-21
6.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	6-28
6.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	6-40
6.5	Cumulative Impacts	6-41
6.6	References Cited	6-41
6.6.1	Printed References.....	6-41
6.6.2	Personal Communications	6-43
Chapter 7	Aquatic Biological Resources	7-1
7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Environmental Setting	7-8
7.2.1	Fish Species	7-9
7.2.2	Reservoirs, Tributaries, and LSJR	7-30
7.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	7-47
7.2.4	Southern Delta	7-48
7.3	Regulatory Background.....	7-53
7.3.1	Federal	7-53
7.3.2	State	7-57
7.3.3	Regional or Local.....	7-58
7.4	Impact Analysis	7-58
7.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	7-58
7.4.2	Methods and Approach	7-59
7.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	7-68
7.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	7-150
7.5	Cumulative Impacts	7-151
7.6	References Cited	7-152
Chapter 8	Terrestrial Biological Resources	8-1
8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.2	Environmental Setting	8-7
8.2.1	LSJR and the Three Eastside Tributaries	8-8
8.2.2	Reservoirs.....	8-23
8.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	8-26
8.2.4	Southern Delta	8-27
8.3	Regulatory Background.....	8-31
8.3.1	Federal	8-31
8.3.2	State	8-34
8.3.3	Regional or Local.....	8-35

8.4	Impact Analysis	8-37
8.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	8-37
8.4.2	Methods and Approach	8-38
8.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	8-46
8.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	8-68
8.5	Cumulative Impacts	8-69
8.6	References Cited	8-70
Chapter 9	Groundwater Resources.....	9-1
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Environmental Setting	9-6
9.2.1	San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin and Subbasins	9-6
9.2.2	Subbasin Groundwater Use	9-17
9.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	9-30
9.2.4	Southern Delta	9-31
9.3	Regulatory Background.....	9-31
9.3.1	Federal	9-31
9.3.2	State	9-31
9.3.3	Regional or Local.....	9-35
9.4	Impact Analysis	9-42
9.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	9-42
9.4.2	Methods and Approach	9-42
9.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	9-53
9.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	9-69
9.5	Cumulative Impacts	9-69
9.6	References Cited	9-70
Chapter 10	Recreational Resources and Aesthetics.....	10-1
10.1	Introduction	10-1
10.2	Environmental Setting	10-6
10.2.1	Rivers.....	10-7
10.2.2	Reservoirs.....	10-9
10.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	10-13
10.2.4	Southern Delta	10-16
10.3	Regulatory Background.....	10-17
10.3.1	Federal	10-17
10.3.2	State	10-19
10.3.3	Regional or Local.....	10-19
10.4	Impact Analysis	10-20

10.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	10-21
10.4.2	Methods and Approach	10-21
10.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	10-39
10.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	10-49
10.5	Cumulative Impacts	10-52
10.6	References Cited	10-52
10.6.1	Printed References.....	10-52
10.6.2	Personal Communications	10-55
Chapter 11	Agricultural Resources	11-1
11.1	Introduction	11-1
11.2	Environmental Setting	11-9
11.2.1	Soil and Water Quality	11-9
11.2.2	Lower San Joaquin River Watershed and Eastside Tributaries.....	11-10
11.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	11-19
11.2.4	Southern Delta	11-20
11.3	Regulatory Background.....	11-24
11.3.1	State	11-24
11.3.2	Regional or Local.....	11-26
11.4	Impact Analysis	11-34
11.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	11-34
11.4.2	Methods and Approach	11-35
11.5	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	11-48
11.6	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	11-66
11.7	Cumulative Impacts	11-66
11.8	References Cited	11-66
Chapter 12	Cultural Resources	12-1
12.1	Introduction	12-1
12.2	Environmental Setting	12-4
12.2.1	Reservoir Historic or Archaeological and Paleontological Resources.....	12-5
12.2.2	River Historic or Archaeological and Paleontological Resources.....	12-9
12.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	12-16
12.2.4	Southern Delta Historic or Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources.....	12-16
12.3	Regulatory Background.....	12-16
12.3.1	Federal	12-16
12.3.2	State	12-17
12.3.3	Regional or Local.....	12-18

12.4	Impact Analysis	12-19
12.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	12-19
12.4.2	Methods and Approach	12-20
12.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	12-26
12.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	12-37
12.5	Cumulative Impacts	12-37
12.6	References Cited	12-38
Chapter 13	Service Providers	13-1
13.1	Introduction	13-1
13.2	Environmental Setting	13-8
13.2.1	Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries.....	13-8
13.2.2	Extended Plan Area.....	13-19
13.2.3	Southern Delta.....	13-19
13.3	Regulatory Background.....	13-33
13.3.1	Federal	13-33
13.3.2	State	13-34
13.3.3	Regional or Local.....	13-40
13.4	Impact Analysis	13-46
13.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	13-46
13.4.2	Methods and Approach	13-47
13.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	13-58
13.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	13-90
13.5	Cumulative Impacts	13-92
13.6	References Cited	13-97
13.6.1	Printed References.....	13-97
13.6.2	Personal Communications	13-103
Chapter 14	Energy and Greenhouse Gases	14-1
14.1	Introduction	14-1
14.2	Environmental Setting	14-5
14.2.1	Lower San Joaquin River and Eastside Tributaries Hydropower Production	14-5
14.2.2	Transmission System in Central California.....	14-7
14.2.3	Climate Change	14-10
14.3	Regulatory Background.....	14-14
14.3.1	Federal	14-14
14.3.2	State	14-15
14.3.3	Regional or Local.....	14-18

14.4	Impact Analysis	14-27
14.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	14-27
14.4.2	Methods and Approach	14-28
14.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	14-38
14.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	14-53
14.5	Cumulative Impacts	14-54
14.6	References Cited	14-55
Chapter 15	No Project Alternative (LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1).....	15-1
15.1	Introduction.....	15-1
15.2	Description of the No Project Alternative	15-2
15.3	Model Results.....	15-3
15.3.1	Stanislaus River	15-3
15.3.2	Tuolumne, Merced, and Lower San Joaquin Rivers.....	15-4
15.4	Impacts of the No Project Alternative.....	15-11
15.4.1	Southern Delta	15-11
15.4.2	Stanislaus River and New Melones Reservoir.....	15-11
15.4.3	Tuolumne River and New Don Pedro Reservoir	15-12
15.4.4	Merced River and Lake McClure	15-12
15.4.5	The Extended Plan Area	15-13
15.5	Cumulative Impacts of the No Project Alternative	15-13
15.5.1	Summary of Potential Cumulative Impacts on Resource Areas	15-13
15.5.2	Additional Resource Areas Considered for Cumulative Impacts under the No Project Alternative	15-16
Chapter 16	Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions.....	16-1
16.1	Introduction	16-1
16.1.1	Chapter Scope and Organization	16-2
16.2	Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives—Other Indirect Actions	16-4
16.2.1	Transfer/Sale of Surface Water	16-5
16.2.2	Substitution of Surface Water with Groundwater.....	16-16
16.2.3	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	16-40
16.2.4	Recycled Water Sources for Water Supply	16-48
16.2.5	In-Delta Diversions.....	16-68
16.2.6	Water Supply Desalination	16-70
16.2.7	New Surface Water Supplies	16-76
16.3	Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives – Non-Flow Measures	16-94
16.3.1	Floodplain and Riparian Habitat Restoration	16-94
16.3.2	Reduce Vegetation-Disturbing Activities in Floodplains and Floodways.....	16-111

16.3.3	Gravel Augmentation.....	16-117
16.3.4	Enhance In-Channel Complexity	16-130
16.3.5	Improve Temperature Conditions	16-144
16.3.6	Fish Passage Improvements – Fish Screens.....	16-157
16.3.7	Fish Passage Improvements – Physical Barrier in the Southern Delta	16-173
16.3.8	Fish Passage Improvements – Removal or Modification to Human-Made Barriers to Fish Migration	16-186
16.3.9	Predatory Fish Control	16-188
16.3.10	Invasive Aquatic Vegetation Control	16-204
16.4	Southern Delta Water Quality Alternatives – Reasonably Foreseeable Methods of Compliance	16-215
16.4.1	New Source Water Supplies	16-216
16.4.2	Salinity Pretreatment Programs	16-240
16.4.3	Desalination	16-262
16.4.4	Agricultural Return Flow Salinity Control	16-285
16.4.5	South Delta Temporary Barriers	16-299
16.4.6	Low Lift Pumping Stations	16-301
16.5	Sources of Funding.....	16-304
16.5.1	Federal Sources.....	16-304
16.5.2	State Sources	16-304
16.6	Potential Mitigation Measures	16-306
16.6.1	Other Indirect Actions and Methods of Compliance	16-306
16.6.2	Non-Flow Measures.....	16-335
16.7	Cumulative Impacts	16-355
16.8	References	16-365
16.8.1	Printed References.....	16-365
16.8.2	Personal Communications	16-384
Chapter 17	Cumulative Impacts, Growth-Inducing Effects, and Irreversible Commitment of Resources	17-1
17.1	Introduction	17-1
17.2	Cumulative Impacts	17-1
17.2.1	Projects Considered	17-1
17.2.2	Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	17-22
17.2.3	Additional Resource Areas Considered.....	17-65
17.2.4	Cumulative Impact Summary.....	17-66
17.3	Growth-Inducing Effects	17-68
17.4	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes	17-70
17.5	References Cited	17-73

Chapter 18	Summary of Impacts and Comparison of Alternatives	18-1
18.1	Introduction	18-1
18.2	LSJR Alternatives Comparison.....	18-3
18.2.1	Summary of Alternatives Impact Analysis	18-14
18.2.2	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.....	18-15
18.2.3	Environmentally Superior Alternative	18-24
18.3	SDWQ Alternatives Comparison	18-27
18.3.1	Summary of Alternatives Impact Analysis <u>and Significant and Unavoidable Impacts</u>	18-27
18.3.2	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.....	18-28
18.3.3	SDWQ Methods of Compliance	18-29
18.3.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative	18-33
Chapter 19	Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30	19-1
19.1	General Introduction	19-1
19.1.1	Problem Statement.....	19-2
19.1.2	Importance of a Natural Flow Regime	19-5
19.2	Temperature	19-8
19.2.1	Importance of a Natural Temperature Regime in Aquatic Environments.....	19-10
19.2.2	Methods of Temperature Evaluation	19-17
19.2.3	Results of Temperature Evaluation	19-20
19.2.4	Summary and Conclusions of Temperature Evaluation	19-47
19.3	Floodplain Inundation.....	19-52
19.3.1	Importance of a Natural Floodplain Inundation Regime	19-52
19.3.2	Methods of Floodplain Inundation Evaluation	19-55
19.3.3	Results of Floodplain Inundation Evaluation	19-62
19.3.4	Summary and Conclusions of Floodplain Inundation Evaluation	19-73
19.4	SalSim.....	19-74
19.4.1	Introduction of SalSim	19-74
19.4.2	Methods of State Water Board SalSim Evaluation	19-77
19.4.3	Results of the SalSim Evaluation.....	19-81
19.4.4	Summary and Conclusions of the SalSim Evaluation.....	19-85
19.5	Final Discussion of Benefits Analysis.....	19-87
19.6	References Cited.....	19-89
Chapter 20	Economic Analyses.....	20-1
20.1	Introduction	20-1
20.2	Summary of Results	20-3

20.3	Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries.....	20-12
20.3.1	Changes in Hydrologic Conditions	20-12
20.3.2	Agricultural Production and Related Effects on Economic and Local Fiscal Conditions	20-14
20.3.3	Effects on Municipal and Industrial Water Supplies and Affected Regional Economies	20-28
20.3.4	Effects on Hydropower Generation, Revenues and the Regional Economy	20-52
20.3.5	Effects on Fisheries and Associated Regional Economies.....	20-58
20.3.6	Effects on Recreational Opportunities, Activity, and the Regional Economy	20-74
20.3.7	Non-Flow Measures.....	20-80
20.4	Southern Delta.....	20-85
20.4.1	Costs of Methods of Compliance	20-85
20.4.2	Effects on Ratepayers and the Regional Economy	20-91
20.5	References Cited	20-94
20.5.1	Printed References.....	20-94
20.5.2	Personal Communications	20-99
Chapter 21	Drought Evaluation	21-1
21.1	Introduction	21-1
21.2	Tributary Runoff and Droughts.....	21-3
21.3	Stanislaus River	21-6
21.3.1	Runoff	21-6
21.3.2	Potential for Drought.....	21-7
21.3.3	Drought Water Management	21-8
21.4	Tuolumne River.....	21-10
21.4.1	Runoff	21-10
21.4.2	Potential for Drought.....	21-11
21.4.3	Drought Water Management	21-12
21.5	Merced River.....	21-13
21.5.1	Runoff	21-13
21.5.2	Potential for Drought.....	21-14
21.5.3	Drought Water Management	21-14
21.6	Evaluation of Recent Historical Reservoir Operations 1970–2015.....	21-15
21.7	Stanislaus River Diversions and Carryover Storage	21-16
21.7.1	Historical	21-16
21.7.2	WSE Baseline.....	21-17
21.8	21.7.3 Tuolumne River Diversions and Carryover Storage	21-18

21.8.1	21.7.4 Historical	21-18
21.8.2	21.7.5 WSE Baseline.....	21-19
21.9	21.8 Merced River Diversions and Carryover Storage.....	21-20
21.9.1	21.8.1 Historical	21-20
21.9.2	21.8.2 WSE Baseline.....	21-21
21.10	21.9 LSJR Alternatives and Water Supply Operations	21-21
21.10.1	21.9.1 Stanislaus River Operations	21-22
21.10.2	21.9.2 Tuolumne River Operations.....	21-27
21.10.3	21.9.3 Merced River Operations.....	21-33
21.11	21.10 Adaptive Implementation Measures for Consideration.....	21-39
21.12	21.11 References Cited	21-40
Chapter 22	Integrated Discussion of Potential Municipal and Domestic Water Supply Management Options	22-1
22.1	Introduction	22-1
22.2	Water Supply	22-2
22.2.1	Water Use	22-2
22.2.2	Water Quality.....	22-3
22.2.3	Municipal Water Use and the Current Drought	22-5
22.2.4	Domestic Wells and Household Water Shortages.....	22-6
22.3	Regulatory Background.....	22-6
22.3.1	Current Planning Efforts	22-7
22.3.2	Managing Water Supplies under Reduced Water Availability Conditions	22-9
22.3.3	Planning for Future Water Needs	22-10
22.4	Impact Analysis	22-12
22.4.1	Potential Impacts of LSJR Alternatives.....	22-12
22.4.2	Potential Impacts on Public Health.....	22-19
22.4.3	Costs of Potential Management Options.....	22-21
22.5	Assistance Programs	22-24
22.5.1	Financial Assistance	22-24
22.5.2	Technical Assistance	22-25
22.6	References Cited	22-26
22.6.1	Printed References.....	22-26
22.6.2	Personal Communications	22-28
Chapter 23	Antidegradation Analysis	23-1
23.1	Overview of Antidegradation Policies	23-1
23.2	The 2006 Bay-Delta Plan.....	23-2

23.3	San Joaquin River Water Quality Objectives for Fish and Wildlife Beneficial Uses	23-3
23.3.1	Current San Joaquin River Flow Objectives	23-3
23.3.2	Proposed Lower SJR Flow Objectives	23-4
23.4	Southern Delta Salinity Water Quality Objectives to Protect Agricultural Beneficial Uses.....	23-5
23.4.1	Current Southern Delta Salinity Objectives	23-5
23.4.2	Proposed Southern Delta Salinity Objectives	23-6
23.5	Antidegradation Analysis	23-7
23.5.1	Salinity.....	23-8
23.5.2	Flow.....	23-25
23.5.3	Other Parameters	23-25
23.6	Conclusion.....	23-28
23.7	References Cited.....	23-28
Chapter 24	List of Preparers.....	24-1
24.1	State Water Resources Control Board	24-1
24.1.1	Project Management Team	24-1
24.1.2	Technical Team	24-1
24.1.3	Additional Contributors	24-2
24.2	ICF International	24-2
24.2.1	Project Management Team	24-2
24.2.2	Technical Team	24-2
24.2.3	Production Team.....	24-3
24.3	Additional Contributors	24-4
24.4	Other Agencies and Members of the Public.....	24-4

Volume 1

Tables

Table	Page
Table ES-1	Percent Unimpaired Flows by LSJR Alternative ES-15
Table ES-2	Summary of Mean Annual Water Supply Effects ES-22
Table ES-3	Mean Annual Water Supply Effects of LSJR Alternative 3 (40 Percent Unimpaired Flow Proposal) by Water Year Type..... ES-23
Table ES-4	Groundwater Use Based on 2009 Levels of Groundwater Pumping ES-25
Table ES-5	Annual Average Applied Water Demand, Groundwater Pumping, and Unmet Demand Based on 2009 Levels of Groundwater Pumping ES-26
Table ES-6	Groundwater Use Based on 2014 Levels of Groundwater Pumping ES-27
Table ES-7	Annual Average Applied Water Demand, Groundwater Pumping, and Unmet Demand Based on 2014 Levels of Groundwater Pumping ES-27
Table ES-8	Average Annual Baseline Energy Generation and Difference from Baseline by Tributary (gigawatt hours) ES-30
Table ES-9	Average Annual Total Economic Output Related to Agricultural Production in the Irrigation Districts under Baseline Conditions and the Change for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 ES-32
Table ES-10	Average Annual Total Employment Related to Agricultural Production in the Irrigation Districts under Baseline Conditions and the change for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 ES-33
Table ES-11	Estimated Annual SFPUC Replacement Water Purchase Costs under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (Annual Average within Severe 6-Year Drought Period Represented by Years 1987–1992) ES-37
Table ES-12	Estimated Mean Annual SFPUC Replacement Water Purchase Costs under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 ES-38
Table ES-13	Mean Annual February–June Instream Flows in the Plan Area..... ES-39
Table ES-14	Mean Annual February–June Instream Flow in the Plan Area by Water Year Type..... ES-40
Table ES-15	Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits with Increased Flows February–June in All Years..... ES-42

Table ES-16	Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits with Increased Flows February–June in Critically Dry Years	ES-43
Table ES-17	Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline, February–June	ES-46
Table ES-18	Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline, April–June	ES-47
Table ES-19	Average Annual Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline (April–June) for Tuolumne River	ES-48
Table ES-20	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in Chapters 5–15, Plan Area	ES-52
Table ES-21	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in Chapters 5–14, Extended Plan Area	ES-53
Table ES-22	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives—Other Indirect Actions	ES-56
Table ES-23	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives Non-Flow Measures	ES-57
Table ES-24	CEQA Significance Summary SDWQ Alternatives—Methods of Compliance	ES-59
Table ES-25a	Organization and Contents of <u>Volume 1</u> , SED Chapters	ES-60
Table ES-25b	Organization and Contents of <u>Volume 2</u> , SED Appendices	ES-61
Table ES-26	Organization and Contents of <u>Volume 3</u> , Responses to Comments	ES-62
Table ES-27	Porter-Cologne Section 13241 Factors	ES-64
Table ES-28	Timeline of Public Involvement for the Planning Process, Public Workshops, and CEQA Noticing	ES-67
Table ES-29	Impact Determinations Identified in Chapters 5–15	ES-77
Table 2-1	Summary of Watershed and Reservoir Characteristics in San Joaquin River Basin	2-3
Table 2-2	Location of LSJR Tributaries and Rim Dams	2-4
Table 2-3	Summary of Major LSJR Surface Water Diverters and Surface Water Diversions as Reported by Irrigation District Agricultural Water Management Plans	2-7
Table 2-4	Merced Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-12
Table 2-5	FERC Project Number 2179 Streamflow Requirements for the Merced River (cfs)	2-12
Table 2-6	Cowell Agreement Streamflow Requirements for the Merced River (cubic feet per second)	2-13

Table 2-7	Historical and Unimpaired Flow February–June on the Merced River (cubic feet per second).....	2-14
Table 2-8	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Merced River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-15
Table 2-9	Monthly and Annual Historical Flow in the Merced River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-16
Table 2-10	Turlock Irrigation District - Water Supply and Use	2-18
Table 2-11	Modesto Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-19
Table 2-12	Tuolumne River Flow Requirement Summary.....	2-20
Table 2-13	FERC Project Number 2299 Streamflow Requirements for the Tuolumne River	2-21
Table 2-14	Historical and Unimpaired Flow February–June on the Tuolumne River (cubic feet per second)	2-22
Table 2-15	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Tuolumne River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-23
Table 2-16	Monthly and Annual Historical Flow in the Tuolumne River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-24
Table 2-17	South San Joaquin Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-26
Table 2-18	Oakdale Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-27
Table 2-19	Stockton East Water District—Water Supply and Use	2-28
Table 2-20	New Melones Reservoir Historical and Unimpaired Flow (cubic feet per second) February–June	2-32
Table 2-21	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Stanislaus River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-32
Table 2-22	Monthly and Annual Historical (Observed) Flow in the Stanislaus River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-33
Table 2-23	Minimum April and May Vernalis Flows (cubic feet per second)	2-35
Table 2-24	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-36
Table 2-25	Monthly and Annual Historical (Observed) Flow in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-36
Table 2-26	Wastewater Treatment Plants with Discharges into the Southern Delta	2-41

Table 3-1	February–June Unimpaired Flow as a Percent of Annual Unimpaired Flow on the Three Eastside Tributaries	3-13
Table 3-2	Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations	3-21
Table 3-3	California Department of Fish and Game Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations, 2010 (cubic feet per second)	3-23
Table 3-4	California Water Impact Network and California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations (cubic feet per second)	3-24
Table 3-5	The Bay Institute and Natural Defense Council Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations (cubic feet per second)	3-26
Table 3-6	American Rivers and Natural Heritage Institute Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations	3-27
Table 3-7	Central Valley Project Improvement Act’s 2005 Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Report Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations (cubic feet per second)	3-29
Table 3-8	Delta Solution Group LSJR Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations (cubic feet per second)	3-31
Table 3-9	Number of Years February– June Flow Schedule-Based Recommendations Exceed LSJR Alternative 4 at Vernalis by Water Year Type	3-33
Table 3-10	State Water Board’s Southern Delta Water Quality (SDWQ) Alternatives.....	3-41
Table 5-1	Summary of Impact Determinations	5-3
Table 5-2	Watershed Characteristics for the SJR at Friant Dam and the LSJR Eastside Tributaries.....	5-7
Table 5-3	Designated Beneficial Uses for Waterbodies in the Bay-Delta and the SJR Basin.....	5-8
Table 5-4	Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Listed Pollutants and Sources for the Study Area and the Upper SJR	5-10
Table 5-5	Summary of Completed and Ongoing Total Maximum Daily Loads in the SJR Basin and the Southern Delta	5-12
Table 5-6a	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of SJR Unimpaired Flow (cfs) at Friant Dam for 1922–2003.....	5-16
Table 5-6b	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of SJR Historical Flow (cfs) below Friant Dam for 1985–2009	5-16

Table 5-7	FERC Project Number 2179 Stream Flow Requirements for the Merced River at Shaffer Bridge (cfs)	5-18
Table 5-8a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Merced River Unimpaired Flow at Stevinson (cfs) for 1922–2003	5-19
Table 5-8b	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of Historical Merced River Flow (cfs) at Stevinson for 1985–2009	5-20
Table 5-9a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Tuolumne River Unimpaired Flow (cfs) for 1922–2003.....	5-24
Table 5-9b	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of Historical Tuolumne River Flow (cfs) at Modesto for 1985–2009	5-25
Table 5-10a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Stanislaus River Unimpaired Flow (cfs) at <u>New Melones Dam</u> for 1922–2003.....	5-27
Table 5-10b	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of Historical Stanislaus River Flow (cfs) at Ripon for 1985–2009	5-27
Table 5-11	2006 Bay-Delta Plan Flow Requirements at Vernalis	5-30
Table 5-12a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of SJR Unimpaired Flow (cfs) at Vernalis for 1922–2003.....	5-31
Table 5-12b	Monthly Cumulative Distribution of Historical SJR Flow (cfs) at Vernalis for 1984–2009	5-31
Table 5-13a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Historical CVP Export Pumping (cfs) for 1985–2009	5-35
Table 5-13b	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Historical SWP Export Pumping (cfs) for 1985–2009	5-35
Table 5-13c	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Historical CVP and SWP Combined Export Pumping (cfs) for 1985–2009	5-36
Table 5-14	Effect of Wastewater Dischargers on Existing Salinity Concentrations in the Southern Delta	5-45
Table 5-15a	Monthly Average Measured SJR at Vernalis EC ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) for 1985–2011	5-47
Table 5-15b	Monthly Average Measured SJR at Brandt Bridge EC ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) for 1985–2009	5-48
Table 5-15c	Monthly Average Measured Old River at Middle River (Union Island) EC ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) for 1993–2009.....	5-49
Table 5-15d	Monthly Average Measured Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge EC ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) for 1985–2009.....	5-50

Table 5-16	Average February–June Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline in the Eastside Tributaries and the SJR at Vernalis for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-year Modeling Period	5-68
Table 5-17a	Flow Summary for the Merced River at Stevinson—Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-year Modeling Period	5-70
Table 5-17b	Flow Summary for the Tuolumne River at Modesto—Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-year Modeling Period	5-71
Table 5-17c	Flow Summary for the Stanislaus River at Ripon—Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-year Modeling Period	5-71
Table 5-17d	Flow Summary for the SJR at Vernalis—Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-year Modeling Period	5-72
Table 5-18	Number and Percent of Months Affected by February–June Minimum Vernalis Flow Requirements Based on the 82 Years Simulated by the WSE Model.....	5-72
Table 5-19a	Average Annual Baseline Water Supply and Differences from Baseline (Changes in Diversions) in the Eastside Tributaries and Plan Area for the LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-73
Table 5-19b	Distribution of Changes in Average Annual Diversions Associated with the LSJR Alternatives.....	5-74
Table 5-20a	Annual Cumulative Distributions of Unimpaired Runoff and Water Supply Diversions for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (20, 40, and 60 Percent Unimpaired Flow) for Irrigation Years 1922–2003 (TAF)	5-76
Table 5-20b	Annual Cumulative Distributions of Percentage of Demand for Diversion Met for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (20, 40, and 60 Percent Unimpaired Flow) for Irrigation Years 1922–2003	5-77
Table 5-21	Cumulative Distribution of Estimated Changes in CVP and SWP Exports Caused by Changes in SJR Flow at Vernalis for the LSJR Alternatives (TAF).....	5-78
Table 5-22a	Average Carryover Storage and Differences from Baseline in the Eastside Tributary Reservoirs for the LSJR Alternatives for the 82-Year Modeling Period.....	5-79
Table 5-22b	Average Carryover Storage and Differences from Baseline in the Eastside Tributary Reservoirs for the LSJR Alternatives for Critical Years during the 82-Year Modeling Period	5-79

Table 5-23a	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Simulated Merced River Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) at River Mile 27.1 for Baseline and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for 1970–2003	5-82
Table 5-23b	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Simulated Tuolumne River Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) at River Mile 28.1 for Baseline and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for 1970–2003	5-82
Table 5-23c	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Simulated Stanislaus River Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) at River Mile 28.2 for Baseline and Differences from Baseline for the LSJR Alternatives for 1970–2003	5-83
Table 5-24a	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for Baseline for 1922–2003.....	5-85
Table 5-24b	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Brandt Bridge EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for Baseline for 1922–2003	5-85
Table 5-24c	Monthly Distribution of Old River at Tracy Boulevard EC Values (100 μ S/cm Increments) for Baseline for 1922–2003	5-86
Table 5-25	Number of Months when Estimated EC Values would be Greater than EC Objectives at Southern Delta Compliance Stations 1922–2003 (984 months)	5-86
Table 5-26a	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 2 for 1922–2003	5-87
Table 5-26b	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Brandt Bridge EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 2 for 1922–2003	5-88
Table 5-26c	Monthly Distribution of Old River at Tracy Boulevard EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 2 for 1922–2003	5-88
Table 5-27a	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 3 for 1922–2003	5-90
Table 5-27b	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Brandt Bridge EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 3 for 1922–2003	5-91
Table 5-27c	Monthly Distribution of Old River at Tracy Boulevard EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 3 for 1922–2003	5-91
Table 5-28a	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-93
Table 5-28b	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Brandt Bridge EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-93
Table 5-28c	Monthly Distribution of Old River at Tracy Boulevard EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-94

Table 5-29a	Cumulative Distributions of April–September Average EC values at Vernalis Baseline and LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-97
Table 5-29b	Cumulative Distributions of April–September Average EC values at Brandt Bridge for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-97
Table 5-29c	Cumulative Distributions of April–September Average EC values at Old River at Tracy Boulevard for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-98
Table 6-1	Summary of Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion Impact Determinations	6-2
Table 6-2	Lower San Joaquin River Channel Reaches.....	6-8
Table 6-3	River Channel Capacity	6-10
Table 6-4	National Weather Service Flood Category, Discharge, and Elevation at Plan Area Stream Gages	6-10
Table 6-5	Local Inundation Observations and Reservoir Flow Limits.....	6-11
Table 6-6	Stanislaus River Channel Reaches.....	6-13
Table 6-7	Tuolumne River Channel Reaches	6-16
Table 6-8	Merced River Channel Reaches	6-17
Table 6-9	Percent of Months with WSE Model Results Greater than Capacity	6-23
Table 6-10	Stanislaus River Peak Monthly Flow and Percent of Channel Capacity by Alternative (Channel Capacity of 8,000 cfs) During Wettest Years	6-24
Table 6-11	Tuolumne River Peak Monthly Flow and Percent of Channel Capacity by Alternative (Channel Capacity of 15,000 cfs) During Wettest Years	6-24
Table 6-12	Merced River Peak Monthly Flow and Percent of Channel Capacity by Alternative (Channel Capacity of 6,000 cfs) During Wettest Years	6-25
Table 6-13	Percentage of Monthly Flows Greater than 1,500 cfs, Stanislaus River at Goodwin.....	6-27
Table 6-14	Percentage of Monthly Flows Greater Than 1,500 cfs, Stanislaus River at Ripon	6-27
Table 7-1	Summary of Aquatic Resources Impact Determinations.....	7-3
Table 7-2	Special-Status Fish Species that Occur in the Plan Area.....	7-9
Table 7-3	Recreationally Important Fish Species in the Plan Area	7-13
Table 7-4	Geographic and Seasonal Occurrence of Indicator Fish Species and Life Stages.....	7-32

Table 7-5	Estimated Population of <i>O. Mykiss</i> from Turlock Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District (2012) Snorkel Surveys.....	7-38
Table 7-6	Tuolumne River Gravel Augmentation Projects	7-39
Table 7-7	A Summary of the Impact Thresholds, Variables, Criteria, and Data or Methods Used.....	7-62
Table 7-8a	Percent of Time Greater than or Equal to 15-foot Change in Elevation from Previous Month for New Melones Reservoir (Average)	7-70
Table 7-8b	Percent of Time Greater than or Equal to 15-foot Change in Elevation from Previous Month for New Don Pedro Reservoir (Average).....	7-70
Table 7-8c	Percent of Time Greater than or Equal to 15-foot Change in Elevation from Previous Month for Lake McClure (Average).....	7-70
Table 7-9a	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for New Melones Reservoir	7-72
Table 7-9b	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for New Don Pedro Reservoir.....	7-72
Table 7-9c	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for Lake McClure.....	7-73
Table 7-10	Flow Ranges used to Evaluate Changes in Weighted Usable Area (WUA) and Floodplain Inundation under the LSJR Alternatives for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers.....	7-74
Table 7-11a	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-76
Table 7-11b	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-77
Table 7-11c	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-78
Table 7-12a	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Spawning in the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-79

Table 7-12b	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Spawning in the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-80
Table 7-13a	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-82
Table 7-13b	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-83
Table 7-13c	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-84
Table 7-14a	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-85
Table 7-14b	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-86
Table 7-14c	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-87
Table 7-15a	Distribution of February–May Monthly Floodplain Inundation Area (acres) on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-88
Table 7-15b	Distribution of February–May Monthly Floodplain Inundation Area (acres) on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-89
Table 7-15c	Distribution of February–May Monthly Floodplain Inundation Area (acres) on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-90
Table 7-15d	Distribution of February–May Monthly Floodplain Inundation Area (acres) on the Lower San Joaquin River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-91

Table 7-16a	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-92
Table 7-16b	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-93
Table 7-16c	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-94
Table 7-17a	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternative 2, 3, and 4	7-95
Table 7-17b	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-96
Table 7-17c	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA <u>in square feet per 1,000 linear feet</u>) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-97
Table 7-18	Water Temperature Thresholds and Primary Locations and Months Used to Evaluate Potential Temperature Impacts on Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Eastside Tributaries	7-105
Table 7-19	Water Temperature Thresholds and Primary Locations and Months Used to Evaluate Potential Temperature Impacts on Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the LSJR	7-105
Table 7-20a	Distribution of September–October 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmon and Steelhead Adult Migration (64.4° F) at the Confluence of the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-108
Table 7-20b	Distribution of September–October 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relations to USEPA Criteria for Salmon and Steelhead Adult Migration (64.4° F) at the Confluence of the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-109
Table 7-20c	Distribution of September–October 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmon and Steelhead Adult Migration (64.4° F) at the Confluence of the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-110
Table 7-20d	Distribution of September–October 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmon and Steelhead Adult Migration (64.4°	

	F) in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-111
Table 7-21a	Distribution of October–March 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Spawning, Egg Incubation, and Fry Emergence (55.4°F) at RM 43.7 on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-113
Table 7-21b	Distribution of October–March 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Spawning, Egg Incubation, and Fry Emergence (55.4°F) at RM 38.3 on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-114
Table 7-21c	Distribution of October–March 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Spawning, Egg Incubation, and Fry Emergence (55.4°F) at RM 37.8 on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-115
Table 7-22a	Distribution of March–May 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Juvenile Rearing (60.8°F) at the Confluence of the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-117
Table 7-22b	Distribution of March–May 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Juvenile Rearing (60.8°F) at the Confluence of the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-118
Table 7-22c	Distribution of March–May 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Juvenile Rearing (60.8°F) at the Confluence of the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-119
Table 7-22d	Distribution of March–May 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Salmonid Juvenile Rearing (60.8°F) in the San Joaquin River near Vernalis under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-120
Table 7-23a	Distribution of July–August 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criterion for Summer Rearing (64.4°F) at RM 43.7 on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-121
Table 7-23b	Distribution of July–August 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criterion for Summer Rearing (64.4°F) at RM 38.3 on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-122

Table 7-23c	Distribution of July–August 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criterion for Summer Rearing (64.4°F) at RM 37.8 on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-123
Table 7-24a	Distribution of April– May –June 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Steelhead Smoltification (57.2°F) at the Confluence of the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-124
Table 7-24b	Distribution of April– May –June 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Steelhead Smoltification (57.2°F) at the Confluence of the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-125
Table 7-24c	Distribution of April– May –June 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Steelhead Smoltification (57.2°F) at the Confluence of the Merced River Under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-126
Table 7-24d	Distribution of April–June 7DADM Water Temperatures in Relation to USEPA Criteria for Steelhead Smoltification (57.2°F) in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-127
Table 7-25	Flow-Depth Relationships for the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reaches in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers.....	7-138
Table 7-26a	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Stanislaus River	7-139
Table 7-26b	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Tuolumne River	7-139
Table 7-26c	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Merced River	7-140
Table 7-27a	Percent of Time that the 59°F Threshold in the Stanislaus River at the Confluence is Exceeded	7-146
Table 7-27b	Percent Time that the 59°F Threshold in the Tuolumne River at the Confluence is Exceeded	7-147
Table 7-27c	Percent Time the 59°F Threshold in the Merced River at the Confluence is Exceeded.....	7-147
Table 7-27d	Percent Time that the 59°F Threshold in the SJR at Vernalis is Exceeded.....	7-147
Table 8-1	Summary of Terrestrial Biological Resources Impact Determinations	8-4
Table 8-2	Summary of National Wildlife Refuges and Other Wildlife Areas	8-9

Table 8-3a	Special-Status Plants with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Effects – LSJR and the Three Eastside Tributaries	8-17
Table 8-3b	Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Indirect Effects	8-18
Table 8-4a	Special-Status Animal Species with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Effects– LSJR and the Three Eastside Tributaries.....	8-20
Table 8-4b	Special-Status Animal Species with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Indirect Effects	8-22
Table 8-5	Special-Status Plants with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Effects – Southern Delta	8-29
Table 8-6	Special-Status Animals with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Effects – Southern Delta	8-30
Table 8-7a	Percent of Time Water Surface Elevation Fluctuation Greater than 10 Feet from Month to Month for New Melones Reservoir	8-45
Table 8-7b	Percent of Time Water Surface Elevation Fluctuation Greater than 10 Feet from Month to Month for New Don Pedro Reservoir	8-45
Table 8-7c	Percent of Time Water Surface Elevation Fluctuation Greater than 10 Feet from Month to Month for Lake McClure	8-45
Table 9-1	Summary of Groundwater Resources Impact Determinations	9-3
Table 9-2	Groundwater Subbasins Underlying the Plan Area	9-6
Table 9-3	Characteristics of Freshwater Aquifers of the Northern San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Subbasins.....	9-8
Table 9-4	Estimates of Average Groundwater Level Decline and Overdraft in the Plan Area Subbasins.....	9-16
Table 9-5	Summary of Irrigated Land in the Plan Area Subbasins.....	9-21
Table 9-6	Estimated Groundwater Pumping in the Plan Area Subbasins.....	9-22
Table 9-7	Relevant Agricultural Water Management Plans	9-36
Table 9-8	Irrigation District Methods for Dealing with Surface Water Shortages.....	9-37
Table 9-9	Relevant Groundwater Management Plans	9-39
Table 9-10	Relevant Integrated Regional Water Management Plans	9-40
Table 9-11	Relevant Urban Water Management Plans	9-41
Table 9-12	Average Annual Net Change in Irrigation District Groundwater Balance Associated with the LSJR Alternatives per Subbasin Area	9-57

Table 10-1	Summary of Recreational Resources and Aesthetics Impact Determinations	10-3
Table 10-2	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Merced River Flow (cubic feet per second [cfs]) at Stevenson for Baseline Conditions (WSE Model Results for 1922–2003)	10-26
Table 10-3	Percentage of Years with Merced River Flow (cubic feet per second [cfs]) Greater than Specified Flows within the Recreation Range Baseline Conditions (WSE Model Results for 1922–2003)	10-27
Table 10-4	Percentage of Years with Monthly Merced River Flows within Specified Recreational Ranges (cubic feet per second [cfs]) (WSE Model Results for 1922–2003)	10-28
Table 10-5	Percentage of Years with Monthly Tuolumne River Flows within Specified Recreational Ranges (cubic feet per second [cfs]) (WSE Model Results for 1922–2003)	10-29
Table 10-6	Percentage of Years with Monthly Stanislaus River Flows within Specified Recreational Ranges (cubic feet per second [cfs]) (WSE Model Results for 1922–2003)	10-30
Table 10-7	Summary of Visual Characteristics and Classifications	10-32
Table 10-8	Lake McClure May–September Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution (feet)	10-34
Table 10-9	Changes in Lake McClure Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution Compared to Baseline (feet)	10-34
Table 10-10	New Don Pedro Reservoir May–September Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution (feet)	10-35
Table 10-11	Changes in New Don Pedro Reservoir Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution Compared to Baseline (feet)	10-36
Table 10-12	New Melones Reservoir May–September Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution (feet)	10-37
Table 10-13	Changes in New Melones Reservoir Minimum Elevations and Elevations at 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution Compared to Baseline (feet)	10-37
Table 11-1	Summary of Agricultural Resources Impact Determinations	11-4
Table 11-2	California Department of Conservation’s Land Use Classification Acreages in the LSJR Area of Potential Effects	11-11
Table 11-3	Changes in Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide and Local Importance (Acres)	11-12

Table 11-4	Acres under Williamson Act Contract in the LSJR and SDWQ Areas of Potential Effects.....	11-14
Table 11-5	Crop Production in the LSJR Area of Potential Effects by DAU (Acres)	11-16
Table 11-6	Crop Production in the LSJR Area of Potential Effects by DAU (Percent).....	11-17
Table 11-7	Irrigation Method Types in Merced, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus Counties (Percent)	11-19
Table 11-8	California Farmland Mapping Program Land Use Classification for the SDWA (2010).....	11-20
Table 11-9	Crop Production in the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects for 2005.....	11-21
Table 11-10	Irrigation Method Types in San Joaquin County.....	11-23
Table 11-11	Acres Zoned for Agricultural Use in the LSJR and SDWQ Areas of Potential Effects.....	11-31
Table 11-12	Average Annual SWAP Baseline Acreage and Percent by Crop Category for Each Irrigation District	11-43
Table 11-13	Available Soil Salinity Threshold, Slope Information, and Relative Salinity Tolerance for Crops Grown in within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects.....	11-47
Table 11-14	Relative Salinity Tolerance for Crops Grown within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects that do not have Quantitative Threshold Information.....	11-48
Table 11-15	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 2.....	11-50
Table 11-16	Average Baseline and Crop Production under LSJR Alternative 2 with Adaptive Implementation.....	11-51
Table 11-17	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 3, by District, Compared to Baseline	11-54
Table 11-18	Percent Average Acreage Reduction from Baseline for Irrigation Districts Impacted under LSJR Alternative 3 for 2009 and 2014 Groundwater Pumping	11-54
Table 11-19	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 4, by District, Compared to Baseline	11-57
Table 11-20	Percent Average Acreage Reduction from Baseline for Irrigation Districts Impacted under LSJR Alternative 4 for 2009 and 2014 Groundwater Pumping Levels.	11-57
Table 11-21	Gross Revenue of Agricultural Commodities.....	11-62
Table 12-1	Summary of Cultural Resource Impact Determinations	12-3
Table 12-2	Documented Prehistoric Sites by County	12-10

Table 12-3	Documented Historic Resources by County in the Northern San Joaquin Valley.....	12-11
Table 12-4	Summary of Formations with High Paleontological Potential along the LSJR and Three Eastside Tributaries	12-14
Table 12-5	Reservoir Elevations (feet) and Expected Changes (feet) for June at the 70, 80, or 90 Percent Cumulative Distribution for New Melones, New Don Pedro, and Lake McClure	12-23
Table 12-6	Reservoir Elevations (feet) and Expected Changes (feet) for June and September at the 10, 20, or 30 Percent Cumulative Distribution for New Melones, New Don Pedro, and Lake McClure	12-24
Table 13-1	Summary of Service Provider Impact Determinations	13-3
Table 13-2	Primary Surface Water Diverters and Other Water Users.....	13-9
Table 13-3a	Public Water Suppliers in the Eastern San Joaquin, Merced, Modesto, and Turlock Subbasins	13-93
Table 13-3b	Groundwater Reliance and Summary of Well Information for Selected Public Water Suppliers in the Eastern San Joaquin, Modesto, Turlock, and Extended Merced Subbasins.....	13-11
Table 13-4	Ten Most Frequently Detected Principal Contaminants Identified in State Water Board 2013a.....	13-15
Table 13-5	Primary Detected Contaminants in Exceedance of Maximum Contamination Level in Drinking Water for Selected Water Suppliers during Representative Non-Drought and Drought Years	13-18
Table 13-6	Annual Water Use of Service Providers in the Extended Plan Area with Post-1914 Water Rights	13-19
Table 13-7	Wastewater Treatment Plants with Discharges in the Southern Delta.....	13-21
Table 13-8	Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Salinity (EC) Effluent Data (dS/m [μ mhos/cm])	13-23
Table 13-9	Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Salinity (EC) Effluent Data April–August and Remainder of the Year (dS/m [μ mhos/cm])	13-24
Table 13-10	Current Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Compliance Status with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Special Provisions for Salinity Requirements.....	13-25
Table 13-11	Salinity Reduction Efforts of Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Dischargers.....	13-25

Table 13-12	Recent Wastewater Treatment Plant National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Enforcement Orders for the Deuel Vocational Institution.....	13-28
Table 13-13	Irrigation District Methods for Addressing Surface Water Shortages	13-40
Table 13-14	Distribution of Annual Baseline Water Supply and Differences from Baseline (Changes in Diversions) in the Eastside Tributaries for the LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003.....	13-49
Table 13-15	Cumulative Distribution of Baseline EC ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) at Vernalis	13-52
Table 13-16	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 2.....	13-53
Table 13-17	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 3.....	13-53
Table 13-18	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 4.....	13-54
Table 13-19	Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant 2011-2014 Annual Average EC Effluent Data and Potential to Comply with an Effluent Limitation set to the SDWQ Alternative 2 EC Objective (dS/m [$\mu\text{mhos/cm}$]).....	13-71
Table 13-20	Current Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant 2011–2014 Annual Average EC Effluent Data and Potential to Comply with an Effluent Limitation set to the SDWQ Alternative 3 EC Objective (dS/m [$\mu\text{mhos/cm}$])	13-76
Table 14-1	Summary of Energy and Greenhouse Gases Impact Determinations	14-3
Table 14-2a	List of Hydropower Facilities.....	14-6
Table 14-2b	Elevation and Maximum Capacity at Major Hydropower Plants on Eastside Tributaries.....	14-7
Table 14-3	Annual Baseline Hydropower Generation on LSJR Eastside Tributaries.....	14-7
Table 14-4	Balancing Authority of Major Hydropower Plants on LSJR Eastside Tributaries.....	14-8
Table 14-5	Local Capacity Requirements versus Peak Load and Local Area Generation for Greater Fresno Area	14-9
Table 14-6	Lifetime and Global Warming Potentials.....	14-11
Table 14-7	Global, National, and State Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventories	14-12
Table 14-8	Agricultural Water Management Plans and Climate Change	14-20
Table 14-9	Urban Water Management Plans and Climate Change	14-25

Table 14-10	Change in Average Annual Hydropower Generation from Baseline	14-31
Table 14-11	Increase in Estimated Average Annual Groundwater Pumping by the Irrigation Districts Relative to Baseline (TAF/y)	14-35
Table 14-12	Increase in Electricity Consumption for Groundwater Pumping	14-35
Table 14-13	2010 Annual Electricity Consumption in San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced Counties	14-35
Table 14-14	Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors (lb/MWh)	14-36
Table 14-15	Estimated Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MT CO ₂ e/year)	14-37
Table 15-1	Monthly Cumulative Distributions of Baseline Flow and Differences from Baseline for the No Project Alternative for the 82-Year WSE Modeling Period	15-5
Table 15-2	Summary of Impact Determinations for the No Project Alternative (LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1)	15-18
Table 16-1	Environmental Water Account Contract Sales 2002–2004	16-6
Table 16-2	Long-Term Transfers 1997–2005	16-7
Table 16-3	Typical Well Pump Test Data in the San Joaquin Groundwater Basin	16-17
Table 16-4	Pacific Gas & Electric Average Bundled Rates by Class 2007–2011	16-17
Table 16-5	Typical Agricultural Groundwater Production Costs by Hydrologic Region	16-18
Table 16-6	Example New Groundwater Well Projects Funded by the California Department of Water Resources Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant Program, Phase 1	16-19
Table 16-7	Potential Environmental Effects of Substituting Surface Water with Groundwater	16-22
Table 16-8	Groundwater Recharge Projects Funded by the California Department of Water Resources Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant Program, Phase 1	16-40
Table 16-9	Potential Environmental Effects of Aquifer Storage and Recovery	16-42
Table 16-10	Potential Environmental Effects of Developing Recycled Water Sources	16-51
Table 16-11a	Cost Estimates for BARDP Use of Existing Water Conveyance and Storage Facilities	16-72
Table 16-11b	Potential Environmental Effects of New Surface Water Supplies	16-79
Table 16-12	Potential Environmental Effects of Floodplain and Riparian Habitat Restoration	16-98

Table 16-13	Potential Environmental Effects of Reducing Vegetation-Disturbing Activities in Floodplains and Floodways.....	16-113
Table 16-14	Central Valley Project Improvement Act ^a Spawning & Rearing Habitat Restoration Projects	16-118
Table 16-15	Potential Environmental Effects of Gravel Augmentation	16-120
Table 16-16	Engineered Log Structures and Large Woody Debris – Cost Estimates.....	16-131
Table 16-17	Potential Environmental Effects of Installation and Operation of In-Channel Enhancing Structures	16-133
Table 16-18	Potential Environmental Effects of Improved Temperature Conditions	16-147
Table 16-19	Design and Construction Costs Davis Ranches Site 2 Pump 4 & 5 Project	16-158
Table 16-20	Potential Environmental Effects of Fish Passage Improvements—Fish Screens.....	16-161
Table 16-21	Potential Environmental Effects of Fish Passage Improvements—Physical Barrier in the Southern Delta.....	16-176
Table 16-22	Potential Environmental Effects of Predatory Fish Control.....	16-192
Table 16-23	Potential Environmental Effects of Invasive Aquatic Vegetation Control	16-207
Table 16-24	Design and Construction Costs for the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project and Delta Water Supply Project	16-217
Table 16-25	Potential Environmental Effects of New Source Water Supply Facilities	16-219
Table 16-26	Inland Empire Utilities Agency Water Softener Buy-Back Program Costs.....	16-241
Table 16-27	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts Water Softener Buy-Back Program Costs.....	16-241
Table 16-28	Potential Environmental Effects of Salinity Source Controls.....	16-244
Table 16-29	California Water Plan Update 2009 Unit Cost of Desalination	16-263
Table 16-30	Potential Environmental Effects of Wastewater Treatment Plant Desalination	16-265
Table 16-31	Costs and Components of a Real-Time Management System.....	16-286
Table 16-32	Potential Environmental Effects of Agricultural Return Flow Salinity Controls.....	16-288
Table 16-33	Temporary Barrier 2015 Schedule	16-300
Table 16-34	Single Pumping Sites Estimated Initial Capital Costs	16-302
Table 16-35	Two Pumping Sites Estimated Initial Capital Costs.....	16-302

Table 16-36	Single Pumping Sites Estimated Annual Costs	16-302
Table 16-37	Two Pumping Sites Estimated Annual Costs.....	16-303
Table 16-38	Potential Mitigation Measures for Construction and Operation Activities Related to Other Indirect and Additional Actions	16-309
Table 16-39	Potential Mitigation Measures for Construction and Operation Activities Related to Non-Flow Measures	16-337
Table 17-1	Cumulative Project List	17-5
Table 17-2	Summary of Chapter 13, <i>Service Providers</i> , Impact Determinations for LSJR and SDWQ Alternatives	17-56
Table 17-3	Summary of Cumulative Impacts in the Plan Area	17-67
Table 17-4	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations for Cumulative Impacts in the Extended Plan Area	17-68
Table 18-1	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in Chapters 5–15	18-5
Table 18-2	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 in Chapters 5–14—Extended Plan Area.....	18-6
Table 18-3	Summary of LSJR Alternatives CEQA Significance Analysis by Geography in Chapters 5–15	18-7
Table 18-4	Impact Determinations Identified in Chapters 5–15	18-35
Table 18-5	Impact Determinations that Change with Adaptive Implementation (LSJR Alternatives 2 and 3).....	18-11
Table 18-6	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives—Other Indirect Actions	18-21
Table 18-7	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives—Non-Flow Measures	18-22
Table 18-8	CEQA Significance Summary SDWQ Alternatives—Methods of Compliance.....	18-31
Table 19-1	Primary Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced River fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead (composite) temperature evaluation considerations.....	19-19
Table 19-2	Primary Lower San Joaquin River fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead (composite) temperature evaluation considerations.....	19-20
Table 19-3	The percentage of time on the Stanislaus River that USEPA salmon and steelhead temperature criteria (7DADM unit of measurement) are met each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the magnitude of expected percent change under modeled unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) locations.....	19-22

Table 19-4 The average daily 7DADM temperature values for each month on the Stanislaus River under modeled baseline (base) condition from 1970 to 2003, and the modeled difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% to 60%. 19-23

Table 19-5 The 90th percentile daily 7DADM temperature values for the 1970 to 2003 model period for each month at different Stanislaus River locations, and the expected difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% and 60%. 19-24

Table 19-6 The percentage of time on the Tuolumne River that USEPA salmon and steelhead temperature criteria (7DADM unit of measurement) are met each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the magnitude of expected percent change under modeled unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) locations..... 19-25

Table 19-7 The average daily 7DADM temperature values for each month on the Tuolumne River under modeled baseline (base) condition from 1970 to 2003, and the modeled difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% to 60%. 19-26

Table 19-8 The 90th percentile daily 7DADM temperature values for the 1970 to 2003 model period for each month at different Tuolumne River locations, and the expected difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% and 60%. 19-27

Table 19-9 The percentage of time on the Merced River that USEPA salmon and steelhead temperature criteria (7DADM unit of measurement) are met each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the magnitude of expected percent change under modeled unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) 19-28

Table 19-10 The average daily 7DADM temperature values for each month on the Merced River under modeled baseline (base) condition from 1970 to 2003, and the modeled difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% to 60%. 19-29

Table 19-11 The 90th percentile daily 7DADM temperature values for the 1970 to 2003 model period for each month at different Merced River locations, and the expected difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% and 60%. 19-30

Table 19-12 The percentage of time on the San Joaquin River that USEPA salmon and steelhead temperature criteria (7DADM unit of measurement) are met each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the magnitude of expected percent change under modeled unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) 19-31

Table 19-13	The average daily 7DADM temperature values for each month on the San Joaquin River (SJR) under modeled baseline (base) condition from 1970 to 2003, and the modeled difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% to 60%.	19-32
Table 19-14	The 90th percentile daily 7DADM temperature values for the 1970 to 2003 model period for each month at different San Joaquin River (SJR) locations, and the expected difference in °F for each of the unimpaired flow percentages between 20% and 60%.....	19-33
Table 19-15	Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits Combined for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers from Different February through June Unimpaired Flow (UF) Percentages for all Modeled Water Years.	19-45
Table 19-16	Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits Combined for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers from Different February through June Unimpaired Flow (UF) Percentages for Critically Dry Water Years	19-46
Table 19-17	Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits Combined for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers from Different February through June Unimpaired Flow (UF) Percentages for Dry Water Years.....	19-47
Table 19-18	Floodplain versus flow relationship for the entire modeled portion (Knight Ferry (RM 54.5) to the confluence (RM 0)) of the Stanislaus River (from USFWS 2013b and personal communication Mark Gard 2013)	19-58
Table 19-19	Lower Tuolumne River overbank (floodplain) inundated area as a function of discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5.....	19-60
Table 19-20	Merced River floodplain area versus flow from Crocker Huffman Dam (RM 52.2) to Santa Fe Road (RM 27).	19-61
Table 19-21	Inundated floodplain acreage in San Joaquin River between Mossdale (Interstate-5 Bridge (RM 56.2) and the confluence with the Stanislaus River (RM 72.5).	19-62
Table 19-22	Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly Stanislaus River flows at Goodwin Dam greater than the specified flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%.....	19-63
Table 19-23	Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly Tuolumne River flows at La Grange Dam greater than the specified flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%.....	19-64
Table 19-24	Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly Merced River flows at Crocker Huffman Dam greater than the specified	

flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%. 19-65

Table 19-25 Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly San Joaquin River flows (above the Tuolumne River confluence) greater than the specified flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%. 19-66

Table 19-26 Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly San Joaquin River flows (above the Stanislaus confluence) greater than the specified flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%. 19-67

Table 19-27 Percentage of years under baseline (base) conditions with average monthly San Joaquin River flows at Vernalis greater than the specified flow, and the expected percent change under each of the unimpaired flows between 20% and 60%. 19-68

Table 19-28 Annual average floodplain inundation in acre*days and percent increase during February through June for baseline and different unimpaired flow percentages. 19-71

Table 19-29 Annual average floodplain inundation in acre*days and percent increase during April through June for baseline and different unimpaired flow percentages. 19-72

Table 19-30 Average annual floodplain inundation in acre*days and percent increase during April through June for baseline and different unimpaired flow percentages for the Tuolumne River. 19-73

Table 19-31 Surrogate years that were used to extend the WSE model for the 2004 through the 2010 time period 19-80

Table 19-32 SalSim Annual Total Adult Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Production for Different Flow Cases..... 19-84

Table 20.2-1 Summary of Average Annual Cost and Beneficial Effects of LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Relative to Baseline Conditions: Agricultural Production and Related Economics..... 20-4

Table 20.2-2 Summary of Average Annual Cost and Beneficial Effects of LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Relative to Baseline Conditions: Municipal and Industrial Water Supply and Related Economics 20-5

Table 20.2-3 Summary of Average Annual Cost and Beneficial Effects of LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Relative to Baseline Conditions: Hydropower Generation and Related Economics..... 20-7

Table 20.2-4	Summary of Average Annual Cost and Beneficial Effects of LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Relative to Baseline Conditions: Fisheries and Related Economics	20-8
Table 20.2-5	Summary of Average Annual Cost and Beneficial Effects of LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, Relative to Baseline Conditions: Recreation Activity-Related Economics	20-9
Table 20.3.1-1	Average Annual Baseline Water Supply and Differences from Baseline (Changes in `Diversion) in the Eastside Tributaries and Plan Area for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (1922–2003).....	20-13
Table 20.3.2-1	Average Annual Acreage of Irrigated Crops for Baseline and Average Difference (in Acres and Percent) between LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 and Baseline, by Crop Group	20-16
Table 20.3.2-2	Estimates of Annual Average Agricultural Revenues under Baseline Conditions and the Change in Revenues for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, by Irrigation District.....	20-17
Table 20.3.2-3	The Average Annual Cost of Groundwater Pumping in the Irrigation Districts, and its Associated Induced Effects on Total Economic Output and Employment under Baseline Conditions and for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	20-20
Table 20.3.2-4	Estimates of Total Economic Output Related to Agricultural Production in the Irrigation Districts under Baseline Conditions and Associated with Changes in Agricultural Production under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	20-22
Table 20.3.2-5	Estimates of Total Employment Related to Agricultural Production in the Irrigation Districts under Baseline Conditions and the Change for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	20-22
Table 20.3.2-6	Estimates of Local Government Tax Revenue and Crop Farming Contribution from IMPLAN.....	20-24
Table 20.3.2-7	Fiscal Impacts by County of a Hypothetical \$1 Million Crop Revenue Loss.....	20-25
Table 20.3.2-8	Estimated Change in Tax Revenue Associated with Predicted Changes in Annual Agricultural Production for LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 Relative to Baseline Conditions.....	20-26
Table 20.3.2-9	Estimates of Local Tax Revenue Associated with Predicted Changes in Annual Agricultural Production, as a Percent of Total Tax Revenue	20-27
Table 20.3.3-1	South San Joaquin Irrigation District Water Usage by Type of Use.....	20-29
Table 20.3.3-2	South San Joaquin Irrigation District 2016 Water Rate Structure	20-30
Table 20.3.3-3	Stockton East Water District Rate Structure and Units Billed, by Type of Use.....	20-31
Table 20.3.3-4	Modesto Irrigation District Water Usage in 2012, by Type of Use	20-31

Table 20.3.3-5 Modesto Irrigation District Water Rate Structure	20-32
Table 20.3.3-6 Cost Estimates for Developing Alternative Water Supplies.....	20-33
Table 20.3.3-7 SFPUC Water Deliveries to Retail and Wholesale Agencies and Reliance of Agencies on San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water, 2010	20-36
Table 20.3.3-8 Percentage Distribution of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Deliveries by Customer Class, 2010	20-37
Table 20.3.3-9a Estimated San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Replacement Water Purchase Costs in Severe Drought Years (1987–1992) under the LSJR Alternatives.....	20-40
Table 20.3.3-9b Estimated Mean Annual (1983–2003) San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Replacement Water Purchase Costs in Severe Drought Years under the LSJR Alternatives	20-41
Table 20.3.3-10 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects (Direct, Indirect, and Induced) during Severe Drought Years on Economic Output in the Bay Area Region Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 1	20-43
Table 20.3.3-11 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects (Direct, Indirect, and Induced) during Severe Drought Years on Jobs in the Bay Area Region Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 1	20-44
Table 20.3.3-12 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects (Direct, Indirect, and Induced) during Severe Drought Years on Economic Output in the Bay Area Region Associated with the LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 2.....	20-45
Table 20.3.3-13 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects (Direct, Indirect, and Induced) during Severe Drought Years on Jobs in the Bay Area Region Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 2.....	20-46
Table 20.3.3-14a Estimated SFPUC Budget Effects of Purchasing Replacement Water Supplies during Severe Drought Periods Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 1	20-47
Table 20.3.3-14b Estimated Longer-Term SFPUC Budget Effects of Purchasing Replacement Water Supplies during Severe Drought Periods Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 1.....	20-48
Table 20.3.3-15a Estimated SFPUC Budget Effects of Purchasing Replacement Water Supplies during Severe Drought Periods Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 2	20-48
Table 20.3.3-15b Estimated Longer-term SFPUC Budget Effects of Purchasing Replacement Water Supplies during Severe Drought Periods Associated with LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4: Scenario 2.....	20-49

Table 20.3.3-16 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects on Economic Output in the Four-County Bay Area Region during Severe Drought Years under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 for Different Water Transfer Prices 20-50

Table 20.3.3-17 Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects on Employment in the Four-County Bay Area Region during Severe Drought Years under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 for Different Water Transfer Prices 20-51

Table 20.3.4-1 Selected 80th Percentile of Hourly Prices from 2006 and Factors used to Escalate to 2008 Dollars..... 20-54

Table 20.3.4-2 Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Generation and Difference from Baseline, by Tributary 20-55

Table 20.3.4-3 Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Generation in New Melones, New Don Pedro, and New Exchequer Hydropower Facilities and Difference from Baseline, by Facility..... 20-55

Table 20.3.4-4 Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Revenue and Difference from Baseline, by Tributary 20-56

Table 20.3.4-5 Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Revenue from New Melones, New Don Pedro, and New Exchequer Hydropower Facilities and Difference from Baseline, by Facility..... 20-56

Table 20.3.5-1 California Commercial Troll Chinook Salmon Landings (in number of fish) and Prices by Catch Area, 1976–2014 20-62

Table 20.3.5-2 California Ocean Recreational Chinook Salmon Landings (in number of fish) by Catch Area, 1976–2014..... 20-65

Table 20.3.5-3 Existing Studies that Estimate the Non-Use Monetary Benefits Associated with Restoring Salmon Populations, as Measured by the Public’s Willingness to Pay 20-72

Table 20.3.6-1 Estimated Use (in Visitor Days) of Affected Recreation Areas, by Watershed..... 20-76

Table 20.3.7-1 Central Valley Project Improvement Act^a Spawning and Rearing Habitat Restoration Projects 20-82

Table 20.3.7-2 Engineered Log Structures and Large Woody Debris—Cost Estimates..... 20-83

Table 20.3.7-3 Design and Construction Costs for Davis Ranches Site 2, Pumps 4 & 5 Project 20-84

Table 20.4.1-1 Design and Construction Costs for the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project and Delta Water Supply Project 20-87

Table 20.4.1-2 California Water Plan Update 2009 Unit Cost of Desalination 20-89

Table 20.4.1-3 Costs and Components of a Real-Time Management System..... 20-90

Table 21-1	Cumulative Distributions of Annual (WY) and February–June Unimpaired Runoff and the February–June Fraction of Runoff for the LSJR Tributaries for 1921–2015 (95 years)	21-3
Table 21-2	Cumulative Distributions of Annual (WY) and February–June Unimpaired Runoff as Fraction of Average Runoff for the for the LSJR Tributaries for 1921–2015 (95 years)	21-5
Table 21-3	Cumulative Distribution of WSE Baseline Annual (WY) Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015	21-9
Table 21-4a	Cumulative Distributions of WSE Model Stanislaus River Diversions for LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2015	21-26
Table 21-4b	Cumulative Distributions of WSE Model Tuolumne River Diversions for LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2015	21-32
Table 21-4c	Cumulative Distributions of WSE Model Merced River Diversions for LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2015	21-38
Table 22-1	Number of Domestic Wells and Number of Well Outage Reported	22-6
Table 22-2	Urban Water Conservation and Residential Water Use	22-11
Table 22-3	Average Annual Change in Surface Water Diversion Compared to Baseline in the Plan Area.....	22-12
Table 22-4	Estimated Effect of LSJR Alternatives on Average Annual Groundwater Pumping in the Study Area (Assuming Maximum Groundwater Pumping Based on 2009 Infrastructure)	22-14
Table 22-5	Estimated Effect of LSJR Alternatives on Average Annual Groundwater Pumping in the Study Area	22-15
Table 22-6	Example New Groundwater Well Projects Funded by the State	22-23
Table 22-7	Costs of Potential Management Options.....	22-23
Table 23-1	Current South Delta EC Standards	23-5
Table 23-2	Annual Average EC at Southern Delta Compliance Locations under Modeled Baseline Conditions and the Change in Value based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow.....	23-15

Volume 1

Figures

Figure		Follows Page
Figure ES-1	San Joaquin River Basin	ES-6
Figure ES-2	Plan Area	ES-6
Figure ES-3	Percent of Time that Temperature Goal for April Core Rearing is Achieved in the Merced River	on ES-41
Figure ES-4	Lower Tuolumne Inundated Wetted Surface Area as a Function of Discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5	on ES-45
Figure 2-1a	Central Valley Basin and San Joaquin River Basin.....	2-2
Figure 2-1b	Vicinity Map of Plan Area and Extended Plan Area	2-2
Figure 2-2	The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	2-4
Figure 2-3	San Joaquin River Basin and Groundwaer Subbasins	2-6
Figure 2-4	Vicinity May of Irrigation Districts	2-6
Figure 2-5	Schematic Representation of Water Use by Irrigation Districts and Riparian Diverters.....	2-6
Figure 2-6	Schematic Representation of Groundwater Pumping with Associated Consumptive Use and Returns.....	2-8
Figure 2-7	Monthly Unimpaired and Historical San Joaquin River Flows at Friant Dam for Water Years 2000–2009	on 2-10
Figure 2-8	Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Merced River Flows February–June for Water Years 2000–2009	on 2-14
Figure 2-9	Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Tuolumne River Flows February–June for Water Years 2000–2009	on 2-22
Figure 2-10	Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Stanislaus River Flows February–June for Water Years 2000–2009	on 2-31
Figure 2-11	Monthly Unimpaired and Historical LSJR Flows at Vernalis February–June for Water Years 2000–2009	on 2-35
Figure 2-12	Vicinity Map of Southern Delta.....	2-38
Figure 3-1	Conceptual Illustrations of Adaptive Implementation Methods for each LSJR Alternative	3-14

Figure 3-2 Flow Exceedance Plot of Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development’s (CCDCD’s) Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives..... on 3-22

Figure 3-3 Flow Exceedance Plot of California Department of Fish and Game’s (CDFG’s) Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives..... on 3-24

Figure 3-4 Flow Exceedance Plot of California Water Impact Network and California Sportfishing Protection Alliance’s (C-WIN/CSPA) Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives on 3-25

Figure 3-5 Flow Exceedance Plot of The Bay Institute and Natural Defense Council’s (TBI/NRDC) Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives..... on 3-27

Figure 3-6 Flow Exceedance Plot of American Rivers and Natural Heritage Institute’s (AR/NHI) Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives on 3-28

Figure 3-7 Flow Exceedance Plot of Central Valley Project Improvement Act’s 2005 Anadromous Fish Restoration Program’s Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives..... on 3-30

Figure 3-8 Flow Exceedance Plot of Delta Solution Group’s Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives..... on 3-32

Figure 5-1 Division of Water Supply between Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts (TID/MID) and the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) for 1992 and 1993 on 5-23

Figure 5-2 Measured Daily Minimum and Maximum Tidal Elevations in Old River Upstream and Downstream of the Temporary Barrier (near the DMC Intake) Compared to the Tidal Elevations at Martinez for 2003 on 5-38

Figure 5-3a DSM2-Simulated Tidal Elevations for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier Location with No CVP or SWP Pumping and No Barrier for July 1985 on 5-39

Figure 5-3b DSM2-Simulated Tidal Flow Volumes (acre-feet) for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier Location with No CVP or SWP Pumping and No Barrier for July 1985 on 5-39

Figure 5-4a DSM2-Simulated Tidal Elevations for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier Location with CVP Pumping (4,533 cfs) and SWP Pumping (7,180 cfs) with No Barriers for July 1985 on 5-40

Figure 5-4b DSM2-Simulated Tidal Flow Volumes (acre-feet) for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier Location with CVP and SWP Pumping with No Barriers for July 1985 on 5-41

Figure 5-5a DSM2-Simulated Tidal Elevations for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier with Full CVP and SWP Pumping with the Barrier Installed for July 1985 on 5-42

Figure 5-5b DSM2-Simulated Tidal Flow Volumes (acre-feet) for Old River at the DMC Temporary Barrier with Full CVP and SWP Pumping with the Barrier Installed for July 1985..... on 5-43

Figure 5-6 Annual WSE Model Baseline SJR Flow at Vernalis and Three Tributary Total Diversion Compared to SWRCB CALSIM Results..... on 5-56

Figure 5-7 Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: New Melones Reservoir Storage for 1922–2003 on 5-67

Figure 5-8 Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: Stanislaus River Total February–June Flows for 1922–2003 on 5-67

Figure 5-9 Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: Stanislaus River Diversions for 1922–2003..... on 5-68

Figure 6-1 San Joaquin River Longitudinal Profile..... 6-6

Figure 6-2abc Meandering Channel Characteristics..... 6-6

Figure 6-3 Channel Capacities and Levees 6-8

Figure 6-4 Longitudinal Profiles for Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers 6-12

Figure 7-1 Estimates of Annual Escapement of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Stanislaus River from 1952 to 2011 7-34

Figure 7-2 Estimates of Annual Escapement of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Tuolumne River from 1952 to 2011..... 7-38

Figure 7-3 Estimates of Annual Escapement of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Merced River from 1952 to 2011 7-42

Figure 8-1a Lower San Joaquin River Land Cover 8-8

Figure 8-1b Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers Land Cover 8-8

Figure 8-2 National Wildlife Refuges and Other Wildlife Areas..... 8-8

Figure 8-3abc Lower San Joaquin River Vegetation Communities 8-14

Figure 8-4abc Merced River Vegetation Communities..... 8-14

Figure 8-5abc Tuolumne River Vegetation Communities..... 8-14

Figure 8-6 abc Stanislaus River Vegetation Communities 8-14

Figure 9-1 Vicinity Map of Groundwater Subbasins 9-2

Figure 9-2 Conceptual Water Budget 9-12

Figure 9-3 Spring 2010 Groundwater Elevation Contours for the San Joaquin Valley
 Portion of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region 9-14

Figure 9-4 Change in Groundwater Elevation Contour Map for the San Joaquin Valley
 Portion of the San Joaquin Hydrologic Region (Spring 2005-Spring 2010) 9-16

Figure 9-5 Spring 2010 Depth to Groundwater Contours for the San Joaquin Valley
 Portion of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region 9-16

Figure 9-6 Partitioning of Baseline Diversions from the Stanislaus River into End Uses..... on 9-49

Figure 9-7a Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied
 Water Demand for the Stanislaus River on 9-50

Figure 9-7b Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied
 Water Demand for the Tuolumne River on 9-50

Figure 9-7c Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied
 Water Demand for the Merced River on 9-51

Figure 9-8 Effect of Stanislaus River Irrigation Districts on Baseline Groundwater
 Balance..... on 9-52

Figure 9-9 Net Annual Contribution to Groundwater Subbasins by the Irrigation
 Districts under Baseline Conditions on 9-52

Figure 9-10 Annual Net Contribution to the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin by SSJID, OID,
 SEWD, and CSJWCD on 9-54

Figure 9-11 Annual Net Contribution to the Modesto Subbasin by MID and OID on 9-55

Figure 9-12 Annual Net Contribution to the Turlock Subbasin by TID and MID..... on 9-55

Figure 9-13 Annual Net Contribution to the Extended Merced Subbasin by MID on 9-56

Figure 11-1 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Designations within the L&JR
 Area of Potential Effects 11-2

Figure 11-2 Agriculture within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects 11-2

Figure 11-3ab Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Baseline.....11-44

Figure 11-4 Irrigated Acreage in OID for Baseline 11-44

Figure 11-5 Irrigated Acreage in SEWD and CSJWCD for Baseline..... 11-44

Figure 11-6 Irrigated Acreage in MID for Baseline..... 11-44

Figure 11-7 Irrigated Acreage in TID for Baseline 11-44

Figure 11-8 Irrigated Acreage in Merced ID for Baseline..... 11-44

Figure 11-9	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	11-50
Figure 11-10	Irrigated Acreage in OID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	11-50
Figure 11-11	Irrigated Acreage in SEWD and CSJWCD for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	11-50
Figure 11-12	Irrigated Acreage in MID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	11-50
Figure 11-13	Irrigated Acreage in TID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline.....	11-50
Figure 11-14	Irrigated Acreage in Merced ID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	11-50
Figure 11-15a	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-15b	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Pasture under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-15c	Irrigated Acreage in Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-16	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Pasture under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-17a	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3.....	11-54
Figure 11-17b	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 3.....	11-54
Figure 11-17c	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Field Crops under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-17d	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Grain under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-17e	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Rice under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-18a	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3.....	11-54
Figure 11-18b	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Field Crops under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-18c	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Pasture under Alternative 3	11-54
Figure 11-19a	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-19b	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-19c	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Pasture under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-19d	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-20a	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-20b	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-20c	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4.....	11-56
Figure 11-20d	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4.....	11-56
Figure 11-20e	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Pasture under Alternative 4	11-56
Figure 11-20f	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Rice under Alternative 4.....	11-56

Figure 11-21a Irrigated Acreage in MID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4..... 11-56

Figure 11-21b Irrigated Acreage in MID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-21c Irrigated Acreage in MID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4..... 11-56

Figure 11-21d Irrigated Acreage in MID for Field Crops under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-21e Irrigated Acreage in MID for Pasture under Alternative 4..... 11-56

Figure 11-21f Irrigated Acreage in MID for Rice under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-21g Irrigated Acreage in MID for Truck Crops under Alternative 4..... 11-56

Figure 11-22a Irrigated Acreage in TID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4..... 11-56

Figure 11-22b Irrigated Acreage in TID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-22c Irrigated Acreage in TID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-22d Irrigated Acreage in TID for Field Crops under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-22e Irrigated Acreage in TID for Pasture under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 11-22f Irrigated Acreage in TID for Truck Crops under Alternative 4 11-56

Figure 13-1a Vicinity Map of Service Providers Relying on Surface Water 13-8

Figure 13-1b Vicinity Map of Selected Service Providers Relying Solely on 11-
 Groundwater..... 13-10

Figure 13-2 Municipal and Domestic Groundwater Wells in the Eastern San Joaquin,
 Modesto, Turlock, Merced, and Tracy Groundwater Subbasins 13-10

Figure 14-1 Global GHG Emissions by Source 14-12

Figure 14-2 National GHG Emissions by Source..... 14-12

Figure 14-3 Statewide GHG Emissions by Source 14-12

Figure 14-4 Change in Average Monthly Hydropower Generation across 82 Years of
 Simulation Associated with the LSJR Flow Alternatives Compared to Baseline on 14-32

Figure 15-1 Comparison of Baseline and No Project Alternative Annual Flow Volume
 (TAF = thousand acre-feet) for the (a) Stanislaus, (b) Tuolumne, and (c)
 Merced Rivers near Their Confluences with the San Joaquin River from
 1922–2003 on 15-6

Figure 15-2 Stanislaus River (a) February–June Flow at Ripon, (b) End-of-September (i.e.,
 Carryover) Storage in New Melones Reservoir, (c) Diversions, and (d)
 February–June Flow as a Percentage of Unimpaired Flow..... on 15-7

Figure 15-3 Tuolumne River (a) February–June Flow at Modesto, (b) End-of-September (i.e., Carryover) Storage in New Don Pedro Reservoir, (c) Diversions, and (d) February–June Flow as a Percentage of Unimpaired Flow..... on 15-8

Figure 15-4 Merced River (a) February–June Flow at Stevinson, (b) End-of-September (i.e., Carryover) Storage in Lake McClure, (c) Diversions, and (d) February–June Flow as a Percentage of Unimpaired Flow on 15-9

Figure 15-5 San Joaquin River (a) February–June Flow at Vernalis, (b) Combined Diversions from the Three Tributaries (Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers), and (c) February–June Flow as a Percentage of Unimpaired Flow..... on 15-10

Figure 19-1 Difference in natural production of adult fall-run Chinook salmon when comparing the 1967-1991 average and the 1992-2011 average in tributaries to the Sacramento or San Joaquin Rivers, showing that salmon declines in the tributaries to the San Joaquin River are greater compared to other watersheds in recent decades. on 19-3

Figure 19-2 Relationship between adult salmon returns to the San Joaquin basin and the river flows they experienced as juveniles..... on 19-4

Figure 19-3 Typical Stanislaus River annual hydrograph of daily average unimpaired and observed flows during a wet water year (2005) illustrating important hydrograph components. on 19-6

Figure 19-4 Typical Stanislaus River annual hydrograph of daily average unimpaired and observed flows during a critically dry water year (2008) illustrating important hydrograph components. on 19-7

Figure 19-5 Average daily water temperature versus average daily flow relationship on the Tuolumne River during May at river mile 28.1 from 1980 to 2010 (modeled historic information from the SJR HEC-5Q model)..... on 19-10

Figure 19-6 Myrick and Cech (2001) illustrate effects of incubation temperature on mortality of Chinook salmon eggs. on 19-15

Figure 19-7 Merced River average daily temperature under baseline conditions from 1960 to 2010 at three different locations, which illustrates that both fall and spring temperature windows have been negatively altered compared to more natural conditions. on 19-50

Figure 19-8 Stanislaus River average daily temperature under baseline conditions from 1960 to 2010 at three different locations. on 19-51

Figure 19-9 Tuolumne River average daily temperature under baseline conditions from 1960 to 2010 at three different locations, which illustrates that there is an altered temperature regime. on 19-52

Figure 19-10 Reaches for Stanislaus River floodplain area versus flow modeling on 19-57

Figure 19-11 Lower Tuolumne River wetted surface area as a function of discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5..... on 19-59

Figure 19-12 Lower Tuolumne River overbank (floodplain) inundated area as a function of discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5..... on 19-60

Figure 19-13 SalSim average total adult fall-run Chinook salmon production per year from 1994 to 2010 resulting from different flow cases. on 19-82

Figure 19-14 SalSim annual total adult fall-run Chinook salmon production from 1994 to 2010 resulting from different flow cases..... on 19-83

Figure 20.3.4-1 Monthly Average Price and Median Monthly Average Price of Power 1998–2008 on 20-53

Figure 21-1 Stanislaus River Annual (WY) and February–June Unimpaired Runoff (TAF) with Annual and Cumulative Runoff Deficits for 1921–2015 on 21-7

Figure 21-2 Tuolumne River Annual (WY) and February–June Unimpaired Runoff (TAF) with Annual and Cumulative Runoff Deficits for 1921–2015 on 21-11

Figure 21-3 Merced River Annual (WY) and February–June Unimpaired Runoff (TAF) with Annual and Cumulative Runoff Deficits for 1921–2015 on 21-14

Figure 21-4 Stanislaus River Runoff with Historical and WSE Baseline Diversions, Diversion Deficits and Carryover Storage Drawdowns for WY 1970–2015..... on 21-17

Figure 21-5 Tuolumne River Runoff with Historical and WSE Baseline Diversions, Diversion Deficits and Carryover Storage Drawdowns for WY 1970–2015..... on 21-18

Figure 21-6 Merced River Runoff with Historical and WSE Baseline Diversions, Diversion Deficits and Carryover Storage Drawdowns for WY 1970–2015 on 21-20

Figure 21-7a WSE Baseline Required Flows and Release Flows at Ripon Compared with Stanislaus River Runoff and Recent Historical Flows..... on 21-22

Figure 21-7b WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Stanislaus River Annual Flows at Ripon (TAF) for 1922–2003 on 21-23

Figure 21-7c WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for New Melones Carryover Storages for 1922–2015..... on 21-24

Figure 21-7d WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Stanislaus River Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015 on 21-25

Figure 21-7e. Relationships between Stanislaus River Runoff, Sum of Alternative Flow Requirements and Full Water Supply Diversions, and Diversion Deficits for 1922–2015 on 21-27

Figure 21-8a WSE Baseline Required Flows and Release Flows at Modesto Compared with Tuolumne River Runoff and Recent Historical Flows..... on 21-28

Figure 21-8b WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Tuolumne River Annual Flows at Modesto (TAF) for 1922–2015 on 21-29

Figure 21-8c WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for New Don Pedro Carryover Storages for 1922–2015 on 21-30

Figure 21-8d WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Tuolumne River Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015 on 21-31

Figure 21-8e Relationships between Tuolumne River Runoff, Sum of Alternative Flow Requirements and Full Water Supply Diversions, and Diversion Deficits for 1922–2015 on 21-33

Figure 21-9a WSE Baseline Required Flows and Release Flows at Stevinson Compared with Merced River Runoff and Recent Historical Flows on 21-34

Figure 21-9b WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Merced River Annual Flows at Stevinson (TAF) for 1922–2015 on 21-35

Figure 21-9c WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Lake McClure Carryover Storages for 1922–2015 on 21-36

Figure 21-9d WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Merced River Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015 21-37

Figure 21-9e Relationships between Merced River Runoff, Sum of Alternative Flow Requirements and Full Water Supply Diversions, and Diversion Deficits for 1922–2015 on 21-39

Figure 23-1 Exceedance Chart of Monthly Average EC (dS/m = deciSiemens per meter) Values at South Delta Monitoring Locations for Irrigation Months from 1995–2015 on 23-10

Figure 23-2 Exceedance Chart of Monthly Average EC (dS/m = deciSiemens per meter) Values at South Delta Monitoring Locations for Non-Irrigation Months from 1995–2015 on 23-11

Figure 23-3 Monthly Average EC (dS/m = deciSiemens per meter) Observed at Vernalis Compared to Monthly Average Flow (cfs = cubic feet per second) Observed at Vernalis from 1995– 2015 on 23-12

Figure 23-4 Monthly Average EC (dS/m = deciSiemens per meter) Observed at Vernalis Compared to CALSIM II Monthly Estimate of EC at Vernalis from 1995–2003 on 23-14

Figure 23-5 Exceedance Chart of the Change in Monthly EC Values for the SJR at Vernalis Based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow, Relative to Modeled Baseline on 23-16

Figure 23-6 Exceedance Chart of the Change in Monthly EC Values, for the SJR at Brandt Bridge and for Old River near Middle River Based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow, Relative to Modeled Baseline..... on 23-17

Figure 23-7 Exceedance Chart of the Change in Monthly EC Values for Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge Based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow, Relative to Modeled Baseline on 23-18

Figure 23-8 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values at Vernalis during April–August under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow on 23-19

Figure 23-9 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values for the SJR at Brandt Bridge and for Old River near Middle River during April–August under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow on 23-20

Figure 23-10 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values for Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge during April–August under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow..... on 23-21

Figure 23-11 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values at Vernalis during September–March under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow on 23-22

Figure 23-12 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values for the SJR at Brandt Bridge and for Old River near Middle River during September–March under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow..... on 23-23

Figure 23-13 Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values for Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge during September–March under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow..... on 23-24

Table of Contents

Volume 2

Appendix A	NOP Scoping and Other Public Meetings
Appendix B	State Water Board’s Environmental Checklist
Appendix C	Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives
Appendix D	Evaluation of the No Project Alternative (LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1)
Appendix E	Salt Tolerance of Crops in the Southern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
Appendix F.1	Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling
Appendix F.2	Evaluation of Historical Flow and Salinity Measurements of the Lower San Joaquin River and Southern Delta
Appendix G	Agricultural Economic Effects of the Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results
Appendix H	Supporting Materials for Chapter 16
Appendix I	Cultural Resources Overview
Appendix J	Hydropower and Electric Grid Analysis of Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives
Appendix K	Revised Water Quality Control Plan
Appendix L	City and County of San Francisco Analyses
Appendix M	Summary of Public Comments on the 2012 Draft SED

Table of Contents

Volume 3

Chapter 1	Introduction and Approach to Responses to Comments	1-1
	Public Participation and Comments Received on the Recirculated SED	1-1
	Regulatory Context.....	1-2
	Approach	1-4
	Organization of Volume 3.....	1-7
	Modifications Contained in Volumes 1 through 3	1-9
	Terminology Used in Volume 3	1-10
	References Cited.....	1-10
Chapter 2	Master Responses and Index of Form Masters	2-1
	Master Responses	2-1
	Form Masters	2-5
	References Cited.....	2-5
Master Response 1.1	General Comments	1
	Overview.....	1
	Acknowledgment of Elected Representative and Other Community Member Concerns	6
	Description and Objectives of the Plan Amendments	6
	Public Review and Recirculation Process	10
	Scoping and 2012 Public Review.....	10
	Legal Basis for Recirculation	11
	Public Outreach Process.....	12
	Length and Complexity of the SED	14
	Voluntary Agreements	15
	Relationship with Other Plans, Programs, Policies, and Agencies	17
	Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem.....	18
	Water-Related Projects, Programs, and Policies	18
	Collaboration with Agencies	26
	State Water Board Authorities	28
	Water Rights	29
	Consideration of Beneficial Use	30
	Public Trust	31
	Clean Water Act	33
	LSJR Alternatives Development.....	33
	Scientific Basis.....	34

Unimpaired Flow Requirements	35
Commenter Suggested Plans and Proposals	38
SDWQ Alternatives Development	42
Approach to Analyses	44
Use of an SED to Meet CEQA Requirements	44
Program-Level Document and Program-Level Analysis.....	45
Watersheds Considered.....	48
General Methods and Modeling.....	49
Substantial Evidence	50
Baseline	51
Mitigation Measures.....	52
Environmental Resources.....	56
Summary of Resource Impacts	56
Aquatic Biological Resources	57
Terrestrial Biological Resources.....	59
Groundwater Resources	59
Agricultural Resources	60
Energy and Greenhouse Gases	61
Recreation and Aesthetics	63
Surface Water/Hydrology and Water Quality	64
Service Providers.....	68
Cumulative Impacts	69
Economic Effects	70
Agriculture	71
Fisheries	72
Recreation and Tourism.....	73
Service Providers and Ratepayers.....	74
Disadvantaged Communities	75
Hydropower	76
References Cited.....	77
Master Response 1.2 Water Quality Control Planning Process.....	1
Overview.....	1
Authorities Related to the Water Quality Control Planning Process	4
The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and the Clean Water Act	4
Administrative Procedure Act.....	8
California Constitution, Article X, Section 2.....	8
Bay-Delta Plan Implementation and Water Rights	9

Program of Implementation.....	11
Implementation through Water Right Proceedings	12
Water Right Priority	12
Water Quality Certification and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Process.....	13
Scope of Bay-Delta Plan Proceedings.....	16
Consideration of Beneficial Uses.....	20
Public Trust Resources.....	22
Domestic and Municipal Uses of Water	23
2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report.....	24
Peer Review Process.....	25
Consultation Process	26
References Cited.....	28
Master Response 2.1 Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan	1
Overview.....	1
Project Description	8
Plan Area and Extended Plan Area	13
Authority to Define Geographic Scope of Bay-Delta Plan	14
Tributary Watersheds	16
Lower and Upper San Joaquin River Watershed	17
LSJR Flow Requirements.....	18
Description of LSJR Flow Objectives	18
LSJR Flow Objectives for Three Tributaries.....	21
Unimpaired Flow and Functional Flows.....	23
February through June Time Period	24
Migratory Corridors	25
Salmon Doubling and Salmon Protection Objective.....	26
Calculating Unimpaired Flow and Percent Unimpaired Flow	28
Emergency Provision.....	29
LSJR Flow Program of Implementation	33
Adaptive Methods for February–June Flows.....	36
STM Working Group	36
Biological Goals	38
San Joaquin River Monitoring and Evaluation Program	39
Integration of Non-Flow Measures.....	40
Voluntary Agreements.....	41
Executive Director Authority.....	41
Southern Delta Salinity Water Quality Objective and Program of Implementation	42

Justification for Plan Amendments	43
Justification for LSJR Plan Amendments	44
Justification for SDWQ Plan Amendments	47
Modifications to the Plan Amendments	50
Modifications	50
Suggested Modifications Not Made	54
References Cited.....	67
Master Response 2.2 Adaptive Implementation.....	1
Overview.....	1
Adaptive Implementation Description	6
Four Methods of Adaptive Implementation	7
Other Features of Adaptive Implementation	11
Difference between Adaptive Implementation and Adaptive Management.....	11
STM Working Group Structure and Governance.....	13
Adaptive Implementation Products, Plans, and Process.....	14
Non-Flow Measures	16
Adaptive Implementation Information Needs	17
Calculated Unimpaired Flow	18
Flow Measurements	20
Biological Goals	21
Examples of Adaptive Implementation	22
Example 1: Single Year Change to an Alternative Percent Unimpaired Flow.....	22
Example 2: Multi-Year Change to an Alternative Percent Unimpaired Flow Depending on Water Year Type.....	23
Example 3: February Through June Adaptive Implementation of 40 Percent Unimpaired Flow (Simple Flow Shaping)	23
Example 4: Flow Shaping and Shifting	24
Example 5: Change Percent Unimpaired Flow, Combined with Flow Shaping and Shifting	25
Monitoring and Assessment.....	25
Modeling Conceptualization of Adaptive Implementation.....	25
References Cited.....	26
Master Response 2.3 Presentation of Data and Results in SED and Responses to Comments.....	1
Overview.....	1
Types of Data.....	4
Tables, Charts, and Graphs.....	5
General Summaries and Statistics.....	6

Averages.....	7
Medians and Quartiles.....	7
Percentages.....	9
SED Use of Averages, Medians, and Percentages.....	9
Time Series.....	12
Frequency of Occurrence.....	13
Cumulative Distributions	15
Percent of Time Equaled or Exceeded (i.e., Exceedance Plots and Tables).....	21
Water Year Types	23
San Joaquin River 60-20-20 Index.....	23
Interpreting Water Year Type from a Cumulative Distribution or Exceedance Chart of Unimpaired Flow.....	26
Use of Water Year Types in the SED	27
References Cited.....	27
Master Response 2.4 Alternatives to the Water Quality Control Plan Amendments	1
Overview.....	1
CEQA Requirements for the Discussion of Alternatives.....	5
Reasonable Range of Feasible Alternatives	5
Elimination of Alternatives	6
Focus of Planning Efforts	7
Feasibility of Commenter-Suggested Plans and Proposals for the LSJR Flow Objectives	10
General Plans and Proposals.....	12
Alternative Flow Regimes	13
Non-Flow Measures.....	16
Merced Irrigation District S.A.F.E. Plan.....	18
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Alternative	20
Upper San Joaquin River and Other Parts of the Watershed	24
Feasibility of Commenter-Suggested Plans and Proposals for the SDWQ Objective.....	25
Changes to the Numeric Salinity Objectives.....	27
Actions Outside of the Plan Area or by Other Entities	28
References Cited.....	29
Printed References.....	29
Personal Communications	30
Master Response 2.5 Baseline and No Project.....	1
Overview.....	1
Notice of Preparation	4
Baseline Conditions	7

Hydrologic Context in the San Joaquin River Watershed	9
Land Use Context	17
Water Quality and Salinity Context	18
No Project Conditions.....	20
Assumptions and Analyses Presented by Commenters.....	23
References Cited.....	25
Printed References.....	25
Personal Communications	27
Master Response 2.7 Disadvantaged Communities	1
Overview.....	1
Consideration of Disadvantaged Communities.....	5
Drinking Water Quality	5
Consideration of the Human Right to Water.....	13
Assistance Programs.....	15
Consolidation or Extension of Service	17
SGMAs Role in the Protection of DACs.....	18
Historical Groundwater Use.....	18
Consideration and Protection of DACs in SGMA	21
Funding Sources for DACs to Prepare GSPs.....	22
References Cited.....	23
Master Response 3.1 Fish Protection	1
Overview.....	1
Current Fish Decline and the Need for Increased and More Variable Flows	5
Purpose of the Bay-Delta Plan Update and the Narrative Objective	10
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1994 Criteria and Approval of the 1995 Bay-Delta Plan.....	11
Delta Decline and the Need for Bay-Delta Plan Update	12
Justification and Description of the Plan Amendments for Protecting Fish	12
Unimpaired Flow Approach	13
Seasonal Flows from February through June	15
Elements of the Plan Amendments that Inform/Enhance Biological Benefits.....	37
SED Use of Best Available Science.....	40
Use of Salmon as an Analysis Surrogate for Steelhead	41
Appendix C, Scientific Basis Report.....	41
Adequacy of Modeling to Support the Analyses.....	43
Modeling Purpose and Standards.....	43
Temperature	44

Weighted Usable Area	56
Floodplain Habitat.....	58
SalSim.....	63
Other Stressors.....	69
Predation.....	69
Role of Hatcheries.....	73
References Cited.....	76
Printed References.....	76
Personal Communications	83
Master Response 3.2 Surface Water Analyses and Modeling	1
Overview.....	1
General Approach.....	8
Water Balance Modeling for the SED	9
Modeling Assumptions.....	12
Baseline Conditions.....	13
Best Available Information	14
Calculation of Percent Unimpaired Flow.....	18
Unimpaired Flow versus Natural Flow.....	19
Measurement and Compliance.....	20
Model Implementation of Percent Unimpaired Flow Objectives.....	21
WSE Model Water Balance Components.....	23
Determination of Surface Water Demand.....	23
Accretions and Depletions.....	35
Groundwater Supplementation.....	40
Hydrologic Modeling Process	41
Hydrologic Modeling Steps.....	43
Surface Water Allocation: Streamflow versus Demand versus Storage.....	45
Reservoir Operations, Reoperation, and Carryover Storage	48
Water Supply Reliability.....	59
Hydrologic Modeling Analyses Presented by Commenters.....	61
Adaptive Implementation	67
HEC-5Q Temperature Model.....	70
Recent Development of the HEC-5Q Temperature Model.....	70
Selection of the HEC-5Q Temperature Model	71
Application of the HEC-5Q Temperature Model.....	71
Climate Change.....	72
Hydropower.....	74

Peaking Operations.....	75
Potential Increases in Spring Hydropower	77
Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion.....	77
Flooding	77
Sedimentation and Erosion.....	78
Presentation of Results for District Surface Water Supply.....	80
References.....	83
Printed References.....	83
Personal Communications	87
Master Response 3.3 Southern Delta Water Quality.....	1
Overview.....	1
Justification for Updating the Southern Delta Salinity Objective.....	6
Discussion of Appendix E and Southern Delta Leaching Fractions.....	8
Leaching Fractions in Appendix E	9
Results in the Leinfelder-Miles Study	10
Validity of the Appendix E Peer Review.....	13
Responsibilities of DWR and USBR.....	13
Maintaining Southern Delta Salinity Requirements	14
Comprehensive Operations Plan and Additional Monitoring Studies.....	15
Addressing Impacts of SWP and CVP Export Operations.....	16
Measuring Compliance with the Salinity Objective in the Interior Delta.....	17
Indirect Effects of the LSJR Alternatives on Southern Delta Salinity.....	17
Methodology and Area Evaluated.....	20
Salinity Effects in the Southern Delta	20
Flow Shifting and its Inclusion in the Analysis of Potential Impacts.....	21
Potential Changes in Delta Operations.....	21
Groundwater Pumping and the Historical Flow–EC Relationship at Vernalis	22
Potential for Displacement of Sacramento River Flow.....	22
References Cited.....	23
Master Response 3.4 Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act	1
Overview.....	1
Historical Groundwater Use and Overpumping.....	4
Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.....	7
SGMA Compliance	13
Groundwater Recharge.....	14
SGMA as a Mitigation Measure	16
Agricultural Economic Effects, Groundwater Pumping, and SGMA	17

Method and Approach of the Groundwater Resource Impact Analysis	18
Baseline Groundwater Pumping and Consideration of SGMA	19
Criteria for Evaluation	21
Area of Analysis.....	22
Modeling and Use of Groundwater Data.....	22
Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems	23
References Cited.....	25
Printed References.....	25
Personal Communications	28
Master Response 3.5 Agricultural Resources.....	1
Overview.....	1
Geographic Area, Baseline, Acreage, and Crop Mix.....	5
Methodology	6
General Approach	7
Use of Checklist Questions.....	8
Criteria to Determine Significance	9
Use of the SWAP Model.....	11
Revised SWAP Model and Data Refinements.....	11
Permanent Crops.....	12
Management of Permanent Crops	12
SWAP Model Results for Permanent Crops.....	14
Potential Effects on Existing Dairy Uses and Cattle.....	16
Dairy Characteristics	17
Milk Prices and Feed	18
Water Demand.....	25
Nutrient Management	26
Cattle and Pasture.....	27
Reductions in Water Demand	30
Crop Substitution	31
Dry Land Farming	31
Deficit Irrigation	31
Irrigation Efficiencies	32
References Cited.....	32
Master Response 3.6 Service Providers.....	1
Overview.....	1
Municipal Water Supply	5
Approach to Impact Analysis	5

Municipal Water Use Compared to Agricultural Water Use	6
Alternative Water Supply Sources	7
Water Code Section 106 and Water for Minimum Health and Safety Needs	8
Water Conservation during the Recent Drought	9
Compliance with SGMA and the Plan Amendments	14
Local Resiliency and Drinking Water Quality	16
Potential effects of SDWQ Alternatives on Wastewater Treatment Plants.....	17
Revised Implementation Program for WWTPs	20
Other Concerns by WWTPs Commenters Regarding Implementation of the SDWQ Alternatives	21
References Cited.....	27
Master Response 3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Analysis	1
Overview.....	1
Direct and Indirect Impacts	3
Greenhouse Gas-Related Conclusions	4
Threshold of Significance.....	5
Mitigation Measures	8
References Cited.....	9
Master Response 5.2 Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures.....	1
Overview.....	1
The Relationship between Flow and Non-Flow Measures.....	4
Importance of Flow.....	4
Role of Non-Flow Measures.....	5
Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures in the Plan Amendments	5
State Water Board’s Authority to Impose Non-Flow Measures	5
Consideration of Non-Flow Measures	7
Non-Flow Measure Costs	13
References Cited.....	14
Master Response 6.1 Cumulative Analysis	1
Overview.....	1
Approach to Cumulative Analysis.....	4
Service Providers	5
Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.....	8
Climate Change and Drought Evaluation	10
Growth-Inducing Effects and Housing Factors.....	11
References Cited.....	13

Master Response 8.0 Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools	1
Overview.....	1
Developing an Appropriate Analytical Framework and Applying Assessment Tools.....	6
Regulatory Context	6
Analytical Framework and Tools.....	6
Key Considerations in Developing an Analytical Framework and Appropriate Assessment Tools	8
Reasonable Assumptions.....	9
Spatial and Temporal Considerations.....	10
Relevant Economic Theory and Concepts.....	11
Measurement and Reporting Practices	12
References Cited.....	14
Master Response 8.1 Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model.....	1
Overview.....	1
Scope of the Local Agricultural Economic Analysis	4
General Approach	4
Geographic Scope	5
Relationship with Groundwater.....	6
Statewide Agricultural Production Model.....	8
SWAP Model Configuration	9
SWAP Model Assumptions.....	15
Revised SWAP Model Run Description and Results	20
Application of Deficit Irrigation for Permanent Crops.....	21
Assumptions for Maximum Deficit Irrigation and the Acreage of Corn Silage.....	21
Total Irrigated Area for Irrigation Districts	21
Crop Prices, Yields, and Production Costs.....	21
Groundwater Use.....	22
Results and Discussion	23
Other Costs Associated with Crop Production	38
Potential Reoptimization of Cropping Patterns and Contraction of the Agricultural Industry	39
Property Values.....	39
Bank Loans and Loan Interest Rates	40
Irrigation District Water Rates	40
Economic Investment and Business Relocation	40
References Cited.....	41
Master Response 8.2 Regional Agricultural Economic Effects	1

Overview.....	1
Regional Economic Setting.....	7
Geographic Scope.....	7
Economic Profile.....	7
Agricultural Economy.....	10
Revised Results for the Regional Economic Analysis.....	15
Consideration of Economic Effects on Industries Supported by the Agricultural Industry.....	16
Potential Economic Effects on Existing Dairies.....	16
Potential Effects on Livestock Operations.....	23
Potential Economic Effects on the Food Processing Industry.....	24
IMPLAN Limitations Regarding Regional Economic Effects on Dairies and other Downstream Industries.....	36
Commenters’ Regional Economic Analyses.....	38
Economic Analysis Performed by Stratecon, Inc.....	38
Economic Analysis Presented by Merced Irrigation District.....	45
Economic Analysis Presented by Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts.....	52
References Cited.....	57
Master Response 8.4 Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations.....	1
Overview.....	1
Economic Contribution of Plan Amendments to Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Other Beneficial Uses.....	5
Ecosystem Services.....	5
Potential Economic Effects of Ecosystem Services.....	6
Municipal Economic Effects.....	12
Water Supply Uncertainty and Potential Effects on Infrastructure Planning.....	12
Water Rates and Fiscal Effects.....	15
Growth and Economic Development.....	17
Effects on Hydropower Generation and Revenues.....	21
Use of the Price Series.....	22
Potential Loss of Seasonal Flexibility in Power Generation.....	22
Effects of Hourly Fluctuations in Power Generation.....	22
Replacement of Power.....	23
Recreation-Related Economic Effects.....	24
Plan Area.....	24
Extended Plan Area.....	25
References Cited.....	28

Master Response 8.5 Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area

Regional Water System1

Overview..... 1

Programmatic Analysis and Adequacy of the SED 8

Assessment of Potential Effects of Plan Amendments on SFPUC Water Supply 9

 Uncertainty 9

 Hydrologic Modeling..... 11

 Key Differences in Analytical Approaches 16

Approaches to Address Potential Water Supply Reductions 21

 Water Supply Planning Approach 22

 Water Rationing-Only Approach..... 48

Hydropower..... 52

References..... 54

 Printed References..... 54

 Personal Communications 59

Chapter 4 References Placeholder4-1

Volume 3 Tables

Table	Page
Table 1-1 Summary of Indices	1-8
Table 2-1 Summary of Master Responses	2-1
Table 2-2 Index of Form Masters	2-5
Table 1.2-1 General Timing of Important Life Stages of San Joaquin River and Sacramento River Watershed Chinook Salmon	19
Table 2.1-1 Summary of Modifications to Plan Amendments and Appendix K Changes	4
Table 2.1-2 San Joaquin Valley Unimpaired Total Outflow	18
Table 2.1-3 Comparison of Resource Effects for LSJR Alternatives 2–4 and Baseline.....	46
Table 2.2-1 Implementation Deliverables and Due Dates.....	15
Table 2.3-1 Crop Acreages of Irrigation Districts A–D	5
Table 2.3-2 Average Acres of Each Crop Type for Irrigation Districts A–D	7
Table 2.3-3 Annual Volume of Water (thousand acre-feet) on Unnamed River for Years 1–11.....	16
Table 2.3-4 Annual Cumulative Distributions of Percentage of Demand for Diversion Met for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (20, 40, and 60 Percent Unimpaired Flow) for Irrigation Years 1922–2003	19
Table 2.3-5 Number of Percent of Years from 1922 to 2003 in each San Joaquin 60-20- 20 Water Year Type Classification Category	25
Table 2.4-1 Performance of Non-Flow Measures Alone to Meet Certain Purposes and Goals	18
Table 2.4-2 Performance of SFPUC Alternative to Meet Certain Purposes and Goals.....	23
Table 2.7-1 Summary of Consumer Confidence Reports for Selected Public Water Suppliers during Representative Non-Drought and Drought Years.....	9
Table 3.1-1 Summary of Sampling Periods for Rotary Screw Trapping on the Stanislaus River at Oakdale and Caswell, 1996–2005.....	32
Table 3.1-2 Summary of Sampling Periods for Rotary Screw Trapping on the Tuolumne River, 1995–2010	33

Table 3.1-3 The Percentage of Time on the Merced River that Harmful Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (Base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Harmful Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations..... 50

Table 3.1-4 The Percentage of Time on the Merced River that Lethal Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (Base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Lethal Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations 50

Table 3.1-5 The Percentage of Time on the Tuolumne River that Harmful Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (Base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Harmful Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations..... 51

Table 3.1-6 The Percentage of Time on the Tuolumne River that Lethal Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (Base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Lethal Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations 51

Table 3.1-7 The Percentage of Time on the San Joaquin River that Harmful Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Harmful Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations..... 52

Table 3.1-8 The Percentage of Time on the San Joaquin River that Lethal Juvenile Migratory Temperatures are Avoided Each Month under Modeled Baseline (Base) Conditions from 1970 to 2003, and the Expected Percent Change in the Amount of Time that Lethal Temperatures are Avoided under Modeled Unimpaired Flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at Different River Mile (RM) Locations 52

Table 3.1-9 The percentage of time on the Stanislaus River that harmful juvenile migratory temperatures are avoided each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the expected percent change in the amount of time that harmful temperatures are avoided under modeled

	unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) locations.....	54
Table 3.1-10	The percentage of time on the Stanislaus River that lethal juvenile migratory temperatures are avoided each month under modeled baseline (base) conditions during 1970 to 2003, and the expected percent change in the amount of time that lethal temperatures are avoided under modeled unimpaired flows of 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% and 60% at different river mile (RM) locations.....	54
Table 3.1-11	SalSim Average Results for 1998–2004 and the Difference Compared to Baseline.....	65
Table 3.2-1	Baseline End-of-September Storage Guidelines, Maximum Draw from Storage, and Minimum Diversion Variables for the Eastside Tributaries.....	54
Table 3.2-2	LSJR Alternative 3 End-of-September Storage Guidelines, Maximum Draw from Storage, and Minimum Diversion Variables for the Eastside Tributaries.....	54
Table 3.2-3	Drought Refill Constraints (Diversion Constraints) and Inflow Triggers in the WSE Model.....	55
Table 3.2-4	Comparison of Average Annual Stanislaus River Streamflow, Diversions, and New Melones Reservoir Carryover Storage for Baseline and 40 Percent Unimpaired Flow Alternatives, in Attachment A and SED Results.....	63
Table 3.2-7	Average Annual Irrigation District Diversions under Baseline, by Year Type Conditions.....	81
Table 3.2-8	Average Annual Irrigation District Diversions under LSJR Alternative 2, by Year Type Conditions.....	82
Table 3.2-9	Average Annual Irrigation District Diversions under LSJR Alternative 3, by Year Type Conditions.....	82
Table 3.2-10	Average Annual Irrigation District Diversions under LSJR Alternative 4, by Year Type Conditions.....	83
Table 3.3-1	Monthly Average EC for the SJR at Vernalis under Modeled Baseline Conditions and the Change in Value based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow.....	18
Table 3.3-2	Monthly Average EC for the SJR at Brandt Bridge and for Old River near Middle River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and the Change in Value based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow.....	19
Table 3.3-3	Monthly Average EC for Old River at Tracy Blvd. Bridge under Modeled Baseline Conditions and the Change in Value based on Percent of Unimpaired Flow.....	19

Table 3.4-1	Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) and Selected Interested Parties Identified in the GSA Formation Notification Submittals by June 30, 2017	8
Table 3.5-1	Irrigated Area for Permanent Crops in Dry and Critical Years with Respect to Baseline and LSJR Alternative 3 (40% Unimpaired Flow)	15
Table 3.5-2	Dairy Cows by Year for the Counties in the Plan Area.....	17
Table 3.5-3	Applied Water for Corn Acreage by Year Type in TID.....	24
Table 3.5-4	Summary of Dairy and Cattle Water use and Percent of Applied Water by County.....	25
Table 3.5-5	Cropland Suitable for Dairy Waste Disposal under LSJR Alternative 3 (40 percent Unimpaired Flow).....	27
Table 3.5-6	Cattle Population in Stanislaus, Merced, and San Joaquin Counties 2011–2015	28
Table 3.5-7	Gross Revenue for Cattle Population in Stanislaus, Merced, and San Joaquin Counties 2011–2015	28
Table 3.6-1	Summary of Conservation Efforts in the Plan Area	13
Table 5.2-1	Example of Restoration Programs in the Three Eastside Tributaries	9
Table 8.0-1	Consumer Price Index Values—All Urban Consumers.....	13
Table 8.1-1	Department of Water Resources (DWR) Crop Group Classifications and Definitions.....	10
Table 8.1-2	SWAP Model Input Data for SSJID, OID, MID, TID, and Merced ID	12
Table 8.1-3	SWAP Model Input Data for SEWD/CSJWCD	12
Table 8.1-4	SWAP Assumptions for the Cost of Groundwater Pumping and the Cost of Surface Water Delivery	13
Table 8.1-5	Proportions of Groundwater and Surface Water Use in the SWAP Model for each Irrigation District	14
Table 8.1-6	Ranking the Ability of Crop Categories Used in the SWAP Model to Accommodate Deficit Irrigation.....	17
Table 8.1-7	Acreage of Corn Silage used for the SWAP Model	20
Table 8.1-8	Minimum Applied Water to Maintain Permanent Crops and 70 Percent of Corn Silage Acres as a Percent of the Total Applied Water Demand	23
Table 8.1-9	Estimated Effect of LSJR Alternatives on Average Annual Groundwater Pumping by the Irrigation Districts	28

Table 8.1-10	Estimated Effect of LSJR Alternatives on Average Annual Groundwater Recharge by the Irrigation Districts	28
Table 8.1-11	Estimated Effect of LSJR Alternatives on Average Annual Irrigation District Groundwater Balance	28
Table 8.1-12	Average Annual Applied Surface Water Deficit Post-Groundwater Replacement	32
Table 8.1-13	Average Annual Fallowing over All Irrigation Districts under Baseline, by Crop and Water Year Type Conditions	33
Table 8.1-14	Increase in Average Annual Fallowing over All Irrigation Districts LSJR Alternative 2 relative to Baseline, by Crop and Water Year Type Conditions	34
Table 8.1-15	Increase in Average Annual Fallowing over All Irrigation Districts LSJR Alternative 3 relative to Baseline, by Crop and Water Year Type Conditions	35
Table 8.1-16	Increase in Average Annual Fallowing over All Irrigation Districts LSJR Alternative 4 relative to Baseline, by Crop and Water Year Type Conditions (Revised SWAP Model Scenario).....	35
Table 8.1-17	Reduction in Average Annual Gross Agricultural Revenue under Baseline, by Irrigation District and Water Year Type Conditions.....	37
Table 8.1-18	Reduction in Average Annual Gross Agricultural Revenue under LSJR Alternative 2 relative to Baseline, by Irrigation District and Water Year Type Conditions	37
Table 8.1-19	Reduction in Average Annual Gross Agricultural Revenue under LSJR Alternative 3 relative to Baseline, by Irrigation District and Water Year Type Conditions	38
Table 8.1-20	Reduction in Average Annual Gross Agricultural Revenue under LSJR Alternative 4 relative to Baseline, by Irrigation District and Water Year Type Conditions	38
Table 8.2-1	Population in the Plan Area and California (2010–2015)	7
Table 8.2-2	Population Projections for the Plan Area and California	8
Table 8.2-3	Income, Poverty Rates, and Unemployment Rates (2015).....	8
Table 8.2-4	Unemployment Rates (%), Plan Area Counties and California (2013–2017).....	9
Table 8.2-5	Employment by Select Aggregate Sectors—Plan Area (2015).....	9
Table 8.2-6	Manufacturing Sectors in Plan Area	10
Table 8.2-7	Top Producing Crops in the San Joaquin Valley, by Acreage (2011–2016 average)	11

Table 8.2-8	Top Producing Commodities in the Plan Area, by Production Value (2011–2016 average)	13
Table 8.2-9	Economic Characteristics of Selected Agricultural Services and Food Processing Sectors in the Plan Area (2015)	14
Table 8.2-10	Average Annual Regional Economic Output Related to Crop Production under Baseline and the Change under the LSJR Alternatives, by Year Type Conditions	16
Table 8.2-11	Average Annual Regional Employment Related to Crop Production under Baseline and the Change under the LSJR Alternatives, by Year Type Conditions	16
Table 8.2-12	Total Corn Acreage in the SWAP Model and the Breakdown between Corn Silage and Grain Corn.....	17
Table 8.2-13	SWAP Model Crop Categories and Average Annual Increase in Fallowed Acreage across all Modeled Irrigation Districts under 40 Percent Unimpaired Flow (LSJR Alternative 3) in the Revised SWAP Model Run.....	29
Table 8.4-1	Economic Indicators for Merced, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus Counties, 2011–2016	18
Table 8.4-2	Residential Water Use Hydrologic Region, California, August (2013–2017) (daily gallons per capita per day).....	20
Table 8.5-1	Annual Average CCSF Water Bank Deficit for 6-Year Drought Period (1987–1992)	13
Table 8.5-2	Comparison of SFPUC HH/LSM Model Results and SED Water Bank Balance Results.....	17
Table 8.5-3	Water System Improvement Program Goals and Objectives Related to Water Supply	24
Table 8.5-4	Wholesale Regional Water System Allocations in Normal, Dry, and Multiple Dry Years	25
Table 8.5-5	Costs for Developing Alternative Sources of Water Supplies.....	26
Table 8.5-6	Confirmed and Executed Temporary Water Transfers between Agriculture and Urban Water Users in 2015	30
Table 8.5-7	Groundwater Supplies for the SFPUC Retail Service Area (mgd)	34
Table 8.5-8	Self-Reported Groundwater and Surface Water Supply for Select BAWSCA Agencies in a Wet Year (2011) vs. a Critically Dry Year (2014)	35
Table 8.5-9	Recycled Water Supplies for the SFPUC Retail Service Area (mgd).....	37

Table 8.5-10 Retail Water Shortage Stages of Action..... 41

Table 8.5-11 Self-Certification Conservation Standards—Stress Test for SFPUC and
BAWSCA Member Agencies..... 42

Volume 3

Figures

Figure		Follows Page
Figure 1.1-1	Unimpaired Flow Concept	10
Figure 1.2-1	Difference in Natural Production of Adult Fall-Run Chinook Salmon when Comparing the 1967–1991 Average and the 1992–2011 Average in Tributaries to the Sacramento or San Joaquin Rivers.....	on 19
Figure 2.3-1	Crop Acreages of Irrigation Districts A–D	6
Figure 2.3-2	Crop Acreages of Irrigation Districts A–D	6
Figure 2.3-3	Average and Median Acreages of Alfalfa for Districts A–D	8
Figure 2.3-4	District A Crops by Percentage of Type	9
Figure 2.3-5	Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: Stanislaus River Diversions for 1922–2003 (taf = thousand acre-feet)	13
Figure 2.3-6	Unnamed River Annual Flow Volume (thousand acre-feet), Years 1–11	16
Figure 2.3-7	Unnamed River Annual Flow (thousand acre-feet), Years 1–11 in Order of Volume.....	17
Figure 2.3-8	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for All Crops, All LSJR Alternatives, and Baseline.....	22
Figure 2.3-9	Exceedance Chart of Total Annual Unimpaired Flow at Vernalis, Color Coded by Water Year Type.....	25
Figure 2.3-10	Example of Water Year Type Classification based on Percentiles of Unimpaired Flow.....	27
Figure 2.7-1	Nut (Walnuts, Pistachios, and Almonds) Harvested Acreage and Production vs. California Total Agricultural Production.....	20
Figure 3.1-1	Stanislaus River Median Monthly Flow (Thousand Acre-Feet [TAF]) from 1984 to 2009 under Unimpaired, Observed, and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions	5
Figure 3.1-2	Tuolumne River Median Monthly Flow (Thousand Acre-Feet [TAF]) from 1984 to 2009 under Unimpaired, Observed, and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions	6
Figure 3.1-3	Merced River Median Monthly Flow (Thousand Acre-Feet [TAF]) from 1984 to 2009 under Unimpaired, Observed, and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions	7

Figure 3.1-4 Difference in Natural Production of Adult Fall-Run Chinook Salmon when Comparing the 1967–1991 Average and the 1992–2011 Average in Tributaries to the Sacramento or San Joaquin Rivers..... 8

Figure 3.1-5 Relationship between Adult Salmon Returns to the San Joaquin River Basin and the River Flows they Experienced as Juveniles..... 9

Figure 3.1-6 Historical June Maximum Daily Water Temperature (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on Stanislaus River at Ripon..... 16

Figure 3.1-7 Historical (1989–1993, 2001–2003, 2005, 2007–2017) June Maximum Daily Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on the Tuolumne River at Modesto 16

Figure 3.1-8 Historical June Average Daily Water Temperature (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on Merced River at Stevinson (2001–2004 and 2009–2011)..... 17

Figure 3.1-9 Historical June Maximum Daily Water Temperature (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on San Joaquin River near Vernalis 17

Figure 3.1-10 Stanislaus River Running 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Temperatures (Fahrenheit) under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions at River Mile 0 from October 1990 through September 1991 18

Figure 3.1-11 Tuolumne River Running 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Temperatures (Fahrenheit) under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions at River Mile 0 from October 1990 through September 1991 19

Figure 3.1-12 Merced River Running 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Temperatures (Fahrenheit) under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions at River Mile 2.52 from October 1990 through September 1991..... 19

Figure 3.1-13 Average Stanislaus River Longitudinal Profile during June of 1991 under Baseline and 40% UF Conditions. (Fahrenheit)..... 20

Figure 3.1-14 Average Tuolumne River Longitudinal Profile during June of 1991 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions. (Fahrenheit) 20

Figure 3.1-17 Merced River Temperature Exceedance Chart (Fahrenheit) for the 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) at River Mile 2.52 for All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions 22

Figure 3.1-18 Stanislaus River Temperature Exceedance Chart (Fahrenheit) for the 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) at River Mile 0 for All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions..... 23

Figure 3.1-19 Average San Joaquin River Longitudinal Profile during June of 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions (Fahrenheit) 24

Figure 3.1-20 San Joaquin River Running 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Temperatures (Fahrenheit) under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions at River Mile 72.501 from October 2002 through September 2003 24

Figure 3.1-22 San Joaquin River Temperature (Fahrenheit) 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Exceedance Chart at River Mile 81.401 for All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions 25

Figure 3.1-23 San Joaquin River Temperature (Fahrenheit) 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Exceedance Chart at River Mile 72.501 for All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions 26

Figure 3.1-24 San Joaquin River Temperature (Fahrenheit) 7-Day Average of the Daily Maximum (7DADM) Exceedance Chart at River Mile 69.31 for All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions 26

Figure 3.1-27 Average Merced River Longitudinal Profile during All Days in June from 1970 to 2003 under Baseline and 40% Unimpaired Flow Conditions (Fahrenheit) 28

Figure 3.1-29 Stanislaus River Fork Length (millimeters) Distribution by Catch Date for *O. mykiss* Captured at the Oakdale Rotary Screw Trap (1995–2009) Indicating that Young-of-the-Year Steelhead Migrate in Relatively Large Numbers in June 30

Figure 3.1-30 Tuolumne River Fork Length (millimeters) Distributions by Catch Date for *O. mykiss* Captured in Rotary Screw Traps from 1999 to 2009, Indicating that Young-of-the-Year Steelhead Migrate in Late May and June 31

Figure 3.1-31 Fork Length (millimeters) Distributions by Catch Date for All Life Stages of Steelhead Passing the Bypass Trap Location on the Diversion Screen Bypass Line at Woodbridge Dam on the Mokelumne River 32

Figure 3.1-32 Lengths of All Sampled Juvenile Fall-Run Chinook Salmon by Day at the Oakdale Rotary Screw Trap Site 35

Figure 3.1-33 Lengths of All Sampled Juvenile Fall-Run Chinook salmon by Day at the Caswell Rotary Screw Trap Site 36

Figure 3.1-33 Weekly Mortality Rate as a Function of Mean Weekly Water Temperature for Juvenile Chinook Salmon, used here to Illustrate the Continuous Effects of Temperature on Juvenile Chinook Salmon as Originally Described in Baker et al. 1995 55

Figure 3.1-34 Floodplain Area Versus Flow for the Lower and Upper Reaches of the Merced River..... 59

Figure 3.1-35 Historical (1989–1994, 2001–2003, 2005, 2007–2017) April Maximum Daily Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on the Tuolumne River at Modesto 61

Figure 3.1-36 Historical (1989–1994, 2001–2003, 2005, 2007–2009, 2011–2017) May Maximum Daily Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on the Tuolumne River at Modesto 62

Figure 3.1-37 Historical (1989–1993, 2001–2003, 2005, 2007–2017) June Maximum Daily Water Temperatures (Fahrenheit) versus Average Daily Flow (cubic feet per second) on the Tuolumne River at Modesto 63

Figure 3.1-38 Long-Term Population Metrics for a Salmon Population that is in Decline in the Tuolumne River 66

Figure 3.1-39a Artificial Examples of Two Idealized Production Doubling Scenarios..... 67

Figure 3.1-39b Artificial Examples of Two Idealized Production Doubling Scenarios..... 67

Figure 3.2-1 CALSIM II and WSE Model Water Balance Components for the Three Eastside Tributaries and the Lower San Joaquin River 11

Figure 3.2-2 Unimpaired/Full Natural Flow and Compliance Locations 19

Figure 3.2-3 Water Balance Schematic Showing Reservoir Release and Compliance Point..... 21

Figure 3.2-4 Geographic Generalization of Surface Water Demand Areas in the WSE Model..... 24

Figure 3.2-5 CUAW_549_PAG Water Year CUAW Demand for 1922–2003 from CALSIM..... 25

Figure 3.2-6 Example of Monthly Crop Consumptive Use of Applied Water for CUAW_549_PAG..... 26

Figure 3.2-7 Average Annual Baseline Water Balance for the Combined Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers below the Major Rim Dams..... 27

Figure 3.2-8 Example of components of Simplified Total Water Demand derived for South San Joaquin Irrigation District 28

Figure 3.2-9 Comparison of District Diversions for OID/SSJID in WSE Model and Stanislaus Operations Model..... 32

Figure 3.2-10 Comparison of District Diversions for MID/TID in WSE Model and Tuolumne Operations Model..... 32

Figure 3.2-11 Comparison of District Diversions for Merced ID in WSE Model and Merced Operations Model..... 33

Figure 3.2-12	Percent Exceedance of District Diversions for OID and SSJID in WSE Model and Stanislaus Operations Model, 1922-2002.....	34
Figure 3.2-13	Percent Exceedance of District Diversions for MID/TID in WSE Model and Tuolumne Operations Model, 1971-2003	34
Figure 3.2-14	Percent Exceedance of District Diversions for Merced ID in WSE Model and Merced Operations Model, 1971–2003	35
Figure 3.2-15	Examples of Required Reservoir Releases as a Function of Local Inflows.....	36
Figure 3.2-16	Monthly WSE Model and Gage-Calculated Accretion on the Tuolumne River for Two 15-Year Periods	39
Figure 3.2-17	Modeling Flow Chart—Analytical Tools Used in the SED Analysis	42
Figure 3.2-18	Daily Reservoir Storage for New Melones Reservoir for 1990–1991 for Three Scenarios.....	56
Figure 3.2-19	Daily 7DADM Temperatures at River Mile 56.77 (below Goodwin Dam) for 1989–1991 for Three Scenarios.....	57
Figure 3.2-20	Stanislaus River Release 7DADM Temperature (estimated below Goodwin Dam) for Three Scenarios	57
Figure 3.2-21	Longitudinal Profile of Average Stanislaus River 7DADM Temperatures in October 1991 for Three Scenarios.....	58
Figure 3.2-22	Percent exceedance of 7DADM temperatures at River Mile 56.77 in October for All Years (1970–2003) below Goodwin Dam in the Stanislaus River for Three Scenarios.....	59
Figure 3.2-23	Percent Exceedance of Annual Water Year Diversion for OID/SSJID and SEWD/CSJWD, from the Stanislaus River based on WSE model LSJR Alternative 3 and Attachment A Pure 40 Percent Unimpaired Flow Scenarios.....	65
Figure 3.2-24	Annual Water Year Diversions to MID/TID from the Tuolumne River in Baseline for 1987–1992; Annual and Average Results from WSE Model Baseline, CALSIM Baseline, and TROps Baseline	66
Figure 3.2-25	Annual (Water Year) Diversions to MID/TID from the Tuolumne River in LSJR Alternative 3 for 1987 through 1992; Annual and Period-Average Results from WSE model and TROps.....	67
Figure 3.2-26	Generalized Illustration of Shifting of Flow Requirement to Summer and Fall.....	69
Figure 3.2-27	Hourly CAISO Hydropower Peaking Pattern during Summer 2015, a Critically Dry Year.....	76

Figure 3.2-28	Hourly CAISO Hydropower Peaking Pattern during Summer 2017, a Wet Year	76
Figure 3.3-1	Relative Yield of Alfalfa vs. Irrigation Water Salinity (for Soil with Leaching Fraction = 3 percent).....	11
Figure 3.3-2	Estimated Annual Alfalfa Yield (tons/acre) vs. Leaching Fractions (Estimated by Dr. Leinfelder-Miles)	12
Figure 3.4-1	Reported New Irrigation Wells and Total Agricultural Production in California (1980 to 2015)	6
Figure 3.5-1	Average Cows/Dairy for Merced, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin Counties	18
Figure 3.5-2	Historical Trends in Milk Production, Milk Per Cow, and Number of Cows	20
Figure 3.5-3	Milk Prices in California.....	21
Figure 3.5-4	California Production of Feed Crops for Dairies	22
Figure 3.5-5	Average Revenue per Unit Head in Counties Potentially Affected by the Plan Amendment in Dollars per Given Year	29
Figure 8.1-1	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in SSJID	24
Figure 8.1-2	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in OID	25
Figure 8.1-3	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in SEWD and CSJWCD combined	25
Figure 8.1-4	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in MID	26
Figure 8.1-5	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in TID.....	26
Figure 8.1-6	Exceedance Chart of Annual Groundwater (GW) Use for Applied Water in Merced ID	27
Figure 8.1-7	Exceedance Chart of Annual Applied Water Delivery as a Percent of Demand in SSJID	29
Figure 8.1-8	Exceedance Chart of Annual Applied Water Delivery as a Percent of Demand in OID	30
Figure 8.1-9	Exceedance Chart of Annual Applied Water Delivery as a Percent of Demand in MID.....	30
Figure 8.1-10	Exceedance Chart of Annual Applied Water Delivery as a Percent of Demand in TID.....	31

Figure 8.1-11	Exceedance Chart of Annual Applied Water Delivery as a Percent of Demand in Merced ID.....	31
Figure 8.2-1	Cash Flow Relationships through the Agricultural Industry and Regional Economy	2
Figure 8.2-2	Top Producing Crops, and Total of All Crops, by Acreage, San Joaquin Valley (2011–2016).....	12
Figure 8.2-3	Top Producing Commodities, and Total of All Commodities, by Value in the Plan Area (2011–2016)	14
Figure 8.2-4	Annual Reduction in Corn Silage Acreage under the LSJR Alternatives, by Water Year Exceedance	18
Figure 8.2-5	Annual Reduction in Corn Silage Production under the LSJR Alternatives, by Water Year Exceedance	19
Figure 8.2-6	Average Annual Reduction in Corn Silage Production Volume Relative to Baseline Conditions under 40 percent unimpaired flow (LSJR Alternative 3), by Water Year Type.....	20
Figure 8.4-1	Water use and California state Gross Domestic Product (GDP)	19
Figure 8.5-1	Total Volume of Water Traded between 2009 and 2014 by Buyer Sector.....	28
Figure 8.5-2	Total Volume of Water Traded between 2009 and 2016 by Buyer Sector in the Primary Geographic Regions of California.....	29
Figure 8.5-3	Total Volume of Water Traded between 2009 and 2016 by Buyer Sector in the San Joaquin River and San Francisco Bay Area.....	29
Figure 8.5-4	Difference in Surface Water and Groundwater Production for Select BAWSCA Agencies—Critically Dry Year (2014) vs. Wet Year (2011).....	36
Figure 8.5-5	Current-Dollar Gross Domestic Product (2009–2016) for San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA and San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA Metropolitan Statistical Areas.....	47
Figure 8.5-6	New Private Housing Units per Year (2009–2016) Authorized by Building Permits for San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA and San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA (Metropolitan Statistical Areas)(Units, Annual (Sum of Monthly Values); Not seasonally adjusted)	48

Acronyms and Abbreviations

°F	degrees Fahrenheit
1991 Bay-Delta Plan	1991 Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan
2006 Bay-Delta Plan	2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Estuary
2010 Delta Flow Criteria Report	2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem report
7DADM	7-day average daily maximum
AB	Assembly Bill
AB 32	California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
ACECs	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
ACWD	Alameda County Water District
AF	acre-feet
AF/acre	acre-feet per acre
AF/day	acre-feet per acre per day
AFRP	Anadromous Fish Restoration Program
AFSP	Anadromous Fish Screen Program
AGR	Agricultural supply
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
AMP	Airport Master Plan
APCDs	applicable air pollution control districts'
AR/NHI	American Rivers and Natural Heritage Institute
ARB	Air Resources Board
ARPA	Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
ARTDA	Amended and Restated Treatment and Delivery Agreement
ASR	Aquifer Storage and Recovery
ATC	Authority to Construct
AWMP	Agricultural Water Management Plan
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BANC	balancing authority of Northern California

BANC	Balancing Authority of Northern California
BARDP	Bay Area Regional Desalination Project
BARDP	Bay Area Regional Desalination Program
BARR	Bay Area Regional Reliability
Basin Plan	Water Quality Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins
Basin Plan Amendments 2004	Central Valley Water Board's Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River, July 2004
BAU	business-as-usual
BAWSCA	Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
Bay Area	San Francisco Bay Area
Bay-Delta Estuary	San Francisco Bay Estuary and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary
Bay-Delta Plan	2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary
Bay-Delta WQCP	2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary
BCWD	Ballico-Cortez Water District
BDCP	Bay Delta Conservation Plan
bhp	brake horsepower
BKD	bacterial kidney disease
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	best management practices
BO/ BiOp	biological opinion
BPS	Best Performance Standards
Business Plan Act	Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act
C	Celsius
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAD	Cowell Agreement Diverters
CAISO	California Independent System Operators
Cal Water	California Water Service Company
Cal. Code Regs	California Code of Regulations

Cal. Const.	California Constitution
Cal. Wat.	California Water
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention Program
CalARP RMP	California Accidental Release Prevention Program Risk Management Plan
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
California HSRG	California Hatchery Scientific Review Group
California Transmission Planning Group	Sacramento and Fresno in California's Central Valley
California WaterFix	California WaterFix Project
Cal-IPC	California Invasive Plant Council's
CAOs	clean up abatement orders
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CAS	Climate Adaptation Strategy
CASGEM	California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring
CBD	Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife
CCAPCD	County Air Pollution Control District
CCCD	Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development
CCCS	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
CCDD	Cherry Creek Diversion Dam
CCF	Clifton Court Forebay
CCID	Central California Irrigation District
CCP	Comprehensive Conservation Plans
CCR	consumer confidence reports
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CDBW	California Department of Boating and Waterways
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDCR	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's
CDEC	California Data Exchange Center
CDFA	California Department of Food and Agriculture
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game

CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDOs	cease and desist orders
CDWA	Central Delta Water Agency
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEHTP	California Environmental Health Tracking Program
Central Valley Water Board	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
Cfs	cubic feet per second
CH ₄	methane
CHRIS	California Historic Resources Information System
Cm	centimeter
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNG	compressed natural gas
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
COA	Cooperative Operating Agreement
COLD	Cold Freshwater Habitat
COMM	Commercial and Sport Fishing
Commission	California Fish and Game Commission
Contra Costa WD	Contra Costa Water District
COP	Comprehensive Operations Plan
Council	Delta Stewardship Council
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CRM	Cultural Resource Management
CSD	Community Services District
CSJWCD	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District
CSJWD	Central San Joaquin Water District
CUAW	Consumptive Use of Applied Water

CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CVCWA	Central Valley Clean Water Association
CVFPB	California Central Valley Flood Protection Board
CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992
CVPM	Central Valley Production Model
CV-SALTS	Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWAP	California Water Action Plan
CWC	California Water Commission
CWD	County Water District
C-WIN/CSPA	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
CWP	California Water Plan
CWSRF	Clean Water State Revolving Fund
D-1641	Water Right Decision 1641
DAC	disadvantaged community
DACs	disadvantaged communities
DAU	Detailed Analysis Units
DBCP	dibromochloropropane
DBW	Department of Boating and Waterways
DDE	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DDSD	Delta Diablo Sanitation District
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DDW	Division of Drinking Water
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
Delta Reform Act	Sacramento–San Joaquin Reform Act of 2009
Delta RMP	Delta Regional Monitoring Program
DFG	Department of Fish and Game
DFW	Department of Fish and Wildlife

DMC	Delta-Mendota Canal
DO	Dissolved oxygen
DOC	Department of Conservation
DOI	U.S. Department of Interior
DOSS	Delta Operations for Salmon and Sturgeon
DOSS	Delta Operations for Salmonids and Sturgeon
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPRA	Don Pedro Recreation Agency
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DROPS	Drought Response Outreach Program for Schools
dS/m	deciseimens per meter
DSC	Delta Stewardship Council
DSG	Davis Delta Solutions Group
DSM2	Delta Simulation Model 2
DSOD	Division of Safety of Dams
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	Department of Water Resources
DWSC	Deep Water Ship Channel
DWSP	Delta Water Supply Project
DWSRF	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund
DWWSP	Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project
E/I	Export/Inflow
Eastside WD	Eastside Water District
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District
EC	electrical conductivity
EDCP	Egeria densa control program
EDU	electrical distribution utilities
EIR	environmental impact report
EIR/EIS	Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
ENR	Engineering News-Record

EO	Executive Order
ERDC	Engineer Research and Development Center
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESJ	Eastern San Joaquin
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
EWA	Environmental Water Account
EWD	Eastside Water District
EWMPs	efficient water management practices
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FNF	Full Natural Flow
FPA	Federal Power Act
ft	feet
ft/s	feet/second
ft/y	feet per year
FY	fiscal year
GAMA	Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment
GBA	Groundwater Banking Authority
GBUAPCD	Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
GBVAB	Great Basin Valleys Air Basin
GDEs	groundwater-dependent ecosystems
GFDL	Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Lab
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographic information systems
GLC	Grant Line Canal
GPM	gallons per minute
GRACE	NASA Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment
GSAs	groundwater sustainability agencies
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plans
GWGP	Groundwater Grant Program Guidelines
GWh	gigawatt-hours

GWMP	groundwater management plan
GWP	global warming potential
GWR	Groundwater Recharge
HAB	Harmful Algal Blooms
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutants
HCP	habitat conservation plan
HEC	Hydrologic Engineering Center
HEC-5Q temperature model	San Joaquin River Basin-Wide Water Temperature and EC Model
Hetchy Power	Hetch Hetchy Power System
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
HH/LSM	Hetch Hetchy/Local Simulation Model
HMI	hazardous materials inventory
HOR	Head of Old River
HORB	Head of Old River Barrier
HPMP	Historic Properties Management Plan
HSC	habitat suitability criteria
HSRG	Hatchery Scientific Review Group
HWMS	hydrologic water quality modeling system
I-5	Interstate 5
ICU	Integrated Conjunctive Use
ICW	Inspection of Completed Works
ID	Irrigation District
IEP	Interagency Ecological Program
IEUA	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
IFIM	Flow Incremental Methodology
IHN	infectious hematopoietic necrosis
IID	Imperial Irrigation District
IMPLAN	Impact Analysis for Planning
IND	Industrial service supply
IOUs	Investor-Owned Utilities
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

IPO	Interim Plan of Operations
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
IRWMP	Integrated Regional Water Management Program
IS/MND	initial study/mitigated negative declaration
ISO	Independent System Operators
ISAA	Irrigation Service Abandonment Agreement
ISB	Independent Science Board
JSA	Joint Settlement Agreement
Km	kilometers
KMZ	Klamath Management Zone
kV	kilovolt
kWh	kilowatt hour
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's
LAFCo	Local Agency Formation Commission
Lbs	Pounds
LCA	Lower Cherry Aqueduct
LCR	local capacity requirements
LCT	Local Capacity Technical
LDPCSD	Lake Don Pedro Community Service District
LESA model	Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model
LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LNG	liquefied natural gas
LOS	level of service
LSJR	Lower San Joaquin River
LSJR alternatives	LSJR Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4
LSZ	low salinity zone
LTE	long-term emergency ratings
m	meters
M&I	municipal and industrial
Madera ID	Madera Irrigation District

MAF	million acre-feet
MAF	million acre-feet
Manteca	City of Manteca
MCAB	Mountain Counties Air Basin
MCAPCD	Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District
MCL	maximum contaminant levels
MeHg	Methylmercury
Merced ID	Merced Irrigation District
mg/L	milligrams per liter
mgd	million gallons per day
MHW	mean high water
MID	Modesto Irrigation District
MIGR	Migration of Aquatic Organisms
MLD	most likely descendant(s)
MLW	mean low water
mm	millimeters
mmhos/cm	millimhos per centimeter
MMP	mitigation and management plan
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MR	Middle River
MRWTP	Modesto Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheets
msl	mean sea level
MT	metric tons
MT CO ₂ e	metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent
MUN	Municipal and domestic water supply
MW	megawatts
MWO	municipal well operator
MZ	mineral resource zones
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NA	not applicable

NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NAV	Navigation
NCS	No Carryover Storage
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NERC	North American Electric Reliability Corporation
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NMI	New Melones Index
No Project Alternative	LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSJ	Northern San Joaquin Valley
NSJWCD	Northern San Joaquin Water Conservation District
NWIP	Noxious Weed Information Project
NWS	National Weather Service
O&M	operations and maintenance
OAG	Office of the Attorney General
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
OCAP	Operational Criteria and Plan
OHW	Ordinary High Water
OID	Oakdale Irrigation District
OMR	Old and Middle River
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
ORT	Old River Near Tracy
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PCM	Parallel Climate Model
PCWA	Placer County Water Agency

PEIR	Program (or Programmatic) Environmental Impact Report
PFCs	perfluorocarbons
PFMC	Pacific FMC
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PKD	Proliferative Kidney Disease
POE	Point-of-Entry
Porter-Cologne Act	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
POTWs	publicly owned treatment works
POU	Point-of-Use
ppm	parts per million
PPP	Pollution Prevention Plan
ppt	parts per trillion
ppt	parts per thousand
PRO	Industrial Process Supply
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PSP	Draft Proposal Solicitation Package
Pub. Resources Code	California Public Resources Code
PWS	public water system
RA	Resource Adequacy
RARE	Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species
RCMP	Regional Congestion Management Program
RDEIR/SDEIS	Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS
REC-1	Water Contact Recreation
REC-2	Non-Contact Water Recreation
Recovery Plan	Golden Gate Salmon Association Salmon Rebuilding Plan, the NMFS Final Recovery Plan
Recovery Program	Colorado Endangered Fish Recovery Program
Regional Water Board	Regional Water Quality Control Boards
Reporting Rule	Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
R-GPCD	residential gallons per capita per day
RM	River Mile
RMP	Resource Management Plan

RMP	risk management plan
RMP/EIS	Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement
RO	reverse osmosis
ROD	Record of Decision
ROG	reactive organic gases
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RTMP	real-time water quality management program
RVDs	recreation visitor days
RWS	Regional Water System
SalSim	simulation model
SB	Senate Bill
SBX7-7	also Senate Bill X7-7
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
Scoping Plan	The Climate Change Scoping Plan
SCVWD	Santa Clara Valley Water District
SDAC	severely disadvantaged communities
SDCWA	San Diego County Water Authority
SDIP EIS/EIR	South Delta Improvement Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report
SDWA	Southern Delta Water Agency
SDWQ	Southern Delta Water Quality
SED	substitute environmental document
SEP	Science Evaluation Process
SEWD	Stockton East Water District
SF6	sulfur hexafluoride
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SHELL	Shellfish Harvesting
Sierra ROD	Sierra Resource Management Record of Decision
SJCFCWD	San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

SJCOG	San Joaquin Council of Governments
SJMSCP	San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan
SJR	San Joaquin River
SJR module	San Joaquin River module
SJRA	San Joaquin River Agreement
SJRGAA	San Joaquin River Group Authority
SJRMEP	San Joaquin River Monitoring and Evaluation Program
SJRRP	San Joaquin River Restoration Program
SJTA	San Joaquin Tributaries Authority
SJVAB	San Joaquin Valley Air Basin
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's
SL	standard length
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SNMP	Salt and Nitrate Management Plan
SNR	Sierra Nevada Region
SOG	Stanislaus Operations Group
SOI	sphere of influence
SONAR	Sound Navigation and Ranging
SO _x	sulfur oxides
SPWN	Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development
SR	State Route
SRA	State Recreation Area
SRF	Stanislaus River Forum
SSJID	South San Joaquin Irrigation District
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
STM Working Group	Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Working Group
subd	subdivision
SWAP	Statewide Agricultural Production model
SWG	Smelt Working Group
SWP	State Water Project

SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TA	Technical Assistance
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TAF	thousand acre-feet
TAF/y	thousand acre-feet per year
TBI/NRDC	The Bay Institute and Natural Resources Defense Council
TBP	Temporary Barrier Program
TCAPCD	Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District
TDS	total dissolved solids
TID	Turlock Irrigation District
TMDL	total maximum daily loads
TROps	Tuolumne River Operations
TSD	Technical Support Document
TUCP	Temporary Urgency Change Petition
TUD	Tuolumne Utilities District
Tulare Lake Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the Tulare Lake Basin
UC	University of California
UC Davis	University of California, Davis
UCCE	University of California Cooperative Extension
Upper SJR	Upper San Joaquin River
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USC	United States Code
USDA	US Department of Agricultural
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UWMP	urban water management plan
UWMP Act	Urban Water Management Planning Act
VAMP	Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan

VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WAP	Water Acquisition Program
WARM	Warm Freshwater Habitat
Water Code	California Water Code
WD	water district
WDRs	Waste Discharge Requirements
WEAP	Water Evaluation and Planning System
WECC	Western Electricity Coordinating Council
WHCP	water hyacinth control program
WID	Woodbridge Irrigation District
WILD	Wildlife Habitat
Williamson Act	California Land Conservation Act of 1965
WMA	Weed Management Area
WOMT	Water Operations Management Team
WQBELs	water-quality based effluent limitations
WQCP	water quality control plans
WQO	Water Quality Order
WQS	water quality standards
WRFPP	e Water Recycling Funding Program
WS	water system
WSA	water supply assessment
WSCP	Water Shortage Contingency Plan
WSE	Water Supply Effects model
WSIP	Water Supply Improvement Project
WSO	Water Supply Options
WTP	willingness-to-pay
WUA	weighted useable area
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
WY	water year
YOY	young-of-the-year
ZEL	zero equivalency level

Zone 7

μmhos/cm

Zone 7 Water Agency

micromhos per centimeter