

Contents

List of Tables	xiv
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	xlvi
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	2-9
2.2.3 Flow Requirements.....	2-9
2.2.4 Hydrology.....	2-10
2.3 Merced River	2-11
2.3.1 Basin Overview	2-11
2.3.2 Water Diversion and Use	2-11
2.3.3 Flow Requirements.....	2-13
2.3.4 Hydrology.....	2-14
2.4 Tuolumne River	2-17
2.4.1 Basin Overview	2-17

2.4.2	Water Diversion and Use	2-18
2.4.3	Flow Requirements	2-20
2.4.4	Hydrology	2-22
2.5	Stanislaus River	2-25
2.5.1	Basin Overview	2-25
2.5.2	Water Diversion and Use	2-26
2.5.3	Flow Requirements	2-30
2.5.4	Hydrology	2-31
2.6	Lower San Joaquin River	2-34
2.6.1	Basin Overview	2-34
2.6.2	Water Diversion and Use	2-34
2.6.3	Flow Requirements	2-35
2.6.4	Hydrology	2-36
2.7	Southern Delta	2-38
2.7.1	Lower San Joaquin River and Tidal Conditions	2-38
2.7.2	Water Diversions	2-39
2.7.3	Return Flows	2-41
2.7.4	Water Quality and Water Quality Objectives	2-43
2.8	San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin	2-43
2.8.1	Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Subbasin	2-44
2.8.2	Modesto Groundwater Subbasin	2-45
2.8.3	Turlock Groundwater Subbasin	2-46
2.8.4	Merced Groundwater Subbasin	2-46
2.9	References Cited	2-47
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	3-15
3.3.8	Common Elements of LSJR Alternatives	3-16
3.3.9	LSJR Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Evaluation	3-19

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	3-38
3.4.3	SDWQ Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	3-39
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	3-40
3.5	References Cited	3-46
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
4.7.1	Peer-Reviewed Scientific Basis Report	4-23
4.7.2	Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling	4-23
4.7.3	Agricultural and Economic Modeling.....	4-24

4.7.4	SalSim	4-25
4.7.5	Salt Tolerance of Crops in the Southern Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta	4-25
4.7.6	Hydropower Modeling	4-26
4.8	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	5-84
5.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	5-105
5.5	Cumulative Impacts	5-106
5.6	References Cited	5-106
5.6.1	Printed References	5-106
5.6.2	Personal Communications	5-109
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	6-17
6.3	Regulatory Background	6-18
6.3.1	Federal	6-18
6.3.2	State	6-18
6.3.3	Regional or Local	6-19

6.4	Impact Analysis.....	6-19
6.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	6-19
6.4.2	Methods and Approach	6-20
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.....	6-40
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	7-29
7.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	7-46
7.2.4	Southern Delta	7-47
7.3	Regulatory Background	7-52
7.3.1	Federal	7-52
7.3.2	State.....	7-56
7.3.3	Regional or Local.....	7-57
7.4	Impact Analysis.....	7-57
7.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	7-57
7.4.2	Methods and Approach	7-58
7.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	7-67
7.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	7-148
7.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	7-149
7.6	References Cited	7-150
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.....	8-27
8.2.4	Southern Delta	8-27
8.3	Regulatory Background	8-32
8.3.1	Federal	8-32
8.3.2	State.....	8-34

8.3.3	Regional or Local.....	8-36
8.4	Impact Analysis.....	8-37
8.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	8-38
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.....	8-70
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	9-18
9.2.3	Extended Plan Area.....	9-31
9.2.4	Southern Delta	9-32
9.3	Regulatory Background	9-32
9.3.1	Federal	9-32
9.3.2	State	9-32
9.3.3	Regional or Local.....	9-36
9.4	Impact Analysis.....	9-43
9.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	9-43
9.4.2	Methods and Approach	9-43
9.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	9-54
9.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	9-70
9.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	9-70
9.6	References Cited	9-71
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.....	11-20
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.....	11-27
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.....	11-46
11.6	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	11-63
11.7	Cumulative Impacts.....	11-63
11.8	References Cited	11-63
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.....	13-9
13.2.1	Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries.....	13-9
13.2.2	Extended Plan Area.....	13-20
13.2.3	Southern Delta	13-20
13.3	Regulatory Background	13-35
13.3.1	Federal	13-35
13.3.2	State	13-36
13.3.3	Regional or Local.....	13-42
13.4	Impact Analysis.....	13-47
13.4.1	Thresholds of Significance	13-47
13.4.2	Methods and Approach	13-48
13.4.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	13-59
13.4.4	Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area	13-89
13.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	13-91
13.6	References Cited	13-96
13.6.1	Printed References.....	13-96
13.6.2	Personal Communications	13-102
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	16-75
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	18-27
18.3.2 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.....	18-28
18.3.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative	18-32
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	20-27
20.3.4	Effects on Hydropower Generation, Revenues and the Regional Economy	20-51
20.3.5	Effects on Fisheries and Associated Regional Economies	20-57
20.3.6	Effects on Recreational Opportunities, Activity, and the Regional Economy	20-73
20.3.7	Non-Flow Measures	20-79
20.4	Southern Delta	20-84
20.4.1	Costs of Methods of Compliance	20-84
20.4.2	Effects on Ratepayers and the Regional Economy	20-90
20.5	References Cited	20-93
20.5.1	Printed References	20-93
20.5.2	Personal Communications	20-98
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
21.7.3	Tuolumne River Diversions and Carryover Storage	21-18
21.7.4	Historical	21-18
21.7.5	WSE Baseline	21-19
21.8	Merced River Diversions and Carryover Storage	21-20

21.8.1	Historical	21-20
21.8.2	WSE Baseline.....	21-21
21.9	LSJR Alternatives and Water Supply Operations.....	21-21
21.9.1	Stanislaus River Operations	21-22
21.9.2	Tuolumne River Operations.....	21-27
21.9.3	Merced River Operations.....	21-33
21.10	Adaptive Implementation Measures for Consideration.....	21-39
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
24.2	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.....	24-3
24.4	Other Agencies and Members of the Public	24-4
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

Tables

	Page
Table ES-1. Percent Unimpaired Flows by LSJR Alternative	15
Table ES-2. Summary of Mean Annual Water Supply Effects	22
Table ES-3. Mean Annual Water Supply Effects of LSJR Alternative 3 (40 Percent Unimpaired Flow Proposal) by Water Year Type	23
Table ES-4. Groundwater Use Based on 2009 Levels of Groundwater Pumping.....	25
Table ES-5. Annual Average Applied Water Demand, Groundwater Pumping, and Unmet Demand Based on 2009 Levels of Groundwater Pumping.....	26
Table ES-6. Groundwater Use Based on 2014 Levels of Groundwater Pumping.....	27
Table ES-7. Annual Average Applied Water Demand, Groundwater Pumping, and Unmet Demand Based on 2014 Levels of Groundwater Pumping.....	27
Table ES-8. Average Annual Baseline Energy Generation and Difference from Baseline by Tributary (gigawatt hours).....	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	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	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)	37
Table ES-12. Estimated Mean Annual SFPUC Replacement Water Purchase Costs under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	38
Table ES-13. Mean Annual February–June Instream Flows in the Plan Area	39
Table ES-14. Mean Annual February–June Instream Flow in the Plan Area by Water Year Type	40
Table ES-15. Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits with Increased Flows February–June in All Years.....	42
Table ES-16. Summary of Mean Annual Temperature Benefits with Increased Flows February–June in Critically Dry Years	43

Table ES-17.	Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline, February–June.....	46
Table ES-18.	Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline, April–June.....	47
Table ES-19.	Average Annual Floodplain Inundation in Acre*Days and Percent Increase over Baseline (April–June) for Tuolumne River	48
Table ES-20.	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in Chapters 5–15, Plan Area	52
Table ES-21.	Summary of CEQA Significance Determinations in Chapters 5–14, Extended Plan Area	53
Table ES-22.	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives—Other Indirect Actions	56
Table ES-23.	CEQA Significance Summary of LSJR Alternatives Non-Flow Measures.....	57
Table ES-24.	CEQA Significance Summary SDWQ Alternatives—Methods of Compliance	59
Table ES-25.	Organization and Contents of SED Chapters	60
Table ES-26.	Organization and Contents of SED Appendices.....	61
Table ES-27.	Porter-Cologne Section 13241 Factors	64
Table ES-28.	Timeline of Public Involvement for the Planning Process, Public Workshops, and CEQA Noticing	66
Table ES-29.	Impact Determinations Identified in Chapters 5–15.....	75
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.....	2-13
Table 2-5.	FERC Project Number 2179 Streamflow Requirements for the Merced River (cfs)	2-13
Table 2-6.	Cowell Agreement Streamflow Requirements for the Merced River (cubic feet per second)	2-14

Table 2-7.	Historical and Unimpaired Flow February–June on the Merced River (cubic feet per second)	2-15
Table 2-8.	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Merced River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-16
Table 2-9.	Monthly and Annual Historical Flow in the Merced River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-17
Table 2-10.	Turlock Irrigation District - Water Supply and Use	2-19
Table 2-11.	Modesto Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-20
Table 2-12.	Tuolumne River Flow Requirement Summary	2-21
Table 2-13.	FERC Project Number 2299 Streamflow Requirements for the Tuolumne River	2-22
Table 2-14.	Historical and Unimpaired Flow February–June on the Tuolumne River (cubic feet per second)	2-23
Table 2-15.	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Tuolumne River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-24
Table 2-16.	Monthly and Annual Historical Flow in the Tuolumne River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-25
Table 2-17.	South San Joaquin Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-27
Table 2-18.	Oakdale Irrigation District—Water Supply and Use	2-28
Table 2-19.	Stockton East Water District—Water Supply and Use	2-29
Table 2-20.	New Melones Reservoir Historical and Unimpaired Flow (cubic feet per second) February–June	2-33
Table 2-21.	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the Stanislaus River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-33
Table 2-22.	Monthly and Annual Historical (Observed) Flow in the Stanislaus River 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-34
Table 2-23.	Minimum April and May Vernalis Flows (cubic feet per second)	2-36
Table 2-24.	Monthly and Annual Unimpaired Flow in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-37
Table 2-25.	Monthly and Annual Historical (Observed) Flow in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis 1984–2009 (thousand acre-feet)	2-37
Table 2-26.	Wastewater Treatment Plants with Discharges into the Southern Delta	2-42

Table 3-1.	February–June Unimpaired Flow as a Percent of Annual Unimpaired Flow on the Three Eastside Tributaries	3-12
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) 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.....	5-83
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	5-86
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).....	5-87
Table 5-26a.	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 2 for 1922–2003.....	5-88
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	5-89
Table 5-27a.	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 μ S/cm increments) for LSJR Alternative 3 for 1922–2003.....	5-91
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	5-92

Table 5-28a.	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Vernalis EC Values (100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-94
Table 5-28b.	Monthly Distribution of SJR at Brandt Bridge EC Values (100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-94
Table 5-28c.	Monthly Distribution of Old River at Tracy Boulevard EC Values (100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ increments) for LSJR Alternative 4 for 1922–2003	5-95
Table 5-29a.	Cumulative Distributions of April–September Average EC values at Vernalis Baseline and LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-98
Table 5-29b.	Cumulative Distributions of April–September Average EC values at Brandt Bridge for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives for 1922–2003	5-98
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	5-99
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	6-15
Table 6-8.	Merced River Channel Reaches	6-16
Table 6-9.	Percent of Months with WSE Model Results Greater than Capacity	6-22
Table 6-10.	Stanislaus River Peak Monthly Flow and Percent of Channel Capacity by Alternative (Channel Capacity of 8,000 cfs) During Wettest Years	6-23
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.....	7-31
Table 7-5.	Estimated Population of <i>O. Mykiss</i> from Turlock Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District (2012) Snorkel Surveys	7-37
Table 7-6.	Tuolumne River Gravel Augmentation Projects	7-38
Table 7-7.	A Summary of the Impact Thresholds, Variables, Criteria, and Data or Methods Used (see also Table 7-1)	7-61
Table 7-8a.	Percent of Time Greater than or Equal to 15-foot Change in Elevation from Previous Month for New Melones Reservoir (Average).....	7-69
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).....	7-69
Table 7-8c.	Percent of Time Greater than or Equal to 15-foot Change in Elevation from Previous Month for Lake McClure (Average)	7-69
Table 7-9a.	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for New Melones Reservoir	7-71
Table 7-9b.	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for New Don Pedro Reservoir	7-71
Table 7-9c.	Percent Change in End-of-September Storage from Baseline for Lake McClure	7-72
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.....	7-73
Table 7-11a.	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-75
Table 7-11b.	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-76
Table 7-11c.	Distribution of October–December Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Spawning on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-77

Table 7-12a.	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Spawning in the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-78
Table 7-12b.	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Spawning in the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-79
Table 7-13a.	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-81
Table 7-13b.	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-82
Table 7-13c.	Distribution of January–March Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Fry Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-83
Table 7-14a.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-84
Table 7-14b.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-85
Table 7-14c.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for Chinook Salmon Juvenile Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	7-86
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.....	7-87
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.....	7-88
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.....	7-89
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.....	7-90

Table 7-16a.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-91
Table 7-16b.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-92
Table 7-16c.	Distribution of April–May Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Fry Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-93
Table 7-17a.	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Stanislaus River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternative 2, 3, and 4.....	7-94
Table 7-17b.	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Tuolumne River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-95
Table 7-17c.	Distribution of July–September Weighted Usable Area (WUA) Values for <i>O. mykiss</i> Juvenile Rearing on the Merced River under Modeled Baseline Conditions and LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.....	7-96
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.....	7-104
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.....	7-104
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.....	7-106
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.....	7-107
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.....	7-108

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 7-109

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 7-111

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 7-112

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 7-113

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 7-115

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 7-116

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 7-117

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 7-118

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 7-119

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	7-120
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	7-121
Table 7-24a.	Distribution of April–May 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	7-122
Table 7-24b.	Distribution of April–May 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	7-123
Table 7-24c.	Distribution of April–May 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	7-124
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	7-125
Table 7-25.	Depth Relationships for the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reaches in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers	7-136
Table 7-26a.	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Stanislaus River	7-137
Table 7-26b.	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Tuolumne River	7-137
Table 7-26c.	Average Monthly Changes in Water Depth (Feet) in the Principal Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Reach of the Merced River	7-138
Table 7-27a.	Percent of Time that the 59°F Threshold in the Stanislaus River at the Confluence is Exceeded	7-144
Table 7-27b.	Percent Time that the 59°F Threshold in the Tuolumne River at the Confluence is Exceeded	7-145

Table 7-27c.	Percent Time the 59°F Threshold in the Merced River at the Confluence is Exceeded	7-145
Table 7-27d.	Percent Time that the 59°F Threshold in the SJR at Vernalis is Exceeded.....	7-145
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.....	8-18
Table 8-3b.	Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur or Known to Occur within the Area of Potential Indirect Effects.....	8-19
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	8-21
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	8-31
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	9-4
Table 9-2.	Groundwater Subbasins Underlying the Plan Area	9-7
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.....	9-17
Table 9-5.	Summary of Irrigated Land in the Plan Area Subbasins	9-22
Table 9-6.	Estimated Groundwater Pumping in the Plan Area Subbasins	9-23

Table 9-7.	Relevant Agricultural Water Management Plans	9-37
Table 9-8.	Irrigation District Methods for Dealing with Surface Water Shortages	9-38
Table 9-9.	Relevant Groundwater Management Plans	9-40
Table 9-10.	Relevant Integrated Regional Water Management Plans	9-41
Table 9-11.	Relevant Urban Water Management Plans	9-42
Table 9-12.	Average Annual Net Change in Irrigation District Groundwater Balance Associated with the LSJR Alternatives per Subbasin Area	9-58
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 Stevinson 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.	Acreages 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)	11-17
Table 11-6.	Crop Production in the LSJR Area of Potential Effects by DAU (Percent).....	11-18
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).....	11-21
Table 11-9.	Crop Production in the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects for 2005	11-22
Table 11-10.	Irrigation Method Types in San Joaquin County	11-24
Table 11-11.	Acreages 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.....	11-42
Table 11-13.	Available Soil Salinity Threshold, Slope Information, and Relative Salinity Tolerance for Crops Grown in within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects.....	11-45
Table 11-14.	Relative Salinity Tolerance for Crops Grown within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects that do not have Quantitative Threshold Information	11-46
Table 11-15.	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 2	11-48
Table 11-16.	Average Baseline and Crop Production 2009 and 2014 Groundwater Pumping under LSJR Alternative 2 with Adaptive Implementation	11-48

Table 11-17.	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 3, by District, Compared to Baseline	11-51
Table 11-18.	Percent Average Acreage Reduction from Baseline for Irrigation Districts Impacted under LSJR Alternative 3 for 2009 and 2014 Groundwater Pumping Levels	11-52
Table 11-19.	Average Cropped Acreage and Acreage Reduction under LSJR Alternative 4, by District, Compared to Baseline	11-54
Table 11-20.	Percent Average Acreage Reduction from Baseline for Irrigation Districts Impacted under LSJR Alternative 4 for 2009 and 2014 Groundwater Pumping Levels	11-55
Table 11-21.	Gross Revenue of Agricultural Commodities.....	11-59
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	13-10
Table 13-3a.	Public Water Suppliers in the Eastern San Joaquin, Merced, Modesto, and Turlock Subbasins	13-92
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	13-12
Table 13-4.	Ten Most Frequently Detected Principal Contaminants Identified in State Water Board 2013a	13-16
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	13-19

Table 13-6.	Annual Water Use of Service Providers in the Extended Plan Area with Post-1914 Water Rights	13-20
Table 13-7.	Wastewater Treatment Plants with Discharges in the Southern Delta	13-22
Table 13-8.	Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Salinity (EC) Effluent Data (dS/m [μ mhos/cm]) ^a	13-24
Table 13-9.	Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Salinity (EC) Effluent Data April–August and Remainder of the Year (dS/m [μ mhos/cm]) ^a	13-25
Table 13-10.	Current Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Compliance Status with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Special Provisions for Salinity Requirements	13-26
Table 13-11.	Salinity Reduction Efforts of Southern Delta Wastewater Treatment Plant Dischargers	13-27
Table 13-12.	Recent Wastewater Treatment Plant National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Enforcement Orders for the Deuel Vocational Institution	13-30
Table 13-13.	Irrigation District Methods for Addressing Surface Water Shortages	13-42
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	13-50
Table 13-15.	Cumulative Distribution of Baseline EC (μ mhos/cm) at Vernalis	13-53
Table 13-16.	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC (μ mhos/cm) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 2	13-54
Table 13-17.	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC (μ mhos/cm) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 3	13-54
Table 13-18.	Change in Cumulative Distribution of EC (μ mhos/cm) at Vernalis Associated with LSJR Alternative 4	13-55
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 [μ 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 [μ mhos/cm])	13-75
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 ^a	16-309
Table 16-39.	Potential Mitigation Measures for Construction and Operation Activities Related to Non-Flow Measures ^a	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	18-34
Table 18-5.	Impact Determinations that Change with Adaptive Implementation (LSJR Alternatives 2 and 3) ^{a,b}	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	18-30
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).....	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) 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) 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 to 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 Diversions) 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 420-19

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 420-21

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 420-21

Table 20.3.2-6. Estimates of Local Government Tax Revenue and Crop Farming Contribution from IMPLAN20-23

Table 20.3.2-7. Fiscal Impacts by County of a Hypothetical \$1 Million Crop Revenue Loss20-24

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 Conditions20-25

Table 20.3.2-9. Estimates of Local Tax Revenue Associated with Predicted Changes in Annual Agricultural Production, as a Percent of Total Tax Revenue20-26

Table 20.3.3-1. South San Joaquin Irrigation District Water Usage by Type of Use20-28

Table 20.3.3-2. South San Joaquin Irrigation District 2016 Water Rate Structure20-29

Table 20.3.3-3. Stockton East Water District Rate Structure and Units Billed, by Type of Use20-30

Table 20.3.3-4. Modesto Irrigation District Water Usage in 2012, by Type of Use20-30

Table 20.3.3-5. Modesto Irrigation District Water Rate Structure20-31

Table 20.3.3-6. Cost Estimates for Developing Alternative Water Supplies20-32

Table 20.3.3-7. SFPUC Water Deliveries to Retail and Wholesale Agencies and Reliance of Agencies on San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water, 201020-35

Table 20.3.3-8. Percentage Distribution of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water Deliveries by Customer Class, 201020-36

Table 20.3.3-9a. Estimated San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Replacement Water Purchase Costs in Severe Drought Years (1987–1992) under the LSJR Alternatives20-39

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	20-40
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 ^a	20-42
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 ^a	20-43
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 ^a	20-44
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 ^a	20-45
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 ^a	20-46
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 ^a	20-47
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 ^a	20-47
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 ^a	20-48
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	20-49
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	20-50
Table 20.3.4-1. Selected 80 th Percentile of Hourly Prices from 2006 and Factors used to Escalate to 2008 Dollars	20-53

Table 20.3.4-2.	Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Generation and Difference from Baseline, by Tributary	20-54
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	20-54
Table 20.3.4-4.	Average Annual Baseline Hydropower Revenue and Difference from Baseline, by Tributary	20-55
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	20-55
Table 20.3.5-1.	California Commercial Troll Chinook Salmon Landings (in number of fish) and Prices by Catch Area, 1976–2014	20-61
Table 20.3.5-2.	California Ocean Recreational Chinook Salmon Landings (in number of fish) by Catch Area, 1976–2014.....	20-64
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	20-71
Table 20.3.6-1.	Estimated Use (in Visitor Days) of Affected Recreation Areas, by Watershed	20-75
Table 20.3.7-1.	Central Valley Project Improvement Act ^a Spawning and Rearing Habitat Restoration Projects	20-81
Table 20.3.7-2.	Engineered Log Structures and Large Woody Debris—Cost Estimates.....	20-82
Table 20.3.7-3.	Design and Construction Costs for Davis Ranches Site 2, Pumps 4 & 5 Project.....	20-83
Table 20.4.1-1.	Design and Construction Costs for the Davis-Woodland Water Supply Project and Delta Water Supply Project.....	20-86
Table 20.4.1-2.	California Water Plan Update 2009 Unit Cost of Desalination.....	20-88
Table 20.4.1-3.	Costs and Components of a Real-Time Management System	20-89
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

Figures

	Page
Figure ES-1. San Joaquin River Basin	follows ES-6
Figure ES-2. Plan Area.....	follows ES-6
Figure ES-3. Percent of Time that Temperature Goal for April Core Rearing is Achieved in the Merced River	ES-41
Figure ES-4. Lower Tuolumne Inundated Wetted Surface Area as a Function of Discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5	ES-45
Figure 2-1a. Central Valley Basin and San Joaquin River Basin	follows 2-2
Figure 2-1b. Vicinity Map of Plan Area and Extended Plan Area.....	follows 2-2
Figure 2-2. The Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta	follows 2-4
Figure 2-3. San Joaquin River Basin and Groundwater Subbasins	follows 2-6
Figure 2-4. Vicinity Map of Irrigation Districts.....	follows 2-6
Figure 2-5. Schematic Representation of Water Use by Irrigation Districts and Riparian Diverters.....	follows 2-8
Figure 2-6. Schematic Representation of Groundwater Pumping with Associated Consumptive Use and Returns	follows 2-8
Figure 2-7. Monthly Unimpaired and Historical San Joaquin River Flows at Friant Dam for Water Years 2000–2009 (cfs = cubic feet per second)	2-10
Figure 2-8. Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Merced River Flows February– June for Water Years 2000–2009 (cfs = cubic feet per second)	2-15
Figure 2-9. Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Tuolumne River Flows February– June for Water Years 2000–2009 (cfs = cubic feet per second)	2-23
Figure 2-10. Monthly Unimpaired and Historical Stanislaus River Flows February– June for Water Years 2000–2009 (cfs = cubic feet per second)	2-32
Figure 2-11. Monthly Unimpaired and Historical LSJR Flows at Vernalis February– June for Water Years 2000–2009 (cfs = cubic feet per second)	2-36
Figure 2-12. Vicinity Map of Southern Delta	follows 2-38
Figure 3-1. Conceptual Illustrations of Adaptive Implementation Methods for each LSJR Alternative.....	follows 3-12

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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow)..... 3-23

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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 3-26

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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 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 (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 3-30

Figure 3-8. Flow Exceedance Plot of Delta Solution Group’s Flow Recommendations and State Water Board’s LSJR Alternatives (TAF = thousand acre-feet; UF = unimpaired flow) 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 (Source: California Department of Water Resources in Environmental Defense 2004) 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-46) (msl = mean sea level) 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-29) (msl = mean sea level) 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-29) 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-33) (msl = mean sea level)..... 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-33) 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-37) (msl = mean sea level)..... 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 (Source: DWR and USBR 2005 Figure 5.2-37)..... 5-43

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

Figure 5-7. Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: New Melones Reservoir Storage for 1922–2003 (TAF = thousand acre-feet) 5-67

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

Figure 5-9. Comparison of WSE Model Results for Baseline and LSJR Alternatives: Stanislaus River Diversions for 1922–2003 (TAF = thousand acre-feet) 5-68

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

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

Figure 6-3. Channel Capacities and Levees..... follows 6-8

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

Figure 7-1. Estimates of Annual Escapement of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Stanislaus River from 1952 to 2011..... follows 7-32

Figure 7-2. Estimates of Annual Escapement of Fall-run Chinook Salmon in the Tuolumne River from 1952 to 2011 follows 7-36

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

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

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

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

Figure 8-3 (a-c). Lower San Joaquin River Vegetation Communities..... follows 8-14

Figure 8-4 (a-c). Merced River Vegetation Communities follows 8-14

Figure 8-5 (a-c). Tuolumne River Vegetation Communities follows 8-14

Figure 8-6 (a-c). Stanislaus River Vegetation Communities..... follows 8-14

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

Figure 9-2. Conceptual Water Budget follows 9-14

Figure 9-3. Spring 2010 Groundwater Elevation Contours for the San Joaquin Valley Portion of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region follows 9-16

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)..... follows 9-16

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

Figure 9-6. Partitioning of Baseline Diversions from the Stanislaus River into End Uses 9-50

Figure 9-7a. Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied Water Demand for the Stanislaus River 9-51

Figure 9-7b. Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied Water Demand for the Tuolumne River..... 9-51

Figure 9-7c. Baseline Groundwater and Surface Water Application to Meet Applied Water Demand for the Merced River 9-52

Figure 9-8. Effect of Stanislaus River Irrigation Districts on Baseline Groundwater Balance 9-53

Figure 9-9. Net Annual Contribution to Groundwater Subbasins by the Irrigation Districts under Baseline Conditions..... 9-53

Figure 9-10. Annual Net Contribution to the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin by SSJID, OID, SEWD, and CSJWCD..... 9-55

Figure 9-11. Annual Net Contribution to the Modesto Subbasin by MID and OID 9-56

Figure 9-12.	Annual Net Contribution to the Turlock Subbasin by TID and MID.....	9-56
Figure 9-13.	Annual Net Contribution to the Extended Merced Subbasin by MID	9-57
Figure 11-1.	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Designations within the LSJR Area of Potential Effects	follows 11-2
Figure 11-2.	Agriculture within the SDWQ Area of Potential Effects	follows 11-2
Figure 11-3.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-4.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-5.	Irrigated Acreage in SEWD and CSJWCD for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-6.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-7.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-8.	Irrigated Acreage in Merced ID for Baseline	follows 11-42
Figure 11-9.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	follows 11-48
Figure 11-10.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline.....	follows 11-48
Figure 11-11.	Irrigated Acreage in SEWD and CSJWCD for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline.....	follows 11-48
Figure 11-12.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline.....	follows 11-48
Figure 11-13.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline	follows 11-48
Figure 11-14.	Irrigated Acreage in Merced ID for All Crops, All Alternatives, and Baseline.....	follows 11-48
Figure 11-15a.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-15b.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Pasture under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-15c.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 3	follows 11-52
Figure 11-16.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Pasture under Alternative 3	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17a.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17b.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17c.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Field Crops under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17d.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Grain under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17e.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Rice under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-17f.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Pasture under Alternative 3	follows 11-52

Figure 11-18a.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Alfalfa under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-18b.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Field Crops under Alternative 3	follows 11-52
Figure 11-18c.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Pasture under Alternative 3.....	follows 11-52
Figure 11-19a.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-19b.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-19c.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Pasture under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-19d.	Irrigated Acreage in SSJID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20a.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20b.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20c.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20d.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Field Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20e.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Pasture under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-20f.	Irrigated Acreage in OID for Rice under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21a.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21b.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21c.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21d.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Field Crops under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21e.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Pasture under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21f.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Rice under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-21g.	Irrigated Acreage in MID for Truck Crops under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22a.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Alfalfa under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22b.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Corn and Grain under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22c.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Small Acreage Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22d.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Field Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22e.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Pasture under Alternative 4.....	follows 11-54
Figure 11-22f.	Irrigated Acreage in TID for Truck Crops under Alternative 4	follows 11-54
Figure 13-1a.	Vicinity Map of Service Providers Relying on Surface Water	follows 13-10
Figure 13-1b.	Vicinity Map of Selected Service Providers Relying Solely on 11- Groundwater	follows 13-12

Figure 13-2. Municipal and Domestic Groundwater Wells in the Eastern San Joaquin, Modesto, Turlock, Merced, and Tracy Groundwater Subbasins follows 3-12

Figure 14-1. Global GHG Emissions by Source..... follows 4-12

Figure 14-2. National GHG Emissions by Source follows 4-12

Figure 14-3. Statewide GHG Emissions by Source follows 4-12

Figure 14-4. Change in Average Monthly Hydropower Generation across 82 Years of Simulation Associated with the LSJR Flow Alternatives Compared to Baseline..... 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..... 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 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 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 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 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. 19-3

Figure 19-2. Relationship between adult salmon returns to the San Joaquin basin and the river flows they experienced as juveniles. 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..... 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. 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)..... 19-10

Figure 19-6. Myrick and Cech (2001) illustrate effects of incubation temperature on mortality of Chinook salmon eggs. 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. 19-50

Figure 19-8. Stanislaus River average daily temperature under baseline conditions from 1960 to 2010 at three different locations. 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..... 19-52

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

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

Figure 19-12. Lower Tuolumne River overbank (floodplain) inundated area as a function of discharge from RM 52 to RM 21.5. 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. 19-82

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

Figure 20.3.4-1. Monthly Average Price and Median Monthly Average Price of Power 1998–2008..... 20-52

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 21-7d. WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Stanislaus River Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015 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 21-27

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

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

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

Figure 21-8d. WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Tuolumne River Water Supply Diversions for 1922–2015 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 21-33

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

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

Figure 21-9c. WSE Baseline and LSJR Flow Objective Alternative Results for Lake McClure Carryover Storages for 1922–2015 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 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..... 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..... 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 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 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..... 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 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 23-18

Figure 23-8. Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values at Vernalis during April–August under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow 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 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.....23-21

Figure 23-11. Exceedance Chart of Monthly EC Values at Vernalis during September–March under Modeled Baseline and Percent of Unimpaired Flow23-22

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 Flow23-23

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.....23-24

Acronyms and Abbreviations

2006 Bay-Delta Plan	2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Estuary
AB	Assembly Bill
ACEC	areas of critical environmental concern
AF	acre-feet
AF/day	acre-feet per day
AF/y	acre-feet per year
AFRP	Anadromous Fish Restoration Program
AFSP	Anadromous Fish Screen Program
AGR	agricultural supply
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
AR/NHI	American Rivers and Natural Heritage Institute
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ARPA	Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979
ARTDA	Amended and Restated Treatment and Delivery Agreement
ASR	aquifer storage and recovery
AWMP	agricultural water management plan
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BANC	Balancing Authority of Northern California
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins
BAU	business as usual
Bay-Delta	San Francisco Bay/Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
BCWD	Ballico-Cortez Water District
BKD	bacterial kidney disease
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	best management practices
BO	biological opinion
BPS	best performance standards
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAD	Cowell Agreement Diverters
CAISO	California Independent System Operator
Cal. Code Regs	California Code of Regulations
Cal-IPC	California Invasive Plant Council
CalISO	California Independent System Operator
CAO	Cooperative Operating Agreement
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CAS	Climate Adaptation Strategy
CASGEM	California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring
CCCDCD	Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development
CCF	Clifton Court Forebay
CCID	Central California Irrigation District

CCP	comprehensive conservation plan
CCRs	consumer confidence reports
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CCWD	Contra Costa Water District
CDCR	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's
CDFA	California Department of Food and Agriculture
CDFEW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
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
CH4	methane
cm	centimeter
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO2	carbon dioxide
CO2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
COA	Coordinated Operations Agreement
Contra Costa WD	Contra Costa Water District
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSD	community service districts
CSJWCD	Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District
CUAW	consumptive use of applied water
CVFPB	California Central Valley Flood Protection Board
CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
CVP	Central Valley Project
CVPIA	Central Valley Project Improvement Act
CV-SALTS	Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability
CWA	Clean Water Act
C-WIN/CSPA	California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
CWP	California Water Plan
DACs	disadvantaged communities
DAU	detailed analysis unit
DBCP	dibromochloropropane
DBW	California Department of Boating and Waterways
DDE	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DDW	Division of Drinking Water
Delta	Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta
Delta RMP	Delta Regional Monitoring Program

DMC	Delta-Mendota Canal
DO	dissolved oxygen
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DPRA	Don Pedro Recreation Agency
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DROPS	Drought Response Outreach Program for Schools
dS/m	deciSiemens per meter
DSG	Davis Delta Solutions Group
DSM2	Delta Simulation Model 2
DSOD	Division of Safety of Dams
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
EC	electrical conductivity
EDU	electrical distribution utilities
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS/EIR	Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report
ENR	Engineering News-Record
EO	executive order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
EWA	environmental water account
EWMPs	efficient water management practices
Farmland	Farmland of Statewide Importance
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FPA	Federal Power Act
ft	feet
ft/s	feet/second
ft/y	feet per year
FY	fiscal year
GAMA	Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program
GFDL	Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Lab
GHG	greenhouse gas
GSAs	groundwater sustainability agencies
GSPs	groundwater sustainability plans
GWh	gigawatt hours
GWMP	groundwater management plan
GWP	global warming potential
HCP	habitat conservation plan
HEC	Hydrologic Engineering Center

HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons
HORB	Head of Old River Barrier
HPMP	historic properties management plan
HSC	habitat suitability criteria
ICW	Inspection of Completed Works
IEP	Interagency Ecological Program
IEUA	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
IFIM	Instream Flow Incremental Methodology
IHN	infectious hematopoietic necrosis
IMPLAN	Impact Analysis for Planning model
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
JSA	Joint Settlement Agreement
km	kilometers
KMZ	Klamath Management Zone
kV	kilovolt
kWh	kilowatt hour
LACSD	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
LAFCo	Local Agency Formation Commission
LCRs	local capacity requirements
LDPCSD	Lake Don Pedro Community Service District
LESA	Land Evaluation and Site Assessment model
LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LSJR	Lower San Joaquin River
No Project Alternative	LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1
LSZ	low salinity zone
LTE	long-term emergency ratings
m	meters
M&I	municipal and industrial
MAF	million acre-feet
Manteca	City of Manteca
MCL	maximum contaminant levels
Merced ID	Merced Irrigation District
mg/L	milligrams per liter
Mgd	million gallons per day
MHW	mean high water
MID	Modesto Irrigation District
MLW	mean low water

mm	Millimeters
mmhos/cm	millimhos per centimeter
MOA	memorandum of agreement
MRWTP	Modesto Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant
MSL	mean sea level
MT	metric tons
MUN	municipal and domestic water supply
MW	megawatts
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NERC	North American Electric Reliability Corporation
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NMFS BO	National Marine Fisheries Service's Biological Opinion
NOP	notice of preparation
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
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
OID	Oakdale Irrigation District
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
OCAP	Operational Criteria and Plan
OMR	Old and Middle River
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
PCM	Parallel Climate Model
PDK	proliferative kidney disease
PFCs	perfluorocarbons
PFMC	Pacific Fisheries Management Commission
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
POE	point-of-entry
Porter-Cologne Act	Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
POU	point-of-use
ppm	parts per million
PPP	pollution prevention plan
ppt	parts per thousand
PRO	industrial process supply
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
Pub. Resources Code	California Public Resources Code
RA	resource adequacy
Recovery Plan	Recovery Plan for Upland Species of California
Recovery Program	Colorado Endangered Fish Recovery Program
Regional Water Boards	Regional Water Quality Control Boards

Reporting Rule	Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
R-GPCD	residential gallons per capita per day
RM	river miles
RMP	resource management plan
RO	reverse osmosis
ROD	record of decision
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Action
RPS	renewable portfolio standard
RTMP	real-time water quality management program
RVDs	recreation visitor days
SalSim	Salmon Simulation model
San Francisco PUC	San Francisco Public Utility Commission
SB	Senate Bill
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
Scoping Plan	The Climate Change Scoping Plan
SDIP EIS/EIR	South Delta Improvement Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report
SDWA	South Delta Water Agency
SED	substitute environmental document
SEWD	Stockton East Water District
SF ₆	sulfur hexafluoride
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
Sierra ROD	Sierra Resource Management Record of Decision
SJCFCWD	San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
SJR	San Joaquin River
SJRA	San Joaquin River Agreement
SJRG	San Joaquin River Group Authority
SJRMEP	San Joaquin River Monitoring and Evaluation Program
SJRRP	San Joaquin River Restoration Program
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SL	standard length
SMUD	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SNR	Sierra Nevada Region
SONAR	Sound Navigation and Ranging
SR	State Route
SRA	State Recreation Area
SSJID	South San Joaquin Irrigation District
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
STM Working Group	Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Working Group
Stockton	City of Stockton
SWAP	Statewide Agricultural Production
SWP	State Water Project
TAF	thousand acre-feet

TAF/y	TAF per year
TBI/NRDC	The Bay Institute and Natural Resources Defense Council
TBP	Temporary Barrier Program
TDS	total dissolved solids
TID	Turlock Irrigation District
TMDL	total maximum daily load
Tracy	City of Tracy
TUCP	Temporary Urgency Change Petition
Upper SJR	Upper San Joaquin River
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UWMP	urban water management plan
UWMPA	California Urban Water Management Planning Act
UWMPs	urban water management plans
VAMP	Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WAP	Water Acquisition Program
WDR	waste discharge requirements
WECC	Western Electricity Coordinating Council
WID	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Williamson Act	California Land Conservation Act of 1965
WMA	Weed Management Area
WQCP	water quality control plans
WQO	Water Quality Order
WSCP	Water Shortage Contingency Plan
WSE	Water Supply Effects model
WSIP	Water System Improvement Program
WTP	willingness to pay
WUA	weighted usable area
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
WY	water year
µmhos/cm	micromhos per centimeter