

Chapter 3. Summary Comparison of the Environmental Consequences

3.1.3 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 3.1-3 identifies the significant avoidable resource impacts, and Table 3.1-4 the significant unavoidable impacts, resulting from implementation of the CALFED Preferred Program Alternative. For significant avoidable impacts, measures are available to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. For significant unavoidable impacts, no feasible means have been identified to mitigate impacts to less-than-significant levels. Specific analysis of environmental impacts, their significance, and the availability and choice of specific mitigation measures will be presented in future environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA and NEPA for specific projects and actions.

3.2 SUMMARY OF GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Potential growth-inducing impacts are summarized in Table 3.2-1. Growth-inducing impacts are the ways in which the proposed project could foster, either directly or indirectly, economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment.

For the purposes of this Programmatic EIS/EIR, it was assumed that any increased water supplies or improved water supply reliability associated with the Program's alternatives will stimulate growth and remove barriers to growth. At the programmatic level, growth-inducing impacts on resources can only be described broadly. Growth-inducing impacts will be analyzed in greater detail in future CEQA/NEPA documents that are tiered from this document.

It is unlikely that any of the CALFED Program alternatives would result in substantial population or economic growth in the Delta, Bay, or Sacramento River Regions. Water supply, improved reliability, and quality would be enhanced by the implementation of the CALFED Program. In the San Joaquin River Region, improvements in water quality, supply, and reliability could allow additional agricultural land to be developed and allow a shift to higher value crops. Further, it is possible that these improvements could result in urban population and economic growth. The improvements in water supply, reliability, and quality could induce urban growth, particularly in the SWP and CVP Service Areas Outside the Central Valley. While urban areas may benefit, growth could increase adverse impacts on habitat essential to support sensitive plant and animal species found in the service areas. Although the exact location of the growth may not be possible to identify, local land use plans in those areas describe where growth will occur, and most local governments/agencies have adopted

DRAFT

DO NOT CIRCULATE

Chapter 3. Summary Comparison of the Environmental Consequences

land conservation plans that target protection of high-quality habitat and restoration of degraded habitat to help recover listed species. A discussion of these assumed growth-inducing impacts is contained in the section discussing vegetation and wildlife impacts (*see Section 6.2 in Chapter 6*). Similarly, additional discussion for other resource categories are provided in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

3.3 SUMMARY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

This section provides a resource-specific summary of the balance between the short-term uses of the project areas and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity in those areas. Short-term uses versus long-term productivity for each resource considered are summarized in Table 3.3-1.

Alternatives 2 and 3 and the Preferred Program Alternative have the potential for greater short-term impacts than Alternative 1 due to their additional conveyance and storage features. However, these alternatives also could result in greater long-term productivity than Alternative 1.

Adverse short-term impacts, primarily related to construction activities, were identified for most resources. However, overall benefits to long-term productivity generally outweigh the short-term adverse impacts.

The short-term, construction-related impacts would be minor and would cease after construction was complete. Specific resources that could be affected include surface water, groundwater, geology and soils, noise, transportation, air quality, fisheries and aquatic ecosystems, vegetation and wildlife, regional economics, agricultural resources, urban resources, recreational resources, flood control resources, cultural resources, power production and energy, public health and environmental hazards, visual resources, and environmental justice. Where possible, avoidance and mitigation measures would be implemented as a standard course of action to lesson impacts on these resources.

Long-term adverse impacts are associated with geology and soils, agricultural resources, and cultural resources. There could be many long-term benefits to these resources as well.

DRAFT
DO NOT CIRCULATE