Westside Districts State Water Project Multi-Year Transfer Agreement with Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

Draft Initial Study –Negative Declaration

prepared by

Dudley Ridge Water District
8501 Brimhall Road
Building 200, Suite 202
Bakersfield, California 93312
Contact: Morgan Campbell, Director of Regulatory Affairs

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
250 East 1st Street, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90012

February 2026

RINCON CONSULTANTS

Table of Contents

Initial Study 1
1. Project Title 1
2. Lead Agency Name and Address 1
3. Contact Person and Phone Number 1
4. Project Location 1
5. Description of Project 2
6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting 7
7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required 7

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 50
19 Utilities and Service Systems 53
20 Wildfire 56
21 Mandatory Findings of Significance 59

References 63
Bibliography 63
List of Preparers 64

Tables

Table 1 Minimum Transfer Requirements for the Proposed Project.....6

Figures

Figure 1 State Water Project Facilities 3

Initial Study

1. Project Title

Westside Districts State Water Project Multi-Year Transfer Agreement with Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

Dudley Ridge Water District (DRWD)
8501 Brimhall Road
Building 200, Suite 202
Bakersfield, California 93312

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Morgan Campbell, Director of Regulatory Affairs
661-633-9022 ext. 5

4. Project Location

The proposed Westside Districts State Water Project Multi-Year Transfer Agreement with Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (herein referred to as the "proposed Project") involves the use of the following existing facilities:

- The Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant (Banks Pumping Plant), located on the border of Contra Costa and Alameda counties, approximately four miles south of the community of Byron; and
- The California Aqueduct, which spans north to south from Banks Pumping Plant to San Bernardino County in southern California. The California Aqueduct includes several branches, including the Coastal Branch (which extends west off the main north-south route of the aqueduct in the southern portion of Kings County to facilitate water movement into northwestern Kern County as well as San Luis Obispo County and Santa Barbara County) and the West Branch (which extends off the southern terminus of main north-south route of the aqueduct at the border of Kern and Los Angeles counties to convey water to northwestern Los Angeles County). SCV Water's existing turnout facilities would be used to divert water to DRWD's existing water conveyance infrastructure for local delivery to the Westside Districts' facilities. Existing turnout facilities would also be used to divert water to Kern County Water Agency's (KCWA) to deliver water to water banks located in Kern County.
- The Las Perillas and Badger Hill Pumping Plants, located along the Coastal Branch in Kings County, approximately 10 miles south of the Interstate 5/State Route 41 interchange.
- Conveyance and storage facilities of the Westside Districts (DRWD, Belridge Water Storage District, Berrenda Mesa Water District, Lost Hills Water District, and Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District) located across various cities and unincorporated areas of Kern and Kings counties.
- The Berrenda Mesa Spreading Grounds, Pioneer Project, and Kern Water Bank water banks located in Kern County.

- The Oso Pumping Plant, located in Los Angeles County, approximately 5.6 miles northeast of the Interstate 5/State Route 138 interchange.
- Conveyance and storage facilities of SCV Water located in Santa Clarita and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.

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. Surface water flows through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta channels until it reaches the Banks Pumping Plant on the border of Contra Costa and Alameda counties. The plant transfers the water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to the California Aqueduct for subsequent distribution throughout the State of California (California Department of Water Resources [DWR] 2025a). Figure 1 shows a map of the SWP facilities.

The SWP is owned by the State of California and operated by DWR. DWR delivers water from the California Aqueduct to 29 public SWP Contractors, including Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water), DRWD, and KCWA, via the California Aqueduct. Water is delivered to SCV Water via the West Branch Aqueduct, which initiates at the Oso Pumping Plant in Los Angeles County. Water is delivered to KCWA and DRWD via the primary branch of the California Aqueduct (DWR 2025a). KCWA has long-term contracts to provide SWP supplies to 13 local water districts, known as KCWA "Member Units" (which include four of the five members of the Westside Districts), and Improvement District No. 4 in Kern County (KCWA 2025).

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" amount). Each SWP Contractor maintains a contract with DWR that specifies a maximum annual "Table A" amount, which is the maximum annual amount of water that may be requested by that Contractor to be delivered in a given year. The actual quantity of an SWP Contractor's Table A amount provided by DWR 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 amounts, the available Table A supplies are allocated proportionally among all SWP Contractors relative to each Contractors' Table A amount. Since 1996, final table A allocations have ranged from 5 percent to 100 percent (DWR 2025c).

DWR also prepares a biennial report to assist SWP Contractors and local agencies that receive water from SWP Contractors in assessing the near-term and long-term availability of SWP supplies. DWR issued its most recent update, the 2023 Delivery Capability Report, in July 2024. The 2023 Delivery Capability Report shows that, under current conditions, the average delivery of Table A supplies to SWP Contractors is estimated to be approximately 53 percent of Table A amounts (DWR 2024).

Figure 1 State Water Project Facilities



Source: DWR 2025a

Westside Districts

The Westside Districts consist of DRWD, Belridge Water Storage District, Berrenda Mesa Water District, Lost Hills Water District, and Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District which collaboratively manage local water resources in the region via a Memorandum of Understanding. The Westside Districts provide water to approximately 140 customers across a service area totaling approximately 355,900 acres. Water supplied by the Westside Districts consists of imported surface water and local groundwater supplies and is provided primarily to agricultural end-users in Kern and Kings County. The Westside Districts jointly organize efforts to obtain surface water supplies for their collective service area to supplement SWP supplies. Of the five agencies included in the Westside Districts, only DRWD is a SWP Contractor and has a maximum annual Table A amount of 41,350 acre-feet. The four other agencies included in the Westside Districts contract with KCWA to purchase a portion of KCWA's SWP Table A surface water amount. In addition, the Westside Districts rely on a series of single-year and multi-year transfer agreements to obtain additional surface water supplies to meet existing customer demand. In any given year, the Westside Districts seek an additional 40,000 to 100,000 acre-feet of water supplies.

SWP supplies are delivered to the Westside District via a series of 39 turnouts located along the California Aqueduct and along the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (specifically for Berrenda Mesa Water District). These turnouts are operated by DWR.

SCV Water

SCV Water serves as a regional water wholesaler agency for the City of Santa Clarita and surrounding unincorporated areas of Castaic and Stevenson Ranch within Los Angeles County. SCV Water was formed in 2018 in accordance with Senate Bill 634, which combined the Newhall Water District, Santa Clarita Water Division, Valencia Water Division, and Castaic Lake Water Agency. Water supplied by SCV Water is used for residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural, and recreational uses. SCV Water supply comes from a variety of local, regional, and state sources, including the purchase of Table A water. SCV Water is an SWP Contractor with a maximum annual Table A amount of 95,200 acre-feet (DWR 2025b). Table 7-2 through Table 7-4 of SCV Water's Urban Water Management Plan presents the projected demand of its service area compared to available water supply and indicates that, through 2050, SCV Water would maintain sufficient water supplies such that SCV Water would have surplus water supplies during normal years, single-dry years, and multiple-dry-year periods (SCV Water 2021). Accordingly, SCV Water can adequately meet the demands of its service area during periods of drought due to its existing agreements for imported supplies, including through the SWP. However, in certain years when demand is met with water supplies carried over from previous years and by other sources, such as other existing exchange agreements, groundwater, and other imported water supplies, SCV Water receives an SWP Table A allocation that exceeds its immediate needs. SCV Water utilizes partnerships with other agencies to maximize the use of these surplus imported water supplies because it is limited in the ability to store water supplies locally.

Project Description

The proposed Project involves a 59-year transfer agreement of SWP Table A supplies between SCV Water and the Westside Districts. The purpose of the agreement is twofold: 1) to increase the Westside Districts' water supply reliability by allowing these districts to offset the use of other water supplies, such as local groundwater, with Table A surface water supplies to meet the demand of

existing customers and 2) to maximize the use of SCV Water's surplus SWP supplies in a manner that considers current and future demands while benefitting its ratepayers.

The agreement would initiate in 2026 and terminate on December 31, 2085. Under the agreement, SCV Water would annually assess its water supplies and determine whether it has surplus Table A water to transfer. On or before June 1 of each year, SCV Water would provide the Westside Districts with an updated quantity of available water for that calendar year. Within ten days of receipt of SCV Water's updated quantity of available water, SCV Water and Westside Districts would finalize the quantity of water for transfer and/or exchange. The specific transfer/exchange scenarios are shown in Table 1 and detailed below:

- **Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts:** In the event the annual Table A allocation for SCV Water is greater than 60 percent, SCV Water would be obligated to transfer a minimum amount of water to the Westside Districts, as shown in Table 1.
- **SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts:** In the event the annual Table A allocations for SCV Water falls between 35 and 65 percent of SCV Water's Table A amount, SCV Water may choose to exchange Table A water with the Westside Districts at a 2:1 ratio, meaning that for every two acre-feet of water transferred to the Westside Districts by SCV Water, one acre-foot would be set aside into SCV Water's exchange balance account.[1]
- **Westside Districts Return Water to SCV Water:** Once there is an exchange balance available, SCV Water may request the Westside Districts return water in the event the annual Table A allocation for SCV Water is between 20 to 35 percent of SCV Water's Table A amount. Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies, or, if necessary, from recovered or pump-in water. If the SCV Water exchange balance account reaches 20,000 acre-feet or more, SCV Water would have the option to either 1) transfer the minimum quantity set forth in Table 1 to the Westside Districts or 2) opt out of executing a transfer in these years and negotiate for the Westside Districts to purchase a portion of the exchange balance owed to SCV Water.
- **Westside Districts Negotiated Return Water to SCV Water:** If the annual Table A allocation for SCV Water is 15 percent or lower, SCV Water may request the Westside Districts return water from its exchange balance account, but the specific amount of water would be negotiated at the time.

[1] The exchange balance account represents a paper account of SCV Water's exchange balance, which the Westside Districts would track. The exchange balance account does not entail the use of any physical infrastructure or water banking facilities.

Table 1 Minimum Transfer Requirements for the Proposed Project

SWP Allocation Percentage	Minimum Transfer (Acre-Feet)[1]	Type of Transfer
100	10,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
95	10,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
90	10,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
85	7,500	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
80	7,500	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
75	5,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
70	5,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts
65	3,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts / SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
60	3,000	Mandatory SCV Water Transfer to Westside Districts / SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
55	2,000	SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
50	2,000	SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
45	2,000	SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
40	2,000	SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts
35	1,000	SCV Water Voluntary 2:1 Exchange with Westside Districts / Westside Districts Return Water to SCV Water
30	1,000	Westside Districts Return Water to SCV Water
25	1,000	Westside Districts Return Water to SCV Water
20	1,000	Westside Districts Return Water to SCV Water
15	--	Westside Districts Negotiated Return Water to SCV Water
10	--	Westside Districts Negotiated Return Water to SCV Water
5	--	Westside Districts Negotiated Return Water to SCV Water

[1] Volumes to be negotiated every five years.

The transfer of Table A supplies would take place at the Banks Pumping Plant. In years in which water is transferred from SCV Water to the Westside Districts, water would travel via the California Aqueduct and DRWD and KCWA facilities to reach the Westside Districts' service areas. The Westside Districts would then convey water to end-users or would store surplus water underground within either the Berrenda Mesa Spreading Grounds, Pioneer Project, or Kern Water Bank, which are existing water storage banks located in Kern County. If the stored water is needed by the Westside Districts to meet water demand within its service area, the stored water would be extracted within the operational limits of these facilities, established by separate agreements and covered by approved California Environmental Quality Act documents. In years in which water is transferred from the Westside Districts to SCV Water, water would travel via the California Aqueduct to reach SCV Water's service areas.

No physical infrastructure upgrades would be required to implement this transfer agreement because the facilities (i.e., Banks Pumping Plant; California Aqueduct; Las Perillas, Badger Hill, and Oso Pumping Plants; KCWA's, Westside Districts', and SCV Water's infrastructure; water banks) currently exist and are in regular use for delivery of SWP supplies to the Westside Districts and SCV Water.

6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Specific land uses at and surrounding the existing facilities that would be utilized for the proposed Project are varied across Alameda, Contra Costa, Kern, Kings, and Los Angeles County and include urban and rural uses, agricultural lands, and open spaces.

7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

In addition to DRWD, the proposed Project would require approvals from Belridge Water Storage District, Berrenda Mesa Water District, Lost Hills Water District, Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water Storage District, SCV Water, KCWA, and DWR.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This proposed 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 proposed Project have been made by or agreed to by the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project is in an urbanized area, would the proposed 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. Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b. Would the proposed Project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project is in an urbanized area, would the proposed Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

d. Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed Project involves a multi-year transfer of SWP Table A supplies between SCV Water and the Westside Districts. The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities, and would not result in physical changes to water conveyance infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially affect scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, or light and glare. No impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

c. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e. Would the proposed 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 proposed 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. No changes in existing allocations to State Water Contractors would occur as a result of the project; therefore, the proposed Project would not create or contribute to water shortages that could adversely affect agricultural practices. In addition, SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate surplus SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies and obtain water supplies from other sources to meet their customer demand. As a result, the proposed Project would not affect the amount of water available for agricultural irrigation in either service area. Furthermore, under all transfer scenarios, water would be allocated to serve existing customers rather than inducing new development that could remove existing agricultural lands from production. Ultimately, the proposed Project would ensure ongoing support for existing agricultural production is maintained by increasing the reliance of water supplies that is made available for irrigation or for groundwater storage and later pumping. Accordingly, the proposed 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 impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

d. Would the proposed Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. The proposed Project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of air pollutant emissions. In addition, the conveyance of SWP water is expected to result in a neutral effect, if not a net reduction, in air pollutants associated with energy usage of SWP facilities. In years when SWP water is transferred from SCV Water to the Westside Districts, water would be delivered at earlier aqueduct turnouts, precluding the need for pumping via one or more pumping plants along the California Aqueduct (depending on the turnout[s] used) as well as pumping through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in correspondingly lower air pollutant emissions. SWP water transferred specifically to Berrenda Mesa Water District would be conveyed through the Coastal Branch Aqueduct via the Las Perrillas and Badger Hill Pumping Plants, which would likely result in similar or lower energy usage (and corresponding air pollutant emissions) than if the water had been delivered to SCV Water given that these two pumping plants have a slightly lower combined vertical pumping capacity than the Oso Pumping Plant (206 feet compared to 231 feet).

In years when the Westside Districts return water to SCV Water from the exchange balance, the transferred SWP water would be conveyed beyond the Westside Districts' service areas to SCV Water through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in increased energy usage. However, these transfers would constitute the return of a portion of SCV Water's available exchange balance accrued in years in which SCV Water had surplus SWP supplies, meaning that air pollutant emissions associated with the conveyance of SWP water under this scenario would have occurred anyway under existing conditions if SCV Water had instead accepted and conveyed its full SWP Table A allocation to its service area in those years when it had surplus SWP supplies.

While the transfer of SCV Water's SWP water to the Westside Districts may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA and the Westside Districts as these districts convey additional water supplies, the conveyance of water along existing KCWA conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of the KCWA conveyance system, including KCWA's maximum pumping capacity. As the proposed project would not require additional conveyance facilities, air pollutant emissions associated with pumping project water through KCWA conveyance facilities would not exceed the maximum potential air pollutant emissions that could be generated by KCWA's conveyance system working at full capacity. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an air quality plan, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase criteria air pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposed 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?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project does not involve any construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. In addition, the proposed Project would not change stream flows or increase surface water pumping from the Sacramento-San Joaquin 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 2025d).

Because the proposed Project would not result in changes in DWR's allocations to SWP Contractors and all water transferred between SCV Water and the Westside Districts would be subject to all of the same regulatory requirements that apply to the delivery of each entity's individual SWP supplies, the proposed Project would not result in impacts to these special status species. Therefore, the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project does not involve construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. In addition, the proposed Project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no impacts on riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, wildlife movement, and native wildlife nursey sites beyond existing conditions.

NO IMPACT

e. Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project would not involve construction or ground-disturbing activities or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with local policies and ordinance protecting biological resources or the provisions of existing and adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved conservation plans. No impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

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

NO IMPACT

b. Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c. Would the proposed 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, the proposed Project would not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources or to disturb human remains because no ground disturbance is involved. Therefore, no impacts 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 proposed Project:				
a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during proposed Project construction or operation?	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	■	☐

a. Would the proposed Project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during proposed Project construction or operation?

b. Would the proposed Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The proposed Project would not increase water delivered by the SWP, and implementation of the proposed Project would not include the construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Under existing conditions, water is delivered to SCV Water via the West Branch Aqueduct, which initiates at the Oso Pumping Plant in Los Angeles County. Water is delivered to DRWD and KCWA via the primary branch of the California Aqueduct and along the Coastal Branch Aqueduct (specifically for Berrenda Mesa Water District) (DWR 2025a). The proposed Project is anticipated to result in a neutral effect, if not a net reduction, in the energy usage of SWP facilities because Table A SWP water transferred between SCV Water and the Westside Districts would largely be conveyed passively via the California Aqueduct. In years when SWP water is transferred from SCV Water to the Westside Districts, water would be delivered at earlier aqueduct turnouts, precluding the need for pumping via one or more pumping plants along the California Aqueduct (depending on the turnout[s] used) as well as pumping through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in correspondingly lower energy usage. SWP water transferred specifically to Berrenda Mesa Water District would be conveyed through the Coastal Branch Aqueduct via the Las Perrillas and Badger Hill Pumping Plants, which would likely result in similar or lower energy usage than if the water had been delivered to SCV Water given that these two pumping plants have a slightly lower combined vertical pumping capacity than the Oso Pumping Plant (206 feet compared to 231 feet).

In years when the Westside Districts return water to SCV Water from the exchange balance, the transferred SWP water would be conveyed beyond the Westside Districts' service areas to SCV Water through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in increased energy usage. However, these transfers would constitute the return of a portion of SCV Water's available exchange balance accrued in years in which SCV Water had surplus SWP supplies, meaning energy usage associated with the conveyance of SWP water under this scenario would have occurred

anyway under existing conditions if SCV Water had instead accepted and conveyed its full SWP Table A allocation to its service area in those years when it had surplus SWP supplies.

While the transfer of SCV Water's SWP water to the Westside Districts may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA, the conveyance of water along existing KCWA conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of the KCWA conveyance system, including KCWA's maximum pumping capacity. As the proposed project would not require additional conveyance facilities, energy use associated with pumping project water through KCWA conveyance facilities would not exceed the maximum energy use that could be generated by KCWA's conveyance system working at full capacity. Therefore, the proposed 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. Impacts to energy would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

b. Would the proposed Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c. Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b. Would the proposed 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). The DWR has implemented a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction Plan that describes agency-specific 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 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).

The proposed Project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of GHG emissions. As described in Section 6, *Energy*, the proposed Project is anticipated to result in similar or decreased energy usage at SWP facilities for pumping SWP water supplies, depending on the direction of transfer, and therefore is likely to result in similar or reduced GHG emissions as compared to existing conditions. While the transfer of SCV Water's Table A SWP water to the Westside Districts may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA and the Westside Districts, the conveyance of water along existing KCWA conveyance facilities would be required to comply with operational parameters of the KCWA conveyance system, including KCWA's maximum pumping capacity. As the proposed project would not require additional conveyance facilities, GHG emissions associated with pumping project water through KCWA conveyance facilities would not exceed the maximum potential GHG emissions that could be generated by KCWA's conveyance system working at full capacity. Therefore, the proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with DWR's GHG Emissions Reduction Plan. Impacts to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposed 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, 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 proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b. Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities or changes in SWP operation. The proposed Project is likely to result in a neutral effect, if not a net reduction, in hazardous material usage (i.e., fuel) at SWP facilities and pumping stations. In years when SWP water is transferred from SCV Water to the Westside Districts, water would be delivered at earlier aqueduct turnouts, precluding the need for pumping via one or more pumping plants along the California Aqueduct (depending on the turnout[s] used) as well as pumping through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in correspondingly lower hazardous materials use. SWP water transferred specifically to Berrenda Mesa Water District would be conveyed through the Coastal Branch Aqueduct via the Las Perrillas and Badger Hill Pumping Plants, which would likely result in similar or lower pumping (and correspondingly lower hazardous materials use) than if the water had been delivered to SCV Water given that these two pumping plants have a slightly lower combined vertical pumping capacity than the Oso Pumping Plant (206 feet compared to 231 feet).

In years when the Westside Districts return water to SCV Water from the exchange balance, the transferred SWP water would be conveyed beyond the Westside Districts' service areas to SCV Water through the West Branch Aqueduct via the Oso Pumping Plant, resulting in increased energy usage. However, these transfers would constitute the return of a portion of SCV Water's available exchange balance accrued in years in which SCV Water had surplus SWP supplies, meaning that hazardous materials use associated with the conveyance of SWP water under this scenario would have occurred anyway under existing conditions if SCV Water had instead accepted and conveyed its full SWP Table A allocation to its service area in those years when it had surplus SWP supplies.

While the transfer of SCV Water's Table A water to the Westside Districts may result in a slight increase in the use of hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, solvents) used for maintenance of KCWA's and Westside Districts' pumping facilities, the use of these materials would carried out in accordance with regular maintenance activities at KCWA facilities and would not result in the potential to create a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, these impacts would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

d. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities or changes in SWP operation and therefore would not create a significant hazard due to being located on a hazardous materials site. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

e. For a proposed 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 proposed Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the proposed 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 proposed Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities or changes in SWP operation. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airports for people residing or working in the proposed Project area. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

f. Would the proposed Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities or changes in SWP operation. Therefore, the proposed Project would not 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 proposed Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Some of the existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the proposed Project 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 proposed Project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities or changes in SWP operation. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in an increase of people or structures within or proximate to areas subject to wildland fires as compared to existing conditions. 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. Would the proposed Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the proposed Project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. The 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 proposed Project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the proposed Project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Therefore, the proposed 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 proposed Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the proposed Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in any increases in impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposed Project would provide multi-year interagency transfer opportunities between SCV Water and the Westside Districts to optimize management of SWP supplies. No native groundwater supplies are proposed to be transferred. SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate surplus SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies and obtain water supplies from other sources to meet their customer demand. As a result, the proposed Project would not require increased groundwater pumping in years when SWP supplies are transferred.

By providing supplemental surface water supplies to the Westside Districts, the proposed Project may reduce reliance on groundwater pumping in some portions of the individual districts' service areas, particularly during dry years or periods of limited local supply. In years when SCV Water exercises a voluntary 2:1 exchange, surplus water would be kept within underground storage banks which would assist with groundwater recharge. In years when SCV Water requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies rather than from groundwater sources. Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the proposed Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

c.(i) Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the proposed Project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. The 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 proposed Project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the proposed Project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Therefore, the proposed 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 proposed Project risk release of pollutants due to proposed Project inundation?

Due to the inland location of existing SWP, SCV Water, KCWA, and Westside Districts facilities, these facilities are not subject to tsunamis. Existing SWP, SCV Water, KCWA, and Westside Districts facilities may be subject to flood hazards, and seiche risk due to their locations. However, the proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As described in Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the proposed Project could result in an increase in the use of hazardous materials for increased conveyance pumping and associated maintenance of existing facilities. However, the increase in use of hazardous materials would be minimal compared to existing conditions, and the proposed Project would not change the hazardous materials storage conditions within existing facilities. Therefore, there would be no change in the risk of pollutant release from a flood, tsunami, or seiche due to Project inundation as compared to existing conditions, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

e. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project is located. 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 proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As described in Threshold 10(a) of this section, because the proposed Project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the proposed Project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. As described in Threshold 10(b) of this section, SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate surplus SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water exercises a voluntary 2:1 exchange, surplus water would be kept within underground storage banks which would assist with groundwater recharge. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies rather than from groundwater sources. As a result, the proposed Project would not require increased groundwater pumping in years when supplies are transferred. Accordingly, the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project physically divide an established community?

b. Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project would utilize existing water conveyance facilities and would not result in land use changes. Under all transfer scenarios, water would be allocated to serve existing customers rather than inducing new development that could change existing land use patterns. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project would utilize existing water conveyance facilities and would not require new or modified facilities or ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts 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 proposed Project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project expose people residing or working in the proposed Project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. Would the proposed Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b. Would the proposed Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c. For a proposed 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 proposed Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

The proposed 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 proposed Project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of noise and does not require construction activities. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed Project does not include the construction of new homes or businesses and thus would not induce population growth. The proposed Project also does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. Under all transfer scenarios, water would be allocated to serve existing customers rather than inducing new development that could result in unplanned population growth. As SWP Table A allocations fluctuate annually, the proposed Project is intended to provide Westside Districts and SCV Water flexibility in managing their own water supplies to serve their existing service area when SWP Table A allocations are low. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not have the potential to displace existing people or housing. Therefore, no impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

a.3. Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As described in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly increase population; therefore, the proposed 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.

In addition, SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate surplus SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies and obtain water supplies from other sources to meet their customer demand. As a result, the proposed Project would not affect the amount of water available for fire protection uses in either service area. As a result, the proposed Project would not affect the amount of water available for use by fire protection services in either service area. No impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities (including parks and recreational facilities) or modifications of existing facilities. As described in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth.

In addition, SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies and obtain water supplies from other sources to meet their customer demand. As a result, the proposed Project would not affect the amount of water available for recreational uses in either service area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

b. Would the proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

c. Would the proposed 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 proposed Project result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed 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 proposed Project would not result in changes to operational activities at DWR, SCV Water, KCWA, or the Westside Districts that would have the potential to induce additional vehicle trips. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts to transportation would occur.

NO IMPACT

18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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:

- 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 2020).

As of November 2025, no Native American Tribes have submitted a written request to DRWD to be notified of DRWD projects, and no Native American Tribes have requested consultation pursuant to AB 52. In addition, the proposed Project does not involve ground disturbance which could otherwise result in potential disturbance of tribal cultural resources. Therefore, no impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed Project involves interagency SWP water transfer opportunities between SCV Water and the Westside Districts using existing facilities and would not include or require the relocation or construction of water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. As described in Section 6, *Energy*, the proposed Project is anticipated to result in similar or decreased energy usage at SWP facilities for pumping SWP water supplies, depending on the direction of transfer, and therefore is likely to extend the life of existing pumping

plants as compared to existing conditions. While the transfer of SCV Water's Table A SWP water to the Westside Districts may result in a slight increase in the use of existing KCWA and Westside District pumping facilities, this increase would not require additional water conveyance infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

The proposed Project would provide interagency water transfer opportunities between SCV Water and the Westside Districts to optimize management of SWP supplies. SCV Water would only transfer water to the Westside Districts in years when it receives at least 60 percent of its SWP Table A allocation (and therefore has a surplus of water supplies) or determines it has adequate surplus SWP supplies to conduct a voluntary exchange. In years when SCV Water receives 20 to 35 percent of its SWP Table A allocation and requests the Westside Districts return water from SCV Water's exchange balance, the Westside Districts would provide this return water from their own Table A supplies and obtain water supplies from other sources to meet their customer demand. As a result, the proposed Project would not adversely affect the ability of the Westside Districts or SCV Water to provide sufficient water supplies to their service areas in normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Furthermore, this agreement would provide the Westside Districts with an additional means of supplementing their water supply to meet the water demands of their service areas and provide SCV Water with a means of "storing" its surplus SWP supplies via the exchange balance procedure for use in dry years when SWP Table A allocations are low, thereby contributing to water supply reliability for both service areas. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not result in insufficient water supplies during normal, dry, or multiple dry years. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

c. Would the proposed Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the proposed Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Because the proposed Project would not induce growth, the proposed Project would not increase wastewater generation beyond existing conditions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

d. Would the proposed Project 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 proposed Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed Project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Because the proposed Project would not induce growth, the proposed Project would not generate solid waste 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 impacts 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 proposed 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 proposed 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. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed 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?

c. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed 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?

d. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed 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?

Some of the existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the proposed Project 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 proposed Project does not involve construction activities or changes in infrastructure operations that could create a potential fire hazard. No changes in existing allocations to State Water Contractors would occur as a result of the project; therefore, the proposed Project would not create or contribute to water shortages that could adversely affect water availability for local fire departments. Therefore, the proposed 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 impacts to the environment, or expose people or structures to downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire slope instability. No impacts related to wildfire would occur.

NO IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 Section 4, *Biological Resources*, and Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, the proposed Project would not result in impacts to biological resources or cultural resources because the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly involve construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. Therefore, the proposed 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 proposed Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a proposed 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 construction of other projects occurs at the same time as a proposed 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 proposed project. For example, if the construction of other projects in the area occurs at the same time as construction of a proposed project, potential impacts associated with noise and traffic in the proposed project area may be more substantial. In addition, this assessment of potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project considers the impacts of reasonably foreseeable future SWP water transfer agreements between other agencies that allow for maximized use of SWP allocations.

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 (DWR 2020). Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c. Does the proposed 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 Section 3, *Air Quality*, Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Section 13, *Noise*, and Section 20, *Wildfire*. As described therein, the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to air quality and hazards and hazardous materials and no impacts related to noise and wildfire. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse

effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed Project's impacts on human beings would be less than significant.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

This page intentionally left blank.

References

Bibliography

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2025. Find your Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ). https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/5065c998b4b0462f9ec3c6c226c610a9. (accessed November 2025).

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2020. State Water Project Water Supply Contract Amendments for Water Management. https://files.ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/200615-3/attachment/sSzQnWFtv6eaaX5yYI1NCcDXhjAgOZUhlPcUTVpCKrh7pSbRhfhSUaxGdf8jmEUYLma_FqQByXeWrghp0 (accessed November 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 October 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 November 2025).

_____. 2025a. SWP Facilities. https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/SWP-Facilities (accessed November 2025).

_____. 2025b. SWP Water Contractors. https://water.ca.gov/programs/state-water-project/management/swp-water-contractors (accessed October 2025).

_____. 2025c. State Water Project Historical Table A Allocations, Water Years 1996-2024. https://cawaterlibrary.net/document/state-water-project-historical-table-a-allocationswater-years-1996-2024-2/ (accessed October 2025).

_____. 2025d. Endangered Species Protection. https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/Endangered-Species-Protection (Accessed November 2025).

_____. 2025e. Producing and Consuming Power. https://water.ca.gov/What-We-Do/Power (accessed November 2025).

Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation. 2020. 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 November 2025).

Kern County Water Agency (KCWA). 2025. Agency Function. https://www.kcwa.com/agencyfunction/ (accessed October 2025).

Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency. https://www.yourscvwater.com/sites/default/files/SCVWA/SCVWA-2020-UWMP-Volume-I_FINAL.pdf (accessed October 2025).

List of Preparers

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared this IS-ND under contract to Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Water District. Persons involved in data gathering analysis, project management, and quality control are listed below.

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Jennifer Jacobus, Principal, Environmental Planning
Annaliese Torres, Supervising Environmental Planner
Ethan Knox, Environmental Planner
Brooke Baranek, Environmental Planner
Luis Apolinar, Publishing Specialist