

---

# CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management

## Section 1. Description of the Project

The proposed project includes amending certain provisions of the State Water Resources Development System (SWRDS) Water Supply Contracts (Contracts). SWRDS (defined in Wat. Code, Section 12931), or more commonly referred to as the SWP, was enacted into law by the Burns-Porter Act, passed by the Legislature in 1959 and approved by the voters in 1960. The Department of Water Resources constructed and currently operates and maintains the SWP, a system of storage and conveyance facilities that provide water to 29 State Water Contractors known as the Public Water Agencies (PWAs)<sup>1</sup>. The Contracts include water management provisions as the methods of delivery, storage and use of water and financial provisions for recovery of costs associated with the planning, construction, and operation and maintenance of the SWP.

DWR and the PWAs have a common interest to ensure the efficient delivery of SWP water supplies and to ensure the SWP's financial integrity. In order to address water management flexibility DWR and the PWAs agreed to the following objectives:

- Supplement and clarify terms of the SWP water supply contract that will provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water supply within the SWP service area.

The proposed project would add, delete, and modify provisions of the Contracts and clarify certain terms of the Contracts that will provide greater water management regarding transfers and

---

<sup>1</sup> The State Water Project Public Water Agencies include Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Zone 7), Alameda County Water District, Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency, City of Yuba City, Coachella Valley Water District, County of Butte, County of Kings, Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency, Desert Water Agency, Dudley Ridge Water District, Empire West Side Irrigation District, Kern County Water Agency, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Mojave Water Agency, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Oak Flat Water District, Palmdale Water District, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District, San Geronio Pass Water Agency, San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clarita WA (formerly Castaic Lake WA), Solano County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, and Ventura County Flood Control District.

exchanges of SWP water within the SWP service area. In addition, the proposed project would not build new or modify existing SWP facilities nor change any of the PWA's annual Table A amounts.<sup>2</sup> The proposed project would not change the water supply delivered by the SWP, as SWP water would continue to be delivered to the PWAs consistent with current Contract terms and all regulatory requirements. The May 20, 2019 AIP is included as Appendix A of the 2020 Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR).

## Section 2. Findings Required Under CEQA

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environment impacts that would otherwise occur. Mitigation measures or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, sub. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15093, 15043, sub. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21081, sub. (b).)

In seeking to effectuate the substantive policy of CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible, an agency, in adopting findings, need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating approval of a proposed project with significant impacts. Where a significant impact can be mitigated to an "acceptable" level solely by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternative that could also substantially lessen or avoid that same impact — even if the alternative would render the impact less severe than would the proposed project as mitigated. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521; see also *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* ("Laurel Heights I") (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403.)

In cases in which a project's significant effects cannot be mitigated or avoided, an agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if it first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the "benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment." (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21081, sub. (b); see also, CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15043, subd. (b), 15093 .)

---

<sup>2</sup> The maximum amount of SWP water that the PWAs can request pursuant to their individual water supply contract. annual Table A amounts also serve as a basis for allocation of some SWP costs among the contractors.

In the Statement of Overriding Considerations found at the conclusion of this exhibit, DWR identifies the benefit that, in its judgment, outweighs the significant environmental effects that the projects would cause.

The California Supreme Court has stated that “[t]he wisdom of approving ... any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Citizens of Goleta* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 564.)

In support of its approval of the proposed project, DWR’s findings are set forth below for the potentially significant environmental effects and alternatives of the proposed project identified in the EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code, Section 21080 and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the 2018 DEIR and 2020 RDEIR (collectively referred to in this document as the DEIR). Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the DEIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the DEIR supporting the determination regarding the impacts of the proposed project. In making these findings, DWR ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the DEIR and Final EIR (FEIR) relating to environmental impacts except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As described below and in the DEIR, there were two significant impacts identified for the proposed project and they were associated with groundwater hydrology and water quality. There were no mitigation measures identified in the DEIR to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant and significant groundwater resource impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was not developed for the proposed project and is not included herein.

Unless otherwise specified, all page references presented herein are to the 2020 RDEIR.

## 2.1. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The following significant and potentially significant environmental impacts of the project are unavoidable and cannot be mitigated in a manner that would lessen the significant impact to below the level of significance. Notwithstanding disclosure of these impacts, DWR elects to approve the project due to overriding considerations as set forth below in Section 7, the statement of overriding considerations.

## Impact Category: Groundwater Hydrology and Water Quality

**Impact 5.10-1:** The increase in groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs could substantially deplete groundwater supplies in some areas of the study area. [p. 5.10-17 – 5.10-21]

**Finding.** It is possible that transfers and exchanges of SWP water among the PWAs could result in benefits to groundwater levels, as transferred or exchanged water could be used instead of groundwater supplies or this water could be used for groundwater recharge. However, it is also possible that transfers and exchanges from agricultural to M&I PWAs could result in an increase in groundwater pumping resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering the local groundwater table in some areas of the study area. DWR's conclusion is based on a program-level analysis, as there is uncertainty in the amount of groundwater use that may occur.

Because the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) is in the process of being implemented and because the extent, location, and implementation timing of groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs are not known, assumptions related to the ability of SGMA to mitigate any changes in groundwater levels are speculative.

PWAs could propose feasible mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant in some cases, although it is not possible for DWR to conclude that feasible mitigation measures would be available to avoid or mitigate significant groundwater effects in all cases. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2), implementation and enforcement mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding.

The extent, location, and implementation timing of groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs are not known. Therefore, it is concluded that the potential increase in groundwater pumping could result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering the local groundwater table. **For these reasons, this impact is significant and unavoidable.**

**Impact 5.10-2:** The increase in groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs could result in subsidence in some of the study area. [p. 5.10-22 – 5.10-25]

**Finding.** It is possible that transfers and exchanges among the PWAs could result in benefits to groundwater levels, as transferred or exchanged water could be used instead of groundwater supplies or this water could be used for groundwater recharge. However, it is also possible that transfers and exchanges from agricultural to M&I PWAs could result in an increase in groundwater pumping in some areas of the study area causing subsidence due to a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering the local groundwater table. Because the extent, location, and implementation timing of groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs are not known, it is concluded that groundwater pumping in

some areas of the study area would cause subsidence due to a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering the local groundwater table and the impact would be potentially significant.

Because SGMA is in the process of being implemented and because the extent, location, and implementation timing of groundwater pumping associated with changes in transfers and exchanges implemented by PWAs are not known, assumptions related to the ability of SGMA to mitigate any changes in groundwater levels or related subsidence are speculative.

PWAs could propose feasible mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant in some cases, although it is not possible for DWR to conclude that feasible mitigation measures would be available to avoid or mitigate significant groundwater effects in all cases. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2), implementation and enforcement mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding.

DWR has no information on specific implementation of the transfers and exchanges from the proposed project and it has no authority to implement mitigation measures in the PWA service area. **For these reasons, this impact is significant and unavoidable.**

### Section 3. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts, as defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, refer to two or more individual effects that, when taken together, are “considerable” or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, actions when added to the impacts of other closely related past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects. Pertinent guidance for cumulative impact analysis is provided in Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The DEIR presents the cumulative impact analysis for the proposed project. Each impact discussion in the DEIR assesses whether the incremental effects of the proposed project could combine with similar effects of one or more of the projects identified in the 2020 RDEIR (p.6-2 – 6.14) to cause or contribute to a significant cumulative effect. If so, the analysis considers whether the incremental contribution of the proposed project would be cumulatively significant (p. 6-8 –6-14).

DWR hereby finds that implementation of the proposed project would not result in physical environmental impacts on the following resource areas: hazards and hazardous materials; noise; population, employment and housing; public services and recreation; surface water hydrology and water quality; transportation; and utilities and service systems. Therefore, these resource areas would not contribute to a cumulative effect and would not compound or increase an environmental impact of these other projects.

The cumulative impact analysis associated with the remaining resource areas (aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, GHG, groundwater hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, and water supply) focused on six types of impacts that were identified as less than significant or

potential impacts of the proposed project that could contribute to cumulative impacts with the cumulative projects (Contract Extension Project, Monterey Amendment and Settlement Agreement, and Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation) identified in the DEIR. The six types of impacts are impacts to groundwater supplies, subsidence, fallowing and changes in crop patterns, energy and Greenhouse Gas (GHG), reservoir storage, and surface water flow above or below diversions. Impacts associated with fallowing and changes in crop patterns, energy and GHG, reservoir storage, and surface water flow above or below diversions were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation required.

Related to groundwater supplies and subsidence, DWR hereby finds as follows:

### **Groundwater Supplies and Subsidence**

**Findings.** The incremental contribution of the proposed project's effect on groundwater supplies and subsidence would be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and current and probable future projects (as full implementation of SGMA is not anticipated until 2040 or 2042). This cumulative impact would be **significant**. PWAs may provide mitigation in their project-level analysis for exchanges and transfers. However, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2), implementation and enforcement mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding.

Because DWR has no information on specific implementation of the transfers and exchanges from the proposed project and it has no authority to implement mitigation measures in the PWA service area, the cumulative impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

## **Section 4. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

According to Sections 15126, subd. (c) and 15126.2, subd. (c) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is required to address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the proposed project be implemented.

The proposed project would add, delete and modify provisions of the Contracts to clarify terms of the Contracts that will provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water supply within the service area. The proposed project would not build or modify existing SWP facilities nor change each PWA's contractual maximum Table A amounts. The proposed project would amend and add financial provisions to the Contracts based on the negotiated Agreements in Principle between DWR and the PWAs. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the commitment of nonrenewable natural resources such as gravel, petroleum products, steel, and slowly renewable resources such as wood products any differently than under existing conditions, and there would be no significant irreversible environmental changes.

## Section 5. Growth-Inducing Effects

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, subd. (d) requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a project. As identified in CEQA Section 15126.2(d), growth inducement is not in and of itself an “environmental impact;” however, growth can result in adverse environmental consequences. Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if the growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and policies for the affected area. Local land use plans, typically General Plans, provide for land use development patterns and growth policies that allow for the “orderly” expansion of urban development supported by adequate urban public services, such as water supply, sewer service, and new roadway infrastructure. A project that would induce “disorderly” growth (i.e., a project in conflict with local land use plans) could indirectly cause adverse environmental impacts. To assess whether a project with the potential to induce growth is expected to result in significant impacts, it is important to assess the degree to which the growth associated with a project would or would not be consistent with applicable land use plans.

In California, cities and counties have primary authority<sup>3</sup> over land use decisions, while water suppliers, through laws and agreements, are expected and usually required to provide water service if water supply is available. Approval or denial of development proposals is the responsibility of the cities and counties in the study area. Numerous laws are intended to ensure that water supply planning, including planning for water supply infrastructure, and land use planning (such as the approval of, or establishment of constraints to, development) proceed in an orderly fashion.

The proposed project would not build new or modify existing SWP facilities nor change each PWA’s contractual maximum Table A amounts. As discussed in DEIR Section 5.14, Population, Employment, and Housing, (p. 5.14-2 to 5.14-5) because there would be no new facilities built or existing facilities modified, no housing is proposed as part of the project or required as a result of it, nor would the project provide substantial new permanent employment opportunities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in direct growth inducement.

Because the proposed project would not result in the construction of new or modification of existing water supply storage, treatment or conveyance facilities it would not remove an obstacle to growth associated with water supply.

As discussed in DEIR Section 5.3 Agricultural and Forestry Resources of the DEIR (p. 5.3-7 to 5.3-9), it is possible that transfers from agricultural to M&I PWAs could result in fallowing of agricultural lands and/or changes in crop patterns (e.g., switching from high water-using crops to low water-using crops) in the study area. It is also possible that exchange of SWP water from agricultural to M&I PWAs could occur. However, these transfers and exchanges and any associated fallowing of agricultural land and/or changes in cropping patterns in the study area would not be anticipated to change the existing agricultural land use designations because the land use would remain in agricultural use. Furthermore, additional water transfers or exchanges

---

<sup>3</sup> Although cities and counties have primary authority over land use planning, there are exceptions to this such as the CEC (with permit authority and CEQA lead agency status for some thermal power plant projects) and the CPUC (with regulatory authority and CEQA lead agency status for certain utility projects).

are not expected to substantially affect the acreage of land fallowed or put into dry farming compared to existing practices for other reasons (e.g., market conditions, economic conditions, etc.). As a result, it would not be anticipated that there would be a change in land uses associated with delivery of SWP water supplies including, conversion of agricultural land uses to urban uses or increased developed uses in urban areas.

While with the proposed amendments transfers and exchanges could be more frequent and longer in duration, they would not be a permanent transfer of a PWA's annual Table A amounts; therefore, it would not represent a viable long-term source of urban water supply to support additional unplanned growth. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in additional water supply that could support growth over what is currently planned for in those jurisdictions and the proposed project would not result in indirect growth inducement.

Furthermore, cities and counties are responsible for considering the environmental effects of their growth and land use planning decisions (including, but not limited to, conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, loss of sensitive habitats, and increases in criteria air emissions). As new developments are proposed, or general plans adopted, local jurisdictions prepare environmental compliance documents to analyze the impacts associated with development in their jurisdiction pursuant to CEQA. The impacts of growth would be analyzed in detail in general plan EIRs and in project-level CEQA compliance documents. Mitigation measures for identified significant impacts would be the responsibility of the local jurisdictions in which the growth would occur. If identified impacts could not be mitigated to a level below the established thresholds, then the local jurisdiction would need to adopt overriding considerations.

## Section 6. Alternatives

DWR has considered the project alternatives presented and analyzed in the DEIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. DWR finds that these alternatives are infeasible. Based on the impacts identified in the DEIR and other reasons summarized below, and as supported by substantial evidence in the record, DWR finds that approval and implementation of the proposed project as proposed is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action and hereby rejects the other alternatives and other combinations and/or variations of alternatives as infeasible based on consideration of the relevant factors set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, subdivision (f). (See also CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).) Each alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each alternative are set forth below.

### Alternatives Considered and Dismissed from Further Consideration

The alternative described below was rejected for further consideration (p 7-3 – 7-4).

**Implement New Water Conservation Provisions in the Contracts:** Agriculture and urban water efficiency, conservation, and management measures are governed by the existing regulatory and legal requirements independent from the proposed project, including Assembly

Bill 1668 and Senate Bill 606. Additional water conservation measures in the Contracts would not provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water as compared to the proposed project because water conservation is already required. Consequently, these actions are independent from the proposed project and do not meet the basic project objectives. Therefore, amending the Contracts to require implementation of agriculture and M&I water conservation measures was rejected, as these actions are required by state statute and are met by local water agencies under existing law.

## Summary of Alternatives Considered

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to a project or to the location of a project that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen significant project impacts. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether or not a variation of the proposed project would reduce or eliminate significant project impacts within the framework of the project's basic objectives.

The alternatives considered in the DEIR include:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Reduce Table A Deliveries
- Alternative 3: Reduced Flexibility in Water Transfers/Exchanges
- Alternative 4: More Flexibility in Water Transfers/Exchanges
- Alternative 5: Only Agriculture to M&I Transfers Allowed

## Alternative 1: No Project

### Description

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, subd. (e) requires consideration of a No Project Alternative. The purpose of this alternative is to allow the decision makers to compare impacts of approving a project with impacts of not approving a project. Under the No Project Alternative, DWR takes no action, and DWR and the PWAs would continue to operate and finance the SWP under the current Contracts.

### Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Alternative 1 would not meet the objective of the project because Alternative 1 does not provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water supply within the SWP service area and as compared to the proposed project. In addition, impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar but greater when compared to the proposed project. Alternative 1 could result in new potentially significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of new water supply facilities that were not identified for the proposed project. In addition, if alternative sources of water are not available, then the less than significant impacts identified for the proposed project could be potentially significant.

## Alternative 2: Amending Contract to Reduce Table A Deliveries

### Description

Under Alternative 2, as with the proposed project, DWR and the PWAs would agree to amend the Contracts based on the May 20, 2019 AIP. However, unlike the proposed project, the Contracts would be amended to reduce annual Table A amounts proportionately for all the PWAs.

### Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Alternative 2 would not meet the objectives of the project because it would cause a reduction in delivery of annual Table A amounts proportional for all PWAs and would not provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges. In addition, impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar but greater when compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2 could result in new potentially significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of new water supply facilities that were not identified for the proposed project. In addition, if alternative sources of water are not available, then the less than significant impacts identified for the proposed project could be potentially significant.

## Alternative 3: Less Flexibility in Water Transfers/Exchanges

### Description

Under Alternative 3, as with the proposed project, DWR and the PWAs would agree to amend the Contracts based on the May 20, 2019 AIP. However, unlike the proposed project, the Contracts would not be amended to modify provisions of the Contracts and clarify certain terms of the Contracts to provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water supply within the SWP service area. Some increase in flexibility of exchanges and transfers would be agreed to, but not all. For example, Alternative 3 would amend the Contracts to allow PWAs to transfer carryover water in San Luis Reservoir, but only 20 percent of the carryover water (the proposed project allows for 50 percent), allow limited multi-year transfers of five years or less (the proposed project allows for up to the Contract term), and not allow use of Transfer Packages. In addition, unlike the proposed project, PWAs would transfer water based on cost compensation established by DWR. Also, under Alternative 3, the Contracts would not amend the text in Article 56(f) regarding water exchanges to add provisions, such as conducting water exchanges as buyers and sellers in the same year and increasing the compensation allowed to facilitate the exchanges. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar or slightly less amount of water transfers among the PWAs than the proposed project, due to the less flexibility in water transfers and exchanges.

### Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Alternative 3 would meet the objectives of the project, but to a lesser degree because the water transfers and exchanges would not provide as much water management flexibility regarding transfers and exchanges. In addition, impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar but greater

when compared to the proposed project. Alternative 3 could result in new potentially significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of new water supply facilities that were not identified for the proposed project. In addition, if alternative sources of water are not available, then the less than significant impacts identified for the proposed project could be potentially significant.

## Alternative 4: More Flexibility in Water Transfer/Exchanges

### Description

Under Alternative 4, as with the proposed project, DWR and the PWAs would agree to amend the Contracts. However, unlike the proposed project, the Contracts would be amended to allow PWAs more flexibility in water transfers and exchanges. Similar to the proposed project, PWAs would be able to transfer carryover water in San Luis Reservoir, transfer water for multiple years without permanently relinquishing that portion of their Table A amounts, and transfer water in Transfer Packages. Similar to the proposed project, PWA would be able to transfer water based on terms they establish for cost compensation and duration, and store and transfer water in the same year. Unlike the proposed project that only allows for a single-year transfers associated with carryover water, Alternative 4 would allow transfers and exchanges to include up to 100 percent of a PWA's carryover in San Luis Reservoir and allow multi-year use of its carryover water in both transfers and exchanges. Similar to the proposed project, the proposed exchange provisions of the AIP would establish a larger range of return ratios in consideration of varying hydrology and also maximum compensation with respect to SWP charges and allow PWAs to conduct additional water exchanges as buyers and sellers in the same year.

### Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility

Alternative 4 would meet the objectives of the project. In addition, Under Alternative 4 the less than significant impacts associated with changes in flow including, adverse effects to special-status fish or terrestrial species, and water supply would be similar to the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, there is potential for Alternative 4 to result in a net deficit in aquifer volume, lowering of the local groundwater table, or subsidence in some areas of the study area with impacts that may be significant and unavoidable.

## Alternative 5: Greater Water Management – Only Agriculture to M&I Transfers Allowed

### Description

Under Alternative 5, as with the proposed project, DWR and the PWAs would agree to amend the Contracts based on the May 20, 2019 AIP.

Unlike the proposed project, DWR and PWAs would amend Contract provisions to allow the transfer of Table A water only from agricultural PWAs to M&I PWAs and not change any current Contract provisions for exchanges. Transfers from M&I PWAs to M&I PWAs, M&I PWAs to agricultural PWAs, and agricultural PWAs to agricultural PWAs would not be allowed. Similar to

the proposed project, PWAs could transfer carryover water in San Luis Reservoir to PWAs, transfer water for multiple years without permanently relinquishing that portion of their Table A amounts and request DWR's approval of Transfer Package; however, unlike the proposed project, these transfers would only be from agricultural PWAs to M&I PWAs. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 would revise the Contract to allow the PWAs to transfer water based on terms they establish for cost compensation and duration. An agricultural PWA would be able to store and transfer water in the same year to M&I PWAs, and transfer up to 50 percent of its carryover water, but only for a single-year transfer to an M&I PWA (i.e., a future or multi-year commitment of transferring carryover water is not allowed). Under Alternative 5, the Contracts would not be amended to modify the text in Article 56(f) regarding water exchanges to include additional provisions, such as conducting water exchanges as buyers and sellers in the same year.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 would not build new or modify existing SWP facilities nor change any of the PWA's contractual maximum Table A amounts. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 would not change the water supply delivered by the SWP as SWP water supply would continue to be delivered to the PWAs consistent with current Contracts terms, including Table A and Article 21 deliveries. Operation of the SWP under this alternative would be subject to ongoing environmental regulations including for water rights, water quality and endangered species protection, among other State and federal laws. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 would not require additional permits or approvals.

## **Facts in Support of Finding of Infeasibility**

Alternative 5 would meet some of the objectives of the project, but to a lesser degree because the water transfers and exchanges would not provide as much water management flexibility regarding transfers and exchanges. In addition, impacts under Alternative 5 would be similar but greater when compared to the proposed project. Alternative 5 could result in new potentially significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of new water supply facilities that were not identified for the proposed project. In addition, if alternative sources of water are not available, then the less than significant impacts identified for the proposed project could be potentially significant.

## **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 subd. (e) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project.

As presented in the DEIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant or no physical environmental impacts to all resource areas except for impacts related to groundwater supplies and subsidence, which are significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts as the proposed project (e.g., net deficit in aquifer volume, lowering of the local groundwater table, or subsidence in some areas of the study area). Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 could result in impacts similar or greater (new potentially significant impacts associated with the construction and operation of new water supply facilities that were not identified for the proposed project) than the proposed project. Therefore, because the

proposed project and Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts and the other alternatives may result in similar or greater impacts, Alternative 4 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

## Section 7. Statement of Overriding Considerations

DWR hereby declares that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, it has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against any unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the proposed project. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, those impacts may be considered “acceptable.”

Having evaluated the reduction of adverse significant environmental effect of the proposed project to the extent feasible, considered the entire administrative record on the Project, and weighed the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable adverse impact, DWR has determined that each of the following benefits of the proposed project separately and individually outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse impacts and render those potential adverse impacts acceptable based upon the following overriding considerations. The following represents the specific reasons to support this determination based on the final EIR and information contained therein.

### Water Transfers

The proposed project would add, delete, and modify provisions of the Contracts and clarify certain terms of the Contracts that will provide greater water management regarding transfers and exchanges of SWP water within the SWP service area.

The transfer provisions of the proposed project would facilitate the PWAs ability to:

- Transfer SWP water for multiple years and multiple parties without permanently relinquishing that portion of their annual Table A amounts;
- negotiate cost compensation and duration among the PWAs on a willing seller-willing buyer basis for water transfers; and
- Transfer SWP water stored outside of the transferring PWA’s service area to the receiving PWA’s service area

All these proposed transfer provisions would provide the PWAs with increased flexibility for short-term and long-term planning and management of their SWP water supplies. The proposed project, however, would not include any change to the PWA’s permanent annual Table A amounts.

Since the Monterey Amendment, DWR has approved short-term water transfers pursuant to Articles 15(a) and 41, and has administered the short-term Turn-Back Water Pool Program pursuant to Article 56 of the Contracts. The Turn-Back Water Pool Program allows a PWA to sell Table A water that it will not use, subject to certain conditions, for a set price that is either 50

percent or 25 percent of the Delta Water Rate for that year. DWR has also administered, on a demonstration basis, a multi-year water pool program for 2013-2014 and 2015-2016 that allowed PWAs to participate in the two-year program as either a buyer or seller for each of the two years (a decision made at the beginning of each of the two-year programs) with greater compensation for the water than allowed under the Turn-Back Water Pool Program. DWR has allowed transfers of Table A water among two PWAs with the same landowner in their respective service areas that do not include an exchange of money.

The proposed project would remove all language related to the Turn-back Pool from the Contracts and, compared to the Turn-Back Water Pool Program where DWR established the price based on the Delta water rate, the proposed project would revise the Contracts to allow the PWAs to transfer water based on terms they establish for cost compensation and duration. Also, in contrast to the Turn-Back Water Pool Program, a water transfer could be as long as the remainder of the term of the PWA's Contract. In addition, a PWA would be able to store and transfer water in the same year, and transfer up to 50 percent of its carryover water in San Luis Reservoir, but only for a single-year transfer (i.e., a future or multi-year commitment of transferring carryover water is not allowed).

The proposed amendments would result in a greater amount of water transfers among the PWAs than under the current Contract provisions. Based on past experience and discussions with PWAs, most water transfers that occur due to the proposed amendments would occur among the PWAs located south of the Delta and would not involve additional export of SWP water from the Delta. Water transfers would be implemented using the existing physical facilities and existing operational and regulatory processes, including CEQA compliance.

## Water Exchanges

The proposed project would amend the text in Article 56(f) regarding water exchanges to include additional provisions. The proposed exchange provisions of the AIP would establish return ratios (up to a 5:1 ratio) based on a consideration of varying hydrology and would set compensation based on a PWA's SWP charges.

The proposed amendments would allow PWAs to exchange carryover water in San Luis Reservoir, and exchange up to 50 percent of their carryover water in a single-year transaction (i.e., a future or multi-year commitment of exchanging carryover water is not allowed). The proposed provisions would also allow PWAs to conduct water exchanges of carryover water as buyers and sellers in the same year.

While DWR has approved water exchanges pursuant to Articles 15(a), 41, and 56(f), the proposed project would provide the PWAs with increased flexibility for short-term and long-term planning of water supplies. Under the proposed project, exchanges may be used more frequently to respond to variations in hydrology, such as wet years, and in single dry-year and multiple dry-year conditions.

## Acronyms and Glossary

AIP	Agreement in Principle
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
Contracts	Water Supply Contracts
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FEIR	Final EIR
PRC	California Public Resources Code
PWAs	Public Water Agencies
RDEIR	Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SWC	State Water Contractors
SWP	State Water Project