

# **Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study**

# Environmental Assessment/ Initial Study Contents

		<b>Page</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	1-1
	1.1 Purpose of This Document .....	1-1
	1.2 Relationship between the Proposed Action and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.....	1-1
	1.3 Relationship between This Document and the CALFED Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report.....	1-2
	1.4 Public Participation .....	1-3
	1.5 Organization of This Document .....	1-3
	1.6 Terminology Used in This Document.....	1-4
 <b>Chapter 2</b>	 <b>Proposed Action and Alternatives</b> .....	 2-1
	2.1 Purpose and Need .....	2-1
	2.2 Background.....	2-1
	2.2.1 Overview of the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project.....	2-1
	2.2.2 Delta-Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie Background.....	2-2
	2.3 Proposed Action.....	2-3
	2.3.1 Location.....	2-3
	2.3.2 Operations.....	2-4
	2.3.3 Project Components.....	2-4
	2.3.4 Construction Activities.....	2-5
	2.3.5 Environmental Commitments .....	2-6
	2.4 No Action Alternative .....	2-13
	2.5 Alternatives Considered but Not Pursued.....	2-13
	2.5.1 Delta-Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie at Delta-Mendota Canal Milepost 7.69 .....	2-13
	2.5.2 Delta-Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie at Milepost 3.54 .....	2-14
	2.5.3 Raise Delta-Mendota Canal Lining and Structures .....	2-14
	2.5.4 Use the State Water Project Banks Pumping Plant and the California Aqueduct to Pump Water for the Central Valley Project .....	2-15

<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	3-1
3.2	Water Supply and Delta Water Management .....	3-3
	3.2.1 Affected Environment.....	3-3
	3.2.2 Approach.....	3-10
	3.2.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-10
	3.2.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-17
3.3	Delta Tidal Hydraulics .....	3-23
	3.3.1 Affected Environment.....	3-23
	3.3.2 Approach.....	3-24
	3.3.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-25
	3.3.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-33
3.4	Water Quality .....	3-35
	3.4.1 Affected Environment.....	3-35
	3.4.2 Approach.....	3-37
	3.4.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-39
	3.4.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-53
3.5	Fish .....	3-55
	3.5.1 Affected Environment.....	3-55
	3.5.2 Approach.....	3-55
	3.5.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-57
	3.5.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-85
3.6	Vegetation and Wildlife .....	3-89
	3.6.1 Affected Environment.....	3-89
	3.6.2 Approach.....	3-94
	3.6.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-98
	3.6.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-102
3.7	Air Quality .....	3-105
	3.7.1 Affected Environment.....	3-105
	3.7.2 Approach.....	3-107
	3.7.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-109
	3.7.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-110
3.8	Noise.....	3-111
	3.8.1 Affected Environment.....	3-111
	3.8.2 Approach.....	3-116
	3.8.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-117
	3.8.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-121
3.9	Power Production and Energy .....	3-123
	3.9.1 Affected Environment.....	3-123
	3.9.2 Approach.....	3-125
	3.9.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-126
	3.9.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-126
3.10	Cultural Resources .....	3-129
	3.10.1 Affected Environment.....	3-129
	3.10.2 Approach.....	3-132
	3.10.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-137
	3.10.4 Cumulative Impacts.....	3-140
3.11	Environmental Justice.....	3-141
	3.11.1 Affected Environment.....	3-141
	3.11.2 Approach.....	3-142

	3.11.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-144
	3.11.4 Cumulative Effects .....	3-144
3.12	Indian Trust Assets .....	3-145
	3.12.1 Affected Environment.....	3-145
	3.12.2 Approach.....	3-145
	3.12.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-146
	3.12.4 Cumulative Effects .....	3-146
3.13	Growth-Inducing Effects.....	3-147
	3.13.1 Affected Environment.....	3-147
	3.13.2 Approach.....	3-147
	3.13.3 Environmental Consequences .....	3-147
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>List of Preparers, Consultation and Coordination .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	List of Preparers.....	4-1
	4.1.1 Bureau of Reclamation.....	4-1
	4.1.2 San Luis & Delta-Mendota Authority .....	4-1
	4.1.3 Jones & Stokes .....	4-1
	4.1.4 CH2M Hill .....	4-2
4.2	Consultation and Coordination.....	4-2
	4.2.1 Future Consultation and Coordination .....	4-4
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>References Cited .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
	Printed References .....	5-1
<b>Appendix A.</b>	<b>CEQA Environmental Checklist</b>	
<b>Appendix B.</b>	<b>CALSIM II Modeling Studies of the Delta Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie</b>	
<b>Appendix C.</b>	<b>Supplemental Water Supply Information</b>	
<b>Appendix D.</b>	<b>Delta Tidal Hydraulic and Water Quality Modeling Methods and Results for the Delta Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie</b>	
<b>Appendix E.</b>	<b>DSM2 Modeling Studies of the Delta Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie</b>	
<b>Appendix F.</b>	<b>Supplemental Fish Information</b>	
<b>Appendix G.</b>	<b>Species List for the Delta Mendota Canal/California Aqueduct Intertie, Alameda and San Joaquin Counties</b>	



# Tables

	<b>Follows Page</b>
3.2-1 CVP Tracy Demands and Pumping Capacity .....	on page 3-6
3.2-2 Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant Demands and Maximum Pumping Capacity.....	on page 3-7
3.2-3a CALSIM II Simulated CVP Tracy Pumping (cfs) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD)	
3.2-3b CALSIM II Simulated CVP Tracy Pumping (cfs) for Proposed Action at Existing Condition .....	3-12
3.2-3c CALSIM II Simulated Change in CVP Tracy Pumping (cfs) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) Compared with Proposed Action Conditions.....	3-12
3.2-4 Monthly Distribution of CVP Tracy Pumping for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and Proposed Action Conditions.....	3-12
3.2-5 CALSIM II-Simulated Average Annual Total CVP South-of-Delta Deliveries (taf) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) Compared to the Proposed Action.....	3-14
3.2-6 Monthly Distribution of CVP Tracy Pumping for No Action (2020 LOD) and Proposed Action Conditions.....	3-14
3.2-7a CALSIM Simulated SWP Banks Pumping (cfs) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD).....	3-14
3.2-7b. CALSIM II Simulated SWP Banks Pumping (cfs) for Proposed Action at the Existing Condition .....	3-14
3.2-7c. CALSIM II Simulated Change in SWP Banks Pumping (cfs) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) Compared with the Proposed Action .....	3-14
3.2-8 Monthly Distribution of SWP Banks Pumping for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and Proposed Action .....	3-14

3.2-9	CALSIM II-Simulated Average Annual Total SWP South-of-Delta Deliveries (taf) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) .....	3-16
3.2-10	Monthly Distribution of SWP Banks Pumping for No Action (2020 LOD) and Proposed Action Conditions.....	3-16
3.3-1	DSM2-Simulated Change in Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow for South Delta Channel Locations with Increasing CVP and SWP Pumping, Using August 1997 Historical Tides and San Joaquin River Flow of 1,500 Cubic Feet per Second with No Barriers .....	3-28
3.3-2	DSM2 Simulated Changes in Tidal Stage and Tidal Flows at Selected South Delta Channel Locations for 1976–1980 .....	3-28
3.4-1	DSM2 Simulated Changes in EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Assessment Locations for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) Conditions for 1976–1991.....	3-42
3.4-2	DSM2 Simulated Changes in Dissolved Organic Carbon (mg/l) at Assessment Locations for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) Conditions for 1976–1991.....	3-48
3.5-1	Central Valley Species Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action .....	3-56
3.5-2	Summary of Assessment Models and Tools by Environmental Correlate for Each Fish Species and Life Stage .....	3-56
3.5-3	Potential Actions, Impact Mechanisms, and Affected Environmental Conditions with Implementation of the Proposed Action .....	3-58
3.5-4	Frequency of Spawning Habitat Availability for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather and American Rivers for the Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-60

3.5-5	Frequency of Change, Relative to Existing Condition (2001 LOD), in Spawning Habitat Availability for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation. ....	3-60
3.5-6	Frequency of Spawning Habitat Availability for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather and American Rivers for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-60
3.5-7	Frequency of Change, Relative to the No Action (2020 LOD), in Spawning Habitat Availability for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-60
3.5-8	Frequency of Occurrence of the Percentage Change in Flow from Existing Condition (2001 LOD) That Could Affect Rearing Habitat Area for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers for Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-60
3.5-9	Frequency of Occurrence of the Percentage Change in Flow from the No Action (2020 LOD) That Could Affect Rearing Habitat Area for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers for Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-60
3.5-10	Life Stage Timing and Distribution of Selected Species Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action.....	3-62
3.5-11	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Keswick for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64
3.5-12	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Bend Bridge for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64
3.5-13	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Red Bluff for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64



3.5-14	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Keswick for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-15	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Bend Bridge for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-16	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Red Bluff for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-17	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Feather River at Thermalito for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-18	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Feather River at Thermalito for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-19	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the American River at Sunrise for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-20	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the American River at Sunrise for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-21	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Keswick for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-22.	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Bend Bridge for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64

3.5-23	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Red Bluff for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-24	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from the No Action (2020 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Keswick for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-25	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from the No Action (2020 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Bend Bridge for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-26	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from No Action (2020 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Sacramento River at Red Bluff for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64
3.5-27	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Feather River at Thermalito for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-28	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from No Action (2020 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the Feather River at Thermalito for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64
3.5-29	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the American River at Sunrise for the No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-64
3.5-30	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from No Action (2020 LOD) for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life Stages in the American River at Sunrise for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-64
3.5-31	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Coho Salmon (based on criteria for Chinook salmon) in the Trinity River at Lewiston for Existing Conditions (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation .....	3-70

3.5-32	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) for Coho Salmon Life Stages in the Trinity River at Lewiston for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-70
3.5-33	Frequency of Water Temperature Survival Indices for Coho Salmon (based on criteria for Chinook salmon) in the Trinity River at Lewiston for No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-70
3.5-34	Frequency of Change in the Water Temperature Survival Indices from No Action (2020 LOD) for Coho Salmon Life Stages in the Trinity River at Lewiston for the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation.....	3-70
3.5-35	Monthly Median and Maximum Proportion (%) of Delta Smelt Distributed within Specific Areas of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary, 20-mm Survey Data .....	3-77
3.6-1	Special-Status Plants Identified During the Prefield Investigation as Having the Potential to Occur in the Intertie Study Area.....	3-90
3.6-2	Special-Status Wildlife Species Identified During the Prefield Investigation as Having the Potential to Occur in the Intertie Study Area.....	3-92
3.7-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards Applicable in California .....	3-106
3.7-2	Construction-Related Significance Thresholds (tons/year).....	on 3-109
3.7-3	Construction Emissions (tons/year) .....	on 3-109
3.7-4	BAAQMD Feasible Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10 .....	on 3-110
3.8-1	Population Density and Associated Ambient Noise Levels .....	on 3-112
3.8-2	State Land Use Compatibility Standards for Community Noise Environment .....	on 3-113
3.8-3	Alameda County Code Exterior Noise Level Standards .....	on 3-114
3.8-4	Alameda County Code Exterior Noise Level Standards for Commercial Properties .....	on 3-115
3.8-5	Office of Noise Control Construction Noise Limits.....	on 3-115
3.8-6	Construction Equipment Inventory and Noise Emission Levels .....	on 3-117

3.8-7 Estimated Construction Noise in the Vicinity of an Active Construction Site as a Function of Distance.....on 3-118

3.8-8 Estimated Operating Pump Noise Levels as a Function of Distance.....on 3-120

3.11-1 Race/Origin Characteristics, Census 2000 (%) .....on 3-142

3.11-2 Household Poverty Status in 1999 (%).....on 3-142



# Figures

**Figures are at the ends of  
respective sections**

- 2-1 CVP Service Areas
- 2-2 SWP Service Areas
- 2-3 Regional Location Map
- 2-4 Detailed Location Map
- 2-5 Proposed Action Site Plan
- 2-6 Proposed Action Cross Section
- 3.2-1 CALSIM II—Simulated CVP South-of-Delta Deliveries for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) and the Proposed Action
- 3.2-2 CALSIM—Simulated SWP South-of-Delta Deliveries for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) and the Proposed Action
- 3.2-3 CALSIM—Simulated San Luis Reservoir Carryover Storage (CVP and Total) for Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD) and Proposed Action
- 3.2-4 CALSIM—Simulated Monthly Average Intertie Flows (taf) under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD)—Taken from Appendix B
- 3.2-5 CALSIM—Simulated Monthly Maximum Tracy Pumping (cfs) under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD)—Taken from Appendix B
- 3.2-6 CALSIM—Simulated Exceedance Probability of Annual Intertie Use (taf/year) under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD)—Taken from Appendix B

- 3.2-7 CALSIM II—Simulated Change in Annual CVP Total Deliveries with Intertie under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD)—Taken from Appendix B
- 3.2-8 CALSIM II—Simulated Change in SWP South-of-Delta Deliveries with Intertie under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and No Action (2020 LOD)—Taken from Appendix B
- 3.3-1 Summary of DSM2—Simulated Effects of Export Pumping on the Tidal Stage Ranges in Old River at Tracy Road and in Grant Line Canal at Tracy Road for August 1997 Tides and San Joaquin River Flow of 1,500 cfs
- 3.3-2 Summary of DSM2—Simulated Effects of Export Pumping on the Tidal Stage Ranges in Old River at Clifton Court Ferry and in Middle River at Tracy Road for August 1997 Tides and San Joaquin River Flow of 1,500 cfs
- 3.3-3 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at Clifton Court Ferry for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-4 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at Clifton Court Ferry for the Proposed Action Compared with No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-5 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-6 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-7 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at the Head of Old River for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-8 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Old River at the Head of Old River for the Proposed Action Compared with No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-9 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Grant Line Canal at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-10 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Grant Line Canal at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991

- 3.3-11 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Middle River at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.3-12 DSM2—Simulated Tidal Stage and Tidal Flow in Middle River at Tracy Road Bridge for the Proposed Action Compared with No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-1 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Emmaton for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-2 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Emmaton for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-3 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Jersey Point for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-4 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Jersey Point the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-5 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at Rock Slough for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-6 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at Rock Slough for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-7 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at State Route 4 for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-8 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at State Route 4 for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-9 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Clifton Court Ferry (SWP Banks) for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-10 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at Clifton Court Ferry (SWP Banks) for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-11 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at CVP Tracy Pumping Plant for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-12 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at CVP Tracy Pumping Plant for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-13 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976-1991
- 3.4-14 DSM2—Simulated EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) in Old River at Tracy Boulevard Bridge for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976-1991



- 3.4-15 DSM2-Simulated EC (uX/cm in Middle River at Mowery Bridge for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-16 DSM2-Simulated EC (uS/cm) in Middle River at Mowery Bridge for the Proposed Action and No Action (2020 LOD) Condition, 1976–1991
- 3.4-17 DSM2-Simulated EC (uS/cm) in Grant Line Canal at Tracy Boulevard Bridge for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-18 DSM2-Simulated EC (uS/cm) in Grant Line Canal at Tracy Boulevard Bridge for the Proposed Action and No Action (2020 LOD) Condition, 1976–1991
- 3.4-19 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Old River at Rock Slough for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-20 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Old River at Rock Slough for the Proposed Action and No Action (2020 LOD) Condition, 1976–1991
- 3.4-21 DSM2–Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Old River at State Route 4 Bridge (Los Vaqueros Intake) for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-22 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Old River at State Route 4 Bridge (Los Vaqueros Intake) for the Proposed Action and No Action (2020 LOD) Condition, 1976–1991
- 3.4-23 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Clifton Court Forebay (SWP Banks Pumping Plant) for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-24 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) in Clifton Court Forebay (SWP Banks Pumping Plant) for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-25 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) at CVP Tracy Pumping Plant for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-26 DSM2-Simulated DOC (mg/l) at CVP Tracy Pumping Plant for the Proposed Action and No Action Condition (2020 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-27 DSM2-Simulated Flow (cfs) and Estimated Summer Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations (mg/l) in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel for the Proposed Action and Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1976–1991
- 3.4-28 DSM2-Simulated Flow (cfs) and Estimated Summer Dissolved Oxygen Concentrations (mg/l) in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel for the Proposed Action and No Action (2020 LOD), 1976–1991

- 3.5-1 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the San Joaquin and Trinity Rivers under Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) and Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-2 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers under Existing Conditions (2001 LOD) and Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-3 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the San Joaquin and Trinity Rivers under No Action (2020 LOD) and Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-4 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the Sacramento, Feather, and American Rivers under the No Action (2020 LOD) and Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-5 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the Sacramento River at Freeport and Monthly Average Delta Outflow under Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-6 Change in the Proportion of Sacramento River Flow Drawn into the Delta Cross Channel and Georgiana Slough under the Proposed Action relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) the No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-7 Change in SWP and CVP Pumping under the Proposed Action Relative to Pumping under (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) the No Action (2020 LOD) Condition, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-8 Comparison of Monthly Average Flow in the Sacramento River at Freeport and Monthly Average Delta Outflow under the No Action (2020 LOD) and the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-9 Comparison of Water Temperature under Proposed Action at Keswick, Bend Bridge, and Red Bluff on the Sacramento River with Water Temperature under the Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-10 Comparison of Water Temperature under Proposed Action on the Feather and American Rivers with Water Temperature under Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-11 Comparison of Water Temperature under the Proposed Action at Keswick, Bend Bridge, and Red Bluff on the Sacramento River with Water Temperature under the No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-12 Comparison of Water Temperature under Proposed Action on the Feather and American Rivers with Water Temperature under the No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation

- 3.5-13 Simulated Entrainment Loss for Fall-, Late Fall-, Winter-, and Spring-Run Chinook Salmon under the Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-14 Simulated Entrainment Loss for Fall-, Late Fall-, Winter-, and Spring-Run Chinook Salmon under No Action (2020 LOD) and the Proposed Action, 1922–1994 Simulation Simulation
- 3.5-15 Comparison of Water Temperature under the Proposed Action on the Trinity River with Water Temperature under Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-16 Comparison of Water Exports from the Trinity River to the Sacramento River under the Proposed Action with Exports under (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-17 Comparison of Water Temperature under the Proposed Action on the Trinity River with Water Temperature under No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-18 Simulated Salvage for Steelhead under the Proposed Action Compared Relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-19 Change in X2 Location under the Proposed Action relative to X2 Location under (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-20 Occurrence of Estuarine Rearing Habitat Area (i.e., proportion of maximum area) for Delta Smelt under (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-21 Change in the Proportion of Estuarine Rearing Habitat Area for Delta Smelt under the Proposed Action relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-22 Simulated Salvage for Delta Smelt under the Proposed Action Relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-23 Annual Change in Delta Smelt Salvage for May–July and August–April Periods for the Proposed Action relative to Existing Condition (2001 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-24 Monthly Median Size of Delta Smelt Salvaged at the SWP and CVP Fish Facilities, 1980–2002 Historical Data

- 3.5-25 Simulated Salvage for Splittail under the Proposed Action Relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-26 Monthly Median Size of Splittail Salvaged at the SWP and CVP Fish Facilities, 1980–2002 Historical Data
- 3.5-27 Occurrence of Proportional Estuarine Rearing Habitat Area for Striped Bass under (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-28 Change in the Proportion of Estuarine Rearing Habitat Area for Striped Bass under the Proposed Action Relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation
- 3.5-29 Simulated Salvage for Striped Bass under the Proposed Action Relative to (a) Existing Condition (2001 LOD) and (b) No Action (2020 LOD), 1922–1994 Simulation

