

3E.1 Introduction

This appendix discusses a wide variety of topics related to the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Reform Act (SB X7-1; ca. 2009; Delta Reform Act), the Delta Stewardship Council (DSC), the requirements of the *Delta Plan*, and references where related information can be found in the Delta Conveyance Project Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Engineering Project Reports (EPRs) (Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority 2022a, 2022b). The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) recognizes and will fully comply with its obligations under the Delta Reform Act. This appendix is not intended to represent DWR’s certification of consistency with the *Delta Plan* for the Delta Conveyance Project (project) in compliance with the Delta Reform Act and should not be considered the entirety of the record necessary to support DWR’s expected certification of consistency that would need to be prepared after completion of the CEQA process if DWR approves the proposed project.

3E.2 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act

3E.2.1 History

In the Delta Reform Act, created by Senate Bill (SB) X7-1, the California State Legislature (Legislature) declared that the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta (Delta) “serves Californians concurrently as both the hub of the California water system and the most valuable estuary and wetland ecosystem on the west coast of North and *South America*,”¹ and

The economies of major regions of the state depend on the ability to use water within the Delta watershed or to import water from the Delta watershed. More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farmland receive water exported from the Delta watershed.²

Yet “existing Delta policies are not sustainable.”³ Accordingly, included within the Delta Reform Act are mandates to various state agencies aimed at achieving the sustainable management of the Delta.

The Delta Reform Act established the coequal goals for the Delta “of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem.”⁴ These coequal goals must be achieved “in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.”⁵

¹ Wat. Code § 85002.

² Wat. Code § 85004.

³ Wat. Code § 85001.

⁴ Pub. Resources Code § 29702, subd. (a); Wat. Code §§ 85001, subd. (c), 85020, 85054.

⁵ Pub. Resources Code § 29702, subd. (a); Wat. Code §§ 85001, subd. (c); 85054.

1 The Legislature declared that the following objectives, among others, “are inherent in the coequal
2 goals:”

- 3 • Manage the Delta’s water and environmental resources and the water resources of the state over
4 the long term;
- 5 • Restore the Delta ecosystem, including its fisheries and wildlife, as the heart of a healthy estuary
6 and wetland ecosystem;
- 7 • Promote statewide water conservation, water use efficiency, and sustainable water use;
- 8 • Improve water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving
9 water quality objectives in the Delta; and
- 10 • Improve the water conveyance system and expand statewide water storage.⁶

11 In light of the environmental challenges facing the Delta and the vital importance of water conveyed
12 through and diverted from the Delta to the state’s economy, the Legislature stated that its intentions
13 in enacting the Delta Reform Act are:

14 to provide for the sustainable management of the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta ecosystem, to
15 provide for a more reliable water supply for the state, to protect and enhance the quality of water
16 supply from the Delta, and to establish a governance structure that will direct efforts across state
17 agencies to develop a legally enforceable *Delta Plan*.⁷

18 Preliminarily, there can be no doubt that the Legislature, in enacting the Delta Reform Act, called for
19 some form of new or improved Delta conveyance. Indeed, the Delta Reform Act specifically
20 recognizes that new conveyance infrastructure is essential to achieving the coequal goals. For
21 example, Water Code Section 85004, subdivision (b), recognizes that providing a more reliable
22 water supply involves “new...Delta conveyance facilities,” and Section 85020, subdivision (f),
23 includes improving the water conveyance system among the objectives inherent in the coequal
24 goals. Water Code Section 85304 requires the *Delta Plan* to “promote options for new and improved
25 infrastructure relating to the water conveyance in the Delta, storage systems, and for the operation
26 of both to achieve the coequal goals,” and it required that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan be
27 incorporated into the *Delta Plan* if it met certain requirements, including study of new Delta
28 conveyance infrastructure.⁸ The Delta Reform Act also requires that the *Delta Plan* as adopted, must
29 include performance measurements to track the health of the Delta estuary and the “reliability of
30 California water supply imported from the Sacramento River or the San Joaquin River watershed.”⁹

31 The current system of natural and engineered conveyance infrastructure in the Delta lacks sufficient
32 capacity and flexibility to manage water operations to benefit the ecosystem and enhance water
33 supply reliability. System capacity and operational flexibility are needed to create more natural,
34 variable flows and support ecosystem health, maintain water quality for in-Delta uses, and move
35 more water during wetter periods when supplies are available for both environmental and
36 consumptive uses (Delta Stewardship Council 2018:99)

37 Current water conveyance infrastructure is also aging, and Delta channels are vulnerable to
38 earthquakes, floods, and other hazards, as further discussed in Chapter 7 of the *Delta Plan* [as
39 amended 2020] (Delta Stewardship Council 2020). Failure of this infrastructure poses significant
40 risks for environmental harm and water supply disruption (Working Group on California

⁶ Wat. Code § 85020, subds. (a)–(f).

⁷ Wat. Code § 85001, subd. (c).

⁸ Wat. Code § 85320. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan project is no longer being pursued.

⁹ Wat. Code § 85211.

Earthquake Probabilities 2003; Mount and Twiss 2005; Sneed et al. 2013). Climate change also is altering precipitation patterns in the Delta watershed and changing the timing and amount of stream flow, affecting water available for both ecosystem management and supply reliability. Sea level rise will increase salinity intrusion into the Delta, degrade water quality for agricultural and municipal uses in and outside the Delta, and alter ecosystem conditions (Fleenor and Bombardelli 2013; Van Lienden et al. 2014; Delta Stewardship Council 2018:99–101).

3E.2.2 The *Delta Plan*

The Delta Reform Act created the DSC and tasked it with furthering the state’s coequal goals of achieving a more reliable water supply and restoring the Delta ecosystem in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place through development of a *Delta Plan*.¹⁰ Although the Delta Reform Act and the *Delta Plan* are often referred to interchangeably, the Delta Reform Act contains a variety of directives for multiple agencies, whereas the *Delta Plan* is a comprehensive, long-term resource management plan for the Delta, containing both regulatory policies and recommendations, aimed at furthering the coequal goals.¹¹ The *Delta Plan* provides for a distinct regulatory process for activities that qualify as covered actions. The Delta Reform Act established a self-certification process for demonstrating consistency of covered actions with the *Delta Plan*.¹² State and local agencies proposing “covered actions” that occur in whole or in part in the Delta, prior to initiating the action, must prepare a written certification of consistency with detailed findings as to whether the covered action is consistent with applicable *Delta Plan* policies and must submit that certification to the DSC.¹³ The determination that a proposed activity meets the definition of a covered action is the responsibility of the state or local agency undertaking the proposed activity.¹⁴

The *Delta Plan* became effective on September 1, 2013, and has been updated and amended several times. In 2018, the DSC adopted significant updates to the *Delta Plan*, including measures “to promote options for water conveyance, storage systems, and the operation of both as required by Water Code Section 85304, based on historical information and the best currently available science” (Delta Stewardship Council 2018:60 [footnote omitted]). As a result, the DSC adopted recommendations WR R12a and WR R12b (Delta Stewardship Council 2018:126–129; see Attachment 3E.1, *Delta Plan Recommendations WR R12a and WR R12b Crosswalk Table* for the full text of these recommendations). In doing so, the DSC recognized that

operational and infrastructure improvements need to progress together and in coordination with other actions identified in the *Delta Plan*, such as those related to restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem (Chapter 4), improving water quality (Chapter 6), achieving greater regional self-reliance and reduced reliance on the Delta (Chapter 3 and Appendix G), and reducing risks to people and property (Chapter 7) (Delta Stewardship Council 2018:94–95).

¹⁰ Wat. Code §§ 85300, subd. (a), 85302, subd. (a).

¹¹ Wat. Code §§ 85059, 85300, subd. (a), 85302, subd. (a).

¹² Wat. Code § 85225.

¹³ Wat. Code § 85225.

¹⁴ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 23, §5001, subd. (j)(3).

3E.2.2.1 Covered Actions

As discussed above, the *Delta Plan's* regulatory policies apply to activities that qualify as covered actions. For an activity to be a covered action it must first meet specific criteria. A *covered action* is defined as a project under CEQA that

(i) will occur, in whole or in part, within the boundaries of the Delta or Suisun Marsh, (ii) will be carried out, approved, or funded by the state or a local public agency, (iii) is covered by one or more provisions of the *Delta Plan*, and (iv) will have a significant impact on achievement of one or both of the coequal goals or the implementation of government-sponsored flood control programs to reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta.¹⁵

Significant impact is defined as “a substantial positive or negative impact...that is directly or indirectly caused by a project on its own or when the project’s incremental effect is considered together with the impacts of other closely related past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.”¹⁶ Projects that are not considered to have a significant impact on the coequal goals include ministerial, emergency, other projects exempted from CEQA (unless there are unusual circumstances indicating a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant impact), and “[t]emporary water transfers of up to one year in duration.”¹⁷ If an activity does not meet all of the above criteria, then it is not a covered action for which a certification of consistency is required. Additionally, even if an activity meets all of the covered action elements, certain activities are statutorily exempt from qualifying as covered actions.¹⁸ For example, “covered action” does not include, either “[a] regulatory action of a state agency” or “(2) Routine maintenance and operation of the State Water Project or the federal Central Valley Project.”¹⁹

Based on the project footprint location and scope described in Chapter 3, *Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives*, the Delta Conveyance Project, if approved, would meet the definition of a covered action as described above because the project:

1. Would occur in whole or in part within the boundaries of the statutory Delta.²⁰ All project alternatives evaluated in the Final EIR (Chapter 3, *Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives*) include facilities (i.e., intakes, tunnel reaches and shafts, forebays, pumping plant, or conveyance facilities as described in Section 3.4, *Common Features of the Alternatives*) that, if approved, would be located in whole or in part in the statutory Delta.
2. Would be conducted, approved, or funded by the State or a local public agency. DWR, a California state agency, would conduct the Delta Conveyance Project and, as the CEQA lead agency, has the discretionary authority to approve the Delta Conveyance Project.
3. Would have a significant impact on the achievement of one or both of the coequal goals or the implementation of a government-sponsored flood control program to reduce risks to people, property, and State interests in the Delta. The fundamental purpose of the Delta Conveyance Project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) water conveyance system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, Central Valley Project (CVP) water deliveries south of the

¹⁵ Wat. Code § 85057.5.

¹⁶ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5001, subd. (dd).

¹⁷ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5001, subd. (dd).

¹⁸ Wat. Code § 85057.5.

¹⁹ Wat. Code § 85057.5, subd. (b).

²⁰ Wat. Code § 12220.

Delta. The Delta Conveyance Project is consistent with and furthers the achievement of the coequal goals by providing the water supply resilience needed to address seismic risks, sea level rise, and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events. Although the Delta Conveyance Project is not required to achieve the coequal goals, it will have a substantial positive impact on achievement of the coequal goals in a manner consistent with state policy. See Chapter 2, *Purpose and Project Objectives*, for more information.

4. Would be covered by one or more of the regulatory policies contained in the *Delta Plan*.²¹ Potential applicability of *Delta Plan* regulatory policies related to the covered action are discussed in Table 3E-1, below.

3E.3 *Delta Plan* Certification of Consistency Process

As described above, the Delta Reform Act established a self-certification process for demonstrating consistency with the *Delta Plan*. State or local public agencies must demonstrate the consistency of their covered actions with applicable *Delta Plan* regulatory policies.²² The regulatory policies that the state or local agency must consider in evaluating consistency are identified below in Table 3E-1, and full descriptions can be found at [govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I1F9E9C5007AA11E39A73EBDA152904D8&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](http://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I1F9E9C5007AA11E39A73EBDA152904D8&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)). The *Delta Plan* acknowledges that, in some cases, based on the nature of the covered action, full consistency with all relevant regulatory policies may not be feasible. In those cases, the agency that files the certification of consistency may nevertheless determine that the covered action is consistent with the *Delta Plan* because, on whole, that action is consistent with the coequal goals.²³ That determination must include a clear identification of areas where consistency with relevant regulatory policies is not feasible, an explanation of the reasons why it is not feasible, and an explanation of how the covered action nevertheless, on whole, is consistent with the coequal goals. That determination is subject to DSC review on appeal. For more information on how the Delta Conveyance Project furthers the coequal goals see Section 3E.5, *Coequal Goals*.

3E.3.1 Appeals Hearing Process

Once the state or local agency has filed a certification of consistency for a covered action, the certification is displayed on the DSC's website for public view. Any person who claims that a proposed covered action is inconsistent with the *Delta Plan* and, as a result of that inconsistency, that the action will have a significant adverse impact on the achievement of one or both of the coequal goals or implementation of government-sponsored flood control programs to reduce risks to people and property in the Delta, may file an appeal within 30 days of the submission of a certification of consistency with the DSC.²⁴ If an appeal is filed with the DSC within that period, then the DSC will have a public hearing on the appeal within 60 days of the date of filing. The DSC will adopt written findings, either denying the appeal or remanding the matter to the state or local

²¹ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, §§ 5003-5015.

²² Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5001 and Appendix B of the Delta Plan.

²³ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002.

²⁴ Wat. Code § 85225.10. subd. (a) and § 85225.15.

public agency for reconsideration, within 60 days of the hearing.²⁵ If there are no appeals, then the State or local public agency may proceed to implement the covered action, following the 30-day appeal period. For more information see the DSC's Administrative Procedures Governing Appeals, Appendix D to the *Delta Plan*, available at coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/Files/Appeals_Regs_1.pdf.

3E.3.2 Early Consultation

Any state or local public agency proposing to undertake a covered action is encouraged to consult with the DSC at the earliest possible opportunity, preferably no later than 30 days before submitting certification to the DSC. The DSC's staff will meet with the covered action agency's staff to review the consistency of the proposed action and make recommendations, as appropriate (Delta Stewardship Council 2010). DWR already has been engaged in early consultation and will continue to meet with the DSC in robust early consultation to ensure that recommendations regarding a potential certification of consistency are considered while developing the Delta Conveyance Project and the certification of consistency. Early consultation generally has occurred monthly (or more frequently) and provides an opportunity to discuss relevant project updates and interpretation of *Delta Plan* policies and certification procedures. Additionally, DWR staff have and will continue to present at DSC monthly public meetings to provide the DSC with an update on the Delta Conveyance Project's ongoing planning process.

3E.4 *Delta Plan* Policies

Each of the project alternatives considered in the Final EIR would be a covered action. As such, if the proposed project—or any of the project alternatives—is approved, a certification of consistency would be submitted for the approved project. DWR has developed this appendix and Table 3E-1, below, to identify information in the EIR and EPRs that demonstrate that the proposed project and project alternatives will not result in significant environmental impacts due to a conflict with any Delta Plan policy and also to assist the public in easily identifying information in the Final EIR and EPRs that may be relevant to the proposed project's or project alternatives' consistency with *Delta Plan* policies.

²⁵ Wat. Code §§ 85225.20-85225.25.

1 **Table 3E-1. Delta Plan Regulatory Policy Crosswalk Table**

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
G P1 (b)(1) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002)	Coequal Goals	Yes, if full consistency with one or more applicable policies is not feasible	<u>Delta Conveyance Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</u> Chapter 1, <i>Introduction</i> Appendix 1A, <i>July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and Addenda</i> Chapter 2, <i>Purpose and Project Objectives</i> • Section 2.1, <i>Overview</i> • Section 2.3, <i>Project Purpose and Objectives</i> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.3, <i>Proposed Project and Alternatives Overview</i> • Section 3.16, <i>Intake Operations and Maintenance</i> • Section 3.17, <i>Real-Time Operational Decision-Making Process</i> • Section 3.19, <i>Community Benefits Program</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> Appendix 3G, <i>Community Benefits Program Framework</i> <u>Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report (EPR)</u> Water Supply Reliability • Central and Eastern Options (C-E EPR) Narrative, with more details in the technical memoranda (TMs) • Bethany Reservoir Alternative (Bethany EPR) Narrative, with more details in the TMs Quality of Delta Environment • C-E EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Intake Site Identification and Evaluation TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Shaft Siting Study TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Southern Forebay Siting Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Logistics Strategy TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Potential Road Access Routes TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Traffic Impact Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Barge Transportation Study TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Rail Potential Study TM, attachment to C-E EPR

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			• Bethany EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Facilities Siting Study—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Logistics Strategy—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR Improve Flood Protection • C-E EPR Narrative Section 3.3, <i>Flood Risk Management Approach</i> • Flood Risk Management TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Levee Vulnerability Assessment TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Intake Flood Management TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Levee Vulnerability Assessment and Flood Risk Management Supplement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
G P1 (b)(2) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002)	Detailed Findings (Mitigation Measures)	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapters 5–32 Appendix 3B, <i>Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> <u>EPR</u> • C-E EPR Narrative and TMs • Bethany EPR Narrative and TMs
G P1 (b)(3) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002)	Detailed Findings (Best Available Science)	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • 3.3.1, <i>Design for Climate Change and Sea Level Rise</i> Appendix 4A, <i>Consideration of 2070 Conditions</i> Chapters 5–32 • <i>Environmental Setting</i> • <i>Methods for Analysis</i> • Associated appendices Appendix 5A, <i>Modeling Technical Appendix</i> Appendix 7A, <i>Flood Protection 2040/2072 Analysis</i> Chapter 12, <i>Fish and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 12.1.4.2, <i>Habitat Conditions and Environmental Stressors in Delta and Suisun Bay/Marsh</i>

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			Appendix 12A, <i>Environmental Setting Background Information</i> • Section 12A.1, <i>Fish and Aquatic Resources Species Descriptions</i> Chapter 13, <i>Terrestrial Biological Resources</i> • Section 13.1.5, <i>Invasive and Noxious Plant Species</i> Chapter 30, <i>Climate Change</i> Chapter 35, <i>Public Involvement</i> <u>EPR</u> Climate Change and Sea Level Rise • C-E EPR Narrative, Section 3, <i>Flood Management</i> • Flood Risk Management TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Levee Vulnerability Assessment TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Intake Flood Management TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Forebay Conceptual Design Criteria TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Bethany EPR Narrative, Section 3, <i>Flood Management</i> • Levee Vulnerability Assessment and Flood Risk Management Supplement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR Design Based on Hydraulic Modeling • C-E EPR Narrative, Section 6.2, <i>Hydraulics and Operational Requirements</i> • Hydraulic Analysis Criteria and Hydraulic Analysis of Delta Conveyance Options—Main Tunnel System TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Hydraulic Analysis Criteria TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Capacity Analysis for Preliminary Tunnel Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • South Delta Conveyance Facilities Hydraulic Analysis Criteria and Analyses TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Sacramento River Hydraulic Modeling—HEC-RAS 2D to Support Aquatics Effects Analysis, attachment to C-E EPR • Bethany EPR Narrative, Section 6.2, <i>Hydraulics and Operational Requirements</i> • Hydraulic Analysis of Delta Conveyance Options—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Bethany Reservoir Aqueduct Surge Protection Alternatives—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR Use of Existing Geotechnical Information and Data • C-E EPR Narrative, Section 6.3, <i>Geotechnical and Soil Considerations</i>

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			• Bethany EPR Narrative, Section 6.3, <i>Geotechnical and Soil Considerations</i> • Potential Future Field Investigations—Central and Eastern Corridor Options TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Conceptual Seismic Design and Geohazard Evaluation Criteria TM, attachment to C-E EPR • West Tracy Fault Preliminary Displacement Hazard Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Liquefaction and Ground Improvement Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Dewatering Estimates for Intake Facilities and Southern Forebay Emergency Spillway TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Conceptual Design Phase Seismic Site Response Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Southern Forebay Seismic Sensitivity Evaluation TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Potential Future Field Investigations—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Liquefaction and Ground Improvement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR GHG Emission Reduction • Soil Balance TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Soil Balance and Reusable Tunnel Material Supplement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
G P1 (b)(4) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002)	Detailed Findings (Adaptive Management)	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.4.14, <i>Land Reclamation</i> • Section 3.18, <i>Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program</i> Appendix 3B, <i>Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices</i> • EC-15: <i>Sediment Monitoring, Modeling, and Reintroduction Adaptive Management</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 3F.6.4, <i>Adaptive Management</i> • Section 3F.7, <i>Performance Standards and Monitoring</i> <u>EPR</u> Intake Operations • River Hydrologic Criteria for Intake Sizing TM, attachment to C-E EPR • North Delta Intake Facilities Configuration, Construction and Operations TM, attachment to C-E EPR

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			Southern Complex and Bethany Connections • South Delta Conveyance Facilities Canal and Tunnel Options Summary Comparison TM, attachment to C-E EPR • South Delta Conveyance Facilities Hydraulic Analysis Criteria and Analyses TM, attachment to C-E EPR • South Delta Conveyance Facilities Operations & Maintenance Facility Requirements TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Delta Mendota Canal Tunnel—Canal Options Comparison TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Bethany Reservoir Pumping Plant Facilities and Site Configuration TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
G P1 (c) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5002)	Conservation Measure	N/A	N/A
WR P1 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5003)	Reduce Reliance on the Delta through Improved Regional Water Self-Reliance	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 1, <i>Introduction</i> • Section 1.2.3, <i>Issues Affecting the Delta and SWP Today</i> • Section 1.2.4, <i>Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts</i> Chapter 2, <i>Purpose and Project Objectives</i> • Section 2.1, <i>Overview</i> • Section 2.3, <i>Project Purpose and Objectives</i> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.16.4, <i>Use of North Delta Diversion Intakes for Wheeling</i> • Section 3.22, <i>Contract Amendments</i> DWR conducted extensive coordination with the DSC to incorporate a WR P1 reporting example methodology in the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan Guidebook and the 2020 Agricultural Water Management Plan Guidebook.
WR P2 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5004)	Transparency in Water Contracting	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.22, <i>Contract Amendments</i>
ER P1 (Cal. Code	Delta Flow Objectives	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i>

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
Regs., tit. 23 § 5005)			• Section 3.16, <i>Intake Operations and Maintenance</i> • Section 3.17, <i>Real-Time Operational Decision-Making Process</i> • Section 3.18, <i>Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program</i> Chapter 5, <i>Surface Water</i> • Section 5.3.2.2, <i>Project Alternatives</i> Appendix 5A, <i>Modeling Technical Appendix</i> Appendix 5B, <i>Surface Water 2040 Analysis</i> Chapter 6, <i>Water Supply</i> • Section 6.4, <i>Water Supply Changes</i> Appendix 6A, <i>Water Supply 2040 Analysis</i> Chapter 12, <i>Fish and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 12.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Fish and Aquatic Resources</i> Appendix 12C, <i>Fish and Aquatic Resources 2040 Analysis</i>
ER P2 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5006)	Restore Habitats at Appropriate Elevations	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.3.1, <i>Design for Climate Change and Sea Level Rise</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 3F.4.3.4.2, <i>Site Selection Criteria and Tools</i> Appendix 5A, <i>Modeling Technical Appendix</i> • Section B.6.2, <i>Sea Level Rise</i> • Section B, Attachment 4, <i>Climate Change Development for Delta Conveyance Project</i> • Section C.6.2, <i>Incorporating Sea Level Rise Effects in DSM2 Planning Simulations</i> Chapter 30, <i>Climate Change</i> • Section 30.4.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives with Climate Change</i>
ER P3 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5007)	Protect Opportunities to Restore Habitat	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Appendix 3A, <i>Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives</i> • Section 3A.4.2, <i>Second Level Screening—Alternative Avoids or Substantially Lessens Impacts Compared to Proposed Project</i> Mapbook 3-1, <i>Central Alignment</i> • Sheet 5: The following project feature is within the Cosumnes/Mokelumne Confluence priority habitat restoration area: tunnel

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			• Sheet 6: The following project features are within the Cosumnes/Mokelumne Confluence priority habitat restoration area: tunnel, power, road improvement, shaft work area, New Hope Tract shaft site, metering area, geotechnical investigation zone. Mapbook 3-2, <i>Eastern Alignment</i>, Sheet 6 • The following project features are within the Cosumnes/Mokelumne Confluence priority habitat restoration area: tunnel, access road, power, metering area, metering area, road work area, New Hope Tract shaft site, geotechnical investigation zone. Mapbook 3-3, <i>Bethany Alignment</i>, Sheet 6 • The following project features are within the Cosumnes/Mokelumne Confluence priority habitat restoration area: tunnel, access road, metering area, New Hope Tract shaft site, power, geotechnical investigation zone. <u>EPR</u> Facility Siting and Other Considerations • C-E EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Shaft Siting Study TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Bethany EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Facilities Siting Study—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
ER P4 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5008)	Expand Floodplains and Riparian Habitats in Levee Projects	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Appendix 3A, <i>Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 3F.4.3.3, <i>Channel Margin Habitat Mitigation Approach</i> • Section 3F.4.3.4, <i>Tidal Wetland Habitat Mitigation Approach</i> <u>EPR</u> • C-E EPR Narrative Section 2.1, <i>Intakes</i> • Intake Site Identification and Evaluation TM, attachment to C-E EPR • C-E EPR Narrative Section 3.3, <i>Flood Risk Management Approach</i> • Flood Risk Management TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Levee Vulnerability Assessment TM, attachment to C-E EPR Levee Vulnerability Assessment and Flood Risk Management Supplement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
ER P5 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5009)	Avoid Introductions of and Habitat Improvements for Invasive Nonnative Species	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.4.14, <i>Land Reclamation</i> Appendix 3B, <i>Environmental Commitments and Best Management Practices</i> • EC-4a: <i>Develop and Implement Erosion and Sediment Control Plans</i> • EC-4b: <i>Develop and Implement Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans</i> • EC-11: <i>Fugitive Dust Control</i> • EC-14: <i>Construction Best Management Practices for Biological Resources</i> Appendix 3F, <i>Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Special-Status Species and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 3F.7.1: <i>Performance Standards</i> • Section 3F.7.2: <i>Monitoring</i> Chapter 12, <i>Fish and Aquatic Resources</i> • Section 12.1.4.2, <i>Habitat Conditions and Environmental Stressors in Delta and Suisun Bay/Marsh</i> • Section 12.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Fish and Aquatic Resources</i> • Mitigation Measure AQUA-1c: <i>Develop and Implement a Fish Rescue and Salvage Plan</i> Chapter 13, <i>Terrestrial Biological Resources</i> • Section 13.1.5, <i>Invasive and Noxious Plant Species</i> • Impact BIO-52: <i>Impacts of Invasive Species from Project Construction and Operations on Established Vegetation</i> Chapter 18, <i>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</i> • Mitigation Measure AES-1c: <i>Implement Best Management Practices to Implement Project Landscaping Plan</i> <u>EPR</u> Use of native plant species • Post-Construction Land Reclamation TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Post-Construction Land Reclamation Supplement—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
DP P1 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5010)	Locate New Urban Development Wisely	N/A	N/A

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
DP P2 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5011)	Respect Local Land Use When Siting Water or Flood Facilities or Restoring Habitats	Yes	<u>EIR</u> Chapter 1, <i>Introduction</i> • Section 1.2.4, <i>Prior Delta Conveyance Planning Efforts</i> • Section 1.6, <i>Public Scoping and Issues of Known Controversy</i> Appendix 1A, <i>July 2020 Delta Conveyance Project Scoping Summary Report and Addenda</i> Chapter 3, <i>Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives</i> • Section 3.19, <i>Community Benefits Program</i> • Section 3.20, <i>Ombudsman</i> Appendix 3A, <i>Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives</i> Appendix 3G, <i>Community Benefits Program Framework</i> Chapter 8, <i>Groundwater</i> • Section 8.3.2.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Groundwater</i> Chapter 9, <i>Water Quality</i> • Section 9.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Water Quality</i> Chapter 14, <i>Land Use</i> • Section 14.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Land Use</i> • Mapbook Figures M14-1, M14-2, and M14-3 Chapter 15, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> • Section 15.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Agricultural Resources</i> Chapter 16, <i>Recreation</i> • Section 16.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Recreation Resources</i> Chapter 17, <i>Socioeconomics</i> • Section 17.3.3.2, <i>Effects of the Project Alternatives on Delta Regional Employment and Income</i> Chapter 18, <i>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</i> • Section 18.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Aesthetics and Visual Resources</i> Chapter 19, <i>Cultural Resources</i> • Section 19.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Cultural Resources</i> Chapter 20, <i>Transportation</i> • Section 20.3.3.3, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Transportation</i> Chapter 23, <i>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases</i> • Section 23.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Air Quality</i>

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
			Chapter 24, <i>Noise and Vibration</i> • Section 24.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Noise and Vibration</i> Chapter 25, <i>Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire</i> • Section 25.4.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives Related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> Chapter 26, <i>Public Health</i> • Section 26.3.3.2, <i>Impacts of the Project Alternatives on Public Health</i> Chapter 29, <i>Environmental Justice</i> • Section 29.4.2.2, <i>Project Alternatives</i> Chapter 31, <i>Growth Inducement</i> • Section 31.2.3, <i>Impacts and Mitigation Approaches</i> <u>EPR</u> Facility Siting Considerations • C-E EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Intake Site Identification and Evaluation TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Shaft Siting Study TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Southern Forebay Siting Analysis TM, attachment to C-E EPR • Bethany EPR Narrative • Efforts to Minimize Delta Community Effects—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR • Facilities Siting Study—Bethany Reservoir Alternative TM, attachment to Bethany EPR
RR P1 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5012)	Prioritization of State Investments in Delta Levees and Risk Reduction	N/A	N/A
RR P2 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5013)	Require Flood Protection for Residential Development in Rural Areas	N/A	N/A

Policy	Policy Description	Potentially Applicable to Alternatives?	Citations to Potentially Relevant Information in Final EIR or EPR
RR P3 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5014)	Protect Floodways	N/A	N/A
RR P4 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23 § 5015)	Floodplain Protection	N/A	N/A

1

3E.5 Coequal Goals

One of the primary challenges facing California is how to address comprehensively the increasingly significant conflict between Delta ecological needs and the need to provide more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. This challenge must be taken into account in decisions by State agencies, such as DWR, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, as they endeavor to strike a reasonable balance between these competing public policy objectives and determine various actions to be taken within the Delta, including DWR's approval and implementation of the project.

As described in Chapter 2, *Purpose and Project Objectives*, DWR's fundamental purpose for the proposed project is to develop new diversions and conveyance facilities in the Delta that are necessary to restore and protect the reliability of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries south of the Delta, consistent with the State's Water Resilience Portfolio and in a cost-effective manner.

The above-stated purpose, in turn, gives rise to several project objectives. In proposing to make physical improvements to the SWP, project objectives are as follows.

- Help address anticipated rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change and extreme weather events.
- Minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts from reduced quantity and quality of SWP water deliveries and, potentially, CVP water deliveries, south of the Delta as a result of a major earthquake that could cause breaching of Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas where existing SWP and CVP pumping plants operate in the southern Delta.
- Protect the ability of the SWP and, potentially, the CVP, to deliver water when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient amounts, consistent with the requirements of State and federal law, including the California and federal Endangered Species Acts and Delta Reform Act, as well as the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements.
- Provide operational flexibility to improve aquatic conditions in the Delta and better manage risks of further regulatory constraints on project operations.

The Delta Conveyance Project is consistent with the achievement of the coequal goals by increasing operational flexibility to divert water during high-outflow events, thereby making water supply more resilient to the adverse impacts of climate change and associated sea level rise, as well as catastrophic levee failures that may result from seismic events or other causes in a manner that does not significantly impact the achievement of protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. It is important to understand that the Delta Conveyance Project, by itself, does not need to further both of the coequal goals to be consistent with the coequal goals, but does need to avoid conflicts with either goal. The Delta Conveyance Project will have a substantial, positive impact on the achievement of the coequal goals in the Delta, but it is only part of a much more comprehensive State effort to achieve the coequal goals.

The regulatory definitions in the *Delta Plan* include the following definition with respect to Delta as a place:

Achieving the coequal goals in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place means accepting that change, including change associated with achieving the coequal goals, will not cease, but that the fundamental characteristics and values that contribute to the Delta's special qualities and that distinguish it from other places can be preserved and enhanced while accommodating these changes. In this regard, the following are core strategies for protecting and enhancing the unique values that distinguish the Delta and make it a special region:

- (A) Designate the Delta as a special place worthy of national and state attention;
- (B) Plan to protect the Delta's lands and communities;
- (C) Maintain Delta agriculture as a primary land use, a food source, a key economic sector, and a way of life;
- (D) Encourage recreation and tourism that allow visitors to enjoy and appreciate the Delta and that contribute to its economy;
- (E) Sustain a vital Delta economy that includes a mix of agriculture, tourism, recreation, related industries and business, and vital components of state and regional infrastructure; and
- (F) Reduce flood and other risks to people, property, and other interests in the Delta²⁶ (Delta Stewardship Council 2013:164, 192).

3E.5.1 The Delta as an Evolving Place

As described above, the Delta Reform Act requires that the coequal goals must be achieved “in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.”²⁷ None of the various tasks identified in the definitions in the Delta Plan listed in the previous section are assigned to DWR. In addition, in Chapter 5 of the *Delta Plan*, the Council recognizes that *Delta as Place* does not mean maintaining the status quo:

The Delta’s uniqueness, however, does not exempt it from change. Increasing pressures of growing populations, shifting commodity markets, climate changes, and rising sea level will require new ways of adaptation for this region. Some changes are driven by the Delta’s location at the center of California’s water systems and are required to meet statewide goals of restoring the Delta’s ecosystem and improving water supply reliability. Other changes may be caused by floods, earthquakes, or other events that threaten the Delta’s levees and islands. Some changes can be managed by policies that shape how the Delta’s traditions are honored and its history preserved; guide new development; enhance recreation and tourism; and encourage agriculture, business expansion, and economic development.

Protecting the Delta as an evolving place means accepting that change will not stop, but that the fundamental characteristics and values that contribute to the Delta’s special qualities and that distinguishes it from other places can be preserved and enhanced while accommodating these changes (Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force 2008). It does not mean that the Delta should be a fortress, a preserve, or a museum (Delta Stewardship Council 2013:167; see also 23 Cal. Code Regs. § 5001, subd. (h)(3)).

²⁶ 23 Cal. Code Regs. § 5001, subd. (h)(3)

²⁷ Wat. Code § 85054.

1 The Delta Conveyance Project Final EIR includes detailed analyses of impacts from the Delta
2 Conveyance Project and alternatives that are relevant to the Delta as Place. To the extent that the
3 Delta Conveyance Project will cause potentially significant impacts on the physical environment,
4 such environmental impacts are disclosed and analyzed in the EIR and, where feasible, mitigation
5 measures have been proposed. The practical effect of many of the mitigation measures and
6 environmental commitments is to protect Delta values. Effects and mitigation related to Delta values
7 are discussed in Chapter 14, *Land Use*; Chapter 15, *Agricultural Resources*; Chapter 16, *Recreation*;
8 Chapter 17, *Socioeconomics*; Chapter 18, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*; and Chapter 19, *Cultural*
9 *Resources*.

10 In addition to the regulatory mitigation in the Final EIR, DWR is proposing the Community Benefits
11 Program and an ombudsman program to protect and enhance Delta values. Appendix 3G,
12 *Community Benefits Program Framework*, identifies the goal, objectives, and potential components of
13 the Delta Conveyance Project Community Benefits Program. The Community Benefits Program
14 Framework is composed of the Delta Community Fund and Economic Development and Integrated
15 Benefits. The Framework objectives are to: (1) provide a mechanism for Delta community
16 members and others identify opportunities for local benefits; (2) provide a mechanism for the
17 project proponents to demonstrate good faith, transparency, and accountability to the community
18 through formal commitments developed with input from community members and others; and (3)
19 protect and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of
20 the Delta as an evolving place. The Ombudsman Program (Chapter 3, Section 3.20, *Ombudsman*) is
21 proposed to increase transparency and effective communication during the construction and
22 implementation of the proposed project and facilitate a claims process for direct construction-
23 related impacts. The ombudsman would be available as a primary point of contact for community
24 members and others and answer questions, refer interested parties to appropriate team members
25 for more information, and aid with claims submittals. The Ombudsman would assist claimants in
26 submission of claims and just compensation as a result of direct construction-related impacts.

27 DWR believes that, through the combination of regulatory mitigation, Community Benefits Program,
28 and Ombudsman Program, the Delta Conveyance Project contributes to protecting and enhancing
29 the Delta as an evolving Place.

30 **3E.6 Delta Plan Recommendations WR R12a and** 31 **WR R12b**

32 As described above, the *Delta Plan* includes both regulatory policies and recommendations.
33 Although it is not required for covered action certifications of consistency, *Delta Plan*
34 recommendations WR R12a and WR R12b include new recommendations specifically relevant to the
35 concept of a dual-conveyance option for the Delta. Many of these new recommendations have
36 already been incorporated into the Delta Conveyance Project and environmental analysis.
37 Attachment 3E.1 outlines where the public can find information in the Final EIR and EPRs related to
38 the recommendations outlined in WR R12a and WR R12b. With the adoption of WR R12a and WR
39 R12b, the DSC recognized that a dual-conveyance system with new screened intakes in the north
40 Delta offers the potential to reduce environmental conflicts while addressing risks to the amount or
41 quality of Delta exports from levee failure and climate change.

3E.7 References Cited

- Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority. 2022a. *Volume 1: Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report—Central and Eastern Options*. May 2022. Sacramento, CA.
- Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority. 2022b. *Volume 1: Delta Conveyance Final Draft Engineering Project Report—Bethany Reservoir Alternative*. May 2022. Sacramento, CA.
- Delta Stewardship Council. 2010. *Administrative Procedures Governing Appeals*. Adopted September 23. Available: https://coveredactions.deltacouncil.ca.gov/Files/Appeals_Regs_1.pdf. Accessed: December 10, 2021.
- Delta Stewardship Council. 2013. *The Delta Plan*. Originally published September 1, 2013; Amended April 26, 2018, July 2019, March 2020. Sacramento, CA. Available: <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan/>. Accessed: December 10, 2021.
- Delta Stewardship Council. 2018. Chapter 3. In *The Delta Plan*. Originally published September 1, 2013; Amended April 26, 2018. Available: <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan/>. Accessed: December 10, 2021.
- Delta Stewardship Council. 2020. Chapter 7. In *The Delta Plan*. Originally published September 1, 2013; Amended March 2020. Available: <http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan/>. Accessed: December 10, 2021.
- Governor’s Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force. 2008. *Our Vision for the California Delta*. January 29 (second printing). Available: https://calafco.org/sites/default/files/resources/Delta_Vision_Final_0.pdf. Accessed: April 7, 2022.
- Fleenor, W., and F. Bombardelli. 2013. *Simplified 1-D Hydrodynamic and Salinity Transport Modeling for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta: Delta Sea Level Rise and Water Diversion Effects*. January 1. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science* 11(4). Available: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3km0d0kt>. Accessed: April 7, 2022.
- Mount, J., and R. Twiss. 2005. Subsidence, Sea Level Rise, and Seismicity in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science* 3(1). Available: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4k44725p>. Accessed: May 6, 2022.
- Sneed, M., J. Brandt, and M. Solt. 2013. *Land Subsidence along the Delta-Mendota Canal in the Northern Part of the San Joaquin Valley, California, 2003–10*. Scientific Investigations Report 2013-5142. Prepared in cooperation with U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20135142>.
- Van Lienden, B., A. Munévar, and T. Das. 2014. West-Wide Climate Risk Assessment: Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins Climate Impact Assessment. Available: <https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/baseline/docs/ssjbia/ssjbia.pdf>. Accessed: April 7, 2022.
- Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities. 2003. *Earthquake Probabilities in the San Francisco Bay Region: 2002–2031*. U.S. Geological Survey. Open-File Report 03-21. Available: https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2003/of03-214/OFR-03-214_FullText.pdf. Accessed: December 2, 2021.