

DUDLEY RIDGE WATER DISTRICT

INITIAL STUDY, ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST, AND PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2020 AGRICULTURAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Introduction

In conformance with the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA), this document has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the Dudley Ridge Water District's 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan (Plan). Unless the Plan is revised, this environmental review and documentation will remain in effect for a period of ten years.

The Dudley Ridge Water District (District) has completed the preparation of this Initial Study to examine and assess the environmental issues that appear on the attached CEQA Checklist. The Initial Study is an information document designed to aid decision-makers in making an informed decision on the project.

Although the District considers that adoption of the Plan is exempt from CEQA (see, for example, California Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c) and 21084, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Sections 15061(b)(3), 15064(f)(3), 15070(a) and 15262), the District is providing CEQA documentation to ensure full public disclosure of its analysis and to assist other agencies, including the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), for approvals to facilitate implementation of the water management strategies identified in the Plan. While further CEQA compliance may be undertaken or required with specific projects that implement the plan, those projects will be evaluated if and when they are proposed.

Description of Project

The Dudley Ridge Water District proposes to adopt and implement the provisions of its 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan. In the Plan, the District identified the need to improve the process for approving water transfers and exchanges among State Water Project (SWP or Project) contractors. As part of DRWD's review of the Plan along with one of the water management strategies identified in the Plan (i.e., streamlining the DWR approval process for water transfer water requests), DRWD is subjecting the Plan and the water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan to CEQA review. These water operations, as described in the Plan, include:

- Deliveries in and out of long-term District banking and exchange programs (i.e., Kern Water Bank Authority, Cawelo Water Regulation Program, Semitropic Water Exchange, San Gabriel Valley Water Banking/Exchange, Kern County Water Agency, Irvine Ranch Water District's Strand Ranch and Stockdale Integrated Banking Projects, etc.).
- Deliveries in and out of short-term or spot market groundwater banking programs or exchanges (i.e., Rosedale Rio-Bravo Water Storage District, Central Coast Water Agency, Mojave Water Agency, Solano County Water Agency, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Central Coast Water Authority, etc.).

- Annual water purchases, including Dry Year Transfer Programs and purchases of non-Project (non-SWP) via the District or the Westside Districts.
- Multi-year water purchases of SWP or non-Project water via the District or the Westside Districts (i.e., Multi-Year Water Pool, Castaic Lake Water Agency, Western Hills Water District, etc.).
- Deliveries to or from other water districts that District landowners have agricultural landholdings, whereby annual water needs can be facilitated by transferring water within a common farming operation (located in multiple water districts) to balance their water supplies where it has the most economic benefit. Historically, common landowner transfers have occurred with member units of the Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, Green Valley Water District, Westlands Water District, and various non-Project water districts located on the eastside of the San Joaquin Valley. Future common landowner transfers may be anticipated in other water districts in Kings, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Merced, and Madera counties where District landowners have landholdings and farming operations that involve SWP water or non-Project water.
- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) for annual or multi-year transfers and transfer packages (exchanges).
- Transfers to/from non-Project water purveyors for annual or multi-year transfers and transfer packages (exchanges).
- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) with established water transfer, banking, or exchange programs.
- Transfers to/from CVP contractors (or their member units) with established water transfer, banking, or exchange programs for annual or multi-year transfers or exchanges.
- Transfers to/from non-project (SWP or CVP) with established water banking or exchange programs for annual or multi-year transfers or exchanges.

Environmental reviews and CEQA documentation for several of the transfers noted above were previously prepared prior to initiation of these projects, programs, and multi-year exchanges. Any future banking, transfers, and exchanges would be consistent with the types of banking, transfers, and exchanges described in the Plan.

Under the Plan, no new lands would be brought under cultivation that had not been historically farmed or maintained/disked at least annually. During the driest years water would be brought in from banking recovery and transfers and exchanges to irrigate permanent crops; during the wetter years, irrigated acreage would be expected to increase, but not above historic levels, as the water available that is excess to crop needs would be transferred to other water agencies for banking or future exchange (within the limits of previously approved banking or exchange programs) or direct use for return/exchange to DRWD in future years (under transfers of the type described in the Plan).

Environmental Setting

State Water Project

The SWP is managed by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and is the largest state-built, multi-purpose water project in the country. It was designed and built to deliver water, control floods, generate power, provide recreational opportunities, and enhance habitats for fish and wildlife. The SWP depends on a complex system of 28 dams and

reservoirs, 26 power and pumping plants, canals, and approximately 660 miles of aqueducts to deliver water.

Location

The District is located in southern Kings County on the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley. The District lies south of Kettleman City and is bounded on the northeast by the Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, on the south by the Kings-Kern County Line, and generally on the west by the Governor Edmund G. Brown California Aqueduct. Interstate 5 traverses the District in a northwest-southeast direction.

Surrounding Land Use and Setting

DRWD is a California water district with a contract with the State to supply and a distribution system to convey water to production agriculture in its service area in southern Kings County. Interstate 5 and the California Aqueduct generally transect the DRWD. Lands in DRWD are planted in orchard crops, vineyard, and historically annual row and field crops.

Soils and Topography

A small portion of the District is on the shore of the old Tulare Lake, however, most of the District is on smooth, gently sloping alluvial fans extending eastward from the Kettleman Hills. Elevations range from about 190 to 350 feet above sea level. The slope varies from 15 feet per mile in the southeast part of the District to slightly more than 60 feet per mile in the northwest. Over shorter distances, near the apex of some more recent alluvial fans, there are slopes of about 4 percent and the break from the fans to the lakebed is very steep. However, most of the District has slopes of less than 25 feet per mile.

There are no major streams in the District. Minor streams (drainage arroyos) in the Kettleman Hills to the west, on rare occasions produce sufficient runoff during storms to reach the District. Damage to land and crop losses due to flooding have occurred during major runoff events.

The predominant soil type for the northern portion of the District (the lower half of township 22 to the upper quarter of township 23) is Wasco-Westhaven-Westcamp. The predominant soil type in the mid portion of the District (the rest of township 23 to the upper quarter of township 24) is Wasco-Panoche-Westhaven. The remainder of the District is both Lethent-Garces-Panoche with Milham bordering the west and Kimberlina-Twisselman the south. The soils are rated by grades from 1 to 6 with 1 being a soil with no limiting factors (i.e. drainage problems, high salinity, etc.) and 6 having the highest limitations for farming. Over 70% of the District is comprised of soils better than Grade 2; the remainder of the soils are generally poorer drained or more severely sloped, and are generally not farmed.

Climate

The District's regional climate is semi-arid with hot, dry summers and mild winters. Average temperatures vary from 45 degrees in January to 84 degrees in July, with the typical diurnal range of 20 degrees in the summer to 32 degrees in the winter. Annual precipitation from 1955 through 2015 averaged 6.64 inches, with 90 percent of the total rainfall received between October and April.

Biological Resources

There are several species of wildlife appearing on Federal and/or State rare and endangered species lists, whose distribution may include the DRWD. Included in these lists are the following (from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife BIOS website, accessed 5/27/21)):

Scientific Name	Common Name	Federal Status	State Status	DFW	CNPS List
Bird					
<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	tricolored blackbird		T	SSC	
<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	Swainson's hawk		T		
<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	western snowy plover	T		SSC	
<i>Sternula antillarum browni</i>	California least tern	E	E	FP	
Mammal					
<i>Ammospermophilus nelsoni</i>	Nelson's antelope squirrel		T		
<i>Dipodomys ingens</i>	giant kangaroo rat	E	E		
<i>Dipodomys nitratooides nitratooides</i>	Tipton kangaroo rat	E	E		
<i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>	San Joaquin kit fox	E	T		
Reptile					
<i>Gambelia sila</i>	blunt-nosed leopard lizard	E	E	FP	
Plant					
<i>Atriplex coronata var. vallicola</i>	Lost Hills crownscale				1B.2
<i>Caulanthus californicus</i>	California jewelflower	E	E		1B.1
<i>Caulanthus lemmonii</i>	Lemmon's jewelflower				1B.2
<i>Delphinium recurvatum</i>	recurved larkspur				1B.2
<i>Eremalche parryi ssp. kernensis</i>	Kern mallow	E			1B.2
<i>Lasthenia chrysantha</i>	alkali-sink goldfields				1B.1
<i>Monolopia congdonii</i>	San Joaquin woollythreads	E			1B.2
<i>Tropidocarpum californicum</i>	Kings gold				1B.1

T Threatened

E Endangered

FP Fully Protected

SSC Species of Special Concern

DFW California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CNPS California Native Plant Society

Implementation of the Plan does not expand the capacity of existing recharge and extraction projects, all located outside the District. These facilities were previously reviewed and addressed under CEQA, the implementation of this Plan is not expected to have any further impact on threatened or endangered animal species associated with these groundwater banking projects. Furthermore, recovery of previously banked water to DRWD would generally occur in years when SWP allocations are less than 100% and no adverse environmental impacts are foreseen within the District, as additional native lands would not be brought into production as a result of the Plan.

Reference Documents

The following CEQA documents were prepared and certified for specific water banking programs in which the District participates. A brief summary of these documents is provided below. Note that these summaries are not intended to be a complete recitation of the original--please refer to the actual report for more details.

- Kern Water Bank Authority (KWBA) Habitat Conservation Plan filed and approved by USFWS on 6/26/1997; on 10/2/97 DFG issued CEQA findings [SCH# 95023035] for

the KWBA HCP/NCCP and the Final EA for the KWB was issued by the USFWS for the KWBA on 10/2/1997. This document analyzed the environmental impacts associated with the construction and implementation of the Kern Water Bank, and described measures to mitigate impacts.

- San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (SGVMWD) Negative Declaration issued 5/11/94 [SCH#94042003]. This document reviewed the environmental impact of a 25-year banking/exchange program between DRWD and SGVMWD. The agencies found that no mitigation measures were required.
- Cawelo Water District (CWD) Negative Declaration filed 4/11/01 [SCH#2001031018]. This document reviewed the environmental impact of a 35-year banking program between DRWD and CWD. The agencies found that no mitigation measures were required.

Finding

The attached environmental checklist was prepared for the proposed project and it was determined that no significant environmental effects would be expected as a result of the adoption and implementation of the 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan. No construction or modification of existing facilities will be required. It has been determined that there will be no biological impacts and no adverse impact to any listed species will occur as a result of the water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan.

Although non-physical projects may contribute directly or indirectly toward a cumulative impact on the physical environment, no significant incremental effects have been identified by this action (project) toward such a cumulative effect because the evaluation of environmental factors (as supported in the environmental checklist form) indicated no significant impacts.

After a thorough review of the project, it has been determined that no significant environmental effects will result from the implementation of the proposed project, and therefore, it is recommended that a Negative Declaration be proposed.

Respectively submitted,

Dale K. Melville, Assistant Manager-Engineer
Dudley Ridge Water District
(Lead Agency)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

DUDLEY RIDGE WATER DISTRICT 2020 WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

- 1. Project Title:** Dudley Ridge Water District 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Dudley Ridge Water District
455 W. Fir Ave.
Clovis, CA 93611
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Dale K. Melville, Assistant Manager-Engineer
(559) 449-2700
- 4. Project Location:** Dudley Ridge Water District is located in Kings County.
- 5. Project Sponsors Name & Address:
(Responsible Agency)** California Department of Water Resources
1416 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
- 6. General Plan Designation:** N.A.
- 7. Zoning** Agricultural.
- 8. Description of Project:** Dudley Ridge Water District (DRWD or District) has prepared an Agricultural Water Management Plan (Plan) to comply with the requirements of the SB X7-7 (the Water Conservation Act of 2009). In the Plan, the District identified the need to improve the process for approving water transfers and exchanges among State Water Project (SWP) contractors. As part of DRWD's review of its Water Management Plan along with one of the water management strategies identified in the Plan (i.e., streamlining the DWR approval process for water transfer water requests), DRWD is subjecting the Plan and the water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan to CEQA review. These water operations, as described in the Plan, include:
 - Deliveries in and out of long-term banking and exchange programs (i.e., Kern Water Bank Authority, Cawelo Water Regulation Program, Semitropic Water Exchange, San Gabriel Valley Water Exchange, Irvine Ranch Water District's Strand Ranch and Stockdale Integrated Banking Projects, etc.);
 - Deliveries in and out of short-term or spot market groundwater banking programs or exchanges (i.e., Rosedale Rio-Bravo Water Storage District, Central Coast Water Agency, etc.);
 - Annual water purchases, including Dry Year Transfer Programs and purchases of non-Project (non-SWP) via the District or the Westside Districts;
 - Multi-year water purchases of SWP or non-Project water via the District or the Westside Districts (i.e., Multi-Year Water Pool, Castaic Lake Water Agency, Western Hills Water District, etc.);
 - Deliveries to or from other water districts that District landowners have agricultural landholdings, whereby annual water needs can be facilitated by transferring water within a common farming operation (located in multiple water districts) to balance their water

supplies where it has the most economic benefit. Historically, common landowner transfers have occurred with member units of the Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, Green Valley Water District, Westlands Water District, and various non-Project water districts located on the eastside of the southern San Joaquin Valley.

Future common landowner transfers may be anticipated in other water districts in Kings, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Merced and Madera counties where District landowners have landholdings and farming operations that involve SWP water or non-Project water;

- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) for annual or multi-year exchanges;
- Transfers to/from non-Project water purveyors for annual or multi-year exchanges;
- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) with established water banking or exchange programs;
- Transfers to/from CVP contractors (or their member units) with established water banking or exchange programs or for annual or multi-year purchases or exchanges;
- Transfers to/from non-Project (SWP or CVP) with established water banking or exchange programs or for annual or multi-year purchases or exchanges.

The DRWD 2020 Water Management Plan can be obtained electronically from the District or may be reviewed at the District office.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: DRWD is a California water district with a contract with the State to supply SWP water and a distribution system to convey water to production agriculture in its service area in southern Kings County. Interstate 5 and the California Aqueduct generally transect the DRWD. Lands in DRWD are planted in orchard crops, vineyard, and occasionally annual row and field crops.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required: No other agency approvals are required for the District to adopt the Plan. DWR has been identified as a responsible agency due to its approval authority for DRWD water transfers or exchanges with other agencies under the Water Supply Contract between DWR and DRWD.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/ Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

Note that none of these factors represent a “Potentially Significant Impact”

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment,

and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Dale K. Melville
Printed Name

Assistant Manager-Engineer
Title

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There are no scenic vistas, scenic resources, or state scenic highways near the project area. The water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan will allow the existing agricultural uses in the District to continue. The visual characteristics would not be changed, and new sources of glare or light would not be created. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined by Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan will allow the existing agricultural uses in the District to continue. The transferred water would be either (1) used on other agricultural lands owned/operated by DRWD growers or (2) exchanged for water in a future year(s) or temporarily banked for delivery at a later time to allow the water resource to be used when it is more critical to sustaining agriculture within DRWD. Water exchanged or banked will be returned in a year when the crop water needs exceed the surface supply available. No uncultivated native lands within the District would be cultivated as a result of the Plan. There is no forest land within the District. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan will allow the existing agricultural uses in the District to continue. Agricultural production at its current level, degree, and intensity as currently occurs would not obstruct the implementation of the air quality management standards set by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and the California Air Resources Board. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, or any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project would not adversely affect, either directly or indirectly, candidate, sensitive, or special status species in either local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The Plan or implementation of the water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations discussed, does not change, modify, or alter in any way and is consistent with the CEQA documents and findings

related to each of the water banking programs (i.e., reference (a) Kern Water Bank Authority (KWBA) Habitat Conservation Plan filed and approved by USFWS on 6/26/1997; on 10/2/97 DFW (as DFG) issued CEQA findings [SCH# 95023035] for the KWBA HCP/NCCP and the Final EA for the KWB was issued by the USFWS for the KWBA on 10/2/1997; (b) San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (SGVMWD) Negative Declaration issued 5/11/94 [SCH#94042003] and (c) Cawelo Water District (CWD) Negative Declaration filed 4/11/01 [SCH#2001031018].

There would be no direct or indirect removal, filling, or interruption of the hydrologic regime of protected wetlands due to this project. As a result of the actions taken by DRWD and its participation in the (a) KWBA consistent with the activities approved under the HCP/EA/NCCP, (b) SGVMWD consistent with activities approved under the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, and (c) CWD consistent with activities approved under the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, there would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project would not require nor induce any new surface disturbing activities such as construction. Farming operations such as plowing, planting, and harvesting would continue to take place on land where surface disturbing activities have continuously occurred for over 56 years. Groundwater banking activities by DRWD have continuously or periodically occurred in the (a) KWBA project area for over 24 years, (b) the SGVMWD service area for over 16 years, and (c) the CWD service area for over 18 years. Therefore, there would be no substantial adverse changes in the significance of historical or archeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines in §15064.5. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOIL. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issues by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Under the project, transfers and groundwater banking operations or continued farm operations on existing farmland would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death from earthquake, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. Unstable soil is not located in any of the project areas where physical facilities have been constructed to implement the project. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan will allow the existing agricultural uses in the District to continue, would not generate additional greenhouse gas emissions. The continued operation of the banking programs will not conflict with any plans, policies, or regulations adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Farm operations in the southern Kings County area would continue to the same degree and intensity as before. The project transfers, exchanges, and water banking operations would not impact schools, airports, hazardous waste sites, or wildlands. The project does not involve emergency response or evacuation plans. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alternation of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alternation of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No additional groundwater (beyond what has been recharged) will be pumped as a result of the project and there would be no adverse impact to groundwater supply, volume, or groundwater levels. The KWBA has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with all adjoining water districts and neighboring groundwater users that defines the operational parameters for recharge and recovering groundwater from the Kern Fan; a groundwater monitoring committee with representatives from the KWBA and each of the surrounding districts monitors banking operations and the health of the groundwater basin. The groundwater exchange/banking projects for both the San Gabriel Valley MWD (SGVMWD) and Cawelo WD (CWD) provide exchanges of their surface water to return previously delivered water back to DRWD. Any future exchange/banking programs would be expected to adhere to similar principles that do not adversely impact local groundwater supplies. Annual transfers or multi-year exchanges with other SWP contractors do not create any new water or water of a permanent nature that could support new growth of either an agricultural or urban environment; such transfers and exchanges facilitate improved management of a water resource that averages 58% of the water supplies contracted for by SWP agricultural and urban contractors (ref. The State Water Project 2019 Final Delivery Capability Report, DWR). There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There are no urban communities located within the DRWD, KWBA, or CWD. Urban areas within SGVMWD include Azusa, Sierra Madre, and Alhambra; no new facilities have been constructed to effect water banking by DRWD and there are no land use plans or conservation plans that are affected by the SGVMWD-DRWD exchange program. Any annual transfers or multi-year exchanges require the approval of DWR and the other transfer/exchange partner; and such transfers/exchanges would be required to be consistent with any applicable land use plans, policies,

or regulations. No material municipal or industrial water use will occur during the term of this plan. Accordingly, there would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There are no mining activities that would be affected by the project. The project would not interfere with a mineral resource recovery site or any future mineral activities. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport and public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project would not increase the level of noise in the effected agricultural or urban areas. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Because the setting of the farmland in DRWD and (a) rural wetlands type groundwater banking environment in the KWBA, (b) farmland in the CWD, and (c) urban environment in the SGVMWD, agriculture production would continue on previously farmed land in DRWD and CWD, groundwater banking operations would continue in the KWBA, and urban uses would continue in the SGVMWD. The SGVMWD-DRWD exchange program provides SGVMWD a net 5% of the water delivered to SGVMWD remain in SGVMWD's service area, however, the program does not provide a firm water source that could induce growth in the SGVMWD due to the fact that there is no obligation for DRWD to deliver water with SGVMWD. Accordingly, there would be no construction of new homes or roads due to the project. Similarly, for case-by-case annual transfer and multi-year exchanges, these have been, and would continue to be, short-term water management practices to optimize the beneficial use of water among SWP contractors; no permanent transfers are proposed by the Plan that could result in growth inducement to urban areas. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would not induce new government facilities nor alter existing facilities. Fire and police protection, schools or other public facilities would not be impacted by the proposed project. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Farming and groundwater banking activities within the described areas would continue; no recreation facilities would be constructed or expanded. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed action does not involve the design or construction of roads, will not induce traffic, or create a demand for parking. Refer to Section XIII for additional discussion related to the Plan not being an inducement for growth. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There are no utilities or service systems associated with the project. Refer to Section XIII for additional discussion related to the Plan not being an inducement for growth. There would be no significant impacts under this resource category as a result of this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The results of this environmental assessment indicate that there are no significant environmental impacts as a result of the project. DRWD has determined that the project does not have a potential for causing significant environmental impacts, and furthermore would not result in either a direct or indirect adverse physical change in the environment.

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Lead Agency – DUDLEY RIDGE WATER DISTRICT
KINGS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Project Title: Adoption and Implementation of the 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan

Project Description: The Dudley Ridge Water District (DRWD or District) proposes to adopt and implement the provisions of the 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan (Plan). In the Plan, the District identified the need to improve the process for approving water transfers and exchanges among State Water Project (SWP or Project) contractors. As part of DRWD's review of the Plan along with one of the water management strategies identified in the Plan (i.e., streamlining the DWR approval process for water transfer water requests), DRWD is subjecting the Plan and the water transfers, exchanges, and banking operations described in the Plan to CEQA review. These water operations, as described in the Plan, include:

- Deliveries in and out of long-term banking and exchange programs (i.e., Kern Water Bank Authority, Cawelo Water Regulation Program, Semitropic Water Exchange, San Gabriel Valley Water Exchange, Irvine Ranch Water District's Strand Ranch and Stockdale Integrated Banking Projects, etc.);
- Deliveries in and out of short-term or spot market groundwater banking programs or exchanges (i.e., Rosedale Rio-Bravo Water Storage District, Central Coast Water Agency, etc.);
- Annual water purchases, including Dry Year Transfer Programs and purchases of non-Project water via the District or the Westside Districts;
- Multi-year water purchases of SWP or non-Project water via the District or the Westside Districts (i.e., Multi-Year Water Pool, Castaic Lake Water Agency, Western Hills Water District, etc.);
- Deliveries to or from other water districts that District landowners have agricultural landholdings, whereby annual water needs can be facilitated by transferring water within a common farming operation (located in multiple water districts) to balance their water supplies where it has the most economic benefit. Historically, common landowner transfers have occurred with member units of the Kern County Water Agency, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, Green Valley Water District, Westlands Water District, and various non-Project water districts located on the eastside of the southern San Joaquin Valley. Future common landowner transfers may be anticipated in other water districts in Kings, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Merced and Madera counties where District landowners have landholdings and farming operations that involve SWP water or non-Project water;
- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) for annual or multi-year exchanges;
- Transfers to/from non-Project water purveyors for annual or multi-year exchanges;
- Transfers to/from other SWP contractors (or their member units) with established water banking or exchange programs;
- Transfers to/from CVP contractors (or their member units) with established water banking or exchange programs or for annual or multi-year purchases or exchanges;

- Transfers to/from non-Project (SWP or CVP) with established water banking or exchange programs or for annual or multi-year purchases or exchanges.

Project Location: The District is located in southern Kings County on the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley. The District lies south of Kettleman City and is bounded on the northeast by the Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, on the south by the Kings-Kern County Line, and generally on the west by the Governor Edmund G. Brown California Aqueduct. Interstate 5 traverses the District in a northwest-southeast direction.

Environmental Finding: Although the District considers that adoption of the Plan is exempt from CEQA (see, for example, California Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c) and 21084, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Sections 15061(b)(3), 15064(f)(3), 15070(a) and 15262), the District is providing CEQA documentation to ensure full public disclosure of its analysis and to assist other agencies, including the Department of Water Resources, for approvals to facilitate implementation of the water management strategies identified in the Plan. However, based on the environmental analysis performed and summarized in the attached Initial Study and Environmental Checklist, DRWD finds that the adoption and implementation of the 2015 Update to the 2012 Water Management Plan will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. The project will not result in any adverse effects which fall within the "Mandatory Findings of Significance" contained in Section 15065 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are necessary.

This Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. A copy of the Initial Study upon which this Negative Declaration was based is available upon request at the District office on 286 W. Cromwell Ave., Fresno, CA 93711.

Submitted by:

Dale K. Melville, Assistant Manager-Engineer
Dudley Ridge Water District

Date