



Water Management Program Agreement between Montecito Water District and Homer LLC

Initial Study – Negative Declaration

SCH #2024051165

prepared by

Montecito Water District

583 San Ysidro Road

Santa Barbara, California 93108

Contact: Nicholas Turner, General Manager

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

319 East Carrillo Street, Suite 105

Santa Barbara, California 93101

October 2024

Table of Contents

Initial Study	1
1. Project Title	1
2. Lead Agency Name and Address	1
3. Contact Information	1
4. Project Location	1
5. Description of Project	1
6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting	3
7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required	3
8. Have California Native American Tribes Traditionally and Culturally Affiliated with the Project Area Requested Consultation Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1?	3
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	4
Determination	4
Environmental Checklist	6
1 Aesthetics	6
2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	8
3 Air Quality	10
4 Biological Resources	11
5 Cultural Resources	14
6 Energy	15
7 Geology and Soils	16
8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	18
9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	19
10 Hydrology and Water Quality	22
11 Land Use and Planning	25
12 Mineral Resources	26
13 Noise	27
14 Population and Housing	28
15 Public Services	29
16 Recreation	31
17 Transportation	32
18 Tribal Cultural Resources	33
19 Utilities and Service Systems	35
20 Wildfire	37
21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	39
References	41
Bibliography	41
List of Preparers	42

Initial Study

1. Project Title

Water Management Program Agreement between Montecito Water District and Homer LLC

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

Montecito Water District
583 San Ysidro Road
Santa Barbara, California 93108

3. Contact Information

Nicholas Turner, General Manager
nturner@montecitowater.com

4. Project Location

The Water Management Program Agreement between Montecito Water District and Homer LLC Project (herein referred to as “project”) involves the use of the following existing facilities:

- Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant (Banks Pumping Plant), located on the border of Contra Costa County and Alameda County, approximately four miles south of the community of Byron; and
- Kern County Water Agency (KCWA) and Homer, LLC (Homer) facilities, located in various cities and unincorporated areas of Kern County.

5. Description of Project

Project Background

State Water Project

The SWP is a water system that diverts and carries water supplies from northern California to southern California via the California Aqueduct, which is owned and operated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). Approximately 66 percent of the water is utilized for residential, municipal, and industrial uses, and approximately 34 percent is used for agricultural irrigation (DWR 2024a). SWP water supplies originate in the high Sierra Nevada Mountains where runoff from precipitation and snowmelt travel through rivers and tributaries to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) (State Water Contractors 2024). SWP water flows through the Delta channels until it reaches the Banks Pumping Plant on the border of Contra Costa and Alameda counties, which transfers water from the Delta to the California Aqueduct. From there, SWP facilities deliver available water through contracts between DWR and the 29 State Water Contractors; these facilities include a network of reservoirs, pumping plants, canals, tunnels, and pipelines spanning more than 705 miles. The 29 State Water Contractors include the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and KCWA. The Central Coast Water Authority (CCWA) is the Joint

Powers Authority administrator formed to manage coastal aqueduct treatment and conveyance facilities serving water districts within Santa Barbara County on behalf of Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Water is delivered to the CCWA via the Coastal Branch Aqueduct, which initiates at the Las Perillas Pumping Plant in Kings County (DWR 2024a). KCWA has long-term contracts to provide SWP supplies to 13 local water districts and Improvement District No. 4 in Kern County (KCWA 2024). Water is delivered to KCWA via the primary branch of the California Aqueduct (DWR 2024a).

Each State Water Contractor maintains a contract with DWR that specifies the 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. CCWA has a maximum Table A allocation of 45,486 acre-feet per year (AFY) for Santa Barbara County, and KCWA has a maximum Table A allocation of 982,730 AFY. DWR makes a determination of total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including State Water Contractors’ 2023 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 rights obligations (DWR 2024b). Whenever the available supply of Table A water is less than the total of all Contractors’ requests, the available SWP water supplies are allocated proportionally among all Contractors relative to the Contractors’ Table A amounts, pursuant to Article 18 of the SWP Water Supply Contracts. Since 1996, final Table A allocations have ranged from 5 percent to 100 percent, with final Table A allocations set at 5 percent in 2021 and 2022, 100 percent in 2023, and 40 percent in 2024 (DWR 2024c).

Montecito Water District

MWD is an independent special district that provides potable water to the communities of Montecito and Summerland. Water supplied by MWD is used for residential, commercial, institutional, agricultural, and recreational uses. MWD water supplies come from a variety of local, regional, and state sources, including purchasing SWP water through the CCWA. The CCWA allots 3,300 AFY of SWP water supplies to MWD; historically, an average of 1,947 AFY has been provided due to fluctuations in water availability. MWD stores the majority of its SWP supplies in San Luis Reservoir prior to conveyance to Lake Cachuma. If San Luis Reservoir is at full capacity and spills, MWD’s remaining SWP water from previous years’ allocations is lost. To minimize the amount of SWP water supplies lost from carryover, MWD stores some water in the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank in Kern County, which is a long-term groundwater storage system that returns stored water to the California Aqueduct for use by its partners in dry years. The operators of the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank return the stored water for use by participating entities either by exchanging its entitlement or by reversing the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank intake facility (Semitropic Groundwater Banking Water Storage District 2024). Because the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank is located south of the Coastal Branch Aqueduct, which conveys SWP water to the Central Coast region, MWD receives stored water via entitlement exchanges. Water deposited in the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank is subject to a 10 percent loss upon withdrawal (MWD 2021).

Tables 5-2 through 5-4 of MWD’s Urban Water Management Plan presents the projected demand of its service area compared to available water supply and indicates that during normal years and single critically dry years, MWD anticipates being able to meet water demand through 2040 with excess water supplies available. However, during a period of multiple dry years, MWD would need to impose water shortage restrictions to meet demands (MWD 2021). In general, MWD’s long-term capacity to store excess water supplies available in normal and single critically dry years is

constrained by the available storage capacity of the San Luis Reservoir, Lake Cachuma, and the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank.

Homer, LLC

Homer is a private agricultural company and operates as the land and water division of Los Angeles-based Renewable Resources Group. Homer receives SWP deliveries from KCWA and maintains a portfolio of water supplies and groundwater basin storage capacity that it uses to manage water resources for agricultural operations.

Project Description

The project involves a five-year transfer agreement of SWP supplies between MWD and Homer. Under the agreement, MWD would annually assess its water supplies and determine whether it has surplus SWP water to transfer. If MWD determines it has surplus water, Homer would be obligated to purchase the surplus SWP water at a predetermined unit price. The transfer would take place at the SWP Banks Pumping Plant. The transfer agreement would not change the maximum annual Table A allocations of CCWA or KCWA or MWD's maximum allocation of SWP supplies from CCWA. As such, the project would not require additional water supplies to be diverted from the Delta.

No physical infrastructure upgrades would be required to implement the transfer agreement because the surface and groundwater facilities (i.e., the Banks Pumping Plant) and Homer facilities currently exist and are in regular use for delivery of SWP supplies via KCWA.

6. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Specific land uses at and surrounding the existing facilities that would be utilized for the project are varied across Kern, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties, and include urban and rural uses, agricultural lands, and open spaces.

7. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

In addition to MWD, the project would require the approval of KCWA, Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and DWR.

8. Have California Native American Tribes Traditionally and Culturally Affiliated with the Project Area Requested Consultation Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1?

On October 4, 2024, MWD distributed Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation letters for the project, including project information, map, and contact information, to Native American tribes locally and culturally affiliated with the project area. As of October 15, 2024, no consultation requests have been received. The 30-day response window concludes on November 4, 2024. Environmental Checklist Section 18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, of the Environmental Checklist provides further information regarding the tribal consultation process.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

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

Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



 Signature

October 16, 2024

 Date

Nicholas Turner

 Printed Name

General Manager

 Title

Environmental Checklist

1 Aesthetics

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

- a. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*
- b. *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*
- c. *Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*
- d. *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

The project involves a multi-year transfer of SWP water supplies from MWD to Homer. The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities, and no physical changes to the environment would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, the

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

2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

☐☐☐☒

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

☐☐☐☒

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

☐☐☐☒

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☐☒

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☐☒

a. *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

b. *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*

c. *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?*

d. *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

- e. *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. No changes in existing allocations to State Water Contractors would occur as a result of the project; therefore, the project would not create or contribute to water shortages that could adversely affect agricultural practices. MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when surplus water is available, and as a result, the project would not affect the amount of water available for agricultural irrigation in MWD's service area. Accordingly, the project would not have the potential to result in the loss of Farmland or forest land; conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract; conflict with zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or involve changes in the environment that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No impacts to agriculture and forest resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

- a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b. *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*
- c. *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*
- d. *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. The project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of air pollutant emissions. In addition, the conveyance of SWP water to Homer rather than MWD is anticipated to result in a net decrease in air pollutants associated with energy usage of SWP facilities because SWP water transferred from MWD to Homer would be conveyed passively to KCWA via the California Aqueduct rather than being pumped to CCWA through the Coastal Branch via the Las Perillas Pumping Plant and to MWD's service area via four subsequent pumping plants. While the transfer of MWD's SWP water to Homer may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA, associated air pollutant emissions would be marginal and would not have the potential to result in substantial release of air pollutants or other adverse effects associated with air quality. Therefore, the 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 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 project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

The project does not involve any construction, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal. In addition, the project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. 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 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 2024d). Because the project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the project would not result in impacts to these special status species. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service beyond existing conditions, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*
- c. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*
- d. *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

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

NO IMPACT

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

Although there are multiple jurisdictions and adopted conservation plans that overlap the locations of existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the project, the project would not involve construction or ground-disturbing activities or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. Therefore, the project would not conflict with local policies and ordinance protecting biological resources or the provisions of adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

NO IMPACT

5 Cultural Resources

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

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

The project does not include any ground-disturbing activities or other physical changes to the environment. The full extent of the California Aqueduct has been previously determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion A/1 for “representing a comprehensively planned and publicly sanctioned water conveyance public works project that facilitated development throughout the state” and Criterion C/3 for “introducing design innovations to water conveyance infrastructure” (ICF 2018). In addition, there is potential that some of the other existing KCWA and Homer conveyance facilities used as part of the project may be considered historical resources; however, the project would not result in alterations to any conveyance facilities or other physical infrastructure. Due to a lack of physical changes to the environment, the project would not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical or archaeological resources or to disturb human remains. No impacts to cultural resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

6 Energy

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

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

The project would not increase water delivered by the SWP, and implementation of the project would not include the construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. Under existing conditions, SWP water is moved to CCWA facilities along the central coast of California through the Coastal Branch of the SWP system, which requires water to pass through five pumping plants as it travels east from its convergence with the California Aqueduct in Kings County to the west into San Luis Obispo County (DWR 2024e) and ultimately to MWD's service area. The project is anticipated to result in a net decrease in the energy usage of SWP facilities because SWP water transferred from MWD to Homer would be conveyed passively to KCWA via the California Aqueduct rather than being pumped to CCWA through the Coastal Branch via the Las Perillas Pumping Plant and to MWD's service area via four subsequent pumping plants. While the transfer of MWD's SWP water to Homer may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA, associated energy use would be marginal and would not have the potential to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources and would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. 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 project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a.1. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*
- a.2. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?*
- a.3. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
- a.4. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?*
- b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*
- c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?*
- d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*
- e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*
- f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities or other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project would not result in the risk of loss, injury, or death involving geologic hazards, cause substantial erosion, create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property due to expansive soils, inadequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature beyond existing conditions. No 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 project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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 weir operations and maintenance (DWR 2024f). The project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of GHG emissions. As described in Environmental Checklist Section 6, *Energy*, the project is anticipated to result in decreased energy usage at SWP facilities for pumping SWP water supplies and therefore is likely to result in a net decrease in GHG emissions. While the transfer of MWD's SWP water to Homer may result in a slight increase in conveyance pumping for KCWA, associated GHG emissions would be marginal. Therefore, the 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 project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. For a project located in an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities, changes in SWP operation, or other physical changes to the environment. The project is likely to result in a net decrease in hazardous material usage (i.e., fuel) at SWP facilities and pumping stations because SWP water transferred from MWD to Homer would instead be conveyed passively to KCWA via the California Aqueduct. While the transfer of MWD's SWP water to Homer may result in a slight increase in the use of hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, solvents) used for maintenance of KCWA pumping facilities, the use of these materials would be marginal 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 project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

The project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities, changes in SWP operation, or other physical changes to the environment 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 project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

Airports are located proximate to the existing water conveyance facilities that would be utilized as part of the project, such as the Byron Airport located two miles north of the Banks Pumping Plant, as well as numerous airports proximate to the California Aqueduct. However, the project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities, changes in SWP operation, or other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

The project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities, changes in SWP operation, or other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project would not result in physical changes to the environment that have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

Some of the existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the project are located in a State Responsibility Area and/or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2024). However, the project does not involve any construction or alterations to existing facilities, changes in SWP operation, or other physical changes to the environment.

Therefore, the project would not result in an increase of people or structures within or proximate to areas subject to wildland fires. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

10 Hydrology and Water Quality

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

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. DWR determines total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including SWP operational and regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (i.e., Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permit, respectively) for the protection of special status species and the water quality parameters supporting such species. Because the project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Therefore, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The project would provide a one-way water transfer opportunity from MWD to Homer to optimize management of SWP supplies. MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when SWP water is determined surplus to MWD's needs, and as a result, the project would not require MWD to increase groundwater pumping in years when SWP supplies are transferred to Homer. Therefore, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- c.(i) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
- c.(ii) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
- c.(iii) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

c.(iv) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, the project would not change stream flows, increase surface water pumping from the Delta, or otherwise result in a change in the physical environment. DWR determines total available SWP supplies on an annual basis based on several factors, including SWP operational and regulatory requirements under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (i.e., Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permit, respectively) for the protection of special status species and the hydrology supporting such species. Because the project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in the Delta. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

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

NO IMPACT

e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

There are several water quality control plans and sustainable groundwater management plans that are implemented to manage water resources in areas where the existing water conveyance infrastructure to be used for the project is located. A project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of these plans are predicated on a project's potential to result in degraded water quality or substantial groundwater reductions. The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities. As described in Threshold 10(a) of this section, because the project would not result in changes in DWR's Table A allocations to State Water Contractors, the project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. As described in Threshold 10(b) of this section, MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when SWP water is surplus to MWD's needs, and as a result, the project would not require MWD to increase groundwater pumping in years when SWP supplies are transferred to Homer. Accordingly, the project would not have the potential to conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

11 Land Use and Planning

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

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not include any ground-disturbing activities or other physical changes to the environment. The project would utilize existing water conveyance facilities and would not result in land use changes or other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impacts to land use and planning would occur.

NO IMPACT

12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

☐	☐	☐	☒
☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- b. *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?*

The project would utilize existing water conveyance facilities and would not require new or modified facilities or result in other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state or locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impacts to mineral resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

- a. *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*
- b. *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*
- c. *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. The project does not include new stationary or mobile sources of noise and does not require construction activities. Therefore, the project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, or expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts to noise would occur.

NO IMPACT

14 Population and Housing

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

- a. *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*
- b. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project does not include the construction of new homes or businesses or other physical changes to the environment and thus would not induce population growth. The project also does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. Accordingly, the project would not have the potential to displace existing people or housing. Therefore, no impacts to population and housing would occur.

NO IMPACT

15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
1 Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2 Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
3 Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4 Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
5 Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. As described in Environmental Checklist Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the project would not directly or indirectly increase population; therefore, the project would not result in the need for new or expanded public services to meet demands for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. In addition, MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when SWP water is determined to be surplus to MWD's needs, and as a result, the project would not affect the amount of water available for use by fire protection services in MWD's 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 project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

b. *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities (including parks and recreational facilities) or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. As described in Environmental Checklist Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. In addition, MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when SWP water is determined surplus to MWD's needs, and as a result, the project would not affect the amount of water available for recreational uses in MWD's service area. Therefore, the 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 to recreation would occur.

NO IMPACT

17 Transportation

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

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. The project would not result in changes to operational activities at KCWA, DWR, and Homer that would have the potential to induce additional vehicle trips. Therefore, the project would not result in conflicts with programs/plans/ordinances/policies addressing the circulation system, conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), increased hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access. No 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 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.	☐	☐	☐	☒

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. Consultation begins with a written notification that must

include a brief description of the project, the project location, the CEQA lead agency contact information, and notification that the California Native American Tribe has 30 days to request consultation. Upon receipt of a written response from a California Native American Tribe requesting consultation, the CEQA lead agency and the California Native American Tribe requesting consultation shall begin the AB 52 process.

MWD circulated AB 52 consultation letters for the project to the following Native American tribes on October 4, 2024:

- Barbareño Band of Mission Indians
- Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
- Chumash Council of Bakersfield
- Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
- Northern Chumash Tribal Council
- Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

Chairperson Gabriel Frausto of the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation responded via email on October 4, 2024 indicating they do not have any tribal cultural resources concerns. Environmental Resource Specialist Ernest R. Houston of the Northern Chumash Tribal Council responded via email on October 9, 2024 indicating they would defer to tribal groups located within MWD's service area. As of October 15, 2024, no consultation requests have been received. The 30-day response window concludes on November 4, 2024.

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

The project does not involve ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or other alterations of the physical environment. As described above, the Tribes contacted by MWD as part of the AB 52 consultation process can request consultation through November 4, 2024. As of October 15, 2024, no tribal cultural resources qualifying for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or determined significant by MWD have been identified as being adversely impacted by the project. Therefore, no impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur.

NO IMPACT

19 Utilities and Service Systems

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

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

The project involves a one-way transfer opportunity from MWD to Homer using existing facilities and would not include or require the relocation or construction of water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. In years in which water is transferred from MWD to Homer, the project would decrease pumping demand at the Las Perillas Pumping Plant and four other pumping plants located on the Coastal Branch, thereby extending the life of these facilities. While the transfer of MWD's SWP water to Homer may result in a slight increase in the use of existing KCWA pumping facilities, this increase would be marginal and

would not require additional water conveyance infrastructure. Therefore, the 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. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The project would provide a one-way water transfer opportunity from MWD to Homer to optimize management of SWP supplies. MWD would only transfer water to Homer in years when SWP water is determined surplus to MWD's needs, and as a result, the project would not require MWD to utilize water required to serve its service area in years when SWP supplies are transferred to Homer. Accordingly, the project would not result in insufficient water supplies for MWD or Homer during normal, dry, or multiple dry years. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Because the project would not induce growth, the project would not result in increased wastewater generation beyond existing conditions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

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

The project does not include the construction or operation of new facilities or modifications of existing facilities and would not result in physical changes to the environment. Because the project would not induce growth, the project would not result in solid waste generation beyond existing conditions. Existing solid waste generation would continue to be managed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations. Therefore, no 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 project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒
a. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
b. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
c. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				

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

Some of the existing facilities that would be utilized as part of the project are located in a State Responsibility Area and/or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2024). However, the project does not involve construction activities, changes in infrastructure operations, or other physical changes to the environment that could create a potential fire hazard. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair adopted emergency response or evacuation plans, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing 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

21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than - Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

- a. *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

As described in Environmental Checklist Section 4, *Biological Resources*, and Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, the project would not result in impacts to biological resources or cultural resources because the project would not directly or indirectly involve construction, ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or other physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range

of rare or endangered plant or animal species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. No impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

- b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual (and potentially less than significant) project effects which, when considered together or in concert with other projects, combine to result in a significant impact within an identified geographic area. Cumulatively considerable impacts could occur if the 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 project area may be more substantial. In addition, this assessment of potential cumulative impacts associated with the project considers the impacts of reasonably foreseeable future SWP water transfer agreements between other agencies that allow for maximized use of SWP allocations. Such transfer agreements could result in cumulative impacts associated primarily with air pollution emissions, energy use, GHG emissions, and hazardous materials use that could increase if additional pumping is required to convey SWP supplies to a different end use destination. However, as discussed throughout this IS-ND, there is little to no potential for the project to contribute to cumulative impacts because it would utilize existing facilities, does not involve new or modified facilities, and would not result in other physical changes to the environment. The potential increase in air pollutant emissions, energy use, GHG emissions, and hazardous materials use that could occur at KCWA facilities during transfer of MWD’s SWP water to Homer would be marginal. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

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

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

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

References

Bibliography

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas. <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008> (accessed October 2024).
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2024a. State Water Project. <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project> (accessed September 2024).
- _____. 2024b. Notice to State Water Project Contractors. https://ccwa.specialdistrict.org/files/9feebb0bd/NTC_24-04_SWP_2024Alloc_40%25_20240423.pdf (accessed September 2024).
- _____. 2024c. State Water Project Historical Table A Allocations. <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/State-Water-Project/Management/SWP-Water-Contractors/Files/Historical-SWP-allocations-1996---2024-w-NOD-tables-062924.pdf> (accessed October 2024).
- _____. 2024d. Endangered Species Protection. <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/Endangered-Species-Protection> (accessed October 2024).
- _____. 2024e. Power, Pumping-Generating, and Pumping Plants. <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project> (accessed September 2024).
- _____. 2024f. 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 September 2024).
- ICF. 2024. Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Sand Hill Wind Repowering Project. https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/landuseprojects/documents/App_C_SH_CultRes.pdf (accessed October 2024).
- Kern County Water Agency (KCWA). 2024. Agency Function. <https://www.kcwa.com/agencyfunction/> (accessed October 2024).
- Montecito Water District (MWD). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. <https://montecitowater.com/doc/7475/> (accessed September 2024).
- Semitropic Groundwater Banking Water Storage District. 2024. Groundwater Banking. <http://www.semitropic.com/GroundwaterBanking.htm> (accessed October 2024).
- State Water Contractors. 2024. The State Water Project Frequently Asked Questions. <https://www.acwd.org/DocumentCenter/View/3072/SWP-FAQ-011323> (accessed October 2024).

List of Preparers

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

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Jennifer Haddow, PhD, Principal

Annaliese Torres, Senior Environmental Planner

Ethan Knox, Environmental Planner

Luis Apolinar, Publishing Specialist