

DRAFT
11/15/99
CALFED 2000

I. Major Decisions/Documents

- A. MOA concerning section 404 of the Clean Water Act - signed by Corps of Engineers, EPA and other CALFED agencies to describe the process that the agencies will use to grant permits for site-specific CALFED actions. In addition, the MOA sets out the process by which CALFED can establish the need for new or expanded surface storage. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Rick Soehren.
- B. Implementation Agreement for Multi-species Conservation Strategy - signed by DFG, USFWS, NMFS and other CALFED agencies to describe the programmatic benefits of the CALFED Program for endangered species. The MSCS also identifies the process by which CALFED can seek take authorization for site-specific CALFED actions. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Chris Beale.
- C. Programmatic ESA Section 7 Biological Opinion(s) in which the USFWS and NMFS will examine the programmatic effects of the CALFED program on endangered species. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Mike Fris.
- D. Dept. of Fish and Game Natural Community Conservation Plan Determination that the CALFED Program meets the criteria for an NCCP. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Chris Beale.
- E. SWRCB MOA on Clean Water Act 401 Certification Strategy. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Rick Woodard.
- F. CZMA Programmatic Consistency Determination. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Rick Breitenbach.
- G. Organizational/Governance Documents. Complete 6/00. Staff contact - Kate Hansel.
 - 1. Framework Agreement
 - 2. Federal Advisory Committee Charter
 - 3. CALFED MOU
 - 4. State-Federal Cost-sharing Agreement

H. Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA) agreement in principle –signed by Bureau, DWR and Environmental Water Account (EWA) Manager

II. **Final EIS/EIR** - complete by 2/29/00 to release 4/07/00

A. Revised EIS/EIR Impact Analysis Document. Staff contact - Rick Breitenbach.

2. Program Description
3. Alternative Descriptions
4. Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequence
5. Guide to Impact Analyses and Description of Land Use Assumptions
6. Physical Environment
 - a. Water Supply and Water Management
 - b. Bay-Delta Hydrodynamics and Riverine Hydraulics
 - c. Water Quality
 - d. Groundwater Resources
 - e. Geology and Soils
 - f. Noise
 - g. Transportation
 - h. Air Quality
6. Biological Environment
 - a. Fisheries and Aquatic Ecosystems
 - b. Vegetation and Wildlife
7. Land Use, Social Issues, and Economics
 - a. Agricultural Land and Water Use
 - b. Agricultural Economics
 - c. Agricultural Social Issues
 - d. Urban Land Use
 - e. Urban Water Supply Economics
 - f. Utilities and Public Services
 - g. Recreation Resources
 - h. Flood Control
 - i. Power Production and Energy
 - j. Regional Economics
 - k. Cultural Resources
 - l. Public Health and Environmental Hazards

- m. Visual Resources
 - n. Environmental Justice
 - o. Indian Trust Assets
 - 8. Compliance with Applicable Laws, Policies and Plans and Regulatory Framework
 - 9. Mitigation Strategies Monitoring Plan
 - 10. Public Agency Involvement
 - 11. List of Preparers
 - 12. Bibliography
 - 13. Index
 - 14. Attachment A: Information about the No Action Alternative, Modeling Assumptions for Existing Conditions, the No Action Alternative, and the Program Alternatives; and Actions that May Contribute to Cumulative Impacts.
 - 15. Attachment B: The CALFED Program Decision
- B. Summary of changes to Impact Analysis Document, Program Plans and other appendices
 - C. Response to Comments Document - includes comments on Draft EIS/EIR and responses
 - D. Eleven Revised Appendices
 - 1. Final Phase II Report. Staff contact - Rick Soehren.
 - 2. Water Management Strategy including Water Management Account. Staff contact - Mark Cowin and Ron Ott.
 - 3. Implementation Plan. Staff contact - Stein Buer.
Finance Plan.
Governance
 - 4. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. Staff contact - Dick Daniel.
Vol I: Ecological Attributes of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Watershed

Vol II: Ecological Management Zone Visions
Vol III: Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration

5. Long-Term Levee Protection Plan. Staff contact - Rob Cooke.
6. Water Quality Program Plan. Staff contact - Paul Hutton.
7. Water Use Efficiency Program Plan. Staff contact - Tom Gohring.
8. Water Transfer Program Plan. Staff contact - Greg Young.
9. Watershed Program Plan. Staff contact - John Lowrie.
10. Multi-species Conservation Strategy. Staff contact - Marti Kie.
11. Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, and Research Program. Staff contact - Leo Winternitz.

III. Record of Decision (NEPA) - signed by federal co-lead agencies - complete 6/00.
Staff contact - Mary Scoonover.

- A. Statement of Decision
- B. Alternatives considered
- C. Factors considered with respect to the alternatives, including economic and technical considerations and agency statutory missions
- D. Identify Environmentally Preferable Alternative
- E. Statement of whether all practicable means to avoid and minimize environmental harm have been adopted, of if not, why not
- F. Adoption of monitoring and enforcement program
- G. Summary of comments received on Final EIS/EIR

IV Certification of Final EIS/EIR (CEQA) - signed by Resources Agency - complete 6/00. Staff contact - Mary Scoonover.

- A. EIS/EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA
- B. EIS/EIR was considered by Secretary prior to approving project

C. EIS/EIR reflects Secretary's independent judgment and analysis

V **Findings (CEQA) - signed by Resources Agency - complete 6/00.** Staff contacts - Marian Moe and Danae Aitchison.

A. Describe potentially significant environmental effects, organized by Resource Area:

1. Water Quality
4. Fisheries
5. Vegetation and Wildlife
6. Water Supply/Management
7. Hydrodynamics/Riverine Hydraulics
8. Groundwater
9. Geology and Soils
10. Noise
11. Transportation
12. Air Quality
13. Agricultural Land and Water Use
14. Agricultural Economics
15. Agricultural Social Issues
16. Urban Land Use
17. Urban Water Supply Economics
18. Utilities and Public Services
19. Recreational Resources
20. Flood Control
21. Power Production & Energy
22. Regional Economics
23. Cultural Resources
24. Public Health
25. Visual Resources

B. For each potentially significant environmental effect, make one or more of three findings:

1. Mitigation measures have been made a part of the project which can avoid or substantially lessen impacts
2. Such mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another agency, and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that agency

3. Specific economic, technological, or other considerations make the mitigation measures infeasible
- C. For each environmental impact which remains significant and unavoidable after mitigation:
 1. Address alternatives which could lessen or avoid same impact
 2. Made a finding on the feasibility of each alternative which could lessen or avoid those impacts
 - D. Identify Environmentally Superior Alternative
 - E. Adopt Reporting and Monitoring Program
 - F. State location and custodian of documents which constitute the Record of Proceedings

VI Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA)-Signed by Resources Agency - complete 6/00. Staff contact - Mary Scoonover.

- A. Identify Significant Unavoidable Impacts
- B. Describe benefits of project and why they outweigh adverse impacts