



Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Program

Final Initial Study – Negative Declaration

prepared by

Oak Flat Water District
P.O. Box 1596
Patterson, California 95363
Contact: Anthea Hansen

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants
4589 North Marty Avenue, Suite 102
Fresno, California 93722

June 2026

Table of Contents

Initial Study	1
1. Project Title	1
2. Lead Agency Name and Address	1
3. Lead Agency Contact Information	1
4. Project Proponent Name and Address	1
5. Description of Project	1
6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting	5
7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required	6
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	8
Determination	8
Environmental Checklist	10
1 Aesthetics	10
2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	13
3 Air Quality	15
4 Biological Resources	17
5 Cultural Resources	21
6 Energy	23
7 Geology and Soils	25
8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	27
9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	29
10 Hydrology and Water Quality	33
11 Land Use and Planning	37
12 Mineral Resources	39
13 Noise	41
14 Population and Housing	43
15 Public Services	45
16 Recreation	47
17 Transportation	49
18 Tribal Cultural Resources	51
19 Utilities and Service Systems	53
20 Wildfire	55
21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	57
References	61
Bibliography	61
List of Preparers	62

Tables

Table 1 Potential Water Transfer Partners 5

Figures

Figure 1 State Water Project Facilities 2

Initial Study

1. Project Title

Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Program

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

Oak Flat Water District
P.O Box 1596
Patterson, California 95363

3. Lead Agency Contact Information

Anthea Hansen
ahansen@delpuertowd.org

4. Project Proponent Name and Address

Homer, LLC
5701 Truxtun Avenue, Suite 201
Bakersfield, California 93309

5. Description of Project

Project Background

State Water Project

The State Water Project (SWP) is a multi-purpose water storage and delivery system. The SWP is comprised of a system of canals, pipelines, reservoirs, and hydroelectric power facilities. It delivers water to 27 million Californians, 750,000 acres of farmland, and businesses throughout California. Water flows through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta channels until it reaches the Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant on the border of Contra Costa and Alameda counties. The plant transfers water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to the California Aqueduct for subsequent distribution throughout the state. Figure 1 shows a map of the SWP facilities.

The SWP is owned by the State of California and operated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). DWR delivers water through the SWP to 29 public agencies (the SWP Contractors), including Oak Flat Water District (OFWD), via the California Aqueduct. Each SWP Contractor maintains a long-term water supply contract with DWR that specifies the maximum annual amount of water that may be requested by that SWP Contractor to be delivered in a given year ("Table A" entitlement).

Figure 1 State Water Project Facilities



Source: California Department of Water Resources 2025a

The actual amount of a SWP Contractor's Table A entitlement that DWR provides can fluctuate annually based on several factors including precipitation, carryover supplies, projected demands, existing storage in SWP conservation facilities, estimates of future runoff, SWP operational and regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts, and water right priorities (DWR 2025b). Whenever the available SWP supply is less than the total of all SWP Contractors' Table A entitlements, the available SWP Water supplies are allocated proportionally among all SWP Contractors, after recognition of any priorities under Area of Origin Settlement Agreements, relative to each Contractors' SWP Water amount. Since 1996, final SWP allocations have ranged from 5 percent to 100 percent (DWR 2025c).

SWP water supply reliability has declined over recent decades due to hydrologic variability and regulatory constraints. DWR prepares a biennial report to assist SWP Contractors and local planners in assessing the near and long-term availability of supplies from the SWP. DWR issued its most recent update, the 2023 Delivery Capability Report (DCR) in July 2024. The 2023 DCR shows that, under current conditions, the average delivery of SWP Water supplies to SWP Contractors are estimated to be approximately 53 percent of SWP Water amounts (DWR 2024a). During drought years or periods of low SWP allocations, agricultural and municipal water users often require supplemental supplies to maintain service reliability during dry periods.

Oak Flat Water District

OFWD is a California special district that provides water to portions of unincorporated Stanislaus County south of the city of Patterson. Water supplied by OFWD is used for agricultural purposes. OFWD is a SWP Contractor with a maximum annual amount of 5,700 acre-feet of SWP Table A entitlement (DWR 2025b).

Beltran Farms, Inc

Beltran Farms, Inc. (Beltran), located in Crows Landing, California owns land within the OFWD service area, and receives a portion of OFWD's Table A entitlement, along with other SWP supplies made available by OFWD through its Water Supply Contract with DWR (OFWD Supplies) for irrigation purposes. Beltran has authorized a third-party developer to construct and operate a solar project on a 700-acre property (Beltran property) where Beltran most currently utilized its OFWD Supplies. The solar facility is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus. The development of solar on the Beltran property has temporarily eliminated the need to utilize its OFWD Supplies for agricultural purposes on the Beltran property during the solar project's operational life.

Homer, LLC

Homer LLC (Homer) has established contracts with landowners and water districts in the San Joaquin Valley and the broader Central Valley to administer water resources through delivery, exchanges, transfers, and banking projects. Homer's water management programs include rights in water banking projects and deliveries to various water management partners (through transfers, exchanges, etc.). For example, Homer has rights to certain capacity in Semitropic Water Storage District's Stored Water Recovery Unit ("SWRU"), in which Homer may temporarily store water for later delivery and use. Homer also contracts with various water management partners to make deliveries to such partners within the SWP service area, including, but not limited to, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency, Metropolitan Water District of Southern

California, Kern County Water Agency, Central Coast Water Agency, Dudley Ridge Water District and Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District.

Project Description

The Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Project (herein referred to as “Project”) involves a Multi-Year Water Purchase Option Agreement Between Oak Flat Water District, Beltran Farms, Inc. (Beltran), and Homer LLC (herein referred to as “Agreement”), whereby Beltran assigns to Homer 100 percent or up to 1,858 AFY, of the OFWD Supplies available to Beltran Property for a period of 30-years, or a total of up to 55,740 AF during the term of the Agreement. Additionally, under the terms of the Agreement, Homer may use the assigned OFWD Supplies both within and outside of OFWD’s service area, limited to only areas within the SWP Place of Use. The purpose of the Project is to provide Homer with flexibility to deliver the OFWD Supplies assigned to Homer under the Agreement outside of OFWD to meet the needs of various water management programs and partners (as described above).

Through the Project, Homer may utilize OFWD supplies for its own uses on Homer properties or sell and deliver its OFWD supplies to water transfer partners in Table 1. To allow for greater management flexibility and timing of deliveries, Homer may temporarily store OFWD supplies in the Semitropic SWRU groundwater banking program (using existing capacity rights) prior to recovering the water for use by Homer or its water transfer partners. Transfers between Homer and water transfer partners would be pursuant to existing or future contracts, subject to any additional approvals as required, and in accordance with OFWD’s and Homer’s water transfer partners’ (see Table 1) respective contracts with the DWR. Water transfer agreements that utilize these water supplies may be single-year or multi-year transactions. Table 1 provides an overview of Homer’s potential water transfer partners (i.e., potential recipients of these water supplies from Homer).

As shown in Table 1, potential water transfer partners are located across California. Water transferred under this agreement may be delivered inside or outside of Kern County to Homer’s water transfer partners listed above in Table 1. The farthest end user from OFWD is the Irvine Ranch Water District, approximately 330 miles in conveyance distance.

Table 1 Potential Water Transfer Partners

Entity	County
Santa Clara Valley Water District	Santa Clara
County of Kings	Kings
Empire West Side Irrigation District	Kings
Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District	Kings
Dudley Ridge Water District	Kings
Kern County Water Agency	Kern
Santa Barbara County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Santa Barbara
Central Coast Water Authority	Santa Barbara/San Luis Obispo
Montecito Water District	Santa Barbara
La Cumbre Mutual Water Company	Santa Barbara
Palmdale Water District	Los Angeles
Santa Clarita Valley Water Authority	Los Angeles
The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Ventura
Mojave Water Agency	San Bernardino
Irvine Ranch Water District	Orange

¹ Conveyance distances are approximate and can vary depending on the specific delivery point within an agency's service area. Some agencies have multiple delivery points, so a central or average location is used for estimation.

The Project would not change the SWP water entitlement for OFWD or increase Beltran's maximum entitlement of SWP supplies from OFWD. As such, the Project would not increase the total quantity of SWP water supplies to be diverted from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta or delivered to OFWD. All of the Project water deliveries would be within the existing capacities of existing water infrastructure (e.g., Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, California Aqueduct, Kern County Water Agency's Cross Valley Canal, SWRU, and other existing facilities). No new facilities or capacity would need to be constructed to operate the Project because storage and conveyance facilities currently exist and are operational. Likewise, all deliveries to Homer's water management partners would be within the operational limits of facilities and projects established by already-approved California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. Water transferred under the Project would be used to offset existing demands and would not be used to support new, previously unplanned development. If future transfer agreements utilizing OFWD supplies will be used to support new, previously unplanned development, then additional CEQA analysis would be required.

6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Specific land uses at and surrounding the existing facilities that would be utilized for the Project are varied across Stanislaus, Alameda, Contra Costa, Kern, Kings, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, and Orange counties, and include urban and rural uses, agricultural lands, and open spaces.

7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

In addition to OFWD, the Project would require the approval of DWR. Additional discretionary approvals may be required from individual water transfer partner agencies if and when OFWD supplies are proposed to be delivered into their service areas. Prior to formal adoption of any future transfer agreements, water transfer partner agencies would be responsible for determining whether subsequent CEQA action is needed. Water transfer partners may rely on and tier from this Initial Study - Negative Declaration, consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15152, to streamline environmental review for future water transfer agreements that utilize these water supplies.

This page intentionally left blank.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This Project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☐ Geology and Soils | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality | ☐ Land Use and Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population and Housing | ☐ Public Services |
| ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation | ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☐ Utilities and Service Systems | ☐ Wildfire | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination

Based on 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 to 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 “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” 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 potential 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

Printed Name

Title

Environmental Checklist

1 Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
a. <i>Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i> b. <i>Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i> c. <i>Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</i> d. <i>Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</i>				

The Project involves a 30-year agreement under which Homer would manage SWP water made available to Beltran by OFWD. Water conveyance and storage facilities (i.e., Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant, California Aqueduct, Kern County Water Agency's Cross Valley Canal, SWRU, and

other existing facilities) currently exist and are in regular use for delivery of SWP supplies. The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities, and therefore the Project would not result in changes to the visual environment. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to substantially affect scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, or light and glare. No impact to aesthetics would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*
- b. *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*
- c. *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?*
- d. *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

- e. *Would the project 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?*

The Project would not change the SWP water entitlement for OFWD or Beltran's maximum entitlement of SWP supplies from OFWD. The Project would not cause the separate solar development on the agricultural land on the Beltran property; rather, the separate solar development is an in-progress development which created the opportunity for the Project. Thus, the Project is not related to any conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use on the Beltran property. Furthermore, the Project would not adversely impact Beltran's ability to access water for agricultural practices after the life span of the solar project. The Project also would not adversely impact OFWD's ability to provide water for agricultural practices within its service area because only water previously made available to Beltran would be transferred to Homer.

Additionally, the Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities, and would not result in physical changes to agriculture or forestry land. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of Farmland or forest land; conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract; conflict with zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or involve changes in the environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No impact to agriculture and forestry resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*
- c. *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*
- d. *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Under the Project, water transfers and exchanges would be implemented using existing physical facilities and in accordance with existing operational protocols and regulatory processes. The Project would not include the construction or modification of facilities. Accordingly, no direct short-term construction emissions would occur as a result of the Project. Furthermore, no indirect operational emissions associated with the generation of electricity would occur, because no new facilities would be constructed or modified and no long-term changes in operation of existing water transfer facilities would occur as part of the Project. In addition, conveyance of water along existing conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of such systems. Compliance with operational parameters would ensure that water transfers would not increase the size of any conveyance and pumping capacities. The Project's environmental impacts associated with air quality are similar to the environmental impacts identified by DWR within the *State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management Environmental Impact Report* (DWR 2020). As a result, no impacts related to air quality would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Program

- a. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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?*

The Project does not involve any construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. In addition, the Project would not change stream flows or increase surface water pumping from the Delta. DWR determines total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (i.e., Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permit, respectively) for the protection of special status species such as longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*; State threatened), delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*; federal threatened and State endangered), winter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*; federal and State endangered), and spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*; federal and State threatened) (DWR 2025f).

Because the Project would not result in changes in DWR's allocations to SWP Contractors, and because all Project water transferred from OFWD to Homer would be subject to all of the same regulatory requirements that apply to the delivery of OFWD's SWP supplies, the Project would not result in impacts to these special status species. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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 United States Fish and Wildlife Service beyond existing conditions, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*
- c. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling,*
- d. *Would the project 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?*

The Project does not involve construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. In addition, the Project would not change stream flows or increase surface water pumping from the Delta. Therefore, the Project would not increase the total quantity of SWP water supplies to be diverted from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and would have no impact on riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, wildlife movement, or native wildlife nursery sites beyond existing conditions.

NO IMPACT

- e. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*
- f. *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

Although there are multiple jurisdictions and adopted conservation plans that overlap the locations of existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the Project, the Project would not involve construction or ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources or the provisions of adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

The Project would not result in alterations to any conveyance or storage facilities or other physical infrastructure. Accordingly, the Project has no potential to result in adverse changes to any historical resources. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*
- c. *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Archaeological resources and human remains typically can be adversely affected or disturbed through ground disturbing activities such as grading or trenching. However, due to a lack of ground disturbance or physical changes to infrastructure, the Project would not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical or archaeological resources or to disturb human remains. No impact to archaeological resources or human remains would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*
- b. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

The SWP is both a major producer and consumer of electricity, with 55 percent of the SWP's power provided by its own hydroelectric generation. As part of the 2023 update to the DWR Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, DWR has committed to reducing its carbon footprint by having a power portfolio consisting of 100 percent carbon-free resources by 2035 (DWR 2025e; DWR 2024b).

Under the Project, water transfers and exchanges would be implemented using existing physical facilities and in accordance with existing operational protocols and regulatory processes. The Project would not include the construction or modification of facilities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Accordingly, no direct short-term construction energy use would occur as a result of the Project. Furthermore, because no new facilities would be constructed or modified, no long-term changes in operational energy use generated by existing water transfer facilities would occur as part of the Project. Conveyance of water along existing conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of such systems. Compliance with operational parameters would ensure that water transfers would not increase the size of any conveyance and pumping capacities. The Project's environmental impacts associated with energy are similar to the environmental impacts identified by DWR within the *State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management Environmental Impact Report* (DWR 2020). Therefore, the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources and would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a.1. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*
- a.2. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?*
- a.3. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
- a.4. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?*
- b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*
- c. Would the project 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?*
- d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*
- e. Would the project 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?*
- f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in the risk of loss, injury, or death involving geologic hazards, cause substantial erosion, create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property due to expansive soils, inadequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature beyond existing conditions. No impact to geology and soils would occur.

NO IMPACT

8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*
- b. *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

With 55 percent of the SWP's power provided by its own carbon-free hydroelectric generation, the SWP has committed to reducing its carbon footprint by having a power portfolio consisting of 100 percent carbon-free resources by 2035 (DWR 2025e). DWR has implemented a *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan* that describes agency-specific greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets and strategies to achieve these goals. GHG emissions generated by operation and maintenance of the SWP include the use of electricity to convey and store water, landscaping and weed control, annual equipment and facilities inspection and maintenance, routine maintenance activities, and weir operations and maintenance. GHG reduction measures in DWR's *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan* include measures involving the implementation of construction best management practices, renewable energy procurement, carbon offsets, and carbon sequestration (DWR 2024b).

Under the Project, water transfers and exchanges would be implemented using existing physical facilities and in accordance with existing operational protocols and regulatory processes. The Project would not include the construction or modification of facilities. Accordingly, no direct short-term construction GHG emissions would occur as a result of the Project. Furthermore, no indirect operational GHG emissions associated with the generation of electricity would occur, because no new facilities would be constructed or modified and no long-term changes in operation of existing water transfer facilities would occur as part of the Project. In addition, conveyance of water along existing conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of such systems. Compliance with operational parameters would ensure that water transfers would not increase the size of any conveyance and pumping capacities. The Project's environmental impacts associated with GHG emissions are similar to the environmental impacts identified by DWR within the *State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management Environmental Impact Report* (DWR 2020). Therefore, the Project would not generate GHG emissions, either

Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Program

directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with DWR's *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan*. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. For a project located in 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*
- c. *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. The Project would be operated within the existing permitted capacities of existing water transfer facilities. Because no construction would occur, the Project would not have the potential to result in accidental releases of hazardous materials. No new facilities or capacity would need to be constructed to operate the Project because storage and conveyance facilities currently exist and are operational. Accordingly, the Project would not result in a substantial hazard associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, or emit hazardous emissions within 0.25-mile of a school. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- d. *Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material 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?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. All of the Project water deliveries would be within the capacities of existing water infrastructure. No new facilities or capacity would need to be constructed to operate the Project because storage and conveyance facilities currently exist and are operational. The Project does not include any activities that would create a significant hazard due to being located on a hazardous materials site. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

Airports are located proximate to the existing water conveyance facilities that would be utilized as part of the Project, such as the Byron Airport located two miles north of the Banks Pumping Plant, as well as numerous airports proximate to the California Aqueduct. However, the Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is

currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. All of the Project water deliveries would be within the capacities of existing water infrastructure. No new facilities or capacity would need to be constructed to operate the Project because storage and conveyance facilities currently exist and are operational. The Project does not include any activities that have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?*

Various points along existing water transfer infrastructure, such as the SWP, are located in a State Responsibility Area and/or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2025). However, the Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Project does not include any activities that would change the existing conditions of exposure of people or structures to areas subject to wildland fires. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒
(iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☐	☒
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the Project would not change stream flows or increase surface water pumping from the Delta. DWR determines total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including SWP operational and regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (i.e., Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permit, respectively) for the protection of special status species and the water quality parameters supporting such species. Because the Project would not result in changes in DWR's allocations to SWP Contractors, and because all Project water transferred from OFWD to Homer's potential water transfer partners would be subject to the same SWP operational and regulatory requirements that apply to the delivery of OFWD's SWP Water entitlement, the Project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Therefore, the Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. The Project would provide water transfer opportunities of SWP water from OFWD to Homer's potential water transfer partners to optimize management of SWP supplies. No native groundwater supplies are proposed to be transferred.

By providing supplemental surface water supplies to Homer's potential water transfer partners, the Project may reduce reliance on groundwater pumping in some service areas, particularly during dry years or periods of limited local supply. Conversely, in areas where transferred water is used to offset other sources or banked for future use, there may be temporary changes in groundwater extraction or recharge patterns. These changes would occur within the operational parameters of existing conjunctive use and groundwater banking programs and regulatory frameworks, including Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) compliance.

The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of any basin, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- c.(i) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
- c.(ii) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
- c.(iii) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would 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?*
- c.(iv) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the Project would not change stream flows or increase surface water pumping from the Delta. DWR determines total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including SWP operational and regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (i.e., Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permit, respectively) for the protection of special status species and the hydrology supporting such species. Because the Project would not increase water pumping in the Delta, it would also not alter existing drainage patterns in the Delta. Therefore, the Project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- d. *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

Due to the inland location of the SWP facilities, these facilities are not subject to tsunamis. However, existing facilities of some of Homer's potential water transfer partners located along the Central Coast, like Montecito Water District and La Cumbre Mutual Water Company facilities, may be subject to tsunami due to proximity to the Pacific Ocean. In addition, existing SWP facilities and facilities of Homer's potential water transfer partners may be subject to flood hazards and seiche risk due to their location. However, the Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Therefore, there would be no change in the risk of pollutant

release from a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche due to Project inundation, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- e. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

There are several water quality control plans and sustainable groundwater management plans that are implemented to manage water resources in areas where the existing water conveyance infrastructure to be used for the Project is located, such as the Delta-Mendota Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan, which is the Groundwater Sustainability Plan applicable to the OFWD service area (EKI Environment & Water 2024). A project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of these plans are predicated on a project's potential to result in degraded water quality or substantial groundwater reductions.

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. As described in *Threshold 10(a)* of this section, because the Project would not result in changes in DWR's allocations to SWP Contractors, the Project would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. As described in *Threshold 10(b)* of this section, the Project would provide a supplemental water supply for Homer's potential water transfer partners and equip them with more operational flexibility for managing supplies. No native groundwater supplies are proposed to be transferred; therefore, the Project would not result in groundwater use that could conflict with the Delta-Mendota Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project physically divide an established community?*
- b. *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. The Project would utilize existing water conveyance and storage facilities and would not result in land use changes. Therefore, the Project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact related to land use and planning would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project 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?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state or locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact to mineral resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*
- b. *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*
- c. *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. The Project would not require construction activities and does not include new stationary or mobile sources of noise. Therefore, the Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, or expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels. No impact related to noise would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?*
- b. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The Project does not include the construction of new homes or businesses and thus would not directly induce population growth. The Project also does not include the construction or operation of new water facilities or modifications of existing water facilities and thus would not indirectly induce population growth by removing a barrier to growth such as water supply infrastructure.

Water transferred under the Project would be used to offset existing demands and would not be used to support new, previously unplanned development. If future transfer agreements utilizing OFWD supplies will be used to support new, previously unplanned development, then additional CEQA analysis would be required.

Accordingly, the Project would not have the potential to induce substantial population growth or displace existing people or housing. Therefore, no impact to population and housing would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:				
1 Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2 Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
3 Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4 Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
5 Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a.1. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?*
- a.2. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental*
- a.3. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?*
- a.4. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, or the need for new or physically altered parks, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?*

- a.5. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of other new or physically altered public facilities, or the need for other new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. As described in Environmental Checklist Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the Project would not directly or indirectly increase population; therefore, the Project would not result in the need for new or expanded public services to meet demands for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. No impact to public services would occur.

NO IMPACT

16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?*

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?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities (including parks and recreational facilities) or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. As described in Environmental Checklist Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Accordingly, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regionals parks or require expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No impact to recreation would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*
- b. *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*
- c. *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?*
- d. *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities that would require additional vehicle trips. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Given that water would be able to be transferred via existing infrastructure, the Project would not result in changes to operations that would have the potential to induce additional vehicle trips or require additional transportation infrastructure. Therefore, the Project would not result in conflicts with programs/plans/ordinances/policies addressing the circulation system, conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), increased hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access. No impact to transportation would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?*
- b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?*

Tribal cultural resources are defined in Public Resources Section 21074(a)(1)(A-B) as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either:

Oak Flat Water District Multi-Year Water Banking and Transfer Program

- Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or
- Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Section 5020.1(k).

AB 52 establishes a formal consultation process for California Tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be adopted or certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project,” specifically with those Native American Tribes that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. If Native American Tribes wish to be notified of projects within its geographic area, the Tribe must submit a written request to the relevant lead agency (Governor’s Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation 2017).

As of September 2025, no Native American Tribes have submitted a written request to OFWD to be notified of OFWD projects. No Native American Tribes have requested consultation pursuant to AB 52. Additionally, the Project does not involve ground disturbance which could otherwise result in potential disturbance of tribal cultural resources. Therefore, no impact to tribal cultural resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The Project would not include or require the relocation or construction of water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The Project would not increase water diverted from the Delta, and water would be delivered to existing facilities through existing infrastructure. Therefore, the Project would not require or result in the construction or relocation of new or expanded utility infrastructure, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The Project would provide transfer opportunities from OFWD to Homer's potential water transfer partners to optimize management of water supplies. The Project would involve the transfer of Beltran's portion of OFWD Supplies, which Beltran will not need for the duration of the Project life. This transfer agreement would not result in changes in DWR's allocation to OFWD or other SWP Contractors, and therefore would not hinder the ability of water agencies to adequately supply water to their service areas. Furthermore, this agreement would provide Homer's potential water transfer partners within the SWP with additional options during dry years to supplement their water supply to maintain existing service reliability. Accordingly, the Project would not result in insufficient water supplies for OFWD or Homer's potential water transfer partners during normal, dry, or multiple dry years. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- c. *Would the project 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?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Because the Project would not induce growth, the Project would not result in increased wastewater generation beyond existing conditions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- d. *Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*
- e. *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. The solar facility on the Beltran property is currently operational, and the environmental effects associated with the solar facility were previously evaluated pursuant to a separate environmental document (SCH No. 2022020479) processed by the County of Stanislaus; therefore, the solar facility does not constitute new development pursuant to the Project. Because the Project would not induce growth, the Project would not result in solid waste generation beyond existing conditions. Existing solid waste generation would continue to be managed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒
a. <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>				
b. <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</i>				
c. <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</i>				

- d. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

Various points along existing water transfer infrastructure, such as the SWP, are located in a State Responsibility Area and/or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2025). However, the Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities. Therefore, the Project does not include any activities that would change the existing conditions of exposure of people or structures to areas subject to wildfire. No impact would occur. Therefore, the Project would not substantially impair adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impact to the environment, or expose people or structures to downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of post fire slope instability. No impact related to wildfire would occur.

NO IMPACT

21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a. Have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?*

As described in Environmental Checklist Section 4, *Biological Resources*, and Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, the Project would not result in impact to biological resources or cultural resources because the Project would not directly or indirectly involve construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to substantially 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, eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant or animal species,

or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- 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)?*

Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual (and potentially less than significant) project effects which, when considered together or in concert with other projects, combine to result in a significant impact within an identified geographic area. Cumulatively considerable impacts could occur if the operation of other projects occurs at the same time as a Project and in the same vicinity, such that the effects of similar impacts of multiple projects combine to expose adjacent sensitive receptors to greater levels of impact than would occur under the Project. This assessment of potential cumulative impacts considers the impacts of reasonably foreseeable future water transfer agreements between other agencies that utilize the same existing water conveyance infrastructure as the Project.

The Water Management Amendment of the State Water Contract allows SWP Contractors to transfer and exchange their SWP supplies, subject to certain terms and conditions. The potential environmental impacts associated with the amounts set forth for SWP supply transfer and exchange have been evaluated in the *State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management Environmental Impact Report* certified by DWR (DWR 2020). Cumulative transfer of SWP water between and among SWP Contractors would not require the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. Although cumulative transfers would allow agencies to maximize the use of SWP allocations by allowing one agency to use the supply when another does not have a need for it, these cumulative transfers would not increase the total allocations available to the SWP Contractors. Accordingly, there is little potential for cumulative transfer agreements to result in substantial cumulative impacts because cumulative transfers do not result in an overall change in the SWP system compared to existing conditions. While cumulative transfer agreements could potentially result in cumulative increases in air pollutant emissions, energy use, GHG emissions, and hazardous materials due to additional pumping requirements to convey SWP supplies to a different end use destination, the cumulative increases in air pollutant emissions, energy use, GHG emissions, and hazardous materials would be marginal compared to existing conditions (DWR 2020). Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Similar to other cumulative development scenarios, the Project would not contribute substantially to cumulative impacts because the Project would utilize existing facilities, does not involve new or modified facilities, and would not result in other physical changes to water conveyance infrastructure which could increase the potential for cumulative impacts compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

- c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Adverse effects on human beings are typically associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and wildfire. These impacts are addressed in Environmental Checklist Section 3, *Air Quality*, Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Section 13, *Noise*, and Section 20, *Wildfire*. As described therein, the Project would result in no impacts to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and wildfire. Therefore, the Project would not result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There would be no impact.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

References

Bibliography

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2025. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas. <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008> (accessed August 2025).
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2025a. SWP Facilities. <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/SWP-Facilities> (accessed July 2025).
- _____. 2025b. 2025 State Water Project Allocation. <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/State-Water-Project/Management/SWP-Water-Contractors/Files/25-05-042925.pdf> (accessed June 2025).
- _____. 2025c. State Water Project Historical Table A Allocations, Water Years 1996-2024. <https://cawaterlibrary.net/document/state-water-project-historical-table-a-allocations-water-years-1996-2024-2/> (accessed June 2025).
- _____. 2025d. Bulletin 132-24 Appendix B Data and Computations Used to Determine 2025 Water Charges. <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/State-Water-Project/Management/Bulletin-132/Bulletin-132/Files/B132-24-Appendix-B-120324.pdf> (accessed September 2025).
- _____. 2025e. Producing and Consuming Power. <https://water.ca.gov/What-We-Do/Power#:~:text=Producing%20and%20Consuming%20Power,system%2C%20to%20make%20this%20happen.> (accessed August 2025).
- _____. 2025f. Endangered Species Protection. <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/Endangered-Species-Protection> (accessed January 2025).
- _____. 2024a. The State Water Project Delivery Capability Report 2023. July 2024. https://data.cnra.ca.gov/dataset/a3bb1ddd-624b-4c3d-95e7-2aa6b3bf2b5b/resource/92356681-957a-48ee-97c4-529d25b9dbb2/download/final_dcr2023_v2.pdf (accessed August 2025).
- _____. 2024b. Climate Action Plan Phase 1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan. <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/All-Programs/Climate-Change-Program/Climate-Action-Plan/Files/Exhibit-C-CAP-Phase-1-Update-2023.pdf> (accessed January 2025).
- _____. 2020. State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments For Water Management. https://files.ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/200615-3/attachment/sSzQnWFtv6eaaX5yYI1NCcDXhjAgOZUhlPcUTVpCKrh7pSbRhfhSUaxGdf8jmEUYLma_FqQByXeWrgph0 (accessed August 2025).
- EKI Environment & Water. 2024. Delta Mendota Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. <https://deltamendota.org/final-gsp-documents/> (accessed September 2025).

Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation. 2017. Technical Advisory AB 52 and Tribal Cultural Resources in CEQA. https://lci.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/20200224-AB_52_Technical_Advisory_Feb_2020.pdf (accessed August 2025).

List of Preparers

Preparers involved in data gathering analysis, project management, and quality control are listed below.

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Jennifer Jacobus, Principal

Amanda Antonelli, Senior Environmental Planner

Ethan Knox, Environmental Planner

Monet Bernard, Environmental Planner