

Introduction and Approach to Responses to Comments

Volume 2, *Responses to Comments*, contains responses to comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Conveyance Project (project). As the lead agency under CEQA, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) released the Draft EIR for public review on July 27, 2022, and the public comment period closed on December 16, 2022. All chapters and appendices mentioned in Volume 2 of this Final EIR are referring to Volume 1, unless otherwise specified.

This chapter describes: (1) comments received and other public input regarding the Draft EIR; (2) the general approach taken by DWR in considering and responding to comments; (3) the format, content, and organization of this Volume 2; and (4) the modifications to the Draft EIR reflected in Volume 1.

1.1 Public Participation and Comments Received

The public comment period for the Draft EIR was originally set for 92 days and scheduled to close on October 27, 2022. In response to requests from multiple commenters, DWR granted a 50-day extension to the public comment period, which closed at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on December 16, 2022. The extension allowed a public comment period totaling 142 days. To ensure time for comment letters sent by mail, DWR treated all comment letters received before January 1, 2023, as timely. As such, those letters have been reviewed, considered, and responded to. Any comments received on or after January 1, 2023, are considered late letters and have been reviewed and considered but are not responded to in the Final EIR.

DWR conducted three public hearings on September 13, September 22, and September 28, 2022, during different times of the day, during which DWR accepted verbal comments on the Draft EIR. In addition, DWR held two Tribal representatives meetings, on October 12 and December 7, 2022, for Tribal leadership, Tribal government representatives, and Tribal communities to provide verbal comments on the Draft EIR.

DWR received approximately 675 unique letters and communications from federal, state, and local/regional agencies; California Native American Tribal governments; elected officials; nongovernmental organizations; and members of the public. After reviewing letters and communications, DWR identified approximately 7,356 discrete comments.

Comments were submitted in many different formats, including form letters, petitions, and unique letters. Form letters are those letters that are identical in content and provided by multiple commenters. Petitions have multiple signatures on one letter identifying one or more unique comment(s) and may be attached to form letters. Unique letters are letters containing individual unique comments submitted by a single commentor or multiple commenters; each verbal comment received at the three public hearings and two Tribal representatives meetings was transcribed and treated as if it were a unique letter. Five form letters were submitted along with one petition that included 108 signatures (See Volume 2, Chapter 2, Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms, Table 2-2). The number of individuals who submitted each form letter are as follows:

- Form letter 1 submitted by 9 individuals
- Form letter 2 submitted by 19 individuals
- Form letter 3 submitted by 2 individuals
- Form letter 4 submitted by 588 individuals
- Form letter 5 submitted by 22 individuals

The comments covered a broad range of environmental concerns and other issues. Major topic areas that elicited frequent comments included but were not limited to: the CEQA process, mitigation measures, and other project requirements; engagement with interested parties and the public outreach process; alternatives development and description, including alternative operations; implementation considerations; surface water quality and groundwater methodologies and impacts; fish and aquatic resources methodology and impacts; terrestrial biological resources methodology and impacts; Tribal cultural resources impacts; and air quality methodology and impacts. The responses to comments provided in this Volume 2 represent DWR's best effort to review and consider the comments and any supporting evidence provided by commenters.

1.2 CEQA Requirements

The purpose of public review of a Draft EIR is to provide agencies and the public the opportunity to review the environmental analysis for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and to provide comments on the environmental impacts of the project.

The CEQA Guidelines describe the general approach to agency responses to public comments as follows:

(c) The written response shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the Lead Agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. There must be good faith, reasoned analysis in response. Conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice. The level of detail contained in the response, however, may correspond to the level of detail provided in the comment (i.e., responses to general comments may be general). A general response may be appropriate when a comment does not contain or specifically refer to readily available information, or does not explain the relevance of evidence submitted with the comment.

(d) The response to comments may take the form of a revision to the draft EIR or may be a separate section in the final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes in the information contained in the text of the draft EIR, the Lead Agency should either: (1) Revise the text in the body of the EIR, or (2) Include marginal notes showing that the information is revised in the response to comments. (California Code of Regulations [Cal. Code Regs.], tit. 14, § 15088, subd. (c) and (d).)

CEQA does not require a lead agency to undertake every suggestion given by commenters, provided that the agency responds to significant environmental issues and makes a good-faith effort at disclosure in a reasoned way. For example, the CEQA Guidelines state:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. [...] [R]eviewers should be aware that

the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15204, subd. (a).)

CEQA does not require DWR to respond to comments unrelated or not germane to the evaluation of potential environmental impacts analyzed in the Draft EIR.

1.3 Approach

DWR has made a good-faith effort to ensure that all comments were identified, considered, and responded to in Volume 2 of the Final EIR. Comments organized by letter can be found in the comment response tables in Volume 2, Chapter 4, *Response to Comments Tables*. DWR reviewed comments exactly as they were provided; this included reviewing comments with misspellings, grammatical errors, unclear writing, or unclear speech. Upon initial review of comments, if identified, DWR corrected spelling errors and noted grammatical errors with “[sic]” in the comments provided. However, given the high volume of comments, DWR did not attempt to identify all spelling and grammatical errors. If a comment letter included bolded, shaded, or italic text, this type of formatting is not replicated in Volume 2, Chapter 4 as a result of processing and logging comments. In addition, these formatting elements do not satisfy DWR’s visual accessibility requirements when provided by third parties. DWR will provide electronic copies (i.e., PDFs) of comment letters and transcripts of public and Tribal representatives meetings upon request. Requests can be made at deltaconveyance@water.ca.gov. Every attempt was made to understand the commenters’ comments in order to provide responses. If a comment was not clearly understood, DWR made a note to that effect in the response provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4. Substantive comments raising significant environmental issues were addressed through a combination of unique responses and Common Responses. The following summarizes the approach DWR used when identifying, considering, and responding to the various types of comments received.

- **Form Letters.** Form letters (letters with duplicate content) were received from multiple different commenters and DWR identified an example of the form letter as a *primary form*. The comments in the primary form were reviewed and responded to one time, instead of responding to the same content repeatedly. The remaining form letters were reviewed to confirm consistency with the primary form, counted, and the total count of each form received was recorded. Volume 2, Chapter 2, *Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms*, identifies the primary form and its associated letter number as well as the names of commenters who submitted the form letter. The responses to the form letters are found in Volume 2, Chapter 4.
 - **Unique Comments within Form Letters:** DWR determined whether form letters contained any unique comments in addition to the form content. Any unique portion of these *form plus letters* was responded to separately from the form letter portion of the comment. Readers and commenters may refer to the responses to the form letters by looking at the primary form list in Volume 2, Chapter 2 under Index 6 and then finding the responses in Volume 2, Chapter 4. Commenters may look up their name in Volume 2, Chapter 2, under Index 5 to view responses to their unique comments in the form plus letters in Volume 2, Chapter 4.

- 1 • **Petitions.** DWR received one petition. The petition was responded to as if it was a primary form.
2 General comments in the petition were primarily addressed in the topics covered in Common
3 Response 1, *CEQA Process, General Approach to Analysis, and Other Environmental Review Issues*.
4 Comments in the petition that raised significant environmental issues were addressed in unique
5 individual responses or by references to other Common Responses, as appropriate. An index of
6 the signatories to the petition is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 2 under Index 6 along with the
7 location of the responses to the petition in Chapter 4.
- 8 • **Background Information Provided by Commenters.** Some commenters provided background
9 information about their agency, organization or affiliation, or biographical information. DWR
10 reviewed this information in consideration of all comments on the Draft EIR. Responses to these
11 types of comments are found in the comment tables. While this type of background and
12 biographical information is helpful to reviewers and decision-makers, background and
13 biographical information does not raise significant environmental issues associated with the
14 Draft EIR. Volume 2, Chapter 2 includes personally identifiable information by necessity (i.e.,
15 name, affiliation); but DWR attempted to redact personally identifiable information (e.g., names,
16 phone numbers, email addresses) in Volume 2, Chapter 4 where possible upon initial review.
- 17 • **Comment Numbering.** In general, comments are numbered sequentially in the order they
18 appear in the original comment letters. Some comments are labeled alphanumerically (e.g., 1a,
19 1b, 1c). In some instances, similar comments may have been grouped together in a way that
20 makes them appear somewhat out of the sequence in which they appear in the original
21 comment letter or transcript. Comment order and numbering is an artifact of the process
22 implemented to review and consider all comments and does not mean that comments were
23 treated or considered differently by DWR.
- 24 • **Comments Referring to Other Comments in the Same Letter.** Where comment content was
25 determined to be duplicative or similar, DWR may have cross-referenced to a response included
26 in the same letter to minimize or avoid repetition of responses.
- 27 • **Comments Referring to Other Comments in Different Letters.** In general, DWR did not cross-
28 reference to responses in different letters. However, in some limited instances, DWR cross-
29 referenced to responses to comments in different letters if, for example, the comments were
30 identified as identical or very similar. In these instances, readers can use the indices in Volume
31 2, Chapter 2, to identify the letter number referenced in a response. If a comment incorporated
32 by reference or cited comments sent to DWR by other commenters, readers may refer to Volume
33 2, Chapter 2 to identify the letter numbers they are interested in reviewing.
- 34 • **Attachments and Exhibits.** Comment letters sometimes included attachments and exhibits.
35 *Attachments* include materials physically attached to the hard copy of the comment letter or
36 contained in the same electronic file (e.g., PDF) as the comment letter; they also may consist of
37 separate files submitted with the comment letter, which may have been provided via a link to a
38 file sharing platform. Attachments may include previously submitted materials, e.g. Notice of
39 Preparation comment letters. *Exhibits* consist of figures, graphs, charts, maps, and other visual
40 aids provided by commenters that were embedded in the text of comment letters.
- 41 ○ Attachments and exhibits for comment letters are typically indicated using brackets in the
42 comment response tables in Volume 2, Chapter 4. The number of each attachment or exhibit
43 in the comment response tables was assigned by DWR through the coding and review
44 process and is not the number provided by the commenter. Generally, the first mention of
45 the attachment or exhibit is noted as a comment but simply is the provided title or content

- 1 summary of the attachment. Exhibits are sequentially numbered in the comment response
2 tables as they appear in the associated comment letter.
- 3 ○ DWR provided individual responses to information contained in an attachment to a
4 comment letter if the attachment included comments on substantive issues related to the
5 environmental analysis in the Draft EIR. If the attachment did not meet this criterion, a
6 unique individual response may not be provided, although the attachment was reviewed
7 and additional information to assist the commenter was referenced when available (e.g.,
8 reference to a Common Response).
- 9 ● **Links Provided by Commenters.** Comment letters that included links to websites, technical
10 documents, news articles, or other material were reviewed by DWR. All linked content was
11 reviewed, downloaded, and indexed for inclusion in the administrative record. DWR provided a
12 response to the comments where the linked materials were relevant and, in some cases,
13 responses to comments in Volume 2, Chapter 4 may cite to the material referenced by the
14 commenter. However, agencies are not required to locate specific information when a general
15 link is provided, therefore DWR did not capture linked information in instances where
16 commenters submitted links to general webpages.
- 17 ● **Verbal Comments.** Verbal comments received at the three public hearings and two Tribal
18 representatives virtual meetings were transcribed by a court reporter and the transcripts were
19 reviewed and are included in the responses to comments in Volume 2, Chapter 4. A transcription
20 of each speaker's comments was classified as a unique letter and DWR responded to the
21 transcription in the same manner as written comments. In some cases, the verbal comments
22 were not clearly understood for the purpose of the transcription, likely due to the dynamic and
23 conversational nature of the verbal public comments; however, responses have been provided
24 based on DWR's review.
- 25 ○ Speakers at the public hearings may also have submitted written comments via letters or
26 emails. Comments submitted in different formats (e.g. email and transcript) by the same
27 commenter were treated as separate letters. In this manner, DWR completely reviewed and
28 responded to all comments from the same commenter even if they were made at separate
29 times during the public comment period or in different formats.
- 30 ● **BDCP/WaterFix Comments.** As described in the Draft EIR Chapter 1, *Introduction*, DWR
31 released the *Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan* (BDCP) and accompanying Draft EIR for public
32 review in December 2013. In April 2015, DWR released the *Bay Delta Conservation*
33 *Plan/California WaterFix Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact*
34 *Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (BDCP/California WaterFix
35 RDEIR/SDEIS) for review. Some commenters resubmitted in 2022 the comment letters and/or
36 attachments that were prepared and submitted during the public review of the 2013 and 2015
37 environmental documents or other regulatory processes (e.g., Change in Point of Diversion).
38 These comments are largely not applicable to the Delta Conveyance Project Draft EIR released
39 on July 27, 2022, because the Delta Conveyance Project is different and wholly independent
40 from BDCP and California WaterFix evaluated in the previous CEQA documents. Furthermore,
41 DWR withdrew certification of the BDCP/California WaterFix Final EIR, rescinded the California
42 WaterFix project approval and bond resolutions, and withdrew permit applications. However,
43 despite the distinction between the two projects, DWR reviewed and considered all
44 BDCP/California WaterFix comments resubmitted in 2022 during the Delta Conveyance Project

comment period and provided responses to those comments that retained relevance to the Delta Conveyance Project.

- **General Comments.** Many comments received were very general in nature. These general comments were reviewed and considered. While DWR is not required under CEQA to respond to general comments that do not raise significant environmental issue(s), DWR addressed all general comments received, primarily by referring commenters to Common Responses or, in some cases, using standard individual responses.

1.4 Organization of Volume 2

Volume 2 is organized into four primary chapters, as described below.

Chapter 1, *Introduction and Approach to Responses to Comments*, (this chapter) contains a description of the public participation and public comments received on the Draft EIR; the approach to reviewing and responding to comments; and the format, content (including terminology), and organization of Volume 2.

Chapter 2, *Indices of Commenters and Index of Primary Forms*, provides a list of the comment letter numbers and names and titles of commenters, when provided, from federal agencies and elected officials; Tribal governments; state agencies and elected officials; local/regional agencies and elected officials; nongovernmental organizations, businesses, conservation groups, unidentified organizations; and members of the public. Chapter 2 also includes an index of form letter and form plus letter commenters, as well as signatories to the petition. The indices in Chapter 2 are organized by organization type, commenter name, and letter number. Readers and commenters can use these indices to identify the letter number or comment numbers associated with the submissions and then find the comments and responses in the comment response tables that are in Volume 2, Chapter 4. Indices are organized by commenter type as described in Table 1-1. Each comment letter is numbered; the corresponding commenter(s) are presented in the indices in Volume 2, Chapter 2.

Table 1-1. Summary of Indices

Index Number	Commenter Type
1	Federal Agencies, Federal Elected Officials, and Tribal Governments
2	State Agencies and Elected Officials
3	Local/Regional Agencies and Elected Officials
4	Nongovernmental Organizations, Businesses, Conservation Groups, Unidentified Organizations, Etc.
5	Individuals
6	Form Letter Submissions and Petition Signatories

Chapter 3, *Common Responses*, contains an introduction with a summary table identifying the number of Common Responses and a general description of the topics addressed by each Common Response. The Draft EIR was the subject of multiple comments on substantially similar topics or recurring comment themes or issues. Common Responses were prepared to provide responses to these frequently raised topics, themes, or issues to avoid repetition and to provide a comprehensive response. Each Common Response provides a brief overview of the topics, issues, or themes that it addresses; a table of contents to orient the reader to specific subtopics; the Common Response text;

and a list of references cited, as needed. Common Responses are described in Volume 2, Chapter 3 to familiarize readers with some of the most commonly raised topics and responses before the presentation of responses to individual comments in Volume 2, Chapter 4.

Chapter 4, *Response to Comments Tables*, presents individual comments and responses in a tabular format organized by commenter type in numerical order by letter number. Volume 2, Chapter 4 also provides a list of references cited in the responses to individual public comments. Any misspellings, grammatical errors, or unintelligible writings in the comment field of these tables are a true and accurate representation of the written comments provided to DWR. Transcribed comments from public meetings may contain mistakes due to the dynamic and conversational nature of the verbal public comments. Comment letters, emails, and other written or transcribed comments were assigned an identifying letter number as they were received and processed by DWR. The tables that appear in Volume 2, Chapter 4 may skip numbers under the following circumstances.

If the comment was a request for information, such as a request for an electronic copy of a document or request for additional time to comment, DWR responded to these requests separately from the response to comments process in a timely manner during the public comment period. Letters requesting information or an extension of the comment period were also assigned a number and included in Volume 2, Chapter 4.

Commenters occasionally submitted a letter more than once (e.g., by email and by a duplicate hard copy via the U.S. Postal Service or courier). Both letters initially may have been assigned separate comment numbers, but because they are duplicates only one copy of the letter was responded to and is included in the tables in Volume 2, Chapter 4.

References cited in comment responses are provided at the end of Chapter 4. The *References Cited* section is organized by letter number. Not all letters have responses that include citations; therefore, the *References Cited* section includes only those letters for which responses included citations.

1.5 Modifications Contained in Volume 1

Modifications related to responses to comments or other modifications made to Volume 1 are listed in the sections below. DWR made minor edits throughout Volume 1, such as modifications to punctuation, correction of misspellings, and typos. In addition, DWR made minor formatting changes throughout Volume 1, such as modification to headings, corrections to page numbers, and corrections of formatting issues found in graphs, charts, and tables. Modifications of the Draft EIR reflected in Volume 1 of the Final EIR that are not minor edits or formatting changes do not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact that was previously analyzed in the Draft EIR. New information added to this Final EIR clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to discussion and analysis in the Draft EIR. To improve readability and because of the need to satisfy visual accessibility requirements, Volume 1 does not use underline and strikeout.

1.5.1 Modifications Made Related to Responses to Comments

If a response to a comment in Volume 2, Chapter 4 identifies a change to Volume 1 of the Final EIR, the response acknowledges a change has been made pursuant to the comment, and may summarize

the change. Readers should go to the appropriate location of Volume 1 identified in the response to review the text as revised in the context of the chapter or appendix. The key refinements made to Volume 1 as a result of responses to comments are summarized below.

- Clarifications to the table titled Potential Agencies and Review, Approval, or Other Responsibilities, in Addition to Those under CEQA in Chapter 1, *Introduction*.
- Clarifications to use of sediment basins and drying lagoons for all alternatives during operations in Chapter 3, *Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives*, section titled *Sediment Basins and Drying Lagoons*.
- Reconfiguring of Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant and Surge Basin facilities primarily within the Bethany Complex footprint for Alternative 5 to allow approximately 35 acres remain undisturbed within the footprint of these facilities, as described in Chapter 3, section titled *Bethany Complex*, and Common Response 3, *Alternatives Development and Description*.
- Inclusion of broader discussion and clarifications of access road and rehabilitation in Chapter 3, section titled *Access Roads*.
- Inclusion of figures based on DSM2 modeling results in Chapter 5, *Surface Water*, regarding reverse flows in the Sacramento River near Freeport.
- Refinements to Chapter 8, *Groundwater*, Impact GW-4 regarding the discussion of operation groundwater modeling results related to groundwater storage to clarify the meaning of the modeling results; inclusion of electrical conductivity in Mitigation Measure GW-1.
- Inclusion of juvenile Chinook salmon screen passage time analysis at 19°C in Chapter 12, *Fish and Aquatic Resources*, Impact AQUA-2, which further supports the impact determination of less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
- Clarifications and additions of factors explaining patterns in north Delta exports and south Delta exports; clarification of footnotes in summary tables of results; and clarification of 5% significance threshold value used for impact analyses in Chapter 12.
- Inclusion of Impact AQUA-20 in Chapter 12 regarding California sea lions, which discloses a less-than-significant impact.
- Refinements to Chapter 13, *Terrestrial Biological Resources*, including: adding specificity to Mitigation Measure BIO-53 to address design specifications, monitoring, and adaptive management; clarifying that if California Department of Fish and Wildlife develops guidance for sandhill crane surveys and work windows DWR will use the guidance; clarifying tricolored blackbird analysis in Impact BIO-44.
- Clarifications in Chapter 16, *Recreation*, regarding location of I-5 ponds in existing conditions and clarifying details regarding I-5 ponds in Impact REC-1 and Impact REC-2.
- Clarifications in Chapter 14, *Land Use*, regarding locations of existing easements.
- Refinements to air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) modeling based on engineering refinements (e.g., off-road equipment type and horsepower, duration of marine vessel use) and to use newer versions of analysis models (e.g., CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.3, eGRID2021); including clarifications regarding modeling in Chapter 23, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases*, and accompanying appendices.

- Refinements to Appendix 3F, *Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources*, including: addition of mitigation measure ratios and 10% stay-ahead commitment; removal of tidal habitat restoration on Bouldin Island; clarifications that mitigation sites will be designed, managed, and maintained to provide habitat requirements for a diversity of targeted wildlife species; and inclusion of requirements to design commitments for California tiger salamander, tricolored blackbird, Swainson's hawk, Crotch bumble bee, and special-status plants.
- Clarifications regarding water transfers in Appendix 3H, *Non-Project Water Transfer Analysis for Delta Conveyance*, and additions to Chapter 9, *Water Quality*, and Chapter 12 methods sections.
- Inclusion of the following information in in Appendix 12B, *Bay-Delta Methods and Results*: additional DSM2-HYDRO outputs; Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Life Cycle Model materials (Attachment 12B.2); and delta smelt and longfin smelt particle tracking modeling entrainment results for North Bay Aqueduct.

1.5.2 Other Modifications

DWR also made other modifications in Volume 1 of the Final EIR that are not a result of a response to a specific comment. While these changes were not made in response to a specific comment, the changes were made in consideration of topics and themes contained in comments, as a result of discussions with responsible agencies during the public comment period, and/or because new information, which DWR has determined does not meet CEQA's definition of "significant new information" pursuant to Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, became available after the Draft EIR was released for public comment. The key other refinements are summarized below. In addition, throughout the public comment period, DWR publicly posted a change sheet identifying changes made; these modifications are incorporated into the Final EIR (California Department of Water Resources 2022).

- Inclusion of undergrounding of 1.9 miles of SCADA lines between Freeport and north of Intake A across from Clarksburg consistent with description in Chapter 3, section titled *SCADA Facilities*, clarifying that some of the SCADA lines would be undergrounded along existing roads and project access routes (as shown in Figure 3-14).
- Refinements to location and acreage of temporary uses within overall footprint at the Southern Complex where the Southern Complex is discussed in Chapter 3 for alternatives (except Alternative 5).
- Clarification of the use of non-specular material for aboveground power lines in Chapter 3, section titled *Electrical Facilities*.
- Clarifications to Impact GW-1, Impact GW-2, and Impact GW-3 in Chapter 8 regarding use of Mitigation Measure GW-1.
- Clarification of methodology in Chapter 9, *Water Quality*, and inclusion of Mitigation Measure WQ-4 in Chapter 9 and Appendix 9M, *Contra Costa Water District Interconnection Facility Mitigation Measure*, regarding the Contra Costa Water District Interconnection Facility, to further reduce the less-than-significant impacts on chloride discussed in Impact WQ-4.
- Additional clarifications regarding construction methods and geotechnical investigations in Chapter 10, *Geology and Seismicity*, section titled *Process and Methods of Review for Geology and Seismicity*, to provide details on DCA activities and design criteria.

- Inclusion of monarch butterfly in Chapter 13, *Terrestrial Biological Resources*, because it is a U.S. Fish and Wildlife candidate species being considered for listing, which discloses a less-than-significant impact, and removal of western bumble bee from Chapter 13 and associated appendices because a recent California Department of Fish and Wildlife publication shows the species' known range is outside of the study area.
- Refinements to air quality modeling to more accurately capture project description components (e.g., barges) in Chapter 23 and associated appendices.
- Inclusion of clarifying information regarding pumping energy usage in Chapter 22, *Energy*.
- Clarifications in mitigation measures and environmental commitments/best management practices throughout the EIR, including Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices*, to provide more clarity regarding the activities, location, timing, roles, or responsibilities, based on technical review.
- Compensatory mitigation refinements in Appendix 3F, *Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special Status Species and Aquatic Resources*, and throughout the EIR as appropriate; refinements include clarification regarding the location of grassland mitigation. In addition to initial mitigation sites and other site protection instruments identified in Appendix 3F, construction areas analyzed as permanent impact may be returned to either agricultural lands or may be planted in grasslands; therefore, grassland mitigation could also occur in those locations.

1.6 References Cited

1.6.1 Printed References

California Department of Water Resources. 2022. *Draft Environmental Impact Report Change Sheet*. Last revised: 2023. Available: <https://www.deltaconveyanceproject.com/planning-processes/california-environmental-quality-act/draft-eir/draft-eir-document>. Accessed: September 26, 2023.