

Impact AES-3: Permanent Damage to Scenic Resources along a State Scenic Highway from Construction of Conveyance Facilities: **The impact on scenic highways associated with the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable (CEQA) with the approved project.**

NEPA Effects: "...the visual elements introduced by the intakes, RTM area north of Intake 2, and intermediate forebay associated with the proposed project would conflict with the existing forms, patterns, colors, and textures along River Road and SR 160; would dominate riverfront visible from SR 160, and would alter broad views and the general nature of the visual experience presently available from River Road and SR 160. These changes would reduce the visual quality near intake structure locations and result in noticeable changes in the visual character of scenic highway viewsheds in the study area. This effect would be adverse for the same reasons discussed for the approved project under the proposed project. Mitigation Measures AES-1a, AES-1c, and AES-1e have been adopted to address these effects, but the effects would remain adverse.

CEQA Conclusion: Construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project would have effects on scenic highways identical to those described for the approved project. Impacts associated with proposed permanent access roads would be the same as described for the approved project.

Incremental Impact: Construction of conveyance facilities under the proposed project would have effects on scenic highways identical to those described for the approved project and there would be no incremental change. ...The presence of the Clifton Court Forebay pumping plants, RTM area, shaft site pads and access hatches, and transmission lines would result in significant impacts, similar to that of the approved project, on scenic highways because construction and operation would result in a reduction in the visual quality in some locations and introduce dominant visual elements that would result in noticeable changes in the visual character of scenic highway viewsheds in the study area. Mitigation Measures AES-1a, AES-1c, and AES-1e would partially reduce these incremental impacts but not to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons identified for the approved project. Thus, the impact would be the same as under the approved project and impacts on scenic highways associated with the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable (CEQA) as with the approved project

Impact AES-4: Creation of a New Source of Light or Glare that Would Adversely Affect Views in the Area as a Result of Construction and Operation of Conveyance Facilities:

NEPA Effects: Changes to light and glare would remain adverse under the proposed project, consistent with the approved project. As described for the approved project in the Final EIR/EIS, there are many viewers in and around the waterways, intake structures, and intermediate forebay; project facilities would increase the amount of nighttime lighting in the Delta above existing ambient light levels; blue-white light LED lighting could exacerbate project lighting impacts; and the study area currently experiences low levels of light because there are fewer light/glare producers than are typical in urban areas. Mitigation Measures AES-4a through AES-4d have been adopted to address the effects that differ from the approved project, although the effects would remain adverse.

CEQA Conclusion: Same as NEPA.

Incremental Impact: These impacts would be considered significant for the same reasons as described for the approved project. Mitigation Measures AES-4a from the Final EIR/EIS would partially reduce the incremental impacts that differ from the approved project but not to a less-than-significant level because all instances of light and glare impacts would not be reduced by the adopted mitigation measures. Thus, the impact would be the same as under the approved project, and the new sources of daytime and nighttime light and glare associated with the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts (CEQA) on public views in the project vicinity.

Impact AES-7: Compatibility of the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities and other Environmental Commitments with Federal, State, or Local Plans, Policies, or Regulations addressing Aesthetics and Visual Resources:

NEPA Effects: Constructing water conveyance facilities and implementing Environmental Commitments under the proposed project would have the same potential for incompatibilities with one or more plans and policies related to preserving the visual quality and character of the Delta as described for the approved project. Potential incompatibility with plans and policies could exist related to preserving the visual quality and character of the Delta (i.e., The Johnston-Baker-Andal-Boatwright Delta Protection Act of 1992, Delta Protection Commission Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta, Delta Plan, Brannan Island and Franks Tract State Recreation Areas General Plan). In addition, with the exception of Solano and Alameda Counties, the proposed project may be incompatible with county general plan policies that protect visual resources in the study area.

CEQA Conclusion: The potential incompatibilities with plans and policies listed above indicate the potential for a physical consequence to the environment. The physical effects they suggest are discussed in Impacts AES-1 through AES-4, and no additional CEQA conclusion is required related to the compatibility of the proposed project with relevant plans and policies.

Cumulative Analysis:

The Final EIR/EIS found that there was a potential for the approved project and other projects to have a cumulative effect on aesthetics and visual resources in the Plan Area because they would result in reduced visual quality and introduce dominant visual elements that would result in noticeable changes that do not blend, are not in keeping or are incompatible with the existing visual environment, and could be viewed by sensitive receptors and from public viewing areas. The size of the study area and the nature of changes introduced by the approved project and other cumulative projects would result in permanent changes to the regional landscape such that there would be noticeable to very noticeable changes that do not blend or are not in keeping with the existing visual environment, including impacting scenic vistas and scenic highways due to temporary and permanent conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses. Cumulative projects could also affect the amount of new artificial sources of light and glare through development and introduction of anthropogenic features. The analysis for cumulative effects for aesthetics and visual resources remains the same as described in the Final EIR/EIS with consideration of the proposed project modifications.mitigation has been adopted to minimize these cumulative effects. However, construction and ongoing operations associate with proposed project modifications would still result in considerable cumulative effects on aesthetics and visual resources.