

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

AQUALLIANCE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, et al.,

Defendants.

1:15-CV-754-LJO-BAM

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER RE CROSS-MOTIONS FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF Nos. 45,
48, 49, 50)**

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs,¹ various water resource management and conservation organizations, challenge Defendants’² “10-year water transfer program to move water from sellers located upstream of the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta (‘Delta’) to willing buyers south of the Delta” (the “Project”). ECF No. 16, First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) at ¶ 2. Specifically, Plaintiffs assert Reclamation’s and the Authority’s creation and approval of the Project’s Final Long-Term Water Transfers Environmental

¹ Plaintiffs are AquAlliance, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, South Delta Water Agency, Central Delta Water Agency, and Local Agencies of the North Delta.

² Defendants are U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (“Reclamation”), San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (the “Authority”) U.S. Department of the Interior (“Interior”), Sally Jewell, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Interior, and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (“FWS”). The Court collectively refers to Defendants, excluding the Authority, as “Federal Defendants.”

1 Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report³ (“FEIS/R”) violated the National Environmental
2 Policy Act (“NEPA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act
3 (“CVPIA”), Public Law 102-575⁴, and the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Cal. Pub.
4 Res. Code §§ 21000 *et seq.* Plaintiffs also assert FWS’s approval of the Project’s Final Biological
5 Opinion (“BiOp”) and Incidental Take Statement (“ITS”) violated the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”),
6 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 *et seq.* FAC at ¶ 1.

7 Before the Court are the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment. ECF Nos. 45, 48, 49, 50.
8 The parties did not request a hearing on the motions and the Court did not set one. For the following
9 reasons, the Court GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART each of the pending motions.

10 **II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

11 Reclamation manages the Central Valley Project (“CVP”) (Administrative Record (“AR”)⁵
12 25427), one of “the largest and most important water projects in the United States.” *San Luis & Delta-*
13 *Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 581, 591 (9th Cir. 2014) (“*San Luis v. Jewell*”). “The CVP
14 consists of a series of dams[;] . . . 21 reservoirs; 11 hydropower plants; and 500 miles of canals and
15 aqueducts,” *id.* at 594 (citation omitted), that deliver irrigation water to the Sacramento and San Joaquin
16 Valleys, and water to cities and industries in Sacramento, the San Joaquin Valley, and the east and south
17 San Francisco Bay Areas. AR 25427. The key purpose of the CVP is “to transfer water from the
18 Sacramento River [in Northern California] to water-deficient areas in the San Joaquin Valley and from
19 the San Joaquin River to the southern regions of the Central Valley.” *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 591
20 (citation omitted).

21 The Project “extends from Shasta County in the northern portion of the Sacramento Valley to
22 Kings County in the southern portion of the San Joaquin Valley and extends as far west as Santa Clara

23
24 ³ Under NEPA, the Project’s environmental report is referred to as an “Environmental Impact Statement,” whereas it is referred to as an “Environmental Impact Report” under CEQA.

25 ⁴ Plaintiffs subsequently abandoned their CVPIA claim. *See* ECF No. 49-1 at 48; ECF No. 51.

26 ⁵ The AR in this case was lodged in several parts. *See* ECF Nos. 38, 39, 42-43, 60, 61-62.

1 County.” AR 16700. The Project’s stated purpose “is to facilitate and approve voluntary water transfers
2 from willing sellers upstream of the Delta to water users south of the Delta and in the San Francisco Bay
3 Area” when those sales use CVP and/or State Water Project (“SWP”) infrastructure. AR 25368, 14786.

4 These transfers, which have occurred for decades (AR 25367), are proposed as a means to
5 address the “severe reduction in CVP water supplies” that occur “during dry hydrological years” in the
6 San Francisco Bay Area and the San Joaquin Valley. AR 25365, 25367. The transferred water would be
7 made available through groundwater substitution, cropland idling, crop shifting, reservoir release, and
8 conservation. AR 14786, 25375-25377. The Project would make up to 511,094 acre-feet⁶ (“AF”) of
9 water available for transfer each year through these measures, depending on hydrological conditions.
10 AR 25461. Buyers and sellers are required to submit CVP transfer proposals to Reclamation, who must
11 approve them. AR 25436; CVPIA § 3405(a)(1). Similarly, transfer proposals with State Water
12 Contractors (“SWC”) and transfers that use SWP facilities require approval by the California
13 Department of Water Resources (“DWR”). AR 25444.

14 This case concerns the FEIS/R issued by Reclamation and the Authority, and the BiOp issued by
15 FWS, which evaluate the Project’s potential environmental and species-related impacts through 2024.
16 AR 25365 (FEIS/R); AR 047711 (BiOp). The FEIS/R’s stated purpose is to “provide a streamlining tool
17 by providing a comprehensive, long-range, project-level view of the potential environment impacts
18 associated with a range of potential transfer activities over a ten-year period, to both expedite approval
19 of water transfers and to reduce participant uncertainty.” AR 27451.

20 Plaintiffs contend, and Defendants dispute, that: “(1) the FEIS/R violates NEPA, (2) the FEIS/R
21 violates CEQA, (3) the FWS’s BiOp and [ITS] are arbitrary and capricious, and (4) Reclamation
22 arbitrarily and capriciously failed to re-initiate ESA consultation for impacts to special-status aquatic
23 species” in violation of Section 7 of the ESA. ECF No. 45 at 12.

24
25 ⁶ An acre-foot of water is the volume of water required to cover one acre of surface area to the depth of one foot, or
approximately 43,560 cubic feet. *United States v. Westlands Water Dist.*, 134 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1139 n. 61 (E.D. Cal. 2001).

III. STANDARDS OF DECISION

A. NEPA

NEPA requires that federal agencies prepare “a detailed statement by the responsible official on . . . the environmental impact” of any federal actions “significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin.*, 538 F.3d 1172, 1185 (9th Cir. 2008). NEPA’s purpose is twofold: (1) to ensure that agencies carefully consider information about significant environmental impacts and (2) to guarantee relevant information is available to the public. *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989); *Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 538 F.3d at 1185. “NEPA is a procedural statute,” designed to ensure “that federal agencies take a ‘hard look’ at the environmental consequences of their proposed actions before deciding to proceed.” *Native Ecosystems Council v. Weldon*, 697 F.3d 1043, 1051 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 350-51). “Although NEPA establishes procedures by which agencies must consider the environmental impacts of their actions, it does not dictate the substantive results of agency decision making.” *Id.* (citing *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 350). “A court generally must be at its most deferential when reviewing scientific judgments and technical analyses within the agency’s expertise under NEPA.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted). The Council of Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) has promulgated regulations governing how NEPA is implemented along with specific instructions regarding the preparation of EISs. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1505.1-1508.28.

B. APA

The Administrative Procedure Act’s (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-06, standard of review applies to Plaintiffs’ NEPA and ESA claims. *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 601. The APA provides that “[a] person suffering legal wrong because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of a relevant statute, is entitled to judicial review thereof.” 5 U.S.C. § 702. Under the APA, the Court shall “hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be”:

1 (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in
2 accordance with law;

3 ***

4 (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of
5 statutory right; [and/or]

6 (D) without observance of procedure required by law[.]

7 ***

8 *Id.* § 706(A). When assessing claims pursuant to the APA, a court, reviewing only the AR, must
9 determine “whether or not as a matter of law the evidence in the administrative record permitted the
10 agency to make the decision it did.” *Sierra Club v. Mainella*, 459 F. Supp. 2d 76, 90 (D.D.C. 2006)
11 (quoting *Occidental Eng’g Co. v. INS*, 753 F.2d 766, 769 (9th Cir. 1985)). In other words, a court’s
12 “review is guided by whether the agency’s analysis is reasonable and offers sufficient detail to ensure
13 that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated.” *Protect Our Communities Found. v.*
14 *Jewell*, 825 F.3d 571, 582 (9th Cir. 2016) (citations and quotation marks omitted).

15 A reviewing court “must consider whether the decision was based on a consideration of the
16 relevant factors and whether there has been a clear error of judgment.” *Citizens to Preserve Overton*
17 *Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 416 (1971), *abrogated in part on other grounds as recognized in*
18 *Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 105 (1977). Although a court’s inquiry must be thorough, the standard
19 of review is highly deferential; the agency’s decision is “entitled to a presumption of regularity,” and a
20 court may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency. *Id.* at 415-16.

21 Courts should defer to the agency on matters within the agency’s expertise unless the agency
22 completely failed to address a factor that was essential to making an informed decision. *Nat’l Wildlife*
23 *Fed’n v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 422 F.3d 782, 798 (9th Cir. 2005). A court “may not substitute its
24 judgment for that of the agency concerning the wisdom or prudence of [the agency’s] action.” *River*
25 *Runners for Wilderness v. Martin*, 593 F.3d 1064, 1070 (9th Cir. 2010). As the Ninth Circuit explained
26 in *River Runners*:

1 In conducting an APA review, the court must determine whether the
2 agency's decision is "founded on a rational connection between the facts
3 found and the choices made . . . and whether [the agency] has committed a
4 clear error of judgment." *Ariz. Cattle Growers' Ass'n v. U.S. Fish &
Wildlife*, 273 F.3d 1229, 1243 (9th Cir. 2001). "The [agency's] action . . .
need only be a reasonable, not the best or most reasonable, decision."
Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. Burford, 871 F.2d 849, 855 (9th Cir. 1989).

5 *River Runners*, 593 F.3d at 1070. Reviewing courts must be at their "most deferential" when an agency
6 makes predictions, "within its area of special expertise, at the frontiers of science." *Baltimore Gas &
7 Elec. Co. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 462 U.S. 87, 103 (1983). In particular, an agency's "scientific
8 methodology is owed substantial deference." *Gifford Pinchot Task Force v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv.*,
9 378 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2004), *superseded on other grounds by regulation as stated in Defenders
10 of Wildlife v. Zinke*, 856 F.3d 1248, 1260 (9th Cir. 2017).

11 But "the deference accorded an agency's scientific or technical expertise is not unlimited."
12 *Brower v. Evans*, 257 F.3d 1058, 1067 (9th Cir. 2001). Deference is not owed if "the agency has
13 completely failed to address some factor consideration of which was essential to making an informed
14 decision," *id.* (internal citation and quotation omitted), and courts are not required to defer to an agency
15 conclusion that runs counter to that of other agencies or other individuals with specialized expertise in a
16 particular technical area. *See, e.g., Am. Tunaboat Ass'n v. Baldrige*, 738 F.2d 1013, 1016-17 (9th Cir.
17 1984) (agency decision under the Marine Mammal Protection Act was not supported by substantial
18 evidence because agency ignored data that was product of "many years' effort by trained research
19 personnel").

20 C. CEQA⁷

21 Much like NEPA, CEQA requires California public agencies to conduct an environmental
22 review of discretionary projects they carry out or approve, and to prepare an Environmental Impact

24 ⁷ This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' CEQA claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), which permits federal
25 courts to hear "claims that are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the
26 same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution." *Communities For A Better Env't v. Cenco Ref.
Co.*, 180 F. Supp. 2d 1062, 1088 (C.D. Cal. 2001).

1 Report (“EIR”) for any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Cal. Pub. Res.
2 Code §§ 21151, 21100, 21080. Generally, judicial review in an action to set aside an agency’s decision
3 under CEQA “shall extend only to whether there was a prejudicial abuse of discretion.” *Vineyard Area*
4 *Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova*, 40 Cal. 4th 412, 426 (2007) (citation
5 and quotation marks omitted). “Such an abuse is established if the agency has not proceeded in a manner
6 required by law or if the determination or decision is not supported by substantial evidence.” *Id.* (citation
7 and quotation marks omitted). A reviewing court “does not pass upon the correctness of the EIR’s
8 environmental conclusions, but only upon its sufficiency as an informative document.” *Laurel Heights*
9 *Improvement Ass’n v. Regents of Univ. of California*, 47 Cal. 3d 376, 392 (1988), *as modified on denial*
10 *of reh’g* (Jan. 26, 1989) (citation and quotation marks omitted).

11 [A] reviewing court must adjust its scrutiny to the nature of the alleged defect, depending on
12 whether the claim is predominantly one of improper procedure or a dispute over the facts.” *Vineyard*, 40
13 Cal. 4th at 435. The Court reviews “de novo whether the agency has employed the correct procedures,
14 scrupulously enforc[ing] all legislatively mandated CEQA requirements.” *Id.* (citation and quotation
15 marks omitted). For instance, “[w]hen an agency fails to include information mandated by CEQA in the
16 environmental analysis, the agency fails to proceed in a manner required by law.” *San Diego Citizenry*
17 *Group v. Cty. of San Diego*, 219 Cal. App. 4th 1, 12 (2013). But “where the agency includes the relevant
18 information, but the [factual] *adequacy* of the information is disputed, the question is one of substantial
19 evidence.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). “Substantial evidence” is defined as “enough relevant information
20 and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a
21 conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Whether a fair argument can be made
22 . . . is to be determined by examining the whole record before the lead agency. Argument, speculation,
23 unsubstantiated opinion or narrative [or] evidence which is clearly erroneous or inaccurate . . . does not
24 constitute substantial evidence.” *Save Our Peninsula Comm. v. Monterey Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 87
25 Cal. App. 4th 99, 116-17 (2001). “A court may not set aside an agency’s approval of an EIR on the

1 ground that an opposite conclusion would have been equally or more reasonable.” *Laurel Heights*, 47
2 Cal. 3d at 393.

3 “The determination of whether an agency has proceeded in the manner required by law is based
4 on a review of the record as a whole: Where some facts show a failure to comply, but the record as a
5 whole supports a finding of compliance, courts should find compliance based on the evidence in the
6 whole record.” *San Diego Citizenry*, 219 Cal. App. 4th at 12-13 (citation and quotation marks omitted).
7 Further, an EIR is presumed adequate under CEQA, and the party challenging the EIR bears the burden
8 of proving its inadequacy. *See Rialto Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rialto*, 208 Cal. App.
9 4th 899, 924-25 (2012). Thus, “an appellant challenging an EIR for insufficient evidence must lay out
10 the evidence favorable to the other side and show why it is lacking. Failure to do so is fatal. A reviewing
11 court will not independently review the record to make up for appellant’s failure to carry his burden.”
12 *Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine*, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1266 (2004).

13 **D. Summary Judgment**

14 The APA’s standard of review applies to Plaintiffs’ NEPA claim and ESA Section 7(a)(2)
15 challenge to the substance of the BiOp. *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 601. Because review under the
16 APA of such a claim would be limited to the AR, a slightly modified approach to summary judgment is
17 applied, whereby the Court determines “whether or not as a matter of law the evidence in the
18 administrative record permitted the agency to make the decision it did.” *Sierra Club v. Mainella*, 459 F.
19 Supp. 2d 76, 90 (D.D.C. 2006) (quoting *Occidental Eng’g Co. v. INS*, 753 F.2d 766, 769 (9th Cir.
20 1985)).

21 As a matter of law, a more traditional summary judgment burden-shifting approach could apply
22 to Plaintiffs’ Section 7(a)(2) failure to consult claim(s).⁸ However, in practice, the parties present this

24 ⁸ While some claims brought under Section 7(a)(2) would arise under the APA and therefore be limited to the AR, *see, e.g.,*
25 *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 602 (limiting review to the administrative record in challenge to substance of biological
26 opinion issued pursuant to Section 7(a)(2)), no such constraint appears to apply to Plaintiffs’ Section 7(a)(2) failure to consult
claim. *See Coal. for a Sustainable Delta v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency*, 812 F. Supp. 2d 1089, 1105 (E.D. Cal. 2011)

1 entire case as one that can be resolved on cross motions for summary judgment based upon the Court’s
2 review of the AR. *See generally* ECF No. 35 (Joint Scheduling Report); *see also* ECF No. 45 at 6.
3 Judicial review of claims brought under CEQA is also limited to the administrative record.

4 **IV. ANALYSIS**

5 The administrative record in this case is enormous—the FEIS/R alone is over 1,000 pages—and,
6 understandably, the parties’ briefs are lengthy, with dozens of issues raised under CEQA, NEPA, and
7 the ESA. While the briefs are generally cogent, they are not flawlessly organized, making the task of
8 teasing out the various threads of argument all the more difficult. The Court has spent many hundreds of
9 hours attempting to address the matters raised as thoroughly as is reasonably possible. It has no intention
10 of doing it twice.

11 **A. CEQA/NEPA Claims**

12 **1. CEQA Lead Agency**

13 For purposes of CEQA, the Authority served as the lead agency for preparation of the EIS/EIR.
14 Plaintiffs argue that the Authority was not the proper CEQA lead agency and that, instead, DWR should
15 have prepared and certified the FEIS/R. ECF No. 45 at 8-12.

16 “Under CEQA, a lead agency is responsible for determining whether an EIR is required for a
17 project. . . . The lead agency, with responsibility for the process by which the EIR is written, approved
18 and certified, plays a crucial role.” *Planning & Conservation League v. Dep’t of Water Res.*, 83 Cal.
19 App. 4th 892, 903 (2000), *as modified on denial of reh’g* (Oct. 16, 2000) (“*PCL I*”) (internal quotation
20 and citation omitted).

21
22 (“Where . . . the claim for relief is that a federal agency failed to consult under ESA § 7, there is no administrative record of a
23 consultation to limit the court’s scope of review.”); *see also Ellis v. Housenger*, No. C-13-1266 MMC, 2015 WL 3660079, at
24 *4 (N.D. Cal. June 12, 2015) (same). So, while a court reviewing such a claim would borrow the standard of review from the
25 APA because the ESA does not establish a standard of review, it would not similarly borrow the scope of review such that a
26 court could, in theory, look outside the AR to resolve a Section 7(a)(2) failure to consult claim. *Id.* Likewise, Section 9 claims
are not limited to the AR, at least in theory. *See Oregon Nat. Desert Ass’n v. Kimbell*, 593 F. Supp. 2d 1213, 1216 (D. Or.
2008). In this case, this is a distinction without a difference because no party has suggested that the Court should look beyond
the AR to decide the claims in this case.

1 The lead agency must independently participate, review, analyze and
2 discuss the alternatives in good faith. Moreover, the agency’s opinion on
3 matters within its expertise is of particular value. As the process continues,
4 the lead agency may determine an environmentally superior alternative is
5 more desirable or mitigation measures must be adopted. In sum, the lead
6 agency plays a pivotal role in defining the scope of environmental review,
7 lending its expertise in areas within its particular domain, and in ultimately
8 recommending the most environmentally sound alternative.

9 *Id.* at 904 (internal citations and quotations omitted).

10 California Public Resources Code § 21067 defines a “[l]ead agency” as “the public agency⁹
11 which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a
12 significant effect upon the environment.” In contrast, a “[r]esponsible agency” means a public agency,
13 other than the lead agency, which has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” *Id.*,
14 § 21069. “Where a project is to be carried out or approved by more than one public agency, one public
15 agency shall be responsible for preparing an EIR or negative declaration for the project. This agency
16 shall be called the lead agency.” 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15050(a).

17 By regulation, California’s Natural Resources Agency promulgated “Guidelines for
18 Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act” (“CEQA Guidelines”), set forth in Title
19 14 of the California Code of Regulations. 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000 *et seq.* Among other things, the
20 CEQA Guidelines provide criteria for identifying which agency shall act as the lead agency where two
21 or more public agencies are involved in the process. Under such circumstances, the determination of
22 which agency will be the lead agency is governed by the following criteria:

23 (a) If the project will be carried out by a public agency, that agency shall
24 be the lead agency even if the project would be located within the
25 jurisdiction of another public agency.

26 (b) If the project is to be carried out by a nongovernmental person or
entity, the lead agency shall be the public agency with the greatest
responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole.

⁹ Both the Authority and DWR are public agencies within the meaning of CEQA. Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21063 (“Public agency” includes any state agency, board, or commission, any county, city and county, city, regional agency, public district, redevelopment agency, or other political subdivision.”).

1 (1) The lead agency will normally be the agency with general
2 governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an
3 agency with a single or limited purpose such as an air pollution
4 control district or a district which will provide a public service or
5 public utility to the project.

6 ***

7 (c) Where more than one public agency equally meet the criteria in
8 subdivision (b), the agency which will act first on the project in question
9 shall be the lead agency.

10 (d) Where the provisions of subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) leave two or
11 more public agencies with a substantial claim to be the lead agency, the
12 public agencies may by agreement designate an agency as the lead agency.
13 An agreement may also provide for cooperative efforts by two or more
14 agencies by contract, joint exercise of powers, or similar devices.

15 CEQA Guidelines § 15051.

16 Plaintiffs rely on *PCL I*. In that case, the Central Coast Water Authority (“CCWA”) served as the
17 CEQA Lead Agency for a project in which “DWR and agricultural urban contractors agreed to a
18 statement of 14 principles, which came to be known as the Monterey Agreement. One of the major goals
19 of the Monterey Agreement was to increase water management flexibility, providing more tools to local
20 water agencies to maximize existing facilities.” *PCL I*, 83 Cal. App. 4th at 901 (internal citation and
21 quotation omitted). Among other things, as part of the Monterey Agreement, DWR agreed to transfer
22 control of a state-owned property in Kern County slated for use as a water bank (“Kern Water Bank”) to
23 agricultural contractors, provide for permanent sales of water among contractors, provide more
24 flexibility in using certain reservoirs for local use, and provide new rules for transportation of non-SWP
25 water to contractors and for storing water outside a contractor’s service area. *See id.* Purported
26 advantages of the Monterey Agreement to individual water contractors included increased water supply
reliability through water transfers, water banking, storage outside service areas, easier transport of non-
project water, permanent sales of water among contractors, and use of the Kern Water Bank by
agricultural and urban water contractors. *See id.*

PCL I held that CCWA was not the proper CEQA Lead Agency because “CCWA, a regional

1 water contractor, does not have principal responsibility for implementing the Monterey Agreement,
2 although it may have a substantial state in seeing it implemented.” *Id.* at 906. “By contrast, DWR, the
3 state agency charged with the statutory responsibility to build, manage, and operate the SWP, clearly
4 retains the principal responsibility to execute amended long-term contracts, to convey [certain properties
5 planned for use as water banks], and to facilitate the water transfers allowed under the Monterey
6 Agreement.” *Id.* *PCL I* concluded that DWR’s “statewide perspective and expertise,” in light of the fact
7 that “allocation of water to one part of the state has potential implications for distribution throughout the
8 system,” made DWR the “logical choice for lead agency because it has principal responsibility for
9 implementation of an agreement that substantially restructures distribution of water throughout the
10 state.” *Id.* at 907.

11 Plaintiffs cite *PCL I* in support of their assertion that the Authority “does not have principal
12 responsibility for implementing” the Project—a statewide transfer program between 28 seller agencies,
13 12 buyer agencies, [] DWR, and [Reclamation].” ECF No. 45 at 9 (citing AR 25370-72 (listing buyer
14 and seller agencies)). The Authority’s boundaries are coextensive with its 29 member water service
15 contractors within the western San Joaquin Valley and San Benito and Santa Clara counties. These
16 boundaries do not encompass any of the participating seller agencies, nor two key buyer agencies: the
17 East Bay Municipal Utility District and the Contra Costa Water District. Furthermore, the Authority’s
18 purposes and powers are restricted by law to providing benefits to its member organizations.¹⁰

19 Moreover, the FEIS/R acknowledges that the transfers “require approval from Reclamation and/or

21 ¹⁰ In support of this assertion, Plaintiffs cite their own comment letters in the AR. *See* AR 27889 (“Comment Letter NG03
22 Barbara Vlamis, Bill Jennings, Jason Flanders, AquAlliance, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Aqua Terra Aeris
23 Law Group”). This is insufficient on its own. *See Protect Lake Pleasant, LLC v. Connor*, No. CIV 07-0454-PHX-RCB, 2010
24 WL 5638735, at *40 (D. Ariz. July 30, 2010) (refusing to consider for their truth statements in comment letter within an
25 administrative record where “[t]here [wa]s nothing in that comment letter substantiating plaintiffs’ view [and] [p]laintiffs
d[id] not, for example, rely upon or cite to any maps or census figures or other pertinent figures from governmental
agencies”). However, the boundaries of the Authority’s member districts are judicially noticeable facts. *See*
http://www.sldmwa.org/OHTDocs/Maps/SLDMWA_Map.jpg (last visited May 4, 2017). Moreover, Plaintiffs’ comment
letter cites (but does not attach), the Authority’s Joint Powers Agreement as authority for the scope of the Authority’s
powers, AR 30151, and the Authority does not object to the characterization.

1 [DWR], which necessitate compliance with NEPA and CEQA.” AR 25368. It is undisputed that
2 Reclamation serves as the “action agency”—the rough equivalent of a lead agency under CEQA—for
3 purposes of NEPA compliance. *See* AR 25365. Plaintiffs insist that DWR should play a parallel role for
4 purposes of CEQA because “[f]or water conveyed through the SWP system, DWR must [] determine if
5 the transfer can be made without injuring any legal user of water and without unreasonably affecting fish
6 wildlife or other instream beneficial uses and without unreasonably affecting the overall economy or
7 environment of the county from which the water is being transferred.” AR 25444.

8 The Court does not believe *PCL I* is analogous to the present case. Among other things, the
9 Project does not involve a statewide policy document that implicates in significant ways the way DWR
10 operates and contracts with water users. The Court believes that *Center for Biological Diversity v. City*
11 *of San Bernardino*, 247 Cal. App. 4th 326 (2016), *as modified* (May 18, 2016) (“*CBD v. San*
12 *Bernardino*”), provides more relevant guidance. That case concerned an EIR for a project planned to be
13 managed by a private, nonprofit entity, the Fenner Valley Mutual Water Company, formed by a private
14 company, Cadiz, Inc., in cooperation with several public water agencies. The project had several
15 components: construction of a number of wells on land owned by Cadiz within the County of San
16 Bernardino; extraction of groundwater from those wells; export of that water via an underwater
17 conveyance pipeline for eventual delivery to the public agencies; and the potential for the public
18 agencies to send surplus surface water to the project site to be held in storage in the groundwater basin.
19 *Id.* at 333. Santa Margarita Water District (“SMWD”) served as the lead agency, with the County of San
20 Bernardino serving as a responsible agency. *Id.* at 332. The project planned for water from the project to
21 go to customers of public agencies located in Los Angeles, Orange (where SMWD is located),
22 Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. *Id.* at 333.

23 Plaintiffs in *CBD v. San Bernardino* argued that the County of San Bernardino should have been
24 the lead agency because it was “in the best position to objectively balance the benefits and risks of the
25 project, rather than the purchaser of the water.” *Id.* at 339. The court determined that because the Project

1 will be carried out, in part, by a public agency, SMWD “was properly designated as the lead agency
2 under [CEQA Guidelines § 15051(a)]” and had the “greatest responsibility for supervising the project *as*
3 *a whole*” under CEQA Guidelines § 15051. *Id.* at 340 (emphasis in original). This was despite the fact
4 that a certain percentage of the water to be transferred would be transferred from one place outside
5 SMWD’s boundaries to another place outside SMWD’s boundaries.

6 The Court finds the situation in *CBD v. San Bernardino* analogous to the present case. Although
7 some of the transfers at issue in the present case may originate and terminate in water districts outside
8 the Authority’s boundaries, the Authority has a more significant role in the overall project than does
9 DWR. The Court agrees with the Authority that it is important to remember that “[w]ater transfers are
10 voluntary actions proposed by willing buyers and sellers and are not initiated by state agencies.” ECF
11 No. 48 at 34 (citing AR 27422). DWR will not be a party involved in negotiating the transfers identified
12 in the EIS/EIR, nor will the agency be party to any of the transfer contracts. AR 27422. The Authority,
13 not DWR, has the greatest responsibility for determining the water needs of its members and in helping
14 to obtain necessary water for those needs. *See* CEQA Administrative Record (“CAR”)¹¹ 14; AR 25370-
15 71, 25430-32 “DWR will have a coordination role in the process because it will coordinate with
16 Reclamation on review of potential transfer information packages (to help ensure consistency between
17 CVP-related transfers and non-CVP-related transfers). DWR may also help facilitate transfers through
18 [SWP] facilities in some years.” AR 27422. The Court agrees with the Authority that “[t]his is not a role
19 with ‘principal responsibility’ such that DWR should be the CEQA lead agency.” ECF No. 48 at 34.
20 DWR, notably, has no responsibility over transfers that do not pass through its facilities. *See* AR 25443-
21 44, 27421-22.

22 Plaintiffs argue that while the Authority “has a duty to comply with CEQA for *its* water
23 transfers, [it] has no ‘principal responsibility’ for other entities’ water transfers in which [the Authority]

24
25 ¹¹ A portion of the administrative record concerns only the CEQA decision-making process. This portion of the record is
26 designated under a separate numbering scheme.

1 has no role at all.” ECF No. 51 at 1. This is true, but does not mean that DWR provides “greater legal,
2 policy, and technical responsibility” for the Project as a whole. As explained above, the Authority’s role
3 is somewhat more significant than DWR’s overall. That is all the law requires, particularly in light of
4 *CBD v. San Bernardino*, which demonstrates by way of example that a lead agency can still qualify as
5 such even though it has little to no control over implementation of some aspects of the project.

6 Plaintiffs make several additional arguments on the lead agency issue that merit serious
7 consideration. First, as mentioned, a lead agency is defined as having “authority to require feasible
8 changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to substantially lessen or avoid significant
9 effects on the environment.” CEQA Guidelines at § 15041. Plaintiffs argue that the Authority fails to
10 satisfy this definition because it has no authority over transfers in which it is not involved. ECF No. 51
11 at 2. More specifically, Plaintiffs emphasize that the FEIS/R relies on the mitigation measures that
12 depend upon DWR for implementation, including “WS-1” and “GW-1”,¹² which are designed to reduce
13 impacts to surface water and groundwater supplies.

14 Under WS-1, a streamflow depletion factor will be applied to transfers “to mitigate potential
15 water supply impacts from the additional groundwater pumping due to groundwater substitution
16 transfers.” AR 25526. “The streamflow depletion factor equates to a percentage of the total groundwater
17 substitution transfer that will not be credited to the transferor and is intended to offset the streamflow
18 effects of the added groundwater pumping due to transfer. *Id.* “The exact percentage of the streamflow
19 depletion factor will be assessed and determined on a regular basis by Reclamation and DWR in
20 consultation with buyers and sellers based on the best technical information available at that time.” *Id.*
21 “Reclamation and DWR require the imposition of a streamflow depletion factor because they will not
22 move transfer water if doing so will violate the no injury rule.” AR 25526-27.

23 Mitigation measure GW-1 requires monitoring of groundwater and/or surface water levels during

24
25 ¹² Presumably the “WS” in WS-1 and the “GW” in GW-1 refer to the impacts they are designed to mitigate: Water Supply
26 and Groundwater. *See* AR 25379-80.

1 transfers to, among other things, avoid potential effects to other legal users of water and mitigate
2 significant environmental effects. AR 25759. Pursuant to GW-1, potential sellers must submit well data
3 “for Reclamation and, where appropriate, DWR review, as part of the transfer approval process.” *Id.* The
4 record does support Plaintiffs’ position that the Authority has no legal mandate to ensure groundwater
5 and surface water impacts felt in other jurisdictions are fully mitigated or avoided. In contrast, DWR
6 does have some role to play in overseeing groundwater management under California’s Sustainable
7 Groundwater Management Act (“SGMA”). Under SGMA, local agencies are tasked with creating
8 Groundwater Sustainability Plans (“GSP”) that must comport with requirements set forth in SGMA. *See*
9 Cal. Water Code. §§ 10723, 10727.2. DWR oversees this process in various ways. *See* Cal. Water Code
10 § 10733.8 (DWR must review GSPs or permitted alternatives every five years, assess whether the GSP
11 complies with SGMA, and may include “recommended corrective actions to address any deficiencies”).

12 The Authority responds that “as lead agency, it adopted mitigation measures that are legally
13 feasible and may be fully enforced by Reclamation through its regulatory authority, in compliance with
14 CEQA,” ECF No. 58 at 16. Building on the CEQA Guideline definition of a lead agency as one having
15 “authority to require feasible changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to
16 substantially lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment,” CEQA Guideline § 15126.4(a)(2)
17 provides: “Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or
18 other legally-binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other
19 public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project
20 design.” Although the Court can locate no cases interpreting these Guidelines provisions in relevant
21 ways, additional guidance can be found in other, similar provisions of CEQA that require mitigation
22 measures be “fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.” Cal. Pub.
23 Res. Code § 21081.6. Interpreting this related provision, at least one California court has found that an
24 agency may adopt mitigation measures made enforceable through another agency with regulatory
25 authority over the impact being mitigated. *Citizens Opposing a Dangerous Env’t v. Cnty. of Kern*, 228

1 Cal. App. 4th 360, 383 (2014) (permitting lead agency to rely on a condition requiring compliance with
2 FAA rules and regulations). Accordingly, the Court concludes that a lead agency does not lack
3 “authority” to require feasible changes simply because it lacks ultimate enforcement authority over the
4 mitigation measure. More would be required to demonstrate a mitigation measure is unenforceable.

5 Plaintiffs also argue that reliance on the Authority as lead agency prejudiced the environmental
6 document by undermining the efficacy of these critical mitigation measures, “since key elements of each
7 mitigation measure are illegally deferred to future DWR review and approval.” ECF No. 45 at 10. This
8 is a complaint about the structure and nature of the mitigation measures. Plaintiffs would be able to raise
9 the same or similar complaint (i.e., that key elements are illegally deferred to future review) about the
10 mitigation measures even if DWR were the lead agency. The Court does not find this to be a basis for
11 finding the Authority is not the proper lead agency for this Project.

12 Finally, Plaintiffs are correct that most if not all of the Project’s potentially significant impacts to
13 water resources fall outside the boundaries of the Authority’s member districts.¹³ The Authority counters
14 by citing CEQA Guidelines section 15051(a), which provides: “If the project will be carried out by a
15 public agency, that agency shall be the lead agency even if the project would be located within the

16
17 ¹³ Plaintiffs attempt to use the fact that the project’s principal impacts will occur outside the Authority’s boundaries to
18 distinguish this case from *Planning & Conservation League v. Castaic Lake Water Agency*, 180 Cal. App. 4th 210 (2009)
19 (“*PCL I*”), as modified on denial of reh’g (Jan. 14, 2010). There, environmental plaintiffs challenged an EIR concerning a
20 water transfer from two local agencies, Kern County Water Agency and Wheeler Ridge-Maricopa Storage District, to a third
21 local agency, Castaic Lake Water Agency (“Castaic”). *Id.* at 219. Castaic acted as the lead agency for an EIR covering the
22 transfer, which was arguably “facilitated by” the Monterey Agreement that was the subject of the challenge in *PCL I*. *See id.*
at 237-39. Plaintiffs argued that DWR, not Castaic, was the appropriate lead agency to review the transfer because:
(1) Castaic lacked the relevant expertise given that the EIR relied on DWR computer models regarding SWP water supplies
to assess the impacts of the transfer and its various alternatives; and (2) DWR had superior expertise because the various
scenarios evaluated in Castaic’s EIR hinged on implementation of the Monterey Agreement, for which DWR was already
conducting an environmental review. *Id.* at 239. The court disagreed, finding that under CEQA and its Guidelines, “courts
have concluded that the public agency that shoulders primary responsibility for creating and implementing a project is the
lead agency, even though other public agencies have a role in approving or realizing it.” *Id.* Critically, “[t]he core of the
project is a local transfer of water between Castaic and Wheeler Ridge.” *Id.* at 240.

23 The Court does not find *PCL II* to be directly on point because it lacks the complication, present here, of a lead
24 agency drafting an EIR for multiple water transfers, not all of which involve the lead agency directly. However, it is worth
25 noting that, while Plaintiffs are correct that *PCL II* is distinguishable from the present case in that in *PCL II* the potential
26 impacts tended to fall within the *PCL II* lead agency’s (Castaic’s) service area, *see id.* at 240, the fact that the impacts in *PCL*
II fell within the lead agency’s boundaries does not prove the inverse: that a public agency may not serve as a lead agency if
the potential impacts will occur elsewhere. In fact, the CEQA Guidelines suggest otherwise. CEQA Guidelines section
15051, which outlines criteria for identifying the lead agency, does not mention the location of project impacts as a relevant
consideration.

1 jurisdiction of another public agency.” Here, the Authority is anticipated to be negotiating transfer
2 agreements with potential sellers on behalf of participating members. AR 27421; *see also* AR 25442-44
3 (Authority identified as a common participant in most past water transfers); AR 25370 (Authority
4 members identified as majority of potential buyers for transfers analyzed in FEIS/R). The fact that
5 potentially significant impacts of the Project lie outside the Authority’s boundaries does not render them
6 per se an improper lead agency.

7 In sum, the Authority is a proper lead agency for the Project. Plaintiffs’ motion for summary
8 judgment on this ground is DENIED and the Authority’s cross-motion GRANTED.

9 **2. CEQA Project Description**

10 Plaintiffs allege that the Project description violates CEQA because: (1) the description of the
11 timing, amount, location, and frequency of transfers are entirely uncertain; and (2) the FEIS/R’s
12 “carriage water” project component improperly conflates a mitigation measure with the project itself and
13 is completely undefined. ECF No. 45 at 12-17.¹⁴

14 Generally, “[a]n accurate, stable and finite project description is the *sine qua non* of an
15 informative and legally sufficient EIR.” *County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles*, 71 Cal. App. 3d 185, 193
16 (1977). “Only through an accurate view of the project may affected outsiders and public decision-
17 makers balance the proposal’s benefit against its environmental cost, consider mitigation measures,
18 assess the advantage of terminating the proposal . . . and weigh other alternatives in the balance.” *Id.* at
19 192-93. A project description that gives conflicting signals to decision makers and the public about the
20 nature and scope of the project is fundamentally inadequate and misleading. *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue*
21 *Center v. County of Merced*, 149 Cal. App. 4th 645, 655-656 (2007) (finding conflict in EIR for mining
22 project, where project description indicated no increases in mine production were being sought, yet also

24 ¹⁴ To the extent that Plaintiffs also suggested the project description similarly violated NEPA, Plaintiffs abandoned any such
25 argument in their Opposition/Reply, which clearly indicates all “project description” challenges arise under CEQA. *See* ECF
26 No. 51 at 4-6; ECF No. 59 at 2.

1 provided for substantial increases in mine production).

2 However, CEQA explicitly cautions courts against interpreting CEQA in a manner that imposes
3 requirements beyond those explicitly stated in the statute or in the Guidelines. Cal. Pub. Res. Code
4 § 21083.1. The CEQA Guidelines explain that “[t]he description of the project shall contain the
5 following information but should not supply extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and
6 review of the environmental impact”:

7 (a) The precise location and boundaries of the proposed project shall be
8 shown on a detailed map, preferably topographic. The location of the
project shall also appear on a regional map.

9 (b) A statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project. A clearly
10 written statement of objectives will help the lead agency develop a
11 reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR and will aid the
12 decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding
13 considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives should include
14 the underlying purpose of the project.

15 (c) A general description of the project’s technical, economic, and
16 environmental characteristics, considering the principal engineering
17 proposals if any and supporting public service facilities.

18 (d) A statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR.

19 (1) This statement shall include, to the extent that the information
20 is known to the lead agency,

21 (A) A list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR
22 in their decision-making, and

23 (B) A list of permits and other approvals required to
24 implement the project.

25 (C) A list of related environmental review and consultation
26 requirements required by federal, state, or local laws,
regulations, or policies. To the fullest extent possible, the
lead agency should integrate CEQA review with these
related environmental review and consultation
requirements.

 (2) If a public agency must make more than one decision on a
project, all its decisions subject to CEQA should be listed,
preferably in the order in which they will occur. On request, the
Office of Planning and Research will provide assistance in

1 identifying state permits for a project.

2 CEQA Guidelines § 15124 (emphasis added).

3 **a. Timing, Amount, Location, and Frequency of Transfers**

4 While the FEIS/R lists each of the entities anticipated to buy and sell transfer water, and places
5 an upper limit on the amount of water transferred, Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R omits critical details
6 about the timing, amount, location, and frequency of transfers. ECF No. 45 at 12. Plaintiffs suggest that
7 the FEIS/R is unlawful because it “lacks the necessary stable and discrete project description required
8 for a project-level review.” ECF No. 45 at 14. Under CEQA, “a program EIR is distinct from a project
9 EIR, which is prepared for a specific project and must examine in detail site-specific considerations.”
10 *Ctr. for Sierra Nevada Conservation v. County of El Dorado*, 202 Cal. App. 4th 1156, 1184 (2012).

11 Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R cannot provide “in detail site-specific considerations” because it does
12 not identify any single site-specific project, ECF No. 45 at 14, and does not set forth with any certainty
13 whether transfers would occur, nor to what use the ultimate transfer water may be put. AR 27977-27979.

14 Plaintiffs somewhat conflate two standards. As discussed above, “[a]n accurate, stable and finite
15 project description is the *sine qua non*” of every “informative and legally sufficient EIR.” *County of*
16 *Inyo*, 71 Cal. App. 3d at 193. At the same time, but not to be confused with the requirement for an
17 “accurate stable and finite project,” CEQA draws a distinction between a “program EIR” and a “project
18 EIR,” the latter being appropriate: “for a specific project and must examine in detail site-specific
19 considerations.” *Sierra Nevada Conservation*, 202 Cal. App. 4th at 1184; *see also* Guidelines § 15160
20 (explaining how the content of an EIR may be “tailored to different situations and intended uses”). The
21 level of specificity required in an EIR is determined by the nature of the project and the “rule of reason.”
22 *City of Irvine v. Cnty. of Orange*, 238 Cal. App. 4th 526, 540 (2015) (internal citation and quotation
23 omitted). When evaluating an EIR, a court should “look to the substance of the EIR, not its nominal
24 title.” *Id.* Therefore, an EIR must provide an accurate, stable and finite project description and must do
25 so at an appropriate level of detail under the circumstances.

1 “unstable and erratic” and that the plan was nothing more than a “conceptual land use map.” *Id.* at 1052.
2 The *Treasure Island* court disagreed, finding that the “EIR made an extensive effort to provide
3 meaningful information about the project, while providing for flexibility needed to respond to changing
4 conditions and unforeseen events that could possibly impact the Project’s final design.” *Id.* at 1053. The
5 EIR described permitted uses of the project area and provided detailed standards that would govern
6 development, including (through incorporation by reference) plans showing street layouts and concepts
7 for the shapes of new buildings and landscapes. *Id.* The court acknowledged, however, that, “as a matter
8 of necessity at this stage in the planning process, there are many Project features that are subject to
9 future revision, and quite likely will be the subjects of supplemental review before the final Project
10 design is implemented.” *Id.* at 1054. The court did not fault the EIR “for not providing detail that, due to
11 the nature of the Project, simply does not now exist.” *Id.* (citing CEQA § 15146 (“The degree of
12 specificity required in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying
13 activity which is described in the EIR.”).) As *Treasure Island* points out, courts need not “require[]
14 resolution of all hypothetical details prior to approval of an EIR.” *Id.*

15 Here, the FEIS/R identifies the purpose of the project: to facilitate voluntary water transfers to
16 CVP contractors to help meet shortfalls in contract amounts. AR 25368. The FEIS/R identifies potential
17 buyers and sellers, AR 25370-72, and provides the maximum potential transfer that is covered by the
18 FEIS/R for each seller, for a total maximum of 511,094 Acre Feet (“AF”). AR 25372. The service area
19 of each potential buyer is described, AR 25370-71, and the potential sellers are grouped into “area[s] of
20 analysis,” AR 25372, which the FEIS/R utilizes in its analyses. AR 25485, 25487, 25540. The FEIS/R
21 also identifies the maximum volume of water that may be transferred through the Delta in any given
22 year (up to 600,000 AF in critical years or dry years following dry or critical years). AR 25375. Finally,
23 the FEIS/R explains that the “transfer window” covered by the FEIS/R is July to September. *Id.* In
24 addition, transfer operations are described by seller geographic region. For example, potential sales from
25 willing sellers on the Sacramento River are described in detail as follows:

1 Potential sellers on the Sacramento River include Conaway Preservation
2 Group, LLC, Cranmore Farms, LLC, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
3 (ID), Pelger Mutual Water Company (MWC), Pleasant Grove-Verona
4 MWC, Reclamation District 108, Reclamation District 1004, Sycamore
5 MWC, and Te Velde Revocable Family Trust, which may provide water
made available through groundwater substitution or crop idling shifting
actions. Anderson Cottonwood ID, Eastside MWC, Natomas MWC, and
River Garden Farms plan to transfer water made available through
groundwater substitution only.

6 Potential sellers receive CVP water that is stored upstream from their
7 service areas in Shasta Reservoir, a CVP facility Releases from Shasta
8 Reservoir may be routed through or around the Shasta Power Plant to the
Sacramento River, where flows are reregulated by Keswick Dam.

9 Delta conveyance capacity would be available when conditions for
10 sensitive species are acceptable to NOAA Fisheries and USFWS, typically
11 from July through September, but groundwater substitution and cropland
12 idling crop shifting transfers would be available from April through
13 September. Storing water in Shasta Reservoir from April through June
14 would help facilitate these types of transfers; however, Shasta Reservoir
15 has a very limited capacity to store transfer water from April through June
16 because of downstream temperature requirements. Reclamation is required
17 by [State Water Resources Control Board] Water Rights Orders 90-05/91-
18 01 to meet average daily temperature requirements as far downstream as
19 practical when temperatures could affect fish. To meet requirements,
20 Reclamation must carefully manage the cold water pool in Shasta
Reservoir by releasing larger quantities of water earlier in the season;
larger flows maintain cooler temperatures for a longer distance
downstream. Reducing releases to hold transfer water in storage could
affect Reclamation's ability to meet these downstream temperature
requirements. Reclamation would only consider storing water for transfers
if it would not affect releases for temperature or if it could be "backed up"
into another reservoir (by reducing releases from that reservoir). Backing
up water may be possible if the Delta is in balanced conditions and
instream standards are met. The decision to back up transfer water would
be made on a case-by-case basis, but storage is analyzed in this EIS/EIR
so that the analysis is complete in the event Reclamation determines that
storage is possible in a specific year.

21 Because of the limitations associated with storing transfer water, crop
22 idling transfers would be more difficult to implement Cropland idling
23 cannot be started partway through the irrigation season, so the water made
24 available from April through June would bypass the pumps and become
Delta outflow if it cannot be stored. Sacramento River sellers and buyers
would generally prefer water transfer options that are more flexible, such
as starting groundwater substitution pumping when Delta pumping
capacity for transfers is available.

1 Proposed sellers divert water from various locations along the Sacramento
2 River or the Sutter Bypass. If a seller shifts from using surface water to
3 groundwater when a transfer is implemented, river flows would not
4 decrease from Shasta Reservoir to the point of diversion absent transfers.
5 River flow would then increase from the seller's usual diversion point
6 downstream to the buyer's point of diversion because water is not diverted
7 for use until it reaches the Delta.

8 If Reclamation determines that it can store water in Shasta Reservoir, the
9 flows in the Sacramento River between Shasta Reservoir and the point of
10 diversion absent transfers would decrease from April through June. Flows
11 downstream of the point of diversion would not change during this period.

12 AR 25468-69. Finally, the FEIS/R indicates that "water would be used only to help meet existing
13 demands and would not serve any new demands in the buyers' service areas." AR 14788; *see also* AR
14 26116 ("Transfers would be used to serve existing demands in the contractors' service areas.").
15 Critically, unlike in *County of Inyo*, Plaintiffs have not pointed to and the Court cannot identify any way
16 in which the project description shifts throughout FEIS/R, or any way in which the analysis evaluates a
17 project that is different than the project described.

18 Similarly, Plaintiffs argue that "without the ability to provide details as to the time, location, and
19 quantity of any actual transfer over the next 10 years, the [F]EIS/R lacks the necessary stable and
20 discrete project description required for project-level review." ECF No. 45 at 14. But, as *Treasure Island*
21 explains, it is perfectly permissible for a CEQA document to evaluate the upper end of a range of
22 impacts, while leaving undescribed some "detail that, due to the nature of the Project, simply does not
23 now exist." *Treasure Island*, 227 Cal. App. 4th at 1054. Plaintiffs' complaint would have more traction
24 if it appeared as though the FEIS/R was intended to be a project-level review. A review of the record
25 reveals, however, that it is not.

26 EPA raised concerns about the level of detail in the Draft EIS/R ("DEIS/R"), stating in its
comments:

The level of detail missing from the [DEIS/R], particularly with regard to
the specific provisions of likely transfer actions . . . , results in an EIS
document more appropriate to a programmatic analysis. Without further
details regarding these aspects of the proposed project, EPA believes the

1 [FEIS/R] will not be sufficient to support project-level decision-making.

2 AR 27456. The FEIS/R indicates that this concern was “addressed” by allowing “project-level decision-
3 making” as described in “Common Response 14,” *id.*, which in turn states, in pertinent part:

4 Implementation of the range of potential water transfers analyzed in this
5 EIS/EIR (annual and multiyear, if any) would be subject to Reclamation’s
annual review and approval.

6 Reclamation’s Potential Action is to review and approve potential transfer
7 activities, if appropriate, based on detailed review of the specific proposed
8 transfer. Reclamation is not soliciting potential buyers or sellers for
9 transfers. The potential buyers and sellers listed in this document could
10 seek to transfer up to the maximum quantities analyzed in this EIS/EIR
11 using this document for NEPA and CEQA compliance, or could propose
12 other transfers outside of this range subject to appropriate environmental
13 review and compliance with any other applicable requirements. Buyers
14 and sellers must implement measures incorporated into the Proposed
15 Action to avoid or reduce potential environmental impacts to obtain
16 Reclamation approval of the transfer. Reclamation technical experts
17 review all proposed transfers prior to approval of the transfer to ensure
that impacts of the proposed transfer are within the scope of analysis in
this EIS/EIR (or require the preparation of further environmental
documentation in the event that new or substantially more severe adverse
impacts are presented by the proposed transfer). Reclamation ensures that
the identified mitigation measures are implemented through review of
monthly reports, field visits, and necessary coordination with transfer
participants. Reclamation and [the Authority] have developed a
Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan, which is included in
Appendix K of the Final EIS/EIR. The requirements of monitoring and
mitigation as they apply to each individual transfer will be included in the
transfer approval.

18 Reclamation will review each water transfer proposal with a view to the
19 proposal’s adequacy in addressing the technical information needed. To
20 fully consider the proposal, site specific conditions may require additional
21 information and considerations beyond that described in current guidance
22 (such as including the Technical Information Document for Preparing
23 Water Transfer Proposals, which is jointly prepared by DWR and
24 Reclamation). This EIS/EIR does not predetermine those needs or those
25 facts and does not foreclose the requirement and consideration of
26 additional information (or further environmental review if necessary based
on the potential for new or more severe environmental effects). The final
quantity of water, if any, to be transferred is dependent on numerous
factors, including future changes in hydrologic conditions, export capacity
available for transfer water, negotiations between buyers and sellers, and
Reclamation approval. Additional information regarding the process by
which individual transfer proposals would be presented, evaluated, and

1 potentially approved, can be found on Reclamation's website at
2 <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/watertransfer/> and DWR's website at
3 <http://www.water.ca.gov/watertransfers/proposals.cfm>.

4 AR 27451-52 (emphasis added). The Court interprets this language in the FEIS/R as an admission by its
5 authors that it does not provide specific, project-level authorization for any particular transfer. Rather,
6 each transfer will be evaluated to determine whether that transfer is consistent with the parameters of the
7 FEIS/R or whether, alternatively, site-specific conditions require additional evaluation beyond that
8 provided in the FEIS/R itself. The Court finds this to be a reasonable approach, providing an appropriate
9 level of detail under the circumstances. The FEIS/R is what it is and provides CEQA approval only for
10 what it describes and evaluates.

11 Program EIRs are designed to work this way under CEQA. "They may be used to address
12 impacts and mitigation measures that apply to the program as a whole to simplify later environmental
13 review for program activities." *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife*, 234 Cal. App.
14 4th 214, 233-34 (2015) ("*CBD v. DFW*") (citing CEQA Guidelines § 15168(d)). "They may also be used
15 to consider broad programmatic issues for related actions at an early planning stage when the agency has
16 greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts." *Id.* (citing CEQA Guidelines §
17 15168 (b)). "The degree of specificity required in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity
18 involved in the underlying activity which is described in the EIR." CEQA Guidelines § 15146.
19 "Accordingly, the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to provide sufficient information in light of what is
20 reasonably feasible." *CBD v. DFW*, 234 Cal. App. 4th 214 at 233-34.

21 Plaintiffs concede that it is "the contents, not the label, of an EIR [that is] of key concern," but
22 insist that even if the Court construes the FEIS/R as a programmatic document, it is inadequate as such
23 because it lacks necessary programmatic safeguards. ECF No. 51 at 4. The CEQA Guidelines provide
24 specific guidance for public agencies that rely on a program EIR to avoid preparing subsequent EIRs;
25 the public agency must examine site-specific program activities "in the light of the program EIR to
26 determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared." CEQA Guidelines §

1 15168(c). More specifically, “[i]f a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the
2 program EIR, a new initial study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a negative
3 declaration.” *Id.* at § 15168(c)(1). In contrast, “[i]f the agency finds that . . . no new effects could occur
4 or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within
5 the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be
6 required. *Id.* at § 15168(c)(2). In addition “[a]n agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures
7 and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.” *Id.* at §
8 15168(c)(3). Finally, “[w]here the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency
9 should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to
10 determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.” *Id.* at §
11 15168(c)(4). Plaintiffs point out that in *CBD v. DFW*, which involved the review of a program EIR
12 concerning stocking of fish in high alpine lakes and that practice’s impact on native frog species, the
13 California Department of Fish and Wildlife (“DFW”) used a protocol to “evaluate each stocking location
14 within the range of a [frog] species in a stepwise fashion to determine whether interactions between
15 stocked trout and [frog] species may occur. If the biologist determines a significant impact is likely, the
16 Department will cease stocking at that location unless and until it develops and implements an aquatic
17 biodiversity management plan for that location.” 234 Cal. App. 4th at 229. Plaintiffs suggest that the
18 *CBD v. DFW* court treated the presence of the evaluation protocol as a pre-requisite to upholding the
19 program EIR. The Court does not read *CBD v. DFW* to impose such a pre-requisite. In fact, *CBD v.*
20 *DFW* reasoned:

21 In effect, after a sufficiently comprehensive and specific program EIR has
22 been certified, CEQA allows much of the initial site-specific review to
23 occur outside a formal CEQA process and beyond public view. CEQA
24 does not require the Department to engage in a public process when it
25 determines whether the impacts from a site-specific project were
26 addressed and adequately mitigated in the program EIR.

Id. at 239. It just so happened that in *CBD v. DFW*, DFW had already developed an evaluation protocol

1 to determine, when faced with project-level decisions, whether further site-specific review was needed.
2 The evaluation protocol, the *CBD v. DFW* court concluded, was “a type of ‘written checklist or similar
3 device’” that CEQA allows a public agency to use to document site-specific impacts. *Id.* However,
4 nothing in *CBD v. DFW* or the Guidelines requires the program EIR to articulate/define such a checklist.
5 It appears permissible for the public agency to develop and apply such a checklist or similar device upon
6 approval of specific programs (in this case specific transfers).

7 The Court agrees with the Authority that the FEIS/R in this case uses the CEQA process as it
8 was intended to be used: to describe and analyze a series of individual activities having generally similar
9 impacts that can be mitigated in similar ways.

10 **b. Carriage Water**

11 The FEIS/R indicates that the preferred alternative contains several “Environmental
12 Commitments” which are designed to “avoid potential environmental impacts from water transfers.” AR
13 25478. One such environmental commitment is the use of “carriage water,” which, according to the
14 FEIS/R, “will be used to maintain water quality in the Delta.” *Id.*

15 Some background is helpful. The CVP and SWP facilities only have potential capacity to convey
16 transferred water when doing so will not interfere with CVP and SWP operations, which are, in turn,
17 subject to complex regulatory requirements. *See, e.g.*, CAR 325 (cautioning potential parties to transfer
18 agreements that transfers can only take place when export capacity is available and that project
19 operations are subject to numerous regulatory requirements); CAR 2305-06 (same). The regulatory
20 requirement most relevant here is State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”) Decision 1641
21 (“D-1641”).

22 SWRCB Decision 1641 and [the related] Water Right Order 2001-05
23 describe the current water right requirements to implement the flow-
24 dependent objectives outlined in the Bay Delta Plan. In SWRCB Decision
25 1641, the SWRCB assigned responsibilities to Reclamation and [DWR]
26 for meeting these requirements. These responsibilities require that the
[CVP] and [SWP] be operated to protect water quality and that DWR and
or Reclamation ensure that the flow dependent water quality objectives are

1 met in the Delta.

2 AR 25539.

3 More specifically, D-1641 “includes specific outflow requirements throughout the year, specific
4 export restraints in the spring, and export limits based on a percentage of estuary inflow throughout the
5 year.” *Nat. Res. Def. Council v. Kempthorne*, 506 F. Supp. 2d 322, 340 (E.D. Cal. 2007) (citing the
6 administrative record of that case). The water quality objectives in D-1641 “are designed to protect in-
7 Delta agricultural, municipal and industrial, and fishery uses and vary throughout the year and by water
8 year type D-1641 will also protect delta smelt by providing transport, habitat and attraction flows.”
9 *Id.* Under the terms of the “Agreement Between the United States of America and the State of California
10 for Coordinated Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project” (“Coordinated
11 Operations Agreement” or “COA”), transfers can only take place when Reclamation and DWR declare
12 that the Delta is in “balanced conditions.” AR 25467. “Balanced water conditions” exist when storage
13 releases plus unregulated flow equal Sacramento in-basin uses, plus exports. AR 15741; *Friant Water*
14 *Auth. v. Jewell*, 23 F. Supp. 3d 1130, 1151 (E.D. Cal. 2014) (citing COA, Art. 3(b)).

15 The FEIS/R does not explain with any precision how carriage water is calculated. Instead, the
16 mechanism by which carriage water is calculated is outlined in a generic sense as follows:

17 Carriage water (a portion of the transfer that is not diverted in the Delta
18 and becomes Delta outflow) will be used to maintain water quality in the
19 Delta. Carriage water calculations will also reflect conveyance losses as
20 the water moves from its source to the Delta export pumps and is
21 conveyed from the Delta to buyers. Carriage water is represented as a
22 percent of the transfer that does not reach the buyer, and this percent is
23 calculated during the transfer based on real-time monitoring information
24 in the Delta. Typical carriage water amounts range from 20 to 30 percent
25 for transfers from the Sacramento Valley, and about 10 percent for
26 transfers from the San Joaquin Valley

AR 25478. Put another way, carriage water is defined as “the extra water needed to carry a unit of water
across the Delta to CVP/SWP export facilities while maintaining a constant salinity.” AR 26419

This means that a certain percentage of any transferred water will be left in the Delta (to serve as

1 outflow) instead of ending up at its transfer destination, with certain other adjustments being made for
2 in-stream losses caused by the cross-Delta conveyance of transfer water. *See generally id.* However, the
3 FEIS/R acknowledged that “initial estimates for carriage water . . . must later be verified and adjusted.”
4 AR 26406. In practice, Reclamation and DWR make actual carriage water calculations based upon real-
5 time monitoring information. AR 25478, 27627, 27840. Plaintiffs are correct that no details about the
6 carriage water calculation process are provided.

7 Several things trouble Plaintiffs about the level of detail provided about the concept of carriage
8 water in the FEIS/R. First, they complain that because the FEIS/R “entirely fails to describe how
9 carriage water will be calculated . . . it is not possible to determine the water quality and supply effects
10 of the program.” ECF No. 45 at 15 (internal citations omitted). In response to similar comments on the
11 DEIS/R, the Authority added the explanation (quoted above) that “[t]ypical carriage water amounts
12 range from 20 to 30 percent for transfers from the Sacramento Valley and about 10 percent for transfers
13 from the San Joaquin Valley,” AR 25478, but without explaining how these estimates were calculated or
14 providing any detail about the carriage water calculation methodology.

15 Yet, Plaintiffs fail to point to any legal authority that suggests further detail is required.
16 According to the Guidelines, CEQA requires a “general description” of the project’s technical
17 characteristics. CEQA Guidelines § 15124. One California appellate court has described this
18 requirement as follows:

19 “General” means involving only the main features of something rather
20 than details or particulars. (Webster’s New Internat. Dict. (3d ed.1986) p.
21 944.) The “general description” requirement for the technical attributes of
22 a project is consistent with other CEQA mandates to make the EIR a user-
23 friendly document. For example, Guidelines section 15140 states that
24 EIRs must be written in plain language so that decision makers and the
25 public can rapidly understand them. The general description requirement
26 also fosters the principle that EIRs should be prepared early enough in the
planning stages of a project to enable environmental concerns to influence
the project’s design. A general description of a project element can be
provided earlier in the process than a detailed engineering plan and is
more amenable to modification to reflect environmental concerns.

1 The degree of specificity required depends on the type of project. There
2 must be sufficient information to understand the environmental impacts of
3 the proposed project. (Guidelines, § 15146, discussion.) The EIR must
4 achieve a balance between technical accuracy and public understanding.
5 (Guidelines, § 15147, discussion.)

6 *Dry Creek Citizens Coal. v. Cty. of Tulare*, 70 Cal. App. 4th 20, 27-28 (1999) (internal case citations
7 omitted). The FEIS/R provides such a general description.

8 Plaintiffs also argue that the project description is unlawful because the FEIS/R fails to explain
9 how carriage water “will maintain water quality in the Delta.” ECF No. 45 at 16. Plaintiffs contend that
10 “the administrative record is clear that water quality in the Delta frequently falls below standards
11 established to protect the beneficial uses of the delta.” *Id.* In support of this assertion, Plaintiffs cite
12 several sources. First, they cite a comment letter submitted by Doug Teeter, of the Butte County Board
13 of Supervisors. *See* AR 27527. The referenced page provides the text of one aspect of that comment
14 letter, in which Teeter, relying on DWR’s own reports, points out that an Index based on Net Delta
15 Outflow (“NDO”),¹⁵ the sum of all inflows and outflows into the Delta used by the CVP and SWP to
16 manage operations, underestimates flow during wet periods and overestimates flow during dry periods.
17 AR 27644. According to Teeter, “the over estimation of [NDO] also results in insufficient carriage water
18 being pulled out of the water transfers to maintain delta water quality and CVP/SWP operational
19 compliance with [other legal requirements].” *Id.* The FEIS/R responds to Mr. Teeter’s comment by
20 indicating that this concern with the measurement tool used to calculate outflow “is something that
21 would apply in both the baseline and the action alternatives” and that “[t]he action alternatives would
22 not affect how the measurement tool works or cause different environmental effects because of the
23 measurement tool.” AR 27645. Plaintiffs fail to explain how this response is insufficient or otherwise
24 unreasonable. Put another way, Plaintiffs have failed to explain how any problems they or others may
25 have with the way the NDO works renders the Project’s description of carriage water insufficient.

26 ¹⁵ The parties do not dispute the assertion in the FEIS/R that increases in NDO “could help Delta water quality” while
“decreases could have an adverse effect.” AR 25567.

1 Plaintiffs also cite their own comment letter on the Final EIS/R. ECF No. 45 at 16 (citing AR
2 30462). In the letter, Plaintiffs argue that the EIS/R “cannot continue to rely on D-1641 standards when
3 these standards are regularly relaxed,” and demand that the EIS/R consider how water transfers will
4 impact the environment in years when D-1641 outflow and salinity requirements are relaxed. *Id.* (citing
5 AR 30462-63); *see also* AR 27513-14 (similar comment referenced in the EIS/R pointing out that in
6 January 2014, Reclamation and DWR jointly filed a Temporary Urgency Change Petition (“TUCP”) to
7 modify D-1641 standards including the Delta Outflow Objective, and objecting that the EIS/R does not
8 evaluate impacts of water transfers on water quality during these extreme conditions). What Plaintiffs
9 appear to be arguing by citing this comment letter is that the project description’s reliance on carriage
10 water is unclear in the context of the regular relaxation of outflow and salinity requirements because it is
11 unclear whether the EIS/R’s assertion that carriage water “will maintain water quality” means water
12 quality will be maintained at the then-existing level of quality (i.e., at the level set by the then-present
13 water quality requirements, as modified by any TUCP), or whether that term is being used in some other
14 way, such as to mean the water will be used to achieve additional gains in water quality. *See* ECF No.
15 45 at 16 (questioning whether during times when water quality is relaxed “carriage water [will] maintain
16 that impaired condition . . . or will it achieve condition by making repairs”).

17 The record belies any confusion Plaintiffs may be attempting to sow. What the EIS/R means by
18 “maintaining water quality in the Delta” is relatively straightforward, at least on a conceptual level. It is
19 a mechanism for maintaining balanced conditions when exports take place. AR 15749 (“Carriage water
20 is defined as the extra water needed to carry a unit of water across the Delta to CVP/SWP export
21 facilities while maintaining a constant salinity.”). The DEIS/R explains how water quality relates to the
22 concept of balanced conditions:

23 The Delta can be in either a balanced or surplus condition. Balanced
24 conditions, as defined in COA, are those periods when DWR and
25 Reclamation agree that releases from upstream reservoirs plus unregulated
26 flow approximately equals the water needed to meet Sacramento Valley
in-basin uses plus exports. Conversely, excess or surplus conditions are

1 periods when it is agreed that releases from upstream reservoirs plus
2 unregulated flow exceed Sacramento Valley in-basin uses plus exports.
3 Sacramento Valley in-basin uses include Delta water quality.

4 AR 15741 (emphasis added). Accordingly, if Delta water quality standards are relaxed, the part of the
5 balanced water equation made up by Sacramento Valley in-basin uses would change, making it possible
6 (at least in theory) to export more water while maintaining balanced conditions. But, even if Delta water
7 quality standards are relaxed, carriage water still serves the purpose of maintaining balanced conditions
8 (i.e., to maintain salinity at whatever point the water quality standards require) whenever transfer water
9 is to be exported from the CVP/SWP export facilities. Carriage water “maintain[s] water quality in the
10 Delta” by preventing shifts in salinity that would be caused by the process of exporting transfer water.
11 While the explanation of this arrangement could have been more direct, the Court does agree that the
12 FEIS/R is unlawful because it fails to explain how carriage water “will maintain water quality in the
13 Delta.” On this ground, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is DENIED and the Authority’s cross-
14 motion is GRANTED.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

c. **Does Description of Carriage Water as an Environmental Commitment
Improperly Compress Analyses of Impacts and Mitigation Measures?**

Plaintiffs argue that the way in which carriage water is described in the project as an
“environmental commitment” improperly compresses the analysis of impacts and mitigation measures
into a single issue, in violation of a principle set forth in *Lotus v. Department of Transportation*, 223
Cal. App. 4th 645, 655-656 (2014). *Lotus* concerned an EIR issued under CEQA for a highway
construction project through old growth redwood forest. *Id.* at 647-48. The project called for the removal
of six trees; the placement of fill within the structural root zone of 41 others; and excavation within the
structural root zone of still another 58 trees. *Id.* at 649. Certain “avoidance minimization and/or
mitigation measures” were incorporated into the project to “avoid and minimize impacts as well as to
mitigate expected impacts,” including, among other things, increased invasive plant removal, ensuring
an arborist is present to monitor any ground disturbing construction activities, the use of specified

1 tools/machinery to minimize disturbance, the implementation of certain procedures whenever roots need
2 to be cut, the use of certain types of construction materials to minimize impacts to roots, and the
3 provision of watering to impacted trees for the entire summer following construction. *Id.* at 650-51.

4 Ultimately, in part because of the above-described avoidance minimization and/or mitigation measures,
5 the EIR concluded there would be no significant environmental effects caused by the project. *Id.* at 651.

6 The court found the EIR unlawful on several grounds. Primarily, the EIR failed to establish a
7 standard of significance and ignored a State Park Natural Resources Handbook that cautioned that “there
8 should be no construction activities in the Structural Root Zone of a protected tree.” *Id.* at 654-55. In
9 addition, and of particular importance to this case, the EIR was also defective because it incorporated the
10 proposed mitigation measures into its description of the project before concluding that any potential
11 impacts from the project were less than significant. *Id.* at 655-56. The “avoidance, minimization and/or
12 mitigation measures,” as they were characterized in the *Lotus* EIR, were not “part of the project,” but,
13 rather, were “mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate the damage to the redwoods
14 anticipated from disturbing the structural root zone of the trees by excavation and placement of
15 impermeable materials over the root zone.” *Id.* at 656. In this way, the EIR improperly “compress[ed]
16 the analysis of impacts and mitigation measures into a single issue,” thereby “disregard[ing] the
17 requirements of CEQA.” *Id.* *Lotus* explains that it this type of failure is dangerous because, among other
18 things, the lack of analysis and findings about the extent of impacts makes it impossible to determine if
19 the mitigation measures are sufficient:

20 The EIR fails to indicate which or even how many protected redwoods
21 will be impacted beyond the tolerances specified in the handbook and, by
22 failing to indicate any significant impacts, fails to make the necessary
23 evaluation and findings concerning the mitigation measures that are
24 proposed. Absent a determination regarding the significance of the
25 impacts to the root systems of the old growth redwood trees, it is
26 impossible to determine whether mitigation measures are required or to
evaluate whether other more effective measures than those proposed
should be considered. Should Caltrans determine that a specific tree or
group of trees will be significantly impacted by proposed roadwork, that
finding would trigger the need to consider a range of specifically targeted

1 mitigation measures, including analysis of whether the project itself could
2 be modified to lessen the impact.

3 *Id.*

4 In the present case, Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R makes a similar error by utilizing carriage
5 water as a “pseudo-project component” to avoid full analysis of potentially significant water quality
6 impacts. ECF No. 45 at 16-17. Plaintiffs characterize carriage water as “mitigation for the Project’s
7 water quality impacts,” but complain that incorporating carriage water into the project description
8 prevents a meaningful analysis of the Project’s potentially significant impacts and the effectiveness of
9 any mitigation measures proposed to address those impacts. *Id.* at 17. As the *Lotus* court explained,
10 “[t]he distinction between elements of a project and measures designed to mitigate impacts of the project
11 may not always be clear.” 223 Cal. App. 4th at 656 n.8. *Lotus* uses as an example the use of “cement
12 treated permeable base” employed to “minimize the thickness of the structural section [of roadway],
13 provide greater porosity, minimize compaction of roots, and minimize thermal exposure to roots from
14 Hot Mix Asphalt paving,” which “might well be considered to define the project itself,” explaining that
15 it “would be nonsensical to analyze the impact of using some other composition of paving and then to
16 consider use of this particular composition as a mitigation measure.” *Id.* In contrast, “the same cannot be
17 said of most of the ‘avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures’ [employed by the *Lotus* EIR],
18 such as the restorative planting and replanting, invasive plant removal, and use of an arborist and of
19 specialized equipment. These are plainly mitigation measures and not part of the project itself.” *Id.*

20 Plaintiffs argue that “[c]arriage water serves only to mitigate or avoid the project’s otherwise
21 adverse water quality and supply impacts, serving no integral function of a water transfer.” POR at 5.
22 Carriage water does have the purpose of mitigation. It is defined as “a portion of the transfer that is not
23 diverted in the Delta and becomes Delta outflow” and is used to maintain balanced Delta conditions to
24 avoid salinity intrusion. AR 25478. However, the existence of “balanced conditions” is a pre-requisite
25 for any transfers to occur under the project. In other words, the existence of balanced conditions is part

1 of “the project itself,” *Lotus*, 223 Cal. App. 4th at 656 n.8. It is logical therefore to consider the
2 deduction of carriage water to be part of the project as well. It would be “nonsensical” to eliminate
3 carriage water from the description of the Project, as this would prevent satisfaction of one of the
4 project’s pre-requisites.¹⁶

5 Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment on this issue is DENIED; the Authority’s
6 cross-motion is GRANTED. Whether or not the FEIS/R adequately evaluates Project impacts and
7 proposes sufficient mitigation measures is a separate question.

8 **3. Description of Project’s Environmental Setting**

9 **a. CEQA Challenges to Description of Project’s Environmental Setting**

10 Plaintiffs next make a series of arguments under the heading “the EIS/R failed to legally describe
11 the project’s environmental setting.” ECF No. 45 17-22.¹⁷ “[A]n EIR must delineate environmental
12 conditions prevailing absent the project, defining a ‘baseline’ against which predicted effects can be
13 described and quantified.” *Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Const. Auth.*, 57 Cal. 4th
14 439, 447 (2013) (internal citation omitted). “[T]he baseline for an agency’s primary environmental
15 analysis under CEQA must ordinarily be the actually existing physical conditions rather than
16 hypothetical conditions that could have existed under applicable permits or regulations.” *Id.* at 448
17 (internal citation omitted).

18
19 ¹⁶ In support of their argument that carriage water is not an essential element of the project itself, Plaintiffs point out,
20 correctly, that certain water transfers described in the Project may be permitted to proceed without subtracting carriage water.
21 Specifically no carriage water adjustment is required for transfers made to East Bay Municipal Utility District (“EBMUD”)
22 because “the transfer water is made available and diverted at the upstream edge of the Delta” so “it is assumed that there is no
23 change in Delta salinity associated with the transfer.” AR 26419. Therefore carriage water—“the extra water needed to carry
24 a unit of water across the Delta to the CVP/SWP export facilities while maintaining a constant salinity”—is unnecessary
25 under those circumstances. The Court is not convinced that this changes the nature of “carriage water” from a Project element
26 to a pure mitigation measure that would need to be divorced from the project description under *Lotus*. Rather, in the case of
transfers to EBMUD, the Project does not require carriage water to function.

¹⁷ As with the previous section, Plaintiffs also suggested the FEIS/R’s description of the environmental setting violated
NEPA, arguing Federal Defendants were required to supplement the DEIS/R or FEIS/R under NEPA. *See* ECF No. 45 at 18
(citing 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9 and related caselaw). Federal Defendants addressed this argument in their opposition/cross-
motion, pointing out various reasons why no supplemental EIS was required under NEPA. ECF No. 49-1 at 12 (under NEPA
“not every change to an EIS requires an agency to recirculate the document,” and re-circulation is only required where the
draft is insufficient to bring about the necessary public comments due to “significant new information or changes to the
plan”) (internal citations omitted). Plaintiff did not address the issue in the context of NEPA in its reply, so the Court treats
this NEPA issue as abandoned.

1 Plaintiffs assert that the DEIS/R omitted numerous “crucial existing environmental features.”
2 ECF No. 45 at 17. According to Plaintiffs, after circulating the Draft for public comment, the FEIS/R
3 “recogniz[ed] some, but not all, of these errors, . . . included significant revisions to its descriptions of
4 the existing environmental conditions, but failed to recirculate this significant new information for
5 public review and comment.” *Id.* The Court interprets Plaintiffs’ argument as having two parts. First,
6 Plaintiffs appear to be asserting that, despite the significant revisions, the FEIS/R nonetheless still failed
7 to describe lawfully the Project’s environmental setting. Second, Plaintiffs argue that the Authority
8 should have re-circulated the FEIS/R for public comment. Plaintiffs make separate sets of arguments in
9 connection with the FEIS/R’s description of (a) existing groundwater levels¹⁸ and (b) existing
10 groundwater contamination.

11 (1) **Description of the Existing Groundwater Levels**

12 It is somewhat difficult to tell whether Plaintiffs intend to challenge the content of the FEIS/R’s
13 description of the Project’s environmental setting in connection with groundwater levels. Plaintiffs
14 critique at length the content of the DEIS/R’s discussion of groundwater elevations and other conditions
15 related to the volume of accessible groundwater, and then concede that the FEIS/R makes “substantial
16 revisions” thereto. ECF No. 45 at 20. Plaintiffs also take care to point out that after additional
17 information was added to the DEIS/R, the document concluded that “[c]omparisons of spring
18 groundwater levels in the last decade (Spring 2004 to Spring 2014) indicate steep declines in
19 groundwater levels up to 40 feet.” AR 25627. Plaintiffs do indicate that “the picture would have been
20 bleaker still had the EIS/R disclosed groundwater conditions in the fall, rather than disclosing only
21 spring levels immediately following winter rains,” ECF No. 45 at 20 (citing AR 30459), and assert that
22 the FEIS/R omitted any evaluation of deep well data, *id.* (citing AR 27894). But, Plaintiffs do not
23 explain how these omissions of fall and deep well data render the FEIS/R’s description of existing

24
25 ¹⁸ The parties confusingly refer to groundwater levels, elevation, and/or flow generically as groundwater “conditions,” even
26 though, as a matter of logic, contamination can impact groundwater “conditions” as well.

1 environmental conditions legally inadequate. Rather, they return to the argument that the “new data
2 added to the FEIS/R, showing 10 years of declining groundwater levels in the Sacramento Valley (and
3 omitting any deep well data, AR 27894), resulting in a slew of wells running dry in 2014, show a very
4 different existing environmental condition than the resilient and ever-recharging groundwater levels the
5 [F]EIS/R describes.” ECF No. 45 at 20. It is impossible to tell whether Plaintiffs, in pointing to the
6 “resilient and ever-recharging groundwater levels the EIS/R describes,” are referring to the DEIS/R or
7 the FEIS/R. Moreover, they do not provide a citation to the FEIS/R that presents picture of “resilient and
8 ever-recharging groundwater levels.”¹⁹ In sum, Plaintiffs fail to point out with any specificity how or
9 why the description of the groundwater levels in the FEIS/R is inadequate.

10 Similarly, Plaintiffs argue, generically, that the “steep decline” in groundwater levels
11 significantly calls into question the effectiveness of mitigation measure GW-1, but fail (at least in this
12 section of their brief) to explain why this might be the case. ECF No. 45 at 20. Plaintiffs also argue that
13 the FEIS/R fails to consider a concurrent decline in surface water connected to the groundwater basins in
14 question. ECF No. 45 at 21 (citing 27813 (showing FEIS/R’s failure to address comment letter pointing
15 to data that tends to show “stream accretion generally decreases at approximately the same rate as
16 groundwater pumping increases”). But, again, Plaintiffs fail to elaborate upon this point in any way. It
17 is not the Court’s obligation to flesh out a parties’ argument. The Court is left with no choice but to
18 conclude that Plaintiffs have not met their burden to establish that the FEIS/R fails to adequately
19 describe existing environmental conditions related to groundwater levels.

20 Plaintiffs’ argument morphs into a somewhat different one in their reply, arguing, for example,
21 that “in continuing to rely on its modeled baseline for its impact analysis, the [F]EIS/R ignores the
22 dramatic depletion of groundwater levels in parts of Glenn, Colusa and Tehama County within the
23 Sacramento Valley; 135 wells in the Sacramento Valley groundwater basin were reported to have gone

24 ¹⁹ The Court’s own review of the record indicates that the FEIS/R attempts to provide a fairly balanced view of the
25 groundwater situation. *See* AR 25625-27 (description of groundwater production, levels, and storage in Sacramento Valley
26 Groundwater Basin); *see also* AR 27428 (explaining how recent hydrology was drier than the long-term average hydrology).

1 dry in 2014 alone.” Doc 51 at 7 (citing AR 27426). The cited page of the AR (27426) is part of one of
2 the Common Responses to comments contained in Appendix J of the FEIS/R. In Common Response 4,
3 the FEIS/R presents the data in question indicating that 135 wells went dry. Plaintiffs’ separate argument
4 that these new additions required recirculation is discussed below. To the extent Plaintiffs are
5 challenging what the FEIS/R did with this information in its analysis, that issue is misplaced in the
6 context of a challenge to the way the project describes the environmental setting.²⁰

7 (2) **Is Recirculation Required in Light of Changes Made to the DEIS/R**
8 **Pertaining to Information about Groundwater Levels?**

9 The FEIS/R describes the “affected environment/existing conditions” to include “Redding Area
10 Groundwater Basin; Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin; San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin;
11 Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin; and Gilroy-Hollister Valley Groundwater Basin.” AR 25600.

12 The majority of groundwater substitution pumping proposed by the Project would occur in the
13 Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin. AR 25463-66, AR 25601. Commenters raised the concern that
14 the DEIS/R had failed to characterize accurately and sufficiently the groundwater resources in these
15 basins. For example, U.S. EPA’s comments succinctly articulate the asserted failure of the DEIS/R:

16 The DEIS is internally inconsistent in defining and treating
17 baseline/existing groundwater elevations. The characterization of existing
18 groundwater conditions uses data sets that conclude at dates ranging from
19 1995 to 2013, and none include data from the 2013-2014 critical drought
20 year. Where older, outdated data are used, it is possible that recent trends
21 in groundwater elevation or land subsidence are not represented in the
22 analysis. The current drought is perhaps the most severe the state has ever
experienced and would be the relevant baseline for additional impact from
the proposed action, slated to commence in 2015. According to the
[DWR’s] November 2014 Drought Update, over 50 percent of monitored
wells in the Central and Sacramento Valleys have experienced
groundwater level decreases of 2.5 feet or more from spring of 2013 to
spring of 2014, with over 20% experiencing decreases of more than 10

23 ²⁰ This kind of mixing of issues is rampant in the briefs in this case, making the Court’s job far more difficult than it needs to
24 be. This problem is exemplified in the headings themselves related to the subject of this paragraph. In the relevant section of
25 Plaintiff’s opposition, the major heading asserts that “the [F]EIS/R failed to legally describe the project’s environmental
26 setting.” ECF No. 51 at 7 (emphasis added). The subheading asserts, however, that “[t]he [F]EIS/R failed to consider existing
drought and overdraft conditions” and proceeds to critique how the FEIS/R analyzed information it disclosed. *Id.* (emphasis
added). These are two separate types of issues, subject to different standards.

1 feet. For the period from spring 2010 to spring 2014, nearly 30% of
2 monitored wells have experienced declines in excess of 10 feet. While the
3 most severe declines occur in the San Joaquin basin, precipitous declines
4 are none-the-less prevalent across a majority of the sellers' service area.
5 Due to these recent declines, some of the monitored wells in the sellers'
6 service area may have reached historic low levels. Consequently, we are
7 concerned that the extent of, or potential for, land subsidence may be
8 greater than is reflected in the DEIS.

9 AR 27462; *see also* AR 27890-27891 (similar comment submitted by Plaintiffs).

10 It is undisputed that the FEIS/R made revisions to the description of groundwater levels. *See* AR
11 25625-25666 (adding dozens of maps and charts to describe existing conditions); *see also* AR 27813
12 (“Section 3.3.1.3, Affected Environment has been revised to clarify the impacts of current drought
13 conditions to the groundwater resources within the area of analysis.”). For example, the FEIS/R states:

14 Change in groundwater elevation figures for (a) Spring 2013 to Spring
15 2014, (b) Spring 2004 to Spring 2014, and (c) Spring 2010 to Spring 2014
16 indicate groundwater levels have decreased within the Sacramento Valley.
17 As shown in Figure J-1 below, water year (WY) 2014 was one of the
18 driest years on record since 1977 and it was preceded by a dry and a
19 critical year. Spring 2014 groundwater levels have changed between +5
20 and -20 feet within the Sacramento Valley in comparison to Spring 2013.
21 Comparisons of spring groundwater levels in the last decade (Spring 2004
22 to Spring 2014) indicate groundwater levels have declined as much as 40
23 feet in parts of Glenn, Colusa and Tehama County within the Sacramento
24 Valley.

25 AR 27424. The FEIS/R characterizes this data as demonstrating a “steep decline.” AR 25672. Likewise,
26 the FEIS/R acknowledged that surface water flows declined alongside groundwater levels. AR 27813
27 (“[S]tream accretion generally decreases at approximately the same rate as groundwater pumping
28 increases.”).

29 Plaintiffs argue that all of the above changes warranted recirculation of the EIR. If the lead
30 agency adds “significant new information” to an EIR subsequent to the close of the public comment
31 period but prior to certification of the final EIR, CEQA requires that the lead agency provide a new
32 public comment period. Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21092.1. The CEQA Guidelines describe “significant
33 new information” as including “a disclosure showing that”:

1 (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project
2 or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

3 (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact
4 would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the
5 impact to a level of insignificance.

6 (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably
7 different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the
8 significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's
9 proponents decline to adopt it.

10 (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and
11 conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were
12 precluded.

13 CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a)(emphasis added). In contrast, “[r]ecirculation is not required where the
14 new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in
15 an adequate EIR.” *Id.* at § 15088.5(b). “[R]ecirculation is not required simply because new information
16 is added.” *S. Cty. Citizens for Smart Growth v. Cty. of Nevada*, 221 Cal. App. 4th 316, 328 (2013).
17 “[T]he final EIR will almost always contain information not included in the draft EIR’ given the CEQA
18 statutory requirements of circulation of the draft EIR, public comment, and response to these comments
19 prior to certification of the final EIR.” *Id.* (quoting *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n. v. Regents of*
20 *University of Cal.*, 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1124 (1993) (“*Laurel Heights II*”). “Recirculation was intended to
21 be an exception, rather than the general rule.” *Laurel Heights II*, 6 Cal. 4th at 1132. “Courts must defer
22 to an agency’s explicit or implicit decision not to recirculate a draft EIR so long as it is supported by
23 substantial evidence.” *San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. California State Lands Comm’n*, 242 Cal. App.
24 4th 202, 224 (2015) (internal citation and quotation omitted). “[A]n agency’s determination not to
25 recirculate is given substantial deference and is presumed to be correct.” *Id.* (internal citations and
26 quotations omitted). Thus, the appellant bears the burden of proving substantial evidence does not
support the agency’s decision not to recirculate an EIR. *Id.*

27 In its resolution certifying the FEIS/R under CEQA, the Authority made an affirmative finding
28 that the new information added to the FEIS/R “adds detail about existing groundwater conditions, but

1 does not change the conclusions drawn regarding impacts of water transfers.” CAR 5-6; *see also* CAR
2 22-27 (CEQA findings regarding project that summarize potential impacts, including impacts from
3 groundwater substitution, which “could decrease flows in surface water bodies following a transfer
4 while groundwater basins recharge,” and finding that proposed mitigation measure WS-1 would reduce
5 this impact to a “less than significant” level).

6 The Authority emphasizes that the FEIS/R “is intended to assess environmental conditions
7 resulting from implementation of the range of potential transfer activities under the Proposed Action for
8 a 10-year period.” AR 27429. The FEIS/R therefore focused on “whether there exists within the period
9 of analysis any 10-year period that is representative of a reasonable worst-case condition for Sacramento
10 Valley hydrology.” *Id.* The average Sacramento Valley combined annual runoff is approximately 17.8
11 million acre-feet (“MAF”) and the average for the ten-year period from 2004-2014 was only 15.7 MAF.
12 AR 27428. Yet, the period from 1985-1994 was even drier (12.7 MAF), with the driest ten-year period
13 on record being 1928-1937 (12.3 MAF). *Id.* The FEIS/R summarizes the situation as follows:

14 Though the Sacramento Valley and other parts of California are currently
15 noticing declining groundwater level trends, past groundwater trends are
16 indicative of groundwater levels declining moderately during extended
 droughts and recovering to pre-drought levels after subsequent wet
 periods.

17 AR 27424.

18 Plaintiffs argue that the new data added to the FEIS/R, showed persistently declining
19 groundwater levels in the Sacramento Valley, resulting in a “slew of wells running completely dry at the
20 time the [F]EIS/R was published.” ECF No. 45 at 23 (emphasis added). In support of this assertion,
21 Plaintiffs cite a large section of the FEIS/R, *see id.* (citing AR 25625-25666), containing, among other
22 things, graphs (or “hydrographs”) depicting groundwater elevations of “select monitoring wells across
23 the Sacramento Valley.” AR 25626. Plaintiffs make no effort to explain their interpretation of this
24 information in any detail. The Court’s own review of the material, along with additional supporting
25 graphs in Appendix L, *see* AR 28256-28344, reveals a more nuanced situation, consistent with the

1 FEIS/R's statements. For example, the FEIS/R describes the data from shallow wells as showing "show
2 long term trends that are either increasing stable or decreasing depending on the well. Several wells also
3 show the recovery of groundwater levels following drought periods." AR 25626. With respect to
4 intermediate wells, the FEIS/R presents a mixed picture:

5 The hydrographs . . . show similar long term trends as the shallow wells
6 (i.e., increasing, stable, or decreasing). Similar to the shallow wells several
7 intermediate wells show recovery of groundwater levels in wetter periods
8 following drought conditions. A number of the wells . . . show recent
9 groundwater levels at or below historic low levels. However, some of
10 these wells also show levels above historic low levels.

11 *Id.* Finally, with respect to deep wells, "a number . . . show long term declining water level trends." AR
12 25626. But, the FEIS/R explains that "most of the [deep] wells shown in [the relevant] figure have a
13 shorter measurement record." *Id.* Moreover, "the recovery of water levels during drought periods can be
14 seen in the hydrograph" for at least one deep water well. AR 25727. To succeed on their claim that re-
15 circulation is required, Plaintiffs must demonstrate that substantial evidence does not support the
16 Authority's implied conclusion that these new hydrographs do not present evidence of "new significant
17 environmental impact would result from the project," or a "substantial increase in the severity of an
18 environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a
19 level of insignificance," either of which would trigger the requirement for re-circulation. CEQA
20 Guidelines § 15088.5(a).²¹ Taken at face value, the FEIS/R's evaluation of the new information suggests
21 that the new data is equivocal on any long-term trends in groundwater levels. Plaintiffs make no effort to
22 demonstrate with any specificity why the FEIS/R's characterization of the new hydrographs is
23 inaccurate.

24 Plaintiffs do point to some generic references that suggest, overall, groundwater levels in the
25 Sacramento Valley are decreasing because drawdown rates are exceeding recovery rates. *See* AR 27894

26 ²¹ The Court does not believe any of the other factors listed in Guidelines § 15088.5 are even arguably relevant here.

1 (letter in which Plaintiffs comment on the DEIS/R, pointing out, among other things: “Although regional
2 measured groundwater levels are purported to ‘recover’ during the winter months (Technical
3 Memorandum 3), data from Spangler (2002) indicate that recovery levels are somewhat less than levels
4 of drawdown, suggesting that, in general, water levels are declining”); AR 29306 (groundwater model
5 manual stating: “Some locales show the early signs of persistent declines in groundwater level,
6 including northern Sacramento County, areas near Chico, and on the far west side of the Valley in Glenn
7 County, where water demands are met primarily, and in some locales exclusively, by groundwater”).
8 However, these general references do not overcome the presumption of correctness that applies to the
9 Authority’s determination, based on evaluation of specific data, not to re-circulate. *See Baykeeper*, 242
10 Cal. App. 4th at 224. Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the new information added to the
11 FEIS/R regarding groundwater levels required re-circulation is DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion
12 is GRANTED.

13 **(3) Description of Existing Groundwater Contamination**

14 Plaintiffs next argue that the FEIS/R failed to describe accurately existing groundwater
15 contamination. For example, the DEIS/R concluded that any additional pumping of groundwater
16 resulting from the project “is not expected to be in locations or at rates that would cause substantial
17 long-term changes in groundwater levels that would cause changes to groundwater quality.” AR 15069;
18 AR 25704 (same language repeated in FEIS/R); *see also* AR 25754 (“Inducing the movement or
19 migration of reduced quality water into previously unaffected areas through groundwater pumping is not
20 likely to be a concern unless groundwater levels and or flow patterns are substantially altered for a long
21 period of time. Groundwater extraction pumping under the Proposed Action would be limited to short-
22 term withdrawals during the irrigation season. Consequently effects from the migration of reduced
23 groundwater quality would be less than significant.”). Plaintiffs argue that the DEIS/R’s conclusion
24 could not be supported without disclosing information about the location of contaminated groundwater
25 and their proximity and interactivity with proposed groundwater pumping. *See* ECF No. 45 at 21. But,

1 again, they admit that the FEIS/R added significant new information describing these contaminated sites
2 to the FEIS/R, *see* AR 25673-25674, including the following paragraph:

3 Figure 3.3-16 below shows the active and open “clean-up” sites from
4 SWRCB’s GeoTracker database. The Sacramento Valley has 481 active
5 clean-up program sites, 234 leaking underground tanks (UST) sites, 54
6 Military sites (includes military privatized UST sites), and one land
7 disposal site as of December 29, 2014 (SWRCB 2014). These sites are in
8 various stages of open investigation which includes site assessment,
9 remediation, and/or monitoring. Most of the clean-up sites shown in
10 Figure 3.3-16 are clustered around urban areas.

11 AR 25673.

12 Plaintiffs again argue that this new information is “significant new information” requiring
13 recirculation under CEQA because “the added mapping and information shows contaminated
14 groundwater sites that were not previously identified.” ECF No. 45 at 22. Plaintiffs argue that this
15 constitutes significant new information because “it reveals for the first time what the [DEIS/R] ignored,
16 i.e. that some sources of groundwater might actually be contaminated.” *Id.* This is not accurate. The
17 DEIS/R does address the issue within Section 3.2 (Water Quality) as follows:

18 *Groundwater substitution transfers could introduce contaminants that*
19 *could enter surface waters from irrigation return flows.* Groundwater
20 substitution transfers would use groundwater for irrigation instead of
21 surface water. The amount of groundwater substituted for surface water
22 under the Proposed Action would be relatively small compared to the
23 amount of surface water used to irrigate agricultural fields in the Seller
24 Service Area. Groundwater would mix with surface water in agricultural
25 drainages prior to irrigation return flow reaching the rivers. Constituents of
26 concern that may be present in the groundwater could enter the surface
27 water as a result of mixing with irrigation return flows. Any constituents
28 of concern, however, would be greatly diluted when mixed with the
29 existing surface waters applied because a much higher volume of surface
30 water is used for irrigation purposes in the Seller Service Area.
31 Additionally, groundwater quality in the area is generally good and
32 sufficient for municipal agricultural domestic and industrial uses. Section
33 3.3 provides additional discussion of groundwater quality. Groundwater
34 substitution transfers would result in a less than significant impact on
35 water quality.

36 AR 14970. Both the DEIS/R and the FEIS/R emphasize that “groundwater quality in the area is
generally good and sufficient for municipal agricultural domestic and industrial uses.” *Id.*; AR 25559.

1 As mentioned, CEQA requires that the lead agency provide a new public comment period if
2 “significant new information” is added to an EIR subsequent to the close of the public comment period
3 but prior to certification of the final EIR. Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21092.1. CEQA Guidelines section
4 15088.5(a) explains that “significant new information” includes information tending to show: (1) “[a]
5 new significant environmental impact would result from the project . . .”; or (2) [a] substantial increase
6 in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that
7 reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.” (Emphasis added.) Here, Plaintiffs have failed to
8 demonstrate that the new information at issue, including the data showing the location of active
9 contaminant clean-up sites, meets either re-circulation trigger criterion. Plaintiffs do not argue that the
10 FEIS/R was wrong to conclude that “groundwater quality in the area is generally good,” nor that the
11 logic underlying the finding of no significance is flawed. They fail to demonstrate that the new
12 information highlights a “new significant environmental impact” or “a substantial increase in the
13 severity of an environmental impact.”²² Re-circulation is therefore not required. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’
14 motion for summary judgment that the new information added to the FEIS/R regarding groundwater
15 quality required re-circulation is DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

16 Plaintiffs also argue that the information pertaining to contamination in the FEIS/R is inadequate
17 because “it does not show the elevation or proximity of any contaminated site to any project
18 groundwater well.” ECF No. 45 at 22. As Federal Defendants point out, the FEIS/R contains a map,
19 which shows the locations of the clean-up sites and of groundwater substitution pumping wells. AR
20 25674. As to whether the groundwater elevation of the contaminated sites is material, the same logic that
21 undercut Plaintiffs’ argument about re-circulation after additions were made to the DEIS/R undercuts
22 their argument about inadequacy of the groundwater quality description in the FEIS/R. Plaintiffs fail to

23
24 ²² Again, here it does not appear reasonable to apply either of the other factors set forth in CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a):
25 where new information shows the availability of a new, feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that would lessen
26 environmental impacts, or where new information shows the EIR was “fundamentally and basically inadequate and
conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.”

1 rebut the assertion in the DEIS/R and FEIS/R that groundwater quality is generally good and the related
2 reasoning that led the authors to conclude groundwater contamination issues would be less than
3 significant. The level of detail required in a project description need not go “beyond that needed for
4 evaluation and review of the environmental impact.” CEQA Guidelines § 15124. Plaintiffs’ motion for
5 summary judgment on this issue is DENIED.²³

6 **b. NEPA Challenges to Description of Groundwater Baseline**

7 Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R violates NEPA because it impermissibly relies upon monitoring
8 set forth in Mitigation Measure GW-1 in lieu of describing the environmental baseline. ECF No. 45 at
9 24-25. This, they contend, violates NEPA, which prohibits an EIS to substitute a mitigation measure as a
10 proxy for measuring the environmental baseline. *Id.* (discussing *N. Plains Res. Council v. Surface*
11 *Transp. Bd.*, 668 F.3d 1067, 1085 (9th Cir. 2001) (rejecting EIR where agency failed to gather
12 information about baseline environmental conditions)). This requirement stems from the uncontroversial
13 proposition that it would be “simply impossible” to evaluate the effects of a project if an agency fails to
14 gather information on the project’s environmental conditions. *LaFlamme v. FERC*, 852 F.2d, 389, 400
15 (9th Cir. 1988). Plaintiffs argue that the task of describing baseline groundwater conditions is “left
16 completely to a future date.” ECF No. 45 at 25. Here, the record does not warrant the finding Plaintiffs
17 advocate. As discussed above, the FEIS/R, including supporting graphs in Appendix L, *see* AR 28256-
18 28344, describes existing groundwater conditions. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary
19 judgment on these grounds is DENIED; Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.

20 Relatedly, Plaintiffs argue elsewhere that the FEIS/R unlawfully defers site-specific review to
21 future mitigation measures. ECF No. 51 at 9-10. Plaintiffs correctly point to authorities applying NEPA

22
23 ²³ The Court does not accept Plaintiffs unsupportable position, ECF No. 51 at 9, that their motion should be granted on this
24 issue simply because the Authority did not address the issue in their opposition/cross-motion. Plaintiffs bear the burden on
25 this claim, *see Rialto Citizens*, 208 Cal. App. 4th at 924-25, and it is the Court’s obligation on summary judgment to
determine whether Plaintiffs have met that burden (i.e., whether Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law), *see*
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) (“The court shall grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to
any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court should state on the record the reasons
for granting or denying the motion.”).

1 that prohibit a federal agency from avoiding site-specific evaluation of impacts, but rely entirely on
2 portions of the FEIS/R that respond to a comment letter from EPA to argue that the FEIS/R omits site-
3 specific analysis of impacts to groundwater. *See id.* at 9 (citing AR 27454 and AR 27471). While these
4 record citations indicate that EPA raised this issue, they do not provide record support for the
5 proposition itself, nor address the FEIS/R's response. The Court simply cannot make heads or tails of
6 this argument as presented. Therefore, as to this issue Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on these
7 grounds is DENIED; Federal Defendants' cross-motion is GRANTED.

8 **4. Assessment of Significant Environmental Impacts**

9 Next, Plaintiffs bring five sets of challenges concerning the FEIS/R's assessment of
10 environmental impacts. The introductory paragraph for this section only cites CEQA authorities,
11 suggesting all sub-arguments are CEQA challenges only. ECF No. 45 at 22. But, the second and third
12 sub-arguments within this larger section also mention NEPA. *See id.* at 24-28. Other than those sections
13 in which NEPA is specifically mentioned, or unless otherwise noted, the Court assumes only CEQA
14 challenges are raised.

15 Under CEQA, "[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the
16 proposed project." CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a). The EIR should examine "changes in the existing
17 physical conditions in the affected area." *Id.* "Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the
18 environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term
19 and long-term effects." *Id.*

20 When reviewing whether an agency's impact analysis complies with NEPA, a reviewing court
21 must ask whether the agency "adequately considered a project's potential impacts and whether the
22 consideration given amounted to a 'hard look' at the environmental effects." *N. Alaska Env'tl. Ctr. v.*
23 *Kemphorne*, 457 F.3d 969, 975 (9th Cir. 2006) (*quoting Idaho Sporting Congress, Inc. v. Rittenhouse*,
24 305 F.3d 957, 963 (9th Cir. 2002)). A "hard look" includes "considering all foreseeable direct and
25 indirect impacts." *Idaho Sporting Congress*, 305 F.3d at 973. "Furthermore, a 'hard look' should involve

1 a discussion of adverse impacts that does not improperly minimize negative side effects.” *N. Alaska*
2 *Envtl. Ctr.*, 457 F.3d at 975 (quoting *Native Ecosystems Council v. U.S. Forest Service*, 428 F.3d 1233,
3 1241 (9th Cir. 2005)). Under NEPA, an agency’s actions are only arbitrary and capricious if it “has
4 relied on factors that Congress has not intended it to consider, has entirely failed to consider an
5 important aspect of the problem, or has offered an explanation for that decision that runs counter to the
6 evidence before the agency or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or
7 the product of agency expertise.” *Pub. Citizen v. Nuclear Regulatory Com’n*, 573 F.3d 916, 923 (9th Cir.
8 2009).

9 **a. Groundwater Impact Modeling Baseline (CEQA)**

10 Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R is not in compliance with CEQA because the model it uses to
11 evaluate its groundwater impacts inaccurately depicts baseline conditions.

12 **(1) Hydrologic Baseline**

13 Plaintiffs first argue that the model defines baseline conditions using an outdated baseline period
14 from 1970-2003. ECF No 45. at 23. Plaintiffs generally assert that “reliance on data from this period
15 fails to accurately reflect existing and foreseeable growth in future water demand, fails to account for
16 ongoing increases in global temperatures, and fails to account for the long-term trend of groundwater
17 drawdown in the state.” *Id.*

18 The determination of the baseline is the first step in the impact review process. *Save our*
19 *Peninsula Comm. v. Monterey Cty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 87 Cal. App. 4th 99, 125 (2001). “Environmental
20 conditions may vary from year to year and in some cases it is necessary to consider conditions over a
21 range of time periods. In some cases, conditions closer to the date the project is approved are more
22 relevant to a determination whether the project’s impacts will be significant.” *Id.* “[A]n agency enjoys
23 the discretion to decide, in the first instance, exactly how the existing physical conditions without the
24 project can most realistically be measured, subject to review, as with all CEQA factual determinations,
25 for support by substantial evidence.” *Baykeeper*, 242 Cal. App. 4th at 218 (internal citation and

1 quotation omitted). Under CEQA, a court must “apply the substantial evidence test to conclusions,
2 findings, and determinations, and to challenges to the scope of an EIR’s analysis of a topic, the
3 methodology used for studying an impact, and the reliability or accuracy of the data upon which the EIR
4 relied because these types of challenges involve factual questions.” *City of Long Beach v. Los Angeles*
5 *Unified Sch. Dist.*, 176 Cal. App. 4th 889, 898 (2009). Such a challenge therefore must be rejected if
6 substantial evidence supports the agency’s approach and the EIR is not clearly inadequate or
7 unsupported. *Id.*

8 Some background is helpful to understanding the selection of 1970-2003 as the modeling period
9 for the FEIS/R. The FEIS/R used three models to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project on
10 groundwater resources: the Sacramento Valley Finite Element Groundwater Flow Model
11 (“SACFEM2013”), CalSim II,²⁴ and the Transfer Operations Model (“TOM”). AR 27428. The full
12 simulation period for which SACFEM2013 was capable at the time the FEIS/R issued was water year
13 (“WY”) 1970 through 2010; the full simulation period for CalSim II was WY 1922 through 2003. *Id.*
14 TOM was developed for, and analysis was conducted on, the 34-year period of WY 1970-2003 because
15 that was the period common to both the SACFEM2013 and CalSim II models. *Id.*

16 Plaintiffs assert that the FEIS/R’s reliance on data from 1970-2003 for its modeling fails to
17 accurately reflect existing conditions during more recent drought years. ECF No. 45 at 23.²⁵ The FEIS/R
18 explains that the model’s reliance on this data period is nonetheless appropriate, despite the fact that the

20 ²⁴ CalSim II is a computer model developed jointly by DWR and Reclamation that simulates SWP and CVP operations and is
21 a standard planning tool for evaluating project operations. *Consol. Delta Smelt Cases*, 717 F. Supp. 2d 1021, 1028 (E.D. Cal.
2010).

22 ²⁵ Plaintiffs assert in their opening brief without any citation to the record that “the EIR admits that reliance on data from this
23 period fails to accurately reflect existing and foreseeable future growth in water demand, fails to account for ongoing
24 increases in global temperatures, and fails to account for the long-term trend of groundwater drawdown in the state.” ECF
25 No. 45 at 23 (emphasis added). Despite the fact that the heading for the sub-section of Plaintiffs’ brief within which this
statement is made addresses climate change, the text of the subsection contains absolutely no substantive information about
climate change. Climate change is instead addressed several sub-sections later. With respect to the argument that data does
not reflect existing and foreseeable future growth in water demand and/or any long-term trend in groundwater drawdown,
Plaintiffs fail to cite and the Court cannot locate anywhere in the record where the EIR admits failure to account for such
issues. Such off-hand and unsupported remarks are more than unhelpful; they have exacerbated the already complex nature of
this case and further delayed its resolution.

1 years since 2003 have been drier than average, because the model inputs included several ten-year
2 periods that were even drier than the most recent period excluded from the model's data set. *See* AR
3 27428.

4 The long-term average annual runoff from [the Sacramento, Feather,
5 Yuba, and American Rivers] is approximately 17.8 [million acre-feet
6 ("MAF")]. The average annual runoff for the period 2004 through 2014 is
7 15.7 MAF, while the average annual runoff for the period of analysis is
8 18.6 MAF. While it is true that the period from 2004 through 2014 has
9 been drier than both the long-term average and the average for the period
10 of analysis, this does not invalidate the analysis supporting the discussions
11 in the environmental document. Hydrology in the period of analysis
12 adequately represents the historical range and the variability that has
13 occurred in the Sacramento Valley, and includes two multi-year droughts:
14 1976-77 and 1987-92. The drought of 1976-77 was more severe than any
15 single year or 2-year period from 2004 through 2014, and the 1987-92
16 drought was more prolonged than any recent 6-year period.

17 Additionally, the EIS/EIR is intended to assess environmental conditions
18 resulting from implementation of the range of potential transfer activities
19 under the Proposed Action for a 10-year period. A key consideration,
20 therefore, is whether there exists within the period of analysis any 10-year
21 period that is representative of a reasonable worst-case condition for
22 Sacramento Valley hydrology. Within the period of analysis, there are
23 several 10-year periods that are considerably drier than the 2004 through
24 2014 period. For example, the average annual runoff for the 10-year
25 period 1985 through 1994 is 12.7 MAF. This is comparable to the
26 minimum average annual runoff, 12.3 MAF in 1928 through 1937, for any
10-year period in the available record. The analysis includes a period
similar to the driest 10 years on record, and drier than the period from
2004 through 2014.

18 AR 27428-29. Plaintiffs fail to rebut this reasonable explanation that is supported by substantial
19 evidence in the form of the cited historical runoff data. *See Baykeeper*, 242 Cal. App. 4th at 219
20 (approving agency's decision that running five year average better reflected baseline than most recent
21 year because most recent year's data was skewed by unique economic conditions, and finding
22 challenger's argument that the more recent years were a more appropriate baseline to be an insufficient
23 "disagreement with the Final EIR's analysis"); *see also Bakersfield Citizens v. City of Bakersfield*, 124
24 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1198 (2004) ("Substantial evidence is defined as enough relevant information and
25 reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion,

1 even though other conclusions might also be reached.”). Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that
2 the FEIS/R’s modeling approach inaccurately defines the environmental baseline related to groundwater
3 levels is DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

4 **(2) Consistency of Baseline**

5 Plaintiffs next appear to argue that the FEIS/R is unlawful because it provides an internally
6 inconsistent²⁶ picture of the environmental baseline. ECF No. 45 at 23.²⁷ As a specific example of
7 internal inconsistency, Plaintiffs compare a portion of the FEIS/R that asserts “groundwater levels
8 declin[e] moderately during extended droughts and recover[] to pre-drought levels after subsequent wet
9 periods,” *id.* (quoting AR 27424), to a section from the FEIS/R containing hydrographs of various
10 monitoring wells in the Sacramento Valley. *Id.* (quoting AR 25625-666). As discussed above, although
11 Plaintiffs claim the hydrographs show “10 years of persistently declining groundwater levels in the
12 Sacramento Valley,” the graphs are more equivocal. *Id.* Therefore, the Court does not find the FEIS/R to
13 be internally inconsistent on this issue. Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment on this issue is
14 DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

15 **(3) Water Supply Demand Baseline**

16 Plaintiffs next argue that the FEIS/R ignores a consistent growth in water supply demand. ECF
17 No. 45 at 23. The CalSim II and SACFEM2013 models are designed to approximate a fixed level of
18 development, with CalSim II using a 2005 level of development and SACFEM2013 using a 2010 level

19
20 ²⁶ Plaintiffs cite an EPA comment to the DEIS/R that raises a similar complaint about internal inconsistency. ECF No. 45 at
21 23 (citing AR 27462). The EPA’s comment makes an argument that is slightly distinct from that raised in Plaintiffs’ briefs. It
22 has been difficult enough to unpack the incredibly dense nature of the briefs in this case. The Court is not obligated to
23 incorporate arguments by reference from comments in the AR.

24 ²⁷ In support of this argument, Plaintiffs cite *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced*, 149 Cal. App. 4th 645
25 (2007), for the proposition that “[b]ecause of its importance to the EIR’s impact analysis, the baseline should be plainly
26 identified and not obscured.” ECF No. 45 at 23. First, Plaintiffs fail to provide a pincite to the portion of this case they claim
supports this proposition. The Court’s own review of the case suggests it is largely inapposite. While *San Joaquin Raptor*
does discuss internal inconsistencies in the context of analyzing that EIR’s project description, 149 Cal. App. 4th at 659, with
regard to the EIR’s evaluation of impacts, the case was concerned with the fact that certain fundamental assumptions that
went into characterizing the baseline were not plainly stated in that EIR, leading the court to hold that “decisionmakers and
general public should not be forced to sift through obscure minutiae or appendices in order to ferret out the fundamental
baseline assumptions that are being used for purposes of the environmental analysis.” *Id.* at 659. *San Joaquin Raptor*’s
discussion of impact analysis is not on point.

1 of development. AR 27430. “This means that population, land use, and agricultural demands used in the
2 models are representative of demands that existed in those years.” *Id.* “These demands are then used
3 with historical hydrology inputs, primarily precipitation, reservoir inflows, and unregulated flows, in
4 model simulations.” *Id.* With respect to those aspects of the modeling in the FEIS/R linked to the
5 SACFEM2013 model,²⁸ the FEIS/R concludes that, even though there have been changes in demand
6 since 2010, the “range of demands simulated in SACFEM2013 is representative of existing conditions in
7 the Sacramento Valley.” AR 27431; *see also* AR 27430 (indicating that “[d]emands in SACFEM2013
8 are based on land use data and surveys taken as recently as 2010 (*see* Appendix M”).²⁹

9 The question is whether the record contains substantial information to support this conclusion.
10 *See Bakersfield Citizens*, 124 Cal. App. 4th at 1198. Plaintiffs argue that substantial evidence does not
11 support the use of this approach to setting a baseline, in light of the “backdrop of decades of persistent
12 growth in groundwater demands.” ECF No. 45 at 24. Plaintiffs correctly point out that data in the
13 FEIS/R indicates groundwater pumping grew consistently from 1961 (250,000 AF) to 2003 (800,000
14 AF). AR 25625; *see also* AR 15024 (same information in DEIS/R). In light of this trend, Plaintiffs argue
15 that there is no support for the FEIS/R’s conclusion that “the range of demands simulated in
16 SACFEM2013 is representative of existing conditions in the Sacramento Valley.” ECF No. 45 at 24.
17 Plaintiffs’ argument suggests, therefore, that the modeling parameters must be adjusted to account for
18 the overall upward trend in groundwater demand resulting in greater demand between 2010 (the last
19 year of inputted demand information) and 2015 (the planned starting year of the Project (*see* AR
20 25365)). *See* ECF No. 58 at 6 (citing 27430) (the Authority conceding that the FEIS/R itself admits that

21
22 ²⁸ The FEIS/R asserts that it is most important to have updated demand information for simulations generated by the
23 SACFEM2013 model, because new demands primarily impact the groundwater supplies modeled by SACFEM2013. AR
24 27430.

25 ²⁹ In the version of the FEIS/R lodged with the Court, Appendix M consists simply of a cover page stating: “Appendix M
26 SACFEM2013 Manual.” *See* AR 029267. The Court therefore reviewed the separate document in the AR entitled
“201502SACFEM_UsersManual_print” (AR 50072) in an effort to determine whether the SACFEM2013 manual indicated
that data more recent than 2010 was incorporated into the modeling process. The manual indicates that the modeling
incorporated data up to and including 2010, but no further. *See, e.g.*, AR 50147 (discussing revisions to SACFEM in 2011
that incorporated data from 2010).

1 “since 2010, groundwater demand has likely increased due to additional irrigated lands (particularly in
2 permanent crops) and population increases”).

3 “An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of
4 the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation
5 is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional
6 perspective.” CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a). “This environmental setting will normally constitute the
7 baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant.” *Id.*
8 Preparation of the FEIS/R began in early 2011. ECF No. 48 at 15 n. 10.

9 However, “[i]n appropriate circumstances an existing conditions analysis may take account of
10 environmental conditions that will exist when the project begins operations; the agency is not strictly
11 limited to those prevailing during the period of EIR preparation.” *Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition*
12 *Metro Line Const. Auth.*, 57 Cal. 4th 439, 452 (2013). “An agency may, where appropriate, adjust its
13 existing conditions baseline to account for a major change in environmental conditions that is expected
14 to occur before project implementation.” *Id.*

15 In so adjusting its existing conditions baseline, an agency exercises its
16 discretion on how best to define such a baseline under the circumstance of
17 rapidly changing environmental conditions. As we explained in our earlier
18 decision, CEQA imposes no uniform, inflexible rule for determination of
19 the existing conditions baseline, instead leaving to a sound exercise of
20 agency discretion the exact method of measuring the existing
21 environmental conditions upon which the project will operate. . . . For
22 example, in an EIR for a new office building, the analysis of impacts on
23 sunlight and views in the surrounding neighborhood might reasonably take
24 account of a larger tower already under construction on an adjacent site at
25 the time of EIR preparation.

21 *Id.* at 452-53. An agency “may forgo analysis of a project’s impacts on existing environmental
22 conditions if such an analysis would be uninformative or misleading to decision makers and the public.”

23 *Id.* at 453. Nonetheless, departure from the norm (i.e., using existing conditions as they existed at the
24 time environmental review commenced) is disfavored because “existing environmental conditions have
25 the advantage that they can generally be directly measured and need not be projected through a

1 predictive model. However sophisticated and well-designed a model is, its product carries the inherent
2 uncertainty of every long-term prediction, uncertainty that tends to increase with the period of
3 projection.” *Id.*

4 Here, Plaintiffs do not appear to be suggesting that the FEIS/R should make uncertain
5 predictions about water supply demand well into the future. Rather, they appear to be making the narrow
6 request that demand information incorporated into the SACFEM2013 model be updated to include the
7 most up to date information possible. *See* ECF No. 45 at 23-24. Nonetheless, as the Authority explains
8 in its supplemental briefing, the 2010 land use data incorporated into SACFEM2013 was the most recent
9 land use data available in 2011, the time of the initiation of this environmental review. *See* ECF No. 68
10 at 8 n.19 (“Demands in SACREM2013 are based on the most recent land use data and surveys available
11 in 2011.”). Moreover, the land use data was combined in SACFEM2013 “with the historical
12 precipitation record to develop demands that vary in each year of the simulation, with higher demands
13 for groundwater in drier years.” *Id.* The Authority contends that the historical data provides a sufficient
14 variety of hydrological conditions to realistically depict the baseline of existing groundwater conditions,
15 ECF No. 68 at 9 (citing AR 25599-697 (period of analysis used in modeling included critical and dry
16 periods as well as multi-year droughts and monthly stress periods)), including droughts more severe than
17 the one persisting at the time the present legal challenge was filed. AR 27429; *see also* AR 25706.
18 Plaintiffs point to no better data set the Authority could have incorporated into its SACFEM2013
19 modeling. Nor do Plaintiffs explain how additional data would have made any material difference in the
20 informational value of the baseline description. In addition, the FEIS/R includes in its in description of
21 the environmental baseline data on groundwater levels through water year 2014 demonstrating “a
22 general decreasing trend in groundwater levels in the Sacramento Valley.” AR 25656. Put another way,
23 the FEIS/R discusses each potentially impacted groundwater basin through the use of both modeling and
24 real data – the real data extending up through and including 2014. In light of the entire record, the Court
25 concludes that substantial evidence supports the Authority’s approach to describing existing

1 groundwater conditions.

2 In response to the Court’s request for supplemental briefing on the issue of the FEIS/R’s
3 description of the groundwater baseline, Plaintiffs focus almost exclusively on new arguments about
4 how the CalSim II model operates, without providing any explanation of how the CalSim II model
5 relates to groundwater conditions. ECF No. 69 at 4-7. This is despite the fact that the record suggests
6 SACFEM2013 is the model used to evaluate groundwater levels and demands. AR 27430. The Court
7 will not entertain new arguments regarding CalSim II in the context of Plaintiffs’ challenge to how the
8 FEIS/R treats groundwater demand in its description of the baseline. Plaintiffs do make one other
9 argument about SACFEM2013, asserting that the Authority “cannot point to substantial evidence
10 demonstrating that the model considers trends in groundwater demands such that the [F]EIS/R could
11 meaningfully assess the extent to which additional groundwater pumping caused by the project would
12 exacerbate trends in groundwater demands that have cause persistent drawdown over the course of
13 decades. Relying on 2005 demands, the [F]EIS/R does not even describe existing conditions at the time
14 of the [Notice of Publication of the FEIS/R].” ECF No. 69 at 5. Here, Plaintiffs appear to confuse the
15 fact that the CalSim II model set its level of demand at 2005 levels, while the SACFEM2013 model used
16 demand set at 2010 levels. The Court is not in a position to tease out an argument from this confusion
17 and finds nothing in Plaintiffs’ response to the request for supplemental briefing that undermines its
18 earlier conclusion that the Authority did not act unlawfully by utilizing a 2010 level of demand for its
19 SACFEM2013 modeling efforts. Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment on this issue is DENIED; the
20 Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

21 **(4) Failure to Utilize Datasets that Better Reflect Climate Change**

22 Finally, Plaintiffs appear to include within their set of challenges to the CEQA “baseline” an
23 argument about climate change. Specifically, as part of Plaintiffs’ critique of the FEIS/R’s use of an
24 “arbitrary baseline period of 1970-2003,” Plaintiffs argue that this period “fails to account for ongoing
25 increases in global temperatures.” ECF No. 45 at 23. Yet, Plaintiffs fail to develop this as a “baseline”

1 argument in any serious way, focusing instead on whether the FEIS/R meaningfully assessed the
2 impacts associated with ongoing climate change. *See id.* at 25. Under the rubric of *Neighbors*, which
3 stands for the general proposition that the baseline should normally be the conditions extant at the time
4 environmental review commences, the arguments Plaintiffs do make about climate change do not fit
5 within the baseline framework. *Id.* at 25-26 (Plaintiffs challenging FEIS/R's conclusion that impacts of
6 climate change over course of project would be minimal). The Court will not manufacture an argument
7 where none is made and where none exists.

8 **b. Analysis of Climate Change Impacts (CEQA and NEPA)**

9 Plaintiffs do argue directly that the FEIS/R as a whole fails to meaningfully assess impacts
10 associated with ongoing climate change.³⁰ As to this argument, Plaintiffs assert the FEIS/R violates both
11 CEQA and NEPA.

12 Here, Plaintiffs point to record evidence in the FEIS/R projecting specific, relevant impacts of
13 climate change on California's water supply. For example, the FEIS/R reviews several major reports on
14 the impacts of climate change on California, each based on different global climate models and
15 emissions scenarios, and presents the range of projected changes. *See* AR 25861-65862. With respect to
16 impacts of climate change on snowpack and streamflow, the FEIS/R indicates:

17 Snowpack and streamflow amounts are projected to decline because of
18 less late winter precipitation falling as snow and earlier snowmelt
(Melillo, Richmond, and Yohe 2014). In California, snow water
19 equivalent (the amount of water held in a volume of snow) is projected to
20 decrease by 16 percent by 2035, 34 percent by 2070, and 57 percent by
21 2099, as compared to measurements between 1971 and 2000 (Melillo,
22 Richmond, and Yohe 2014). By the end of the century, late spring
23 streamflow could decline by up to 30 percent (CEC 2011).

24 AR 25864 (emphasis added) . Plaintiffs' comments on the DEIS/R suggested that the Lead Agencies use
25 these figures to calculate projected loss of snowpack over the life of the project, as snowpack is a factor
26

25 ³⁰ As the present argument is not limited to the issue of modeling, it is analogous to but more expansive than the one
discussed directly above.

1 in surface water supply projections. AR 21832. Instead of doing so, the FEIS/R acknowledges that
2 “changes to annual temperatures, extreme heat, precipitation, sea level rise and storm surge, and
3 snowpack and streamflow are expected to occur in the future because of climate change,” but concludes:
4 “Because of the short-term duration of the Proposed Action (10 years), any effects of climate change on
5 this alternative are expected to be minimal. Impacts to the Proposed Action from climate change would
6 be less than significant.” AR 25874. Again, this conclusion appears to be in conflict with the data
7 disclosed in the FEIS/R itself. With snow water equivalent predicted to decline by 16 percent by 2035,
8 one cannot escape the obvious deduction that snow water equivalent is likely to decline by some
9 (possibly significant) fraction of 16 percent by the end of the Proposed Action in 2024.

10 (1) **CEQA Analysis**

11 The Authority takes the position that CEQA does not require an agency to analyze significant
12 effects of climate change on a project. ECF No. 68 at 11. *California Bldg. Indus. Ass’n v. Bay Area Air*
13 *Quality Mgmt. Dist.*, 62 Cal. 4th 369, 386 (2015) (“*CBIA I*”), provides some support for this proposition,
14 but requires considerable explanation. As discussed above, CEQA requires public agencies to conduct
15 an environmental review of discretionary projects they carry out or approve and to prepare an EIR for
16 any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21151, 21100,
17 21080. The CEQA Guidelines “encourage public agencies to develop and publish ‘thresholds of
18 significance’ to assist in determining whether a project’s effect will be deemed significant.” *California*
19 *Bldg. Indus. Ass’n v. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist.*, 2 Cal. App. 5th 1067, 1073 (2016), *as modified*
20 *on denial of reh’g* (Sept. 9, 2016) (“*CBIA II*”) (citing CEQA Guidelines § 15064.7). “A threshold of
21 significance is an identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level of a particular environmental
22 effect, non-compliance with which mean the effect will normally be determined to be significant by the
23 agency and compliance with which means the effect normally will be determined to be less than
24 significant.” CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7(a).

25 *CBIA I* evaluated a challenge to thresholds of significance concerning certain air pollutants,

1 along with guidelines concerning their use, published by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.
2 *CBIA II*, 2 Cal. App. 5th at 1073. The challenged thresholds directed project proponents to evaluate
3 whether the project would locate “new receptors” (such as residences, schools, school yards, parks,
4 playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical facilities) close to existing or future proposed
5 sources of air pollution and whether those existing sources would adversely affect individuals within the
6 planned project. *Id.* at 1074-75. Building interests sued, arguing, among other things, that the “new
7 receptor” thresholds “were arbitrary and capricious to the extent they required an evaluation . . . of the
8 impacts the environment would have on a given project.” *Id.* at 1076. Both the trial and appellate courts
9 resolved the matter on other grounds. *Id.* at 1076-77. The California Supreme Court granted a petition
10 for review of the question: “Under what circumstances, if any, does CEQA require an analysis of how
11 existing environmental conditions will impact future residents or users (receptors) of a proposed
12 project?” *Id.* (citing *CBIA I*, 62 Cal. 4th at 381). The appellate court’s summary of the Supreme Court’s
13 analysis is concise and accurate:

14 In the proceedings before the Supreme Court on review, [the Air] District
15 took the position that “when existing environmental conditions on or near
16 the proposed project site pose hazards to humans brought to the site by the
17 project, the project may have potentially significant environmental effects
18 requiring evaluation.” (*Building Association, supra*, 62 Cal. 4th at p. 386.)
19 CBIA took the “contrasting view” that the relevant consideration when
20 determining the need for an EIR was the project’s effect on the
21 environment, not the environment’s effect on the project. (*Ibid.*) In its
22 opinion, the Supreme Court agreed with CBIA as a general matter: “In
23 light of CEQA’s text and structure, we conclude that CEQA generally
24 does not require an analysis of how existing environmental conditions will
25 impact a project’s future users or residents.” (*Building Association, supra*,
26 62 Cal.4th at p. 386.)

21 In reaching this conclusion, the Supreme Court acknowledged District’s
22 argument that CEQA is concerned with public health and safety, and
23 requires a finding of ““a significant effect on the environment”” ([Pub.
24 Res. Code] § 21083(b)) whenever the ‘environmental effects of a project
25 will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or
26 indirectly.’ ([Pub. Res. Code], § 21083(b)(3).)” (*Building Association,*
supra, 62 Cal. 4th at p. 387.) But the District’s reading of this language
“goes too far. . . . The statute does not provide enough of a basis to suggest
that the term ‘environmental effects’ as used in this context is meant, as a

1 general matter, to encompass these broader considerations associated with
2 the health and safety of a project’s future residents or users. [Public
3 Resources Code s]ection 21060.5 defines ‘environment’ as ‘the physical
4 conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a
5 proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise,
6 objects of historic or aesthetic significance.’ ([Pub. Res. Code,] §
7 21060.5.) Given the text of [Public Resources Code] section 21083 and
8 other relevant provisions of the statutory scheme to which it belongs—
9 including CEQA’s statute-wide definition of ‘environment’—the phrase in
10 question is best interpreted as limited to those impacts on a project’s users
11 or residents that arise from the project’s effects on the environment. Even
12 if one reads into CEQA’s definition of ‘environment’ a concern with
13 people—a reading that, notwithstanding [Public Resources Code] section
14 21060.5, is conceivable given the Legislature’s interest in public health
15 and safety—[Public Resources Code] section 21083 does not contain
16 language directing agencies to analyze the environment’s effects on a
17 project. Requiring such an evaluation in all circumstances would
18 impermissibly expand the scope of CEQA.” (*Building Association*, at p.
19 387, italics added.)

20 The Supreme Court continued: “The rest of the statute’s relevant
21 provisions underscore why. Despite the statute’s evident concern with
22 protecting the environment and human health, its relevant provisions are
23 best read to focus almost entirely on how projects affect the environment.
24 (*E.g.*, [Pub. Res. Code,] §§ 21060.5 [defining environment], 21068 [‘
25 “Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially
26 substantial, adverse change in the environment’], 21083(b)(1) [directing
that a project shall be found to have a “significant effect on the
environment” ‘ if it ‘has the potential to degrade the quality of the
environment’].) Indeed, the key phrase ‘significant effect on the
environment’ is explicitly defined by statute in a manner that does not
encompass the environment’s effect on the project. (§ 21068 [“Significant
effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially substantial,
adverse change in the environment.’].) And nowhere in the statute is there
any provision that cuts against the specificity of that definition by plainly
delegating power for the agency to determine whether a project must be
screened on the basis of how the environment affects its residents or
users.” (*Building Association*, supra, 62 Cal.4th at p. 387.)

21 The court then turned its attention to CEQA Guidelines section
22 15126.2(a), cited by District in support of its position that CEQA requires
23 a consideration of the environment’s effect upon future users of a project.
24 CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(a) “calls for an EIR to ‘identify and
25 focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project,’
26 including ‘any significant environmental effects the project might cause
by *bringing development and people into the area affected.*’ (Italics
added.)” (*Building Association*, supra, 62 Cal. 4th at p. 385.) It further
states: “‘[A]n EIR [should] evaluate any potentially significant impacts of
locating development in other areas susceptible to hazardous conditions

1 (e.g., floodplains, coastlines, wildfire risk areas) as identified in
2 authoritative hazard maps, risk assessments or in land use plans addressing
such hazards areas.’ “ (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126(a).)

3 The Supreme Court found valid the above-quoted portions of CEQA
4 Guidelines section 15126(a) “to the extent they call for evaluating a
5 project’s potentially significant *exacerbating* effects on existing
6 environmental hazards....” (*Building Association, supra*, 62 Cal. 4th at p.
7 388.) “Because this type of inquiry still focuses on the *project’s impacts*
8 *on the environment*—how a project might worsen existing conditions—
9 directing an agency to evaluate how such worsened conditions could affect
10 a project’s future users or residents is entirely consistent with this focus
11 and with CEQA as a whole.” (*Id.* at p. 389.) But the Court found two
12 additional sentences contained in CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(a) to
be “clearly erroneous and unauthorized under CEQA: ‘[A]n EIR on a
subdivision astride an active fault line should identify as a significant
effect the seismic hazard to future occupants of the subdivision. The
subdivision would have the effect of attracting people to the location and
exposing them to the hazards found there.’” (*Building Association, supra*,
62 Cal. 4th at p. 390.) These two sentences—which described a project
that would not itself exacerbate the hazard, but whose occupants might be
jeopardized by existing conditions—”impos[ed] a requirement too far
removed from evaluating a project’s impacts on the environment.” (*Ibid.*)

13 *CBIA II*, 2 Cal. App. 5th at 1077-1079 (parallel citations omitted, italicized emphasis in original,
14 underlined emphasis added). In sum, CEQA “does not generally require an agency to consider the
15 effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project’s future users or residents” but does
16 mandate “an analysis of how a project might exacerbate existing environmental hazards.” *CBIA I*, 62
17 Cal. 4th at 392 (emphasis added). The California Supreme Court provided an example.

18 Suppose that an agency wants to locate a project next to the site of a long-
19 abandoned gas station. For years, that station pumped gasoline containing
20 methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE), an additive—now banned by
21 California—that can seep into soil and groundwater. [Citations.] Without
22 any additional development in the area, the MTBE might well remain
23 locked in place, an existing condition whose risks—most notably the
24 contamination of the drinking water supply—are limited to the gas station
25 site and its immediate environs. But by virtue of its proposed location, the
project threatens to disperse the settled MTBE and thus exacerbate the
existing contamination. The agency would have to evaluate the existing
condition—here, the presence of MTBE in the soil—as part of its
environmental review. Because this type of inquiry still focuses on the
project’s impacts on the environment—how a project might worsen
existing conditions—directing an agency to evaluate how such worsened
conditions could affect a project’s future users or residents is entirely

1 consistent with this focus and with CEQA as a whole.

2 *Id.* at 389. In *Ballona Wetlands Land Tr. v. City of Los Angeles*, 201 Cal. App. 4th 455, 474 (2011), for
3 example, a case decided before *CBIA I*, a California appellate court held that an EIR was not required to
4 discuss the impact of sea level rise on a planned real estate development project because “identifying the
5 environmental effects of attracting development and people to an area is consistent with CEQA’s
6 legislative purpose and statutory requirements, but identifying the effects on the project and its users of
7 locating the project in a particular environmental setting is neither consistent with CEQA’s legislative
8 purpose nor required by the CEQA statutes.”

9 The FEIS/R does analyze of the Project’s anticipated contribution to global climate change in the
10 form of, for example, increased emissions of greenhouse gasses caused by increased groundwater
11 pumping for groundwater substitution transfers. AR 25382; 25872-77. Plaintiffs do not challenge this
12 aspect of the FEIS/R. Plaintiffs do insist, however, that climate change is an “existing condition” and
13 “hazard,” the effects of which the Proposed Action could potentially exacerbate and therefore that
14 additional analysis was required in the FEIS/R. ECF No. 69 at 8. There is scant caselaw applying this
15 “exacerbation” rule. One of the only cases to discuss it in any detail is *East Sacramento Partnership for*
16 *a Livable City v. City of Sacramento*, 5 Cal. App. 5th 281, 296-97 (2016), *as modified on denial of reh’g*
17 (Dec. 6, 2016) (“*ESPLC*”). Plaintiffs in that case challenged an EIR for a residential infill development,
18 claiming that the “[a]dditional vehicles, residents, visitors, and others coming to the property because of
19 the Project will undeniably contribute to and exacerbate, the already bad air quality, traffic, and other
20 environmental conditions.” *Id.* at 297. Critically, the *ESPLC* court demanded of Plaintiffs factual
21 support for their assertions of exacerbation. *Id.*

22 In the absence of a specific factual foundation in the record, dire
23 predictions by nonexperts regarding the consequences of a project do not
24 constitute substantial evidence. Unsubstantiated opinions, concerns, and
25 suspicions about a project, though sincere and deeply felt, do not rise to
26 the level of substantial evidence. Thus, project opponents must produce
evidence, other than their unsubstantiated opinions, that a project *will*
produce a particular adverse effect.

1 *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted, emphasis in original). Here, Plaintiffs point out,
2 correctly, that the record supports a finding that climate change will have an impact on the water supply,
3 which will in turn put pressure on California’s water resources “which are already fully utilized by the
4 demands of a growing economy and population.” AR 25865. Moreover, the record indicates that “larger
5 agricultural demands may lead to increased stress on the management of surface water resources and,
6 potentially, the over exploitation of groundwater aquifers.” *Id.* But, Plaintiffs fail to point to record
7 evidence substantiating their position that the Project may exacerbate impacts to water supply caused by
8 climate change. They repeatedly demand that the Authority provide substantial evidence of the absence
9 of such a connection. *See* ECF No. 69 at 10 (Authority “has failed to incorporate into the FEIS/R any
10 meaningful analysis of whether the Proposed Action would exacerbate existing climate change
11 hazards.”). But, as discussed, *ESPLC* suggests Plaintiffs bear the burden of identifying evidence of
12 exacerbation. This makes sense in light of the fact that the exacerbation standard is an exception to the
13 general rule that an EIR need not evaluate the impacts of the environment on a proposed project.
14 Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R’s climate change analysis violates CEQA is
15 DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

16 (2) **NEPA Analysis**

17 In contrast, the parties appear to be in agreement that NEPA requires an evaluation of the impact
18 of climate change on a project, at least under certain circumstances. *See* ECF No. 67 at 5-6 & n.4. Draft
19 Guidance in place at the time the FIES/R issued indicated:

20
21 When assessing the effects of climate change on a proposed action, an
22 agency typically start[s] with an identification of the reasonably
23 foreseeable future condition of the affected environment for the “no
24 action” alternative based on available climate change measurements,
25 statistics, observations, and other evidence. *See* Considering Cumulative
26 Effects (CEQ 1997) at www.nepa.gov. The reasonably foreseeable
affected environment should serve as the basis for evaluating and
comparing the incremental effects of alternatives. 40 CFR § 1502.15.

1 “Draft NEPA Guidance On Consideration of The Effects Of Climate Change And Greenhouse Gas
2 Emissions,” (Feb. 18, 2010)(available at [https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and-](https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and-guidance/20100218-nepa-consideration-effects-ghg-draft-guidance.pdf)
3 [guidance/20100218-nepa-consideration-effects-ghg-draft-guidance.pdf](https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and-guidance/20100218-nepa-consideration-effects-ghg-draft-guidance.pdf)) (hereinafter “Draft
4 Guidance”).³¹

5 At least one climate modeling scenario included in the AR predicts that, statewide, snow water
6 equivalent will decrease by 16 percent by 2035. AR 25864.³² Despite this, the FEIS/R evaluates the
7 impact of the Project on water supplies using the CalSim II model, which is based upon “82 years of
8 historical hydrology from water year 1922 through 2003.” AR 27843. Plaintiffs protest this approach,
9 arguing that it was unreasonable to rely on modeling that utilizes only historic data when the record
10 reflects that “[t]he past century is no longer a reasonable guide to the future for water management.”
11 ECF No. 69 at 18 (citing AR 82917, the “Second National Climate Assessment,” cited in the FEIS/R
12 and included in the AR).

13 Federal Defendants offer several explanations in an attempt to justify the approach used in the
14 FIES/R. First, Federal Defendants point to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental
15 Impact Statement for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (“Draft Bay Delta EIR/EIS”), which incorporated
16 temperature and precipitation projections drawn from “multiple general circulation models and
17 emissions projections” into rainfall runoff models. ECF No. 67 at 2 (citing AR 139843-58). The results
18 of these runoff models were compared to runoff modeling results based on historic temperature and
19 precipitation information to “define the influences of climate change centered on these future periods.”
20 *Id.* The results predict that, on an annual basis, inflow to key reservoirs in California will not be

21
22 ³¹ The Draft Guidance was superseded by a Final Guidance on August 5, 2016, “Final Guidance for Federal Departments and
23 Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental
24 Policy Act Reviews,” but that Final Guidance was withdrawn on April 5, 2017 by the CEQ in light of Executive Order 13783
(Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth, 82 Fed. Reg. 16,093 (Mar. 31, 2017)). *See* 82 Fed. Reg. 16,576
(Apr. 5, 2017). Nonetheless, Federal Defendants indicate that the Draft Guidance, while non-binding, “does not change any
law, regulation, or other legally binding requirement.” *See* [https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-](https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-climate_final_guidance.html)
[climate_final_guidance.html](https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-climate_final_guidance.html) (last visited January 4, 2018).

25 ³² The Court agrees with Plaintiffs that this is not, as Federal Defendants suggest (ECF No. 67 at 3), based on an outlier
study. Other evidence in the record corroborates the assertion that snowpack in California has and likely will continue to
decrease as a result of climate change. AR 21886.

1 substantially different from historic patterns. *Id.* at 3 (citing AR 139849-58). For example, the ratio of
2 projected average inflow in 2025 to historic inflow to Shasta Reservoir is 1:1. AR 139844-45, 139851-
3 52. In theory, this record evidence demonstrating that precipitation overall will not change as a result of
4 climate change could justify reliance on modeling that utilized historic datasets, were it not for a
5 significant limitation of the analysis on which Federal Defendants rely. Plaintiffs point out, correctly,
6 that the modeling results to which Federal Defendants refer are based upon predictions of annual inflows
7 to reservoirs. They argue that reviewing only annual trends misses a key factor: changes in the timing of
8 precipitation. Plaintiffs point to information in the record that indicates “[r]educed snowpack and earlier
9 snow melt will alter the timing and amount of water supplies, posing significant challenges for water
10 resource management in the West.” AR 82878. An appendix to the Draft Bay Delta EIR/EIS entitled
11 “Climate Change Effects on Hydrology in the Study Area Used for CALSIM Modeling Analysis”
12 (“CalSim II Appendix”) acknowledges this, indicating: “The simulated projected changes in monthly
13 and annual runoff from projected future climate change generally reflect the expected shift from
14 snowpack runoff (in April, May, and June) to rainfall runoff (in January, February, and March).” AR
15 139843. This is not academic nit-picking. As the CalSim II Appendix explains, this “decrease in inflow
16 during the peak irrigation period of June, July and August will be particularly difficult for existing
17 agricultural water supplies, and will likely require additional groundwater recharge in the spring with
18 increased groundwater pumping in the summer months.” AR 139849 (emphasis added).³³ Federal
19 Defendants’ focus on annual patterns ignores a critical aspect of the impact in question.

20 Second, Federal Defendants suggest that the predicted 16 percent snow-water equivalent
21 decrease emphasized by Plaintiff was based upon modeling of a “worst case scenario.” ECF No. 67 at 3-
22 4. Specifically, the relied-upon prediction came from the “A2” emissions scenario, one of several

23
24 ³³ As Plaintiffs acknowledge, this quote is drawn from a section of the CalSim II Appendix discussing Millerton Reservoir,
25 which, because of its location to the east of Fresno, California, does not impact directly the seller areas at issue in this case.
26 Nonetheless, Plaintiffs point out, correctly, that modeling for other, more relevant reservoirs shows similar seasonal patterns.
AR 139844 (Trinity Reservoir); 139845 (Shasta); 139846 (Oroville).

1 modeled scenarios. *See* AR 25861-62. According to Federal Defendants, “A2” scenario predicts the
2 “highest and worst-case events and assumes continued increases in emissions throughout the century.”
3 ECF No. 67 at 3 (citing AR 83089, 83545-547). Presumably, Federal Defendants make this argument
4 because NEPA does not require worst-case analysis. *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 356. But, as Plaintiffs
5 point out, ECF No. 51 at 11, the A2 scenario is not a “worst case” scenario, at least not in the way that
6 term is generally understood, in part because the record reflects that “[r]ecent carbon dioxide emissions
7 have, in fact, been higher than in the A2 scenario. Whether this trend will continue is not possible to
8 predict because it depends on societal choices.” AR 83903 (emphasis added).

9 Federal Defendants make one other argument that is simply illogical, asserting:

10 The global dispersion of greenhouse gases means that localized
11 environmental impacts cannot be traced to California’s particular
12 emissions. Even if there were a way to trace state-specific emissions to
13 particular climate change impacts, record evidence demonstrates that
14 emissions in California are decreasing, *see e.g.*, AR82457 (indicating that
15 greenhouse gas emissions decreased by 1.6 percent between 2000 and
16 2012 in California), and that the State has set goals for future reduction in
17 coming years, including over the life of the Project. *See, e.g.* AR82461.
18 Thus, given this and other information in the record discussed above, it
19 was not contradictory for Federal Defendants to conclude that “any effects
20 of climate change on [the Proposed Action] alternative are expected to be
21 minimal. Impacts to the Proposed Action from climate change would be
22 less than significant.” AR25874.

23 ECF No. 67 at 4. In this argument Federal Defendants rely on information demonstrating greenhouse
24 gas emissions from California sources are decreasing to argue that impacts to the Proposed Action from
25 climate change would be less than significant. This adds nothing but confusion to the discussion. As the
26 first sentence of the above-quoted paragraph indicates, it is undisputed (and indisputable) that
greenhouse gas emissions from California cannot and will not control the trajectory of climate change
overall.

27 The Authority’s relevant arguments on this topic (i.e., those arguments that could arguably be
28 applied to a NEPA analysis), which focus on modeling, are equally unavailing. The Authority
29 emphasizes that “[modeling] is the best available tool to estimate the effects of transfers in a range of

1 scenarios” and argues that “[a]ny climate change effects that may have occurred in the most recent ten-
2 year period are difficult to discern in context and would be too small to be outside the range of modeling
3 variability.” ECF No. 48 at 17 (citing AR 27429, 27934). The Authority then sets up a straw man by
4 arguing that “[i]t is certainly possible that the next ten years may be the driest on record, potentially
5 influenced to an unknown extent by climate change, but it would be speculative to develop hydrology
6 for the period of analysis in the [FEIS/R] (2015-2024) as a series of 10 consecutive critical years based
7 on potential climate change.” *Id.* (citing AR 27429). In light of the contrary record evidence cited above
8 concerning decreasing snow water equivalent, the Authority fails to point to record evidence to support
9 its conclusory assertion that it is “speculative to develop hydrology for the period of analysis in the
10 [FEIS/R].” The cited pages from the AR contain no explanation of or support for this conclusion,
11 leaving the Court with nothing upon which it could find that the Authority’s assertion is based upon
12 record evidence.³⁴

13 In evaluating the treatment of climate change in the FEIS/R, the Court finds *Wild Fish*
14 *Conservancy v. Irving*, 221 F. Supp. 3d 1224 (E.D. Wash. 2016), to be instructive, even though the
15 relevant sections of that case concern the ESA’s best available science standard. In that case, the
16 National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS”) was required to evaluate under the ESA whether the
17 operation of a fish hatchery would jeopardize the continued existence of endangered fish that spawn in
18 the same watershed serviced by the hatchery. *Id.* at 1227-28. That analysis contained a detailed
19 discussion of the effects of climate change on salmon recovery in the region, “including that models
20 predict a significant reduction in total snowpack and low-elevation snowpack, affecting streamflow and
21 water temperatures.” *Id.* at 1233. Despite the projected changes reflected in the record, NMFS used

23 ³⁴ Rather than providing supporting citations, the Authority’s brief immediately pivots to explain that “modeling is theoretical
24 and water projects are managed in real time,” as a segue to arguing that Mitigation Measure GW-1 is “designed to avoid and
25 reduce impacts based on actual conditions at the time of transfer, rather than predicted conditions from the modeling effort.”
26 ECF No. 48 at 17. However, a mitigation measure cannot be used as a substitute for analysis of environmental impacts under
NEPA or CEQA. *See N. Plains Res. Council, Inc. v. Surface Transp. Bd.*, 668 F.3d 1067, 1084 (9th Cir. 2011); *Lotus*, 223
Cal. App. 4th at 653-54.

1 historic stream and water temperature data to analyze the hatchery’s operations and water use. *Id.* NMFS
2 argued that it properly considered the best available science on region-wide climate change and relied on
3 only historic averages to conduct its analysis of the specific stream on which the hatchery was located
4 because no finer-scale climate change analysis of that stream was available. *Id.*

5 While acknowledging that a court must give deference to an expert agency on highly scientific or
6 technical questions, the Wild Fish court emphasized that “a voluminous and technical record does not
7 insulate a decision from judicial review under that deferential standard.” *Id.*

8 The problem with NMFS’s analysis is not that it used recent historical
9 streamflow data to model the effects of hatchery operations and water use
10 at different flow levels. [Record citation.] The problem here is that NMFS
11 included no discussion whatsoever of the potential effects of climate
12 change in the BiOp’s analysis of the Hatchery’s future operations and
13 water use. NMFS discusses the effects of climate change generally and
14 then proceeds with analysis on the apparent assumption that there will be
15 no change to the hydrology of Icicle Creek. NMFS does not necessarily
16 need to conduct a study or build a model addressing the impacts of climate
17 change on the Icicle Creek watershed. But its analysis must consider that
18 the best available science, which it discusses elsewhere in the BiOp,
19 suggests that baseline historical flow averages may not be effective
20 predictors of future flows.

21 *Id.* at 1233-34. The failure was not necessarily the failure to build a model based on the more general
22 climate change information, but the failure to consider that information in any meaningful or logical
23 way. This was arbitrary and capricious “fail[ure] to consider an important aspect of the problem.” *Id.* at
24 1234.

25 The FEIS/R suffers from a strikingly similar failure. It explains that snowpack and streamflow is
26 predicted to decline:

27 Snowpack and Streamflow: Snowpack and streamflow amounts are
28 projected to decline because of less late winter precipitation falling as
29 snow and earlier snowmelt (Melillo, Richmond, and Yohe 2014). In
30 California, snow water equivalent the amount of water held in a volume of
31 snow is projected to decrease by 16 percent by 2035, 34 percent by 2070,
32 and 57 percent by 2099, as compared to measurements between 1971 and
33 2000 (Melillo, Richmond, and Yohe 2014). By the end of the century, late
34 spring streamflow could decline by up to 30 percent.

1 AR 25864. Nonetheless, the FEIS/R fails to address or otherwise explain how this information about the
2 potential impacts of climate change can be reconciled with the ultimate conclusion that climate change
3 impacts to the Project will be less than significant:

4 *Changes to the environment from climate change could affect the*
5 *Proposed Action.* As described in the Section 3.6.1.3, changes to annual
6 temperatures, extreme heat, precipitation sea, level rise and storm surge,
7 and snowpack and streamflow are expected to occur in the future because
8 of climate change. Because of the short-term duration of the Proposed
9 Action (10 years), any effects of climate change on this alternative are
10 expected to be minimal. Impacts to the Proposed Action from climate
11 change would be less than significant.

12 AR 25874. As in *Wild Fish*, this amounts to a “failure to consider an important aspect of the problem.”³⁵

13 Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R’s analysis of climate change
14 violates NEPA is GRANTED; Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is DENIED.

15 **c. Assessment of Water Quality Impacts (CEQA and NEPA)**

16 Plaintiffs next argue that the FEIS/R is unlawful because it fails to evaluate water quality impacts
17 in a manner that comports with the law. ECF No. 45 at 28. Plaintiffs do not specify whether this
18 challenge is brought under CEQA and NEPA. Because both the Authority and Federal Defendants have
19 responded to the motion substantively, the Court addresses compliance with both statutes.

20 Plaintiffs first point out that the FEIS/R sets forth certain standards of significance for impacts to
21 water quality as follows:

22 **Significance Criteria**

23 For the purposes of this EIS/EIR, impacts to water quality would be
24 considered significant if implementation of any of the alternatives would:

25 ³⁵ While this specific language – failure to consider an important aspect of the problem – is referenced most often in the
26 context of ESA cases, the language has its roots in the APA standard of review, which applies to NEPA cases as well. *See*
27 *Cascadia Wildlands v. Bureau of Indian Affairs*, 801 F.3d 1105, 1110 (9th Cir. 2015) (in NEPA case, court “will reverse a
28 decision as arbitrary and capricious only if the agency relied on factors Congress did not intend it to consider, entirely failed
29 to consider an important aspect of the problem, or offered an explanation that runs counter to the evidence before the agency
30 or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise”).

- Violate existing water quality objectives or standards;
- Result in long-term adverse effects on beneficial uses; or
- Substantially degrade existing water quality.

AR 25556. Plaintiffs focus on the first trigger.³⁶ Among applicable water quality standards or objectives, the FEIS/R references those included in D-1641, which “require that the [CVP] and [SWP] be operated to protect water quality, and that DWR and/or Reclamation ensure that the flow dependent water quality objectives are met in the Delta.” AR 25539. Plaintiffs complain that the FEIS/R fails to mention that Reclamation and DWR “routinely request relaxation of these standards.” ECF No. 45 at 28 (citing AR 30364). The SWRCB relaxed D-1641’s outflow and salinity requirements in 2014 and 2015. *See* AR 30364. In 2014, operators were unable to maintain temperature control in the Sacramento River, which resulted in significant impacts to listed fish species that spawn in the upper reaches of the Sacramento River. *See* AR 30348.

While acknowledging that “exceedances of water quality standards have occurred, especially during recent drought years,” the FEIS/R concluded that “changes in operations associated with the range of potential water transfer activities . . . are not expected to significantly affect water quality or exceedances.” AR 28006. Among other things, as the Authority points out, carriage water is used to maintain compliance with whatever water quality standards are in force and effect. *See* ECF No. 48 at 10-12³⁷; *see also supra* at part IV.A.2.b. The fact that the SWRCB may authorize temporary changes to water rights conditions related to water quality is not an impact of this Project and operation under any such temporarily modified water quality regime does not result in a violation of water quality objectives or standards because operating under a TUCP with SWRCB permission excuses any such violation. *See* California Water Code §§ 1435-1442. Therefore, Plaintiffs’ argument is at its heart nonsensical. They

³⁶ Federal Defendants also argue that “Plaintiffs completely fail to acknowledge that [the significance criteria concerned with violations of water quality standards] is just one of three significance criteria.” ECF No. 49-1 at 17. This is unpersuasive, as the FES/R appears to treat all three criteria as independent triggers.

³⁷ Plaintiffs are not correct that the Authority has conceded this argument. The fact that the Authority’s factual response to this argument may be located within a different section of their opposition brief is as much a reflection of the overlapping organization of Plaintiffs’ own motion as anything else.

1 argue the FEIS/R is unlawful because it failed to consider frequent, authorized exceedances of water
2 rights conditions in light of the significance criteria concerned with “violat[ions] of existing water
3 quality objectives or standards.” ECF No. 45 at 28. An authorized exceedance cannot be a violation of
4 existing water quality objectives or standards. Without more to this argument (e.g., an argument that
5 water quality is compromised in a material way) – this hyper-technical complaint is unpersuasive.

6 Plaintiffs next argue that the FEIS/R presents a “skewed and generalized” discussion of the
7 potential for additionally pumped contaminated groundwater to contaminate surface water via irrigation
8 runoff. ECF No. 45 at 29 (citing AR 25559). This argument builds upon the argument, discussed above,
9 that the FEIS/R failed to accurately describe existing groundwater contamination. *See supra* Part
10 IV.A.3.a(3). As mentioned, the FEIS/R revealed that there were numerous active groundwater clean-up
11 sites in the Sacramento Valley, but that most of these sites were clustered around urban areas. AR
12 25673. As the FIES/R explains, “[g]roundwater substitution transfers would use groundwater for
13 irrigation instead of surface water.” AR 25559. However, “[t]he amount of groundwater substituted for
14 surface water under the Proposed Action would be relatively small compared to the amount of surface
15 water used to irrigate agricultural fields in the Seller Service Area.” *Id.* “Groundwater would mix with
16 surface water in agricultural drainages prior to irrigation return flow reaching the rivers.” *Id.* Therefore,
17 “[c]onstituents of concern that may be present in the groundwater could enter the surface water as a
18 result of mixing with irrigation return flows. Any constituents of concern, however, would be greatly
19 diluted when mixed with the existing surface waters applied because a much higher volume of surface
20 water is used for irrigation purposes in the Seller Service Area.” *Id.* In addition, the FEIS/R finds that
21 “groundwater quality in the area is generally good and sufficient for municipal agricultural domestic and
22 industrial uses.” *Id.* In their opening brief, Plaintiffs call the FEIS/R’s conclusion that constituents of
23 concern would be diluted “specul[ative],” ECF No. 45 at 29, but in response to Federal Defendants
24 citing the groundwater quality analyses in the FEIS/R, *see* ECF No. 49-1 at 13 & 18, Plaintiffs do not
25 address this issue. ECF No. 51 at 13. The Court therefore treats this issue as abandoned.

1 **d. Assessment of Impacts to Giant Garter Snake (CEQA)**

2 Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R fails to satisfy CEQA’s requirements with respect to analysis of
3 the Project’s impacts on Giant Garter Snake (“GGS”). Because the Court dedicates a lengthy section of
4 this decision to evaluating an ESA challenge to the BiOp pertaining to GGS, *see infra* at Part IV.B, and
5 because that discussion informs its analysis of the CEQA challenge, the Court addresses the CEQA
6 challenge after the ESA discussion. *See infra* at Part IV.C.

7 **e. Analysis of Biological Impacts of Reductions to Delta Outflows (CEQA)**

8 Plaintiffs next argue that the FEIS/R fails to adequately analyze impacts resulting from
9 acknowledged reductions to Delta outflows. ECF No. 45 at 32. Specifically, they argue that the
10 FEIS/R’s threshold of significance related to this particular impact is arbitrary and therefore violates
11 CEQA and that the cumulative impact analysis fails to take into consideration the already degraded
12 condition of the Delta.³⁸ *Id.*

13 In connection with the direct (as opposed to cumulative) impact analysis, the FEIS/R indicates
14 that “[m]odeled changes in Delta outflow or X2³⁹ relative to existing conditions were considered
15 substantial and required further analysis if they were greater than ten percent.” AR 25904. In selecting
16 this threshold, the FEIS/R relied upon environmental studies evaluating impacts to fish habitat caused by
17 decreased flows in freshwater streams and rivers. AR 25903. These studies revealed a “consensus that
18 differences in modeled flows [in those circumstances] of less than ten percent would be within the noise
19 of the model outputs and beyond the ability to measure actual changes.” AR 25903. Plaintiffs complain
20 that applying this ten percent threshold, derived from studies of impacts to streams and rivers, to Delta

21
22 ³⁸ The Court agrees with Federal Defendants’ assessment that Plaintiffs only challenge the FEIS/R’s treatment of this issue
under CEQA, raising no parallel NEPA challenge. *See* ECF No. 49-1; ECF No. 59 at 6.

23 ³⁹ “X2 is the point identified by its distance from the Golden Gate Bridge where salinity at the river’s bottom is about two
24 parts per thousand (ppt) and is the basis for standards to protect aquatic life.” *Ctr. for Envtl. Sci., Accuracy & Reliability v. U.S.*
Dep’t of Interior, 376 F.3d 853, 876 (9th Cir. 2004) (“X2 measures the intrusion of water with a salinity level of two parts
25 per thousand concentration of salt into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. X2 represents the number of kilometers the salt
water has moved into the Delta from the Golden Gate Bridge. As fresh water inflows to the Delta decrease, X2 moves
26 eastward into the Delta.”).

1 outflow is inappropriate because “non-tidally influenced systems,” such as rivers and streams, “are
2 different from tidally-influenced waterbodies,” such as the Delta. ECF No. 51 at 16. Plaintiffs maintain
3 that while “a 10% reduction in flow in a purely freshwater system simply means that less water is in the
4 channel, the same is not true in the delta. Instead, reducing freshwater flows changes the chemistry of
5 the water itself. Uncritically adopting the freshwater standard is therefore not adequate.” *Id.* However,
6 Plaintiffs cite no factual information to support this assertion. They do cite *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d
7 at 595, for that case’s explanation that decreased inflow into the Delta from upstream sources increases
8 Delta salinity, which in turn affects the location of X2, which (at least for purposes of the environmental
9 document evaluated in *San Luis v. Jewell*) serves as a proxy for the location of the habitat for at least
10 one protected fish species. But, *San Luis v. Jewell* does not directly or even indirectly support Plaintiffs’
11 factual assertion that a 10% threshold of significance is less appropriate for Delta outflow impacts than it
12 is for streamflow impacts. Information contained in the FEIS/R could support the opposite assertion:
13 because tidal fluctuations can be huge (average daily changes on the order of 170,000 cfs), the modeled
14 changes in outflow (reductions of not more than 147 cfs), would be miniscule in comparison. *See* AR
15 25920. Without more, the Court is simply not in the position to question the FEIS/R’s reliance on a 10%
16 threshold of significance for direct impacts, given that the use of such a threshold seems to be well
17 supported in the related context of freshwater streamflow.⁴⁰

18 _____
19 ⁴⁰ Moreover, Plaintiffs do not dispute that the analysis provided in the FEIS/R reveals that adverse impacts to Delta Outflows
20 (i.e., reductions in outflow and resulting upstream shifts of X2) come nowhere near the 10% threshold of significance. As the
FEIS/R indicates:

21 Under the Proposed Action, modeled mean Delta outflows would not be more than 1.3 percent
22 (147 cfs) lower than flows under the No Action/No Project Alternative in any month or water year
23 type. Outflow would be 12.2 percent (500 cfs) higher during July in critically dry water years. The
24 maximum mean monthly upstream shift in X2 location would be 0.1 km (0.2 percent upstream)
25 during periods of decreased flow, and 1.9 km (1.0 percent downstream) during periods of
increased flow. Average daily fluctuations in outflow, and therefore X2 position, at Chipps Island
due to tides are 170,000 cfs (DWR 1995). Therefore, a change of 500 cfs in Delta outflow would
be 0.3 percent of the daily tidal change experienced in this area. These changes to Delta outflow,
and resultant changes in X2 position, due to the Proposed Action would not have a substantial
adverse impact on biological resources because either outflow reductions would be minimal (less
than 1.3 percent) or the potential outflow increase of 12.2 percent could be beneficial.

1 The Court finds Plaintiffs’ arguments regarding the analysis of cumulative impact to Delta
2 outflow to be more compelling. Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R violated CEQA because it failed to
3 consider the existing degraded environmental conditions in setting the threshold of significance. In
4 support of this argument, Plaintiffs place great weight on *Communities for a Better Environment v.*
5 *California Resources Agency*, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98 (2002) (“CBE”), disapproved of on other grounds by
6 *Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley*, 60 Cal. 4th 1086 1109 n. 3 (2015), which addressed a
7 challenge to the implementation of CEQA Guidelines sections 15064(i)(4) and 15130(a)(4). The version
8 of section 15064(i)(4) in force in 2002 stated:

9 A lead agency may determine that the incremental impacts of a project are
10 not cumulatively considerable when they are so small that they make only
11 a de minimis contribution to a significant cumulative impact caused by
12 other projects that would exist in the absence of the proposed project.
13 Such de minimis incremental impacts, by themselves, do not trigger the
14 obligation to prepare an EIR. A de minimis contribution means that the
15 environmental conditions would essentially be the same whether or not the
16 proposed project is implemented.

17 The 2002 version of CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(4) states:

18 An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s
19 incremental effect is cumulatively considerable Where a lead agency
20 is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not ‘cumulatively
21 considerable,’ a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but
22 shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is
23 not cumulatively considerable. [¶] . . . [¶] (4) An EIR may determine that a
24 project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact is de minimis
25 and thus is not significant. A de minimis contribution means that the
26 environmental conditions would essentially be the same whether or not the
27 proposed project is implemented.

28 The *CBE* court found these two provisions inconsistent with controlling CEQA law because they
29 “turn[ed] cumulative impact analysis on its head by diminishing the need to do a cumulative impact
30 analysis as the cumulative impact problem worsens.” *Id.* at 118. The court’s reasoning is instructive.

31 The seminal decision is *Kings County [Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford,*

32 AR 25920. The Court therefore finds that in the context of the direct impact evaluation, even if the 10% threshold of
33 significance were inappropriate, any such error would not be prejudicial because the disclosed impact is far lower.

1 221 Cal. App. 3d 692, 718 (1990)]. There the court concluded that an EIR
2 inadequately considered an air pollution (ozone) cumulative impact. The
3 court said: “The [EIR concludes the project’s contributions to ozone
4 levels in the area would be immeasurable and, therefore, insignificant
5 because the [cogeneration] plant would emit relatively minor amounts of
6 [ozone] precursors compared to the total volume of [ozone] precursors
7 emitted in Kings County. The EIR’s analysis uses the magnitude of the
8 current ozone problem in the air basin in order to trivialize the project’s
9 impact.” The court concluded: “The relevant question to be addressed in
10 the EIR is not the relative amount of precursors emitted by the project
11 when compared with preexisting emissions, but whether any additional
12 amount of precursor emissions should be considered significant in light of
13 the serious nature of the ozone problems in this air basin.”

8 *Los Angeles Unified [Sch. Dist. v. City of Los Angeles, 58 Cal. App. 4th*
9 *1019 (1997)]* followed the *Kings County* approach. It found an EIR
10 inadequate for concluding that a project’s additional increase in noise level
11 of another 2.8 to 3.3 dBA was insignificant given that the existing noise
12 level of 72 dBA already exceeded the regulatory recommended maximum
13 of 70 dBA. The court concluded that this “ratio theory” trivialized the
14 project’s noise impact by focusing on individual inputs rather than their
15 collective significance. The relevant issue was not the relative amount of
16 traffic noise resulting from the project when compared to existing traffic
17 noise, but whether any additional amount of traffic noise should be
18 considered significant given the nature of the existing traffic noise
19 problem.

14 From *Kings County* and *Los Angeles Unified*, the guiding criterion on the
15 subject of cumulative impact is whether any additional effect caused by
16 the proposed project should be considered significant given the existing
17 cumulative effect.

17 *CBE*, 103 Cal. App. 4th at 117-18 (footnotes omitted). “In the end, the greater the existing
18 environmental problems are, the lower the threshold should be for treating a project’s contribution to
19 cumulative impacts as significant.” *Id.* at 120.

20 Here, the record suggests that the present condition of the Delta is already precarious, due in part
21 to reduced Delta outflows. AR 151608 (SWRCB Report indicating that current Delta flows are
22 insufficient to support public trust resources, which include fish and wildlife). Yet, the FEIS/R fails to
23 account for this in its cumulative impacts analysis, focusing instead on the fact that changes to Delta
24 outflow and X2 position would be “small” (less than three percent) and that this and all other projects
25 would be subject to numerous regulatory constraints, including requirements imposed under the ESA

1 and D-1641:

2 *The Proposed Action in combination with other cumulative projects could*
3 *cause Delta outflows to be lower than under the No Action/No Project*
4 *Alternative. Long-term water transfer actions under the Proposed Action*
5 *would have a less than significant impact on fisheries resources that may*
6 *be influenced by Delta outflow, as changes in Delta outflow and X2*
7 *location would be small (less than three percent) in all months and water*
8 *year types. In addition, all cumulative water operations projects affecting*
9 *Delta exports would be required to meet Delta water quality standards*
10 *(e.g., D-1641) and meet the requirements of the USFWS and NOAA*
11 *Fisheries BOs for the long term coordinated operations of the CVP and*
12 *SWP. Because changes in Delta outflow and X2 location are predicted to*
13 *be small and there are additional protections for fisheries and aquatic*
14 *resources already in place under the ESA and D-1641, these impacts*
15 *would be less than significant. The Proposed Action in combination with*
16 *other cumulative actions would not result in a cumulative significant*
17 *impact on fisheries resources related to changes in Delta outflow and X2*
18 *location.*

19 AR 25942. Neither the Authority nor the Federal Defendants respond to this argument directly.

20 Even if one interprets the above cumulative impacts analysis as imposing a threshold of
21 significance of three percent, the total absence of consideration of the existing environmental problems
22 related to outflow is a legal failure that is potentially prejudicial to the FEIS/R's analysis. The Authority
23 points out, correctly, that "Delta outflow remains the same or increases when water transfers are
24 occurring, which helps alleviate extreme dry conditions," ECF No. 58 at 7 (citing AR 25567, 27473,
25 27476), but, as the FEIS/R makes very clear, NDO will decrease during other times of the year. AR
26 25567. The FEIS/R does not discount the potential significance of these increases because of their
27 timing, but rather based upon magnitude. *See id.*; *see also* AR 27473 (FEIS/R agreeing with comment
28 that flows during wet times of the year can be important to aquatic ecosystems, but finding increases to
29 be insignificant because they did not exceed threshold levels). It is the latter form of discounting (and
30 the only one relied upon in the FEIS/R) that has the potential to be prejudicial under CEQA.

31 In sum, while the Court finds the analysis of direct impacts to Delta outflow passes muster under
32 CEQA, the analysis of cumulative impacts to Delta outflow does not because the thresholds utilized do
33 not take into account existing conditions in the Delta. As to the former, Plaintiffs' motion for summary

1 judgment is DENIED, and the Authority's cross-motion GRANTED. As to the latter, Plaintiffs' motion
2 for summary judgment is GRANTED, and the Authority's cross-motion DENIED.

3 **5. Evaluation of Mitigation Measures**

4 **a. Background on Mitigation Measure GW-1**

5 The FEIS/R concluded that "[g]roundwater substitution transfers could cause a reduction in
6 groundwater levels in the Seller Service Area" that would be significant, but that those impacts would be
7 reduced to a level of insignificance by Mitigation Measure GW-1. AR 25757.

8 Groundwater substitution transfers under the Proposed Action could
9 decrease groundwater levels potentially affecting non-transferring wells
10 near participating substitution wells. Declining groundwater levels could
11 also affect land subsidence and groundwater quality; however, these
12 effects would be less than significant. Cropland idling transfers under the
13 Proposed Action could reduce percolation to groundwater, but the
14 reduction would be small because rice (the main crop proposed for idling)
15 is typically grown on soils with low permeability. Potential effects on
16 groundwater resources in the Seller Service Area under Proposed Action
17 would be greater than the No Action/No Project Alternative. These effects
18 could be reduced by Mitigation Measure GW-1 (Section 3.3.4.1).

14 AR 25758.

15 Mitigation Measure GW-1 is described in Section 3.3.4.1 of the FEIS/R. The stated objective of
16 GW-1 is "to avoid significant adverse environmental effects" related to groundwater and "ensure prompt
17 corrective action in the event unanticipated effects occur." AR 25759. More specifically GW-1 aims to:

18 (1) minimize potential effects to other legal users of water; (2) provide a
19 process for review and response to reported effects to non-transferring
20 parties; (3) assure that a local mitigation strategy is in place prior to the
21 groundwater transfer; and (4) mitigate significant adverse environmental
22 effects.

21 *Id.* The measure purports to accomplish these by "monitoring groundwater and/or surface water levels
22 during transfers to avoid potential effects." *Id.*

23 GW-1 calls upon sellers to implement several sets of measures. First, sellers must submit well
24 data to Reclamation and/or DWR for review. The specific requirements for the well data are
25 incorporated by reference from a separate document: the "DRAFT Technical Information for Preparing
26

1 Water Transfer Proposals” (“DTIPWTP”) *Id.*; *see also, e.g.*, AR 62603-62650 (2013 version of
2 DTIPWTP).

3 Second, sellers must implement a monitoring program that “shall, at a minimum,” include:

4 (1) “sufficient number of monitoring wells, as determined by Reclamation and the sellers in relation to
5 local conditions, to accurately characterize groundwater levels and response in the area before, during,
6 and after transfer pumping takes place” with possible additional monitoring required near ecological
7 resource areas (AR 25760); (2) installation into “all wells pumping to replace surface water designated
8 for transfer . . . a permanent instantaneous and totalizing flow meter capable of accurately measuring
9 well discharge rates and volumes” with the requirement that “[f]low meter readings will be recorded just
10 prior to initiation of pumping and at designated times, but no less than monthly and as close as practical
11 to the last day of the month throughout the duration of the transfer” (*id.*); (3) collection of groundwater
12 level data from both participating transfer wells and monitoring wells before, during, and after transfer-
13 related pumping at specified intervals⁴¹ (*id.*).

14 According to the FEIS/R, “[s]ellers thus monitor effects to groundwater levels that may result
15 from the proposed transfer and avoid significant impacts.” *Id.* The FEIS/R indicates that “[t]he primary
16 criteria used to identify potentially significant impacts to groundwater levels are the [basin management
17 objectives (“BMOs”)] set by [Groundwater Management Plans (“GMPs”) promulgated by local
18

19 ⁴¹ The specific intervals are as follows:

- 20 • Prior to transfer: Groundwater levels will be measured monthly from March in the year of the
21 proposed transfer-related pumping until the start of the transfer (where possible).
- 22 • Start of transfer: Groundwater levels will be measured on the same day that the transfer-related
23 pumping begins, prior to the pump being turned on.
- 24 • During transfer-related pumping: Groundwater levels will be measured weekly throughout the
25 transfer-related pumping period, unless site specific information indicates a different interval
26 should be used.
- Post-transfer pumping: Groundwater levels will be measured weekly for one month after the end
of transfer-related pumping, after which groundwater levels will be measured monthly through
March of the year following the transfer.

AR 25760.

1 agencies].” AR 25760-61. While several counties in the Sacramento Valley have established GMPs,
2 other areas have not. AR 25671. In areas where quantitative BMOs do not exist, GW-1 sets forth the
3 following procedure:

4 Reclamation, [the Authority], and the potential sellers will coordinate
5 closely with potentially impacted third parties to collect and monitor
6 groundwater data. If a third party expects that it may be impacted by a
7 proposed transfer, that party should contact Reclamation and the seller
8 with its concern. The burden of collecting groundwater data will not be the
9 responsibility of the third party. If warranted, groundwater level
10 monitoring to address the third-party’s concern may be incorporated in the
11 monitoring and mitigation plans required by Mitigation Measure GW-1.

12 *Id.*

13 Finally, “to avoid significant effects to vegetation and allow sellers to modify actions before
14 significant effects occur, sellers will monitor groundwater depth data to verify that significant adverse
15 effects to deep-rooted vegetation are avoided.” *Id.* If monitoring data indicate that groundwater levels
16 have dropped below the level of typical root zones “the seller must implement actions set forth in the
17 mitigation plan,” subject to certain exceptions. *Id.* If significant adverse impacts to deep-rooted
18 vegetation occur as a result of the transfer despite the monitoring efforts and implementation of the
19 mitigation plan, the seller “will prepare a report documenting the result of the restoration activity to
20 plant, maintain, and monitor restoration of vegetation for 5 years to replace the losses.” *Id.*

21 **b. CEQA Challenges to GW-1**

22 **(1) CEQA’s General Mitigation Measure Requirements**

23 CEQA requires that whenever an EIR finds that an impact to the environment will be significant,
24 the EIR must propose mitigation measures to minimize those significant effects. *See* Cal. Pub. Res.
25 Code § 21100(b)(3). To be legally adequate, mitigation measures must be capable of: “(a) [a]voiding the
26 impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action[;] (b) [m]inimizing impacts by
limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation[;] (c) [r]ectifying the impact by
repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment[;] (d) [r]educing or eliminating the

1 impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action[;]

2 (e) [c]ompensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.”

3 CEQA Guidelines § 15370; *see also Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council of Sacramento*, 229 Cal.
4 App. 3d 1011, 1027 (1991) (citing same).

5 If the EIR identifies significant environmental effects, the public agency may approve the project
6 only if it makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect: “(a) ... [¶]
7 (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or
8 avoid the significant effects on the environment. . . . [¶] (3) Specific economic, legal, social,
9 technological or other considerations . . . make infeasible the mitigation measures or [project]
10 alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.” Cal. Pub. Res. Code. § 21081. “For each
11 significant effect, the EIR must identify specific mitigation measures; where several potential mitigation
12 measures are available, each should be discussed separately, and the reasons for choosing one over the
13 others should be stated.” *Lotus*, 223 Cal. App. 4th at 653 (internal citations and quotations omitted).

14 To comply with CEQA, a mitigation measure must be enforceable and likely to be effective. *See*
15 *Sierra Club v. Cty. of San Diego*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1169 (2014) (finding mitigation measures
16 insufficient where not enforceable and/or not likely to achieve mitigation purposes); *see also* CEQA
17 Guideline § 15126.4(a)(2) (“Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions,
18 agreements, or other legally-binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy,
19 regulation, or other public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy,
20 regulation, or project design.”); *Tracy First v. City of Tracy*, 177 Cal. App. 4th 1, 937 (2009) (citing
21 same). “The purpose of these requirements is to ensure that feasible mitigation measures will actually be
22 implemented as a condition of development, and not merely adopted and then neglected or disregarded.”
23 *Fed’n of Hillside & Canyon Associations v. City of Los Angeles*, 83 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1261 (2000)
24 (emphasis omitted). “[W]here substantial evidence supports the approving agency’s conclusion that
25 mitigation measures will be effective, courts will uphold such measures against attacks based on their

1 alleged inadequacy.” *Sacramento Old City*, 229 Cal. App. 3d at 1027 (citing *Laurel Heights*, 47 Cal. 3d
2 at 407). Implementation of measures must occur before the start of the project activity that causes the
3 impact. *POET, LLC v. California Air Res. Bd.*, 217 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 740 (2013), *as modified on*
4 *denial of reh’g* (Aug. 8, 2013).

5 **(2) Draft Technical Information for Preparing Water Transfer Proposals**

6 In the section describing GW-1, the FEIS/R states that the DTIPWTP “provides guidance for the
7 development of groundwater substitution water transfer proposals . . . [and] informs the development of
8 the monitoring and mitigation program for the range of potential transfer activities evaluated in this
9 EIS/ER.” AR 25757. Plaintiffs note that GW-1 does not incorporate those requirements by reference
10 into GW-1 itself. *See* ECF No. 45 at 36; AR 25759. Moreover, the DTIPWTP itself states that its
11 purpose is “to help facilitate temporary water transfers (duration of up to 1 year),” and that “multi-year
12 or long-term transfers typically require . . . a more rigorous analysis . . . and . . . may require additional
13 information beyond that specified in this document.” AR 76342. In addition, DTIPWTP states that
14 CEQA and NEPA “requirements are not addressed by this technical document.” AR 76343. The
15 Authority does not dispute any of these assertions and concedes that the DTIPWTP is merely a
16 “reference” for formulating the independent requirements and guidance of the FIES/R. ECF No. 48 at
17 27. To the extent the FEIS/R relies on another document as a “reference” in this manner, the FEIS/R
18 must stand on its own in terms of its requirements and performance standards.

19 **(3) Monitoring**

20 When it is uncertain whether a particular impact will occur, an agency may adopt a contingent
21 mitigation measure that will be triggered under certain conditions. *See Save Cuyama Valley v. County of*
22 *Santa Barbara*, 213 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1070-71 (2013); *Save Panoche Valley v. San Benito Cnty.*, 217
23 Cal. App. 4th 503, 524-26 (2013). Appropriate monitoring programs will ensure compliance with
24 mitigation obligations. *See City of Hayward v. Cal. State Univ.*, 242 Cal. App. 4th 833, 854-55 (2015);
25 *see* CEQA Guidelines § 15091 (when making a finding that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required

1 in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental
2 effect as identified in the final EIR . . . the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or
3 monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to
4 avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully
5 enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.”).

6 GW-1’s monitoring program requires that at each transfer pumping well “[f]low meter readings
7 will be recorded just prior to initiation of pumping and at designated times, but no less than monthly and
8 as close as practical to the last day of the month, throughout the duration of the transfer.” AR 25760.
9 Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R fails to provide substantial evidence that this monitoring frequency
10 would avoid significant impacts. In other words, Plaintiffs assert that substantial impacts could occur
11 between monitoring intervals and/or that such infrequent monitoring might not capture day-to-day
12 variations in pumping. ECF No. 45 at 37. Plaintiffs misunderstand how this aspect of GW-1 works. Any
13 transfer “shall be configured with a permanent instantaneous and totalizing flow meter capable of
14 accurately measuring well discharge rates and volumes.” AR 25760 (emphasis added). Although no
15 party makes any effort to define this language for the Court, the Court assumes that the plain meaning of
16 the term “totalizing” is pertinent: “to add up; to express as a whole.”⁴² Accordingly, the frequency of the
17 reading only reflects how often the meter is read, not whether the meter captures variable flow rates.
18 Moreover, any such impacts from the pumping at transfer wells would, presumably, be captured by
19 groundwater level monitoring at those wells and surrounding/nearby monitoring wells. Therefore, the
20 Court does not find error in the FEIS/R’s monitoring requirements for pumping well flow rate meters.
21 On this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is DENIED, and the Authority’s cross-motions
22 are GRANTED.

23 GW-1 also requires that monitoring of groundwater levels at both participating transfer wells and

24
25 ⁴² Totalize, Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/totalize> (last
visited February 8, 2018).

1 monitoring wells will occur prior to transfer (at least monthly “where possible”), at the start of transfer
2 (the day of, prior to the pump being turned on), during the transfer period (at least weekly “unless site-
3 specific information indicates a different interval should be used”), and post transfer (weekly for one
4 month, then monthly through March of the year following the transfer). AR 25760. To the extent
5 Plaintiffs suggest that “monthly” monitoring will not capture impacts as a result of groundwater
6 extraction, *see* ECF No. 45 at 37, GW-1 generally requires weekly monitoring during extraction and for
7 a month after. Nothing in the record suggests this is insufficient to recognize impacts in a timely
8 manner. On this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is DENIED, and the Authority’s cross-
9 motions are GRANTED.

10 Plaintiffs do raise a more significant concern with the seemingly open-ended exceptions to the
11 “minimum” monitoring requirements set forth in GW-1, questioning what the FEIS/R means by
12 requiring pre-pumping monitoring on a monthly basis “where possible” and during-pumping monitoring
13 weekly “unless site specific information indicates a different interval should be used.” ECF No. 45 at 37.
14 The Authority makes only minimal effort to address this concern, asserting that the monitoring
15 requirements set forth in GW-1 are only “minimum” requirements. *See* ECF No 58 at 11. But the
16 Authority cites documents that merely regurgitate the language of GW-1, which in turn incorporates the
17 above-mentioned exceptions into the minimum requirements. The public is left guessing what these
18 exceptions mean and, critically, the extent to which monitoring might be lessened and under what
19 circumstances. The presence of such open-ended exceptions makes it impossible for the Court to find
20 that the monitoring program is enforceable or will be effective at avoiding potential significant impacts.
21 On this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is GRANTED and the Authority’s cross-motion
22 is DENIED.⁴³

24 ⁴³ The Court is not persuaded by Plaintiffs’ related assertion that the FEIS/R suggests monitored data will be provided to the
25 lead agencies only before and after a transfer occurs. *See* ECF No. 45 at 37-38. GW-1 plainly states that “[a]t a minimum,
26 sellers will provide data summary tables to Reclamation, both during and after transfer-related groundwater pumping.” ECF
No. 45. The wording of requirements related to final reports does not diminish this relatively clear requirement.

1 (4) **GW-1 Performance Standards**

2 An EIR may not defer the formulation of mitigation measures to a future time, but mitigation
3 measures may instead specify performance standards which would mitigate the project's significant
4 effects and that may be accomplished in more than one specified way. CEQA Guidelines
5 § 15126.4(a)(1)(B). *Sacramento Old City Ass'n*, 229 Cal. App. 3d at 1028-29. Thus, "for [the] kinds of
6 impacts for which mitigation is known to be feasible, but where practical considerations prohibit
7 devising such measures early in the planning process (e.g., at the general plan amendment or rezone
8 stage), the agency can commit itself to eventually devising measures that will satisfy specific
9 performance criteria articulated at the time of project approval." *Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine*, 119
10 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1275-76 (2004) (internal quotation and citation omitted). "Impermissible deferral of
11 mitigation measures occurs when an EIR puts off analysis or orders a report without either setting
12 standards or demonstrating how the impact can be mitigated in the manner described in the EIR." *Clover*
13 *Valley Foundation v. City of Rocklin*, 197 Cal. App. 4th 200, 236 (2011). For example, "[a]n EIR is
14 inadequate if [t]he success or failure of mitigation efforts . . . may largely depend upon management
15 plans that have not yet been formulated, and have not been subject to analysis and review within the
16 EIR." *CBE v. Richmond*, 184 Cal. App. 4th 70, 92 (internal citations and quotations omitted); *compare*
17 *Pres. Wild Santee v. City of Santee*, 210 Cal. App. 4th 260, 281-82 (2012) (EIR providing for post-
18 approval formulation of habitat plan to mitigate impacts to butterfly insufficient where EIR failed to
19 include any performance standards or other measures to demonstrate that project's significant effects
20 would be mitigated) *with Rialto*, 208 Cal. App. 4th at 942 (mitigation measure that included specific
21 performance standards sufficient to ensure potential impact would be mitigated).

22 Plaintiffs contend that GW-1 unlawfully defers mitigation without setting appropriate
23 performance measures regarding groundwater impacts. ECF No. 45 at 38-39. The FEIS/R explains that
24 changes in groundwater levels are not, viewed in isolation, significant impacts. *See* AR 25679. It is the
25 secondary effects of reduced groundwater levels that are of concern, including, among other things:

1 “(1) increased groundwater pumping costs due to increased pumping depth; (2) decreased yield from
2 groundwater wells due to reduction in the saturated thickness of the aquifer; or (3) lowered groundwater
3 table elevation to a level below the vegetative root zone, which can result in environmental effects.”
4 *Id.*⁴⁴ In addition, excessive groundwater extraction can “lower groundwater levels and decrease pore-
5 water pressure” which can result in land subsidence, which, in turn, can, under certain circumstances, be
6 permanent and cause damage to infrastructure, wells, and drainage patterns. *Id.*

7 Plaintiffs do not seem to take issue with the measures and performance standards in GW-1
8 pertaining to vegetation (#3 above). Whether or not GW-1 contains sufficient performance standards and
9 monitoring in relation to subsidence is discussed separately below. The remaining two concerns –
10 increased pumping costs and decreased yield – relate to impacts on third parties. Plaintiffs argue that
11 GW-1 fails to include appropriate performance standards to avoid these impacts because, while it relies
12 on BMOs for those areas where BMOs exist, where BMOs do not exist, the articulated procedure
13 amounts to no performance standard at all. ECF No. 45 at 38. In areas where quantitative BMOs do not
14 exist:

15 Reclamation, [the Authority], and the potential sellers will coordinate
16 closely with potentially impacted third parties to collect and monitor
17 groundwater data. If a third party expects that it may be impacted by a
18 proposed transfer, that party should contact Reclamation and the seller
19 with its concern. The burden of collecting groundwater data will not be the
20 responsibility of the third party. If warranted, groundwater level
21 monitoring to address the third-party’s concern may be incorporated in the
22 monitoring and mitigation plans required by Mitigation Measure GW-1.

23 AR 25761. Plaintiffs contend that the promise to “coordinate closely” and incorporate additional
24 groundwater monitoring “if warranted” provides absolutely no standards. In response, the Authority
25 argues these “[r]equirements involving third parties are directly linked to satisfying the significance
26 criteria and avoiding effects on other water users.” ECF No. 48 at 27. The relevant significance criterion

24 ⁴⁴ As discussed elsewhere in this decision, changes in groundwater levels can impact groundwater quality by, among other
25 things, mobilization of areas of poorer quality water. AR 25698. But, the FEIS/R correctly determined that such impacts are
26 not likely to be significant. AR 25572; *see also supra* Part IV.A.4.c.

1 classifies an impact as potentially significant if it causes “[a] net reduction in groundwater that would
2 result in substantial adverse environmental effects or effect to non-transferring parties.” AR 25702; AR
3 28035 (clarifying that impacts to non-transferring parties must be substantial to be considered
4 significant).

5 The Authority cites *Save Cuyama Valley v. Cty. of Santa Barbara*, 213 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1071
6 (2013), *as modified* (Feb. 8, 2013), in support of the proposition that sufficient criteria are present. The
7 EIR in *Cuyama Valley* reviewed the impacts of a proposed project to mine gravel from the bed of the
8 Cuyama River. *Id.* at 1062. The EIR identified a number of potential off-site hydrologic impacts from
9 the project. *Id.* at 1064. While the EIR concluded the possible impacts were “expected to be minor” and
10 “appear to be less than significant,” the EIR acknowledged “the inherent uncertainty of simulation
11 models and the potential to underestimate hydrological effects.” *Id.* at 1065. The EIR accordingly
12 deemed these impacts “potentially significant but mitigatable.” *Id.* The EIR then proposed a mitigation
13 measure, which required semi-annual river bottom elevation surveys, submission of the results of those
14 surveys to regulatory officials, and a requirement that should “adverse hydraulic conditions [be] evident,
15 or appear to be developing, which could result in off-site impacts,” the project proponent must “confer”
16 with the regulatory agencies “to modify the mining pit layout, width and/or depth to avoid these
17 impacts.” *Id.* The plaintiffs in *Cuyama* asserted that the mitigation measure did “not spell out the criteria
18 by which effectiveness will be evaluated.” *Id.* at 1071. The Court disagreed, finding that the mitigation
19 measure’s command to “avoid these impacts” necessarily referred to the “adverse hydraulic conditions .
20 . . . which could result in off-site impacts.” *Id.* “Because these impacts are caused by how water flows
21 into and out of the mining pits, measures to reconfigure the orientation of those pits (that is, their layout,
22 width and depth) address those impacts.” *Id.*

23 While the command in *Cuyama Valley* was sufficiently specific because it required avoidance of
24 specific adverse hydraulic conditions and offered measures that could address those conditions and their
25 impacts, Mitigation Measure GW-1 is far less specific in relation to the third party impacts of pumping

1 costs and decreased yield. What exactly is the impact to be avoided? Although GW-1 generically
2 identifies increased pumping costs and decreased yield as types of impacts to third parties, there is no
3 indication as to when such impacts might be considered “significant.” That regulators and sellers will
4 “coordinate closely with potentially impacted third parties to collect and monitor groundwater data. . . .
5 and address the third-party’s concern,” provides no assurance, for example, that the third party’s
6 concerns will be deemed significant enough to require action. *See Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v.*
7 *Cty. of Orange*, 131 Cal. App. 4th 777, 793-94 (2005) (finding mitigation measure that requires
8 construction to “meet ‘exterior and interior noise standards’ satisfactory to the manager of the county’s
9 building permit division insufficient” because “[n]o criteria or alternatives to be considered are set out.
10 Rather, this mitigation measure does no more than require a report be prepared and followed, or allow
11 approval by a county department without setting any standards.”). This case does not present, as the
12 Authority seems to suggest, an EIR with clear performance standards where future monitoring is then
13 relied upon to tailor on the ground measures. *See City of Hayward v. Bd. of Trustees of the California*
14 *State Univ.*, 242 Cal. App. 4th 833, 855 (2015) (identifying as performance standard the “goal to reduce
15 drive-alone vehicle trips,” while permitting project proponent flexibility in designing mitigation
16 measures to reach that goal). While the Authority is correct that CEQA “does not define how specific
17 the performance standards set forth in an EIR must be,” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Dep’t of Fish &*
18 *Wildlife*, 234 Cal. App. 4th 214, 242 (2015), it does not permit the situation present here, where
19 performance standards are effectively absent. On this issue, the Court finds Plaintiffs have met their
20 burden of establishing no performance standard exists. As to this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary
21 judgment is GRANTED and the Authority’s cross-motion is DENIED.

22 **(5) GW-1 Monitoring and Mitigation for Land Subsidence**

23 Plaintiffs next argue that GW-1’s monitoring and mitigation related to land subsidence is
24 unlawful under CEQA because it “allows irreversible impacts to occur.” ECF No. 45 at 39. The Court
25 interprets this as an argument that GW-1 is not likely to be effective at preventing or alleviating land

1 subsidence. As discussed above, CEQA requires that mitigation measures be enforceable and likely to
2 be effective. *See Sierra Club*, 231 Cal. App. 4th at 1169 (finding mitigation measures insufficient where
3 not enforceable and/or not likely to achieve mitigation purposes); *see also* CEQA Guideline
4 § 15126.4(a)(2) (“Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements,
5 or other legally-binding instruments.”); *Sacramento Old City*, 229 Cal. App. 3d at 1027 (*citing Laurel*
6 *Heights*, 47 Cal. 3d at 407) (“[W]here substantial evidence supports the approving agency’s conclusion
7 that mitigation measures will be effective, courts will uphold such measures against attacks based on
8 their alleged inadequacy.”).

9 GW-1 requires sellers to examine historic pumping events or groundwater substitution transfers
10 to estimate whether groundwater levels are “likely to decline below historic levels,” which would trigger
11 “land surface elevation measurements.” AR 25762. More specifically, if, based upon the monitoring
12 discussed above, “the measured groundwater level falls below the historic low level, the seller must
13 confirm the measurement within seven days.” *Id.* If by that time the water level has risen above the
14 historic low level, the seller may continue transfer pumping. *Id.* If, however, the “measured groundwater
15 level remains below the historic low level the seller will stop transfer-related pumping immediately or
16 begin land surface elevation measurements in strategic locations within and/or near the transfer-related
17 pumping area.” *Id.*

18 Plaintiffs take issue with two specific aspects of this arrangement. First, they complain that the
19 seven-day delay between initial indications that groundwater levels are dropping below historic levels
20 and the requirement that the seller confirm those measurements “only extends the severity of the
21 impact.” ECF No. 45 at 39. In addition, they complain that, upon confirmation that groundwater levels
22 remain below historic levels, the seller may, instead of stopping transfer-related pumping, alternatively
23 “begin land surface elevation measurements in strategic locations.” *Id.* This, according to Plaintiffs,
24 “further allows an increase in the severity of any land subsidence occurring.” *Id.* Relatedly, “if the land
25 surface elevation survey indicates an elevation decrease between 0.1 foot and 0.2 foot from the initial

1 measurement,” GW-1 indicates that “the seller could have significant impacts and would need to start
2 the process identified below in the Mitigation Plan.” AR 25762 (emphasis added). Plaintiffs argue that
3 this “unlawfully allows the Project’s significant impacts to begin before implementing any mitigation
4 measure.” ECF No. 45 at 39-40.

5 The Authority responds to all these arguments by asserting that “[l]ike groundwater levels,
6 lowered land-surface elevations are not, of themselves, significant environmental impacts, but may
7 result in significant impacts if they cause permanent loss of aquifer capacity or damage to structures or
8 physical features.” ECF No. 48 at 28 (citing AR 25697). GW-1 does contain a relevant threshold that
9 triggers further action:

10 If the land surface elevation survey indicates an elevation decrease
11 between 0.1 foot and 0.2 foot from the initial measurement, the seller
12 could have significant impacts and would need to start the process
13 identified below in the Mitigation Plan (Section 3.3.4.1.3). The seller will
14 also work with Reclamation to assess the accuracy of the survey
15 measurements based on current limitations of technology, professional
16 engineering/surveying judgment, and any other data available in or near
17 the transferring area.

18 The threshold of 0.1 foot was chosen as this value is typical of the elastic
19 (i.e., recoverable) portion of subsidence; the threshold of 0.2 foot was
20 selected considering limitations of current land survey technology. This
21 threshold is supported by a review of data from extensometers within the
22 Sacramento Valley. Figure 3.3-39 shows the subsidence data from
23 extensometer 22N02W15C002M in Glenn County. This extensometer has
24 not been identified as having long-term declining trends, but exhibits a
25 small amount of movement (up to about 0.1 foot).

26 AR 25762. While Plaintiffs do not appear to challenge the choice of 0.1-0.2 feet of subsidence as a
27 trigger,⁴⁵ they do question the nature of the further action that the trigger would “trigger.” Instead of
28 requiring specific actions to prevent permanent subsidence, the seller “would need to start the process
29 identified . . . in the Mitigation Plan (Section 3.3.4.1.3).” *Id.* That Mitigation Plan section in turn
30 requires that sellers “must complete and implement a mitigation plan to avoid potentially significant

31 ⁴⁵ The choice appears to be supported by substantial evidence pertaining to the amount of subsidence that recovers each
32 winter. *See* AR 25762-63.

1 groundwater impacts and ensure prompt corrective action in the event unanticipated effects occur.”

2 Mitigation actions could include:

- 3 • Curtailment of pumping until natural recharge corrects the issue.
- 4 • Lowering of pumping bowls in non-transferring wells affected by
5 transfer pumping.
- 6 • Reimbursement for significant increases in pumping costs due to the
7 additional groundwater pumping to support the transfer.
- 8 • Curtailment of pumping until water levels rise above historic lows if
9 non-reversible subsidence is detected (based on local data to identify
10 elastic versus inelastic subsidence).
- 11 • Reimbursement for modifications to infrastructure that may be affected
12 by non-reversible subsidence.
- 13 • Other appropriate actions based on local conditions, as determined by
14 Reclamation.

15 AR 25764. This menu of options does not impose any particular specific action in the face of subsidence
16 that exceeds the trigger, but this is not required. This mitigation measure in the FEIR/R is not unlike the
17 EIR found to be lawful in *Cuyama Valley*. As mentioned, in *Cuyama Valley*, an EIR was found
18 sufficient where it articulated a performance standard requiring “avoidance” of “adverse hydraulic
19 conditions” that could cause off-site impacts and required that should “adverse hydraulic conditions [be]
20 evident, or appear to be developing, which could result in off-site impacts,” the project proponent must
21 “confer” with the regulatory agencies “to modify the mining pit layout, width and/or depth to avoid
22 these impacts.” 213 Cal. App. 4th at 1065, 1071. The *Cuyama Valley* court found it significant that
23 measures to reconfigure the orientation of those pits would address those impacts. *Id.* at 1071.

24 Read in its entirety, the Court interprets GW-1 as requiring sellers to “avoid potentially
25 significant groundwater impacts” including “non-reversible subsidence” and “ensure prompt corrective
26 action in the event unanticipated effects occur.” AR 25764. Likewise, here, the menu of options includes
27 measures (e.g., suspending pumping) that will curtail non-reversible subsidence and correct damage to
28 infrastructure caused by subsidence. The Court finds that the FEIS/R complies with CEQA insofar as it

1 does not fail to spell out the criteria by which its effectiveness will be avoided: avoiding non-reversible
2 subsidence. It is not impermissible for the Authority to use a mechanism that requires monitoring for
3 reversible subsidence and then curtails or modifies activities to halt the impact.

4 Plaintiffs are correct that GW-1 may allow a certain amount of irreversible subsidence to occur
5 before mitigation procedures are triggered. But the Court cannot identify any authority suggesting this is
6 per se unlawful, so long as the mitigation measures overall reduce the impact to less than significant. As
7 to the specific argument that GW-1 is unlawful for failing to identify performance standard, Plaintiffs'
8 motion for summary judgment is DENIED and the Authority's motion is GRANTED.

9 Plaintiffs separately raise a number of arguments all going to the question of whether the record
10 supports a finding that the measures associated with land subsidence in GW-1 will be effective. ECF No.
11 45 at 41-42. Plaintiffs criticize the monitoring frequency for subsidence-related impacts. Specifically,
12 whenever measured groundwater levels remain below the historic low level, the seller "will stop
13 transfer-related pumping or begin land surface elevation measurements in strategic locations within
14 and/or near the transfer related-pumping area . . . on a monthly basis during the transfer." AR 25762
15 (emphasis added). The Authority rejoins by citing record evidence that groundwater flows more slowly
16 than surface water, because groundwater flows through porous media rather than in open channels. *See*
17 ECF No. 48 at 24-25. Specifically, groundwater flows at a "very slow rate, usually less than 1,000 feet
18 per year because of the great amount of friction resulting from movement through the spaces between
19 grains of sand and gravel." AR 74372. In addition, the Authority argues that "[m]ore frequent
20 measurements would serve no purpose because subsidence generally occurs in small increments, and
21 shorter intervals would not be expected to provide reliable data outside the margin of error." ECF No. 58
22 at 12-13. The record indicates "[s]ubsidence generally occurs in small increments during dry years when
23 groundwater pumping lowers groundwater levels below historical lows in areas that are geologically
24 susceptible because they have compressible clays." AR 25667. Plaintiffs fail to cite any record evidence
25 to suggest that the movement of groundwater (or any other aspect of the subsidence) would warrant
26

1 more than monthly monitoring. Taking all of this together, the record supports the FEIS/R's implied
2 conclusion that monthly monitoring of subsidence is sufficient. Accordingly, on this issue, Plaintiffs'
3 motion for summary judgment is DENIED and the Authority's cross-motion GRANTED.

4 Plaintiffs next challenge a number of specific aspects the mitigation approach set forth in of GW-
5 1 "Stage 3":

6 *Stage 3: Local Investigation*

7 If the threshold of 0.2 foot of ground surface elevation change is exceeded,
8 the seller shall cease groundwater substitution pumping for the transfer
9 until one of the following occurs: (1) groundwater levels recover above
10 historic low groundwater levels; (2) seller completes a more detailed local
11 investigation identifying hydrogeologic conditions that could potentially
12 allow continued transfer-related pumping from a subset of wells (if the
13 seller can provide evidence that this pumping is not expected to cause
14 additional subsidence); or (3) seller completes an investigation of local
15 infrastructure that could be affected by subsidence (such as water delivery
16 infrastructure, water supply facilities, flood protection facilities, highways
17 etc.) indicating the local threshold of subsidence that could be experienced
18 before these facilities would be adversely affected. Any option should also
19 consider the effect of non-transfer pumping that may be causing
20 subsidence.

21 AR 25766. Plaintiffs complain that item 1 in the above paragraph "simply does not mitigate land
22 subsidence at all, as groundwater levels could have recovered due to any number of reasons, even where
23 land elevations have not. Moreover, the mitigation measure fails to provide direction to the seller if
24 groundwater level[s] never recover." ECF No. 45 at 42. This ignores the record evidence discussed
25 above indicating that subsidence is caused by groundwater withdrawal and irreversible subsidence is not
26 irreversible if it does not exceed the threshold levels.

According to Plaintiffs, the second element is ineffective because it "provides no criteria by
which the agencies would make this determination to allow groundwater pumping to continue even
where groundwater levels have dropped to below historic lows, and land surface elevations have been
measured to appreciably drop." ECF No. 45 at 42. This is an overly cramped reading of the second
element, which permits it to operate as an exception to the prohibition against further pumping only if

1 “the seller can provide evidence that this pumping is not expected to cause additional subsidence.” AR
2 25766. This provides a criterion: no additional subsidence.

3 Finally, Plaintiffs complain that the third element “impermissibly prioritizes ‘infrastructure,’
4 such as the transferring agencies’ own ‘water supply facilities,’ above physical environmental features
5 not considered, such as local residences, or the capacity of the aquifer itself, impacts to which GW-1 is
6 silent.” ECF No. 45 at 42. On this point, the Court agrees. The use of the operative “or” in the paragraph
7 quoted above indicates that a seller may resume pumping if it satisfies any of the three factors.

8 Therefore, this paragraph indeed suggests that if a seller is able to demonstrate that subsidence would
9 not exceed “the local threshold of subsidence⁴⁶ that could be experienced before these facilities would
10 be adversely affected,” the seller may continue to pump even though there might be other, non-
11 infrastructure related impacts, such as impacts to aquifer capacity. AR 25697. This creates an unlawful
12 loophole in the mitigation plan that would permit impacts to occur. As to this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion
13 for summary judgment is GRANTED and the Authority’s cross-motion is DENIED.

14 **(6) Re-Circulation in Light of New Information Regarding GW-1**

15 Plaintiffs assert that the FEIS/R should have been re-circulated in light of the fact that the final
16 version of GW-1 added several new components (including the above-mentioned reliance on BMOs) to
17 the mitigation measure after comments on the Draft of GW-1 requested additional detail to enable
18 meaningful evaluation of the viability and effectiveness of the mitigation plan. *See* ECF No. 45 at 43
19 (citing AR 27454).

20 As discussed above, if a CEQA lead agency adds “significant new information” to an EIR

21
22 ⁴⁶ The Court is not persuaded by Plaintiffs’ separate argument that GW-1 is unlawful because it “fails to provide any criteria
23 or performance standards to guide how [the] determination of the [“local threshold of significance”] will be made.” ECF No.
24 45 at 42. Plaintiffs express concern that it is infeasible for groundwater sellers to make such technical determinations and that
25 the process impermissibly defers to them the formulation of a performance standard. *Id.* The Court does not agree. The
26 language in question calls for a technical determination of how much subsidence local infrastructure can tolerate and places
the burden of proving that tolerance upon the sellers. If sellers cannot acquire the relevant expertise to demonstrate to the
regulators’ satisfaction that subsidence can be tolerated, they cannot take advantage of this exception. Such judgments of
sufficiency are exactly the kind of technical matters the law leaves up to the regulating agencies. *See Laurel Heights*, 47 Cal.
3d at 393 (“A court’s task is not to weigh conflicting evidence and determine who has the better argument when the dispute is
whether adverse effects have been mitigated or could be better mitigated.”).

1 subsequent to the close of the public comment period but prior to certification of the final EIR, CEQA
2 requires that the lead agency provide a new public comment period. Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21092.1.

3 (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project
4 or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

5 (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact
6 would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the
7 impact to a level of insignificance.

8 (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably
9 different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the
10 significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's
11 proponents decline to adopt it.

12 (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and
13 conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were
14 precluded.

15 CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a)(emphasis added). "Recirculation is not required where the new
16 information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an
17 adequate EIR." *Id.* at § 15088.5(b).

18 Here, Plaintiffs argument fails to trigger the legal standard. Nowhere do they demonstrate that
19 use of BMOs as the operative performance standard (where BMO's exist) is problematic in any way.
20 (This is unlike their separate argument above, that complains of how GW-1 operates in circumstances
21 where BMOs are not present.) While Plaintiffs point out that some commenters raised "serious
22 concerns" about whether "the disparate BMOs are effective mitigation measures," Plaintiffs fail to
23 provide support for any such "serious concerns" and therefore fail to establish that the inclusion of
24 BMOs as triggers in the FEIS/R raised any "significant new information."

25 Plaintiffs' motion on this ground is DENIED; the Authority's cross-motion is GRANTED.

26 **c. CEQA Challenges to Mitigation Measure WS-1**

27 The FEIS/R evaluated whether the Project would impact surface water supplies and concluded
28 that "[g]roundwater substitution transfers could decrease flows in neighboring surface water bodies
29 following a transfer while groundwater basins recharge, which could decrease pumping at Jones and

1 Banks Pumping Plants and or require additional water releases from upstream CVP reservoirs.” AR
2 25519. The FEIS/R explains that some of the groundwater recharge “would occur during periods when
3 there is higher flow in waterways,” and that “[d]uring these times although the recharge would decrease
4 flows in the waterways, the decreased flows would not affect water supplies or the ability to meet flow
5 or quality standards.” AR 25520. “However if the recharge occurs during dry periods, then the recharge
6 would decrease river flows at times when it would affect Reclamation and DWR,” because
7 “Reclamation and DWR are responsible for meeting river flow and water quality standards on the
8 Sacramento River, its tributaries, and within the Delta.” *Id.* “If decreased river flows affect the ability to
9 meet these standards, Reclamation and DWR would need to either decrease Delta exports or release
10 additional flow from upstream reservoirs to meet flow or water quality standards.” *Id.* While transfers
11 would not impact whether water flow or water quality standards are met, “the actions taken by
12 Reclamation and DWR to meet these standards because of instream flow reductions due to the
13 groundwater recharge could affect CVP and SWP water supplies.” *Id.* In sum, while the impacts to
14 water supplies as a result of streamflow depletion would be small on average, “the greater depletion in
15 some years could have a potentially significant effect on water supply.” AR 25522.

16 To reduce these effects, WS-1 imposes a streamflow depletion factor “to be incorporated into
17 transfers to account for the potential water supply impacts to the CVP and SWP.” *Id.* As briefly
18 discussed above, WS-1 mandates that a streamflow depletion factor will be applied to transfers “to
19 mitigate potential water supply impacts from the additional groundwater pumping due to groundwater
20 substitution transfers.” AR 25526. “The streamflow depletion factor equates to a percentage of the total
21 groundwater substitution transfer that will not be credited to the transferor and is intended to offset the
22 streamflow effects of the added groundwater pumping due to transfer. *Id.* “The exact percentage of the
23 streamflow depletion factor will be assessed and determined on a regular basis by Reclamation and
24 DWR in consultation with buyers and sellers based on the best technical information available at that
25 time. The percentage will be determined based on hydrologic conditions, groundwater and surface water

1 modeling, monitoring information and past transfer data,” but will never be less than 13 percent. AR
2 25526-27. “The streamflow depletion factor may not change every year but will be refined as new
3 information becomes available and may become more site specific as better data and groundwater
4 modeling becomes available.” AR 25526. “Reclamation and DWR require the imposition of a
5 streamflow depletion factor because they will not move transfer water if doing so will violate the no
6 injury rule. This process to evaluate and determine the streamflow depletion factor will help verify that
7 the factor reduces potential impacts to avoid legal injury to CVP or SWP water supplies and a
8 substantial impact or injury.” AR 25526-27.

9 Plaintiff argues that WS-1 unlawfully defers mitigation without articulating a clear performance
10 standard. The Court disagrees. The streamflow depletion factor is a performance standard designed to
11 avoid significant impacts. While Plaintiffs argue that it is inappropriate to apply one streamflow
12 depletion factor to multiple areas, they do not explain how 13 percent is insufficient for any particular
13 area or set of conditions. Plaintiffs acknowledge that WS-1 delineates a “minimum value” of 13 percent
14 for the streamflow depletion factor, but complain that WS-1 “also admits that the specific value will be
15 identified at a later time, based on information not currently available to the agencies.” ECF No. 45 at
16 44. However, the plain language of WS-1, as confirmed by the Authority, *see* ECF No. 48 at 30,⁴⁷
17 indicates the 13 percent minimum streamflow depletion factor is a minimum value. Plaintiffs fail to
18 explain how later modifications of that value to increase the streamflow depletion factor undermines
19 WS-1 or its performance standard. The Court will not manufacture an argument where there is none.

20 As to this issue, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is DENIED and the Authority’s cross-
21 motion is GRANTED.

22 **d. NEPA Challenge to Mitigation Measures**

23 NEPA and its implementing regulations also require agencies to consider mitigation measures

24
25 ⁴⁷ There is no support for Plaintiffs’ suggestion that the Authority offers no rebuttal to its motion regarding WS-1. *See* ECF
26 No. 51.

1 before approving a major agency action. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C)(ii) (EIS must include a detailed statement
2 on “any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented”)
3 (emphasis added); 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14 (requiring EIS alternatives analysis to include “appropriate
4 mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives”). “Implicit in NEPA’s
5 demand that an agency prepare a detailed statement on ‘any adverse environmental effects which cannot
6 be avoided should the proposal be implemented,’ is an understanding that the EIS will discuss the extent
7 to which adverse effects can be avoided.” *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 351-52 (quoting 42 U.S.C. §
8 4332(2)(C)(ii)). NEPA does not contain, however, “a substantive requirement that a complete mitigation
9 plan be actually formulated and adopted.” *Id.* at 352. Such a requirement “would be inconsistent with
10 NEPA’s reliance on procedural mechanisms.” *Id.* at 353.

11 Plaintiffs rely on *South Fork Band Council of Western Shoshone of Nevada v. U.S. Dep’t of*
12 *Interior*, 588 F.3d 718, 727 (9th Cir. 2009), to argue that the FEIS/R violated NEPA by failing to
13 analyze the effectiveness of GW-1. The plaintiffs in *South Fork* challenged the Bureau of Land
14 Management’s (“BLM”) approval of a mining project on federal land. 588 F.3d at 721. Among other
15 things, the EIS in that case conceded that the mining project would cause significant impacts to
16 groundwater, resulting in the drying up of local springs and streams. *Id.* at 727. The plaintiffs argued
17 that BLM failed to conduct an appropriate mitigation analysis in connection with this dewatering
18 impact. *Id.* at 726-27. Citing *Methow Valley*, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that “[t]hrough NEPA . . . does
19 not require that these harms actually be mitigated, it does require that an EIS discuss mitigation
20 measures, with ‘sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly
21 evaluated.’” *Id.* at 727 (quoting *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 352). *South Fork* made it clear that “[a]n
22 essential component of a reasonably complete mitigation discussion is an assessment of whether the
23 proposed mitigation measures can be effective.” *Id.* (comparing *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. U.S.*
24 *Forest Service*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1381 (9th Cir. 1998) (disapproving an EIS that lacked such an
25 assessment) with *Okanogan Highlands Alliance v. Williams*, 236 F.3d 468, 477 (9th Cir. 2000)

1 (upholding an EIS where “[e]ach mitigating process was evaluated separately and given an effectiveness
2 rating”). Again referencing *Methow Valley, South Fork* concluded: “[a] mitigation discussion without at
3 least some evaluation of effectiveness is useless in making that determination.” *Id.*; see also *Protect Our*
4 *Communities Found. v. Jewell*, 825 F.3d 571, 582 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting with approval *S. Fork* for the
5 proposition that an agency must provide “an assessment of whether the proposed mitigation measures
6 can be effective . . . [and] whether anticipated environmental impacts can be avoided). Applying those
7 parameters, the Ninth Circuit rejected the EIS for the mining project, finding it did not “assess the
8 effectiveness of the mitigation measures relating to groundwater.” *S. Fork*, 588 F.3d at 727. Rather the
9 EIS only stated: “[f]easibility and success of mitigation would depend on site-specific conditions and
10 details of the mitigation plan.” *Id.* Critically, “[n]othing whatsoever [was] said about whether the
11 anticipated harms could be avoided by any of the listed mitigation measures.” *Id.*

12 The BLM argued that an effectiveness discussion was not required because it was “impossible to
13 predict the precise location and extent of groundwater reduction, and that problems should instead be
14 identified and addressed as they arise.” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit rejected this argument, reasoning: “NEPA
15 requires that a hard look be taken, if possible, before the environmentally harmful actions are put into
16 effect.” *Id.* (internal citation omitted). Given that the EIS conceded that a large number of perennial
17 springs and creeks would likely dry up as a result of the project, the fact that the specific identity of
18 impacted streams and seeps could not be conclusively determined in advance due to limited
19 understanding of the relevant hydrology did not excuse the agency from discussing “mitigation of
20 reasonably likely impacts at the outset.” *Id.* “Even if the discussion must necessarily be tentative or
21 contingent, NEPA requires that the agency give some sense of whether the drying up of these water
22 resources could be avoided.” *Id.*

23 Federal Defendants attempt to distinguish *South Fork*, by arguing that, unlike the EIS in *South*
24 *Fork*, the FEIS/R here does not concede any significant impacts are likely to occur. Federal Defendants
25 cite AR 25758 in support of this factual assertion. The relevant language on that page states:

1 Groundwater substitution transfers under the Proposed Action could
2 decrease groundwater levels potentially affecting non-transferring wells
3 near participating substitution wells. Declining groundwater levels could
4 also affect land subsidence and groundwater quality; however, these
5 effects would be less than significant. Cropland idling transfers under the
6 Proposed Action could reduce percolation to groundwater, but the
7 reduction would be small because rice (the main crop proposed for idling)
8 is typically grown on soils with low permeability. Potential effects on
9 groundwater resources in the Seller Service Area under Proposed Action
10 would be greater than the No Action/No Project Alternative. These effects
11 could be reduced by Mitigation Measure GW-1 (Section 3.3.4.1).

7 AR 25758. Notably, this text does not indicate that groundwater impacts would be insignificant in all
8 respects. In fact, Table 3.3-9 on the immediately preceding page indicates that “[g]roundwater
9 substitution transfers could cause a reduction in groundwater levels in the Seller Service Area” that
10 would be significant. AR 25757. The Court cannot comprehend how Federal Defendants could read
11 these pages of the AR and conclude that the “agencies determined that effects caused by groundwater
12 substitution would be less than significant” prior to mitigation. ECF No. 49-1 at 21 (citing AR 25758).

13 The Court is then left to determine the extent to which effectiveness must be evaluated explicitly
14 in an EIS. The district court in *Wilderness Society v. U.S. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 822 F. Supp. 2d 933,
15 940-41 (D. Ariz. 2011), *aff’d sub nom. Wilderness Soc. v. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 526 F. App’x 790 (9th
16 Cir. 2013), reviewed several relevant cases, exploring how much analysis of mitigation was required
17 relative to the predicted impacts of the project. For example, *Robertson* held that proposed mitigation
18 measures could not be “deemed overly vague or underdeveloped” when the EIS revealed minimal
19 impacts that could be “easily mitigated.” 490 U.S. at 357-58. In *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain*, the
20 Ninth Circuit rejected a U.S. Forest Service EIS because it appeared that “the Forest Service did not
21 even consider mitigating measures for the creeks actually affected by the [timber] sale.” 137 F.3d at
22 1381.

23 It is also not clear whether any mitigating measures would in fact be
24 adopted. Nor has the Forest Service provided an estimate of how effective
25 the mitigation measures would be if adopted, or given a reasoned
26 explanation as to why such an estimate is not possible. The Forest
Service’s own experts suggest that the mitigation measures suggested by

1 the Forest Service “are not mitigation and are so general that it would be
2 impossible to determine where, how, and when they would be used and
3 how effective they would be.”

4 *Id.* at 1381 (quoting the administrative record).

5 In contrast, in *Okanogan*, the Ninth Circuit found that the Forest Service did take a “hard look”
6 at the environmental effects and mitigating measures. 236 F.3d at 476. The EIS in that case predicted
7 that the environmental effects from a mine on groundwater would be minimal, nonetheless required
8 extensive monitoring. *Id.* The EIS then proposed several ways to prevent mine operations from affecting
9 water quality. *Id.* If those measures proved unsuccessful, the EIS provided a process for achieving
10 compliance with water-quality standards. *Id.* at 476-77. Similar processes were described for other
11 potential impacts. Critically, “[e]ach mitigating process was evaluated separately and given an
12 effectiveness rating.” *Id.* at 477. Accordingly, while “the mitigating measures are described in general
13 terms and rely on general processes, not on specific substantive requirement,” this approach was
14 appropriate because, in the face of uncertain impacts, the EIS set up a “procedure to determine [whether]
15 specific mitigation or treatment, if any, is required.” *Id.* (record citation omitted in original). The EIS
16 also required deposit of a “performance security,” assuming that treatment of discharged water would be
17 necessary. *Id.* In sum, “[b]ecause the actual adverse effects are uncertain, and the EIS considered
18 extensively the potential effects and mitigation processes,” the Ninth Circuit concluded that the
19 *Okanogan* was “closer to *Methow Valley*” and therefore found the discussion of mitigating measures in
20 the EIS adequate. *Id.*

21 After considering the cases above, the district court in *Wilderness Society* adopted a flexible rule
22 articulated in *Okanogan*: the difference between adequate and inadequate mitigation discussions
23 “appears to be one of degree.” *Wilderness Society*, 822 F. Supp. 2d at 941. This malleable standard is
24 mirrored in *Methow Valley*’s requirement that “mitigation be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that
25 environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated.” 490 U.S. at 353; *see also City of Carmel-By-*
26 *The-Sea v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 123 F.3d 1142, 1172 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing same); *Alaska Survival v.*

1 *Surface Transp. Bd.*, 705 F.3d 1073, 1088 (9th Cir. 2013) (“Perfunctory descriptions or mere lists of
2 mitigation measures are insufficient.”). The Court finds it appropriate to apply this standard here.

3 No case provides a perfect analogy to aid in the application of these standards. Nonetheless, in
4 light of all the authorities discussed above, the Court concludes it has no choice but to find a NEPA
5 violation here because the FEIS/R does not contain any evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation
6 measure GW-1, and the parties have not directed the Court’s attention to any other record document that
7 does so in the FEIS/R’s stead.⁴⁸ This is particularly troubling in the context of an FEIS/R that finds at
8 least one groundwater impact to be potentially significant and then relies upon GW-1 to reduce that
9 impact. *See* AR 25757.⁴⁹ Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R violates NEPA
10 because it fails to evaluate the effectiveness of the GW-1 is GRANTED; Federal Defendants’ cross-
11 motion is DENIED.

12 **6. Alternatives Analysis (NEPA)**

13 Plaintiffs next challenge the FEIS/R’s selection of alternatives for examination. This challenge is
14 brought under NEPA against Reclamation only. *See* ECF No. 45 at 45-49 (discussing only
15 Reclamation’s actions and NEPA authorities). NEPA requires the action agency to “study, develop, and
16 describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves

17
18 ⁴⁸ In this way, the present case is distinguishable from *Gaule v. Meade*, 402 F. Supp. 2d 1078 (D. Alaska 2005), upon which
19 Federal Defendants rely for the proposition that a discussion of effectiveness is not required under NEPA. In that case, the
20 Forest Service evaluated the environmental impacts of issuing a permit to a heli-ski operation in an Alaskan National Forest.
21 *Id.* at 1080. Although the EIS in that case contained only a very brief discussion of mitigation, *id.* at 1085-86, the EIS did
22 contain a discussion of why certain measures were chosen, a discussion the district court concluded “[went] to the probable
23 effectiveness of the mitigation measures.” *Id.* at 1087. Here, although it is relatively clear why certain mitigation measures
24 were chosen (e.g., curtailment of pumping is a mitigation measure designed to avoid irreversible subsidence should certain
25 monitoring triggers be exceeded), the “probable effectiveness” of mitigation measures designed to avoid impacts to third
26 parties remains unclear.

⁴⁹ Federal Defendants make a separate attempt to divert Plaintiffs’ NEPA challenge by focusing on the undisputed legal
principle that NEPA permits a mitigation plan to rely on ongoing monitoring. *See Protect Our Communities Found. v. Jewell*,
825 F.3d 571, 582 (9th Cir. 2016) (approving of mitigation measures that rely on continuous monitoring to complement other
mitigation measures). It is true that “a mitigation plan need not be legally enforceable, funded or even in final form to comply
with NEPA’s procedural requirements.” *Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 222 F.3d 677, 681 n. 4
(9th Cir. 2000); *Laguna Greenbelt, Inc. v. United States Dep’t of Transp.*, 42 F.3d 517, 528 (9th Cir. 1994) (NEPA does not
require a fully developed plan that will mitigate all environmental harm before an agency may act). But, Plaintiffs clearly
describe their NEPA mitigation challenge as an attempt not to impose a substantive mitigation requirement, but rather to
enforce “NEPA’s procedural requirement that an agency evaluate the effectiveness of the mitigation it proposes.” ECF No.
51 at 22. This the agency has not done.

1 unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(E). This
2 “alternatives provision” requires the agency to give full and meaningful consideration to all reasonable
3 alternatives. *Native Ecosystems*, 428 F.3d at 1245. Agencies shall “rigorously explore and objectively
4 evaluate all the reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study,
5 briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). Department of the
6 Interior NEPA procedures define reasonable alternatives as “alternatives that are technically and
7 economically practical or feasible and meet the purpose and need of the proposed action.” 43 C.F.R.
8 § 46.420(b). “The existence of a viable but unexamined alternative renders an [EIS] inadequate.”
9 *Western Watersheds Project v. Abbey*, 719 F.3d 1035, 1050 (9th Cir. 2013) (internal citations and
10 quotations omitted).

11 The FEIS/R screened a large number of possible alternatives based on “their ability to meet key
12 elements of the purpose and need/basic project objectives” by reference to the following factors:

- 13 • Immediate: the term proposed for this EIS/EIR is 2015 through 2024.
14 This period is relatively short, and measures need to be able to provide
15 some measurable benefit within this time period.
- 16 • Flexible: project participants need water in some years, but not in others.
17 They need measures that have the flexibility to be used only when needed.
- 18 • Provide Substantial Water: project participants need measures that have
19 the capability of providing additional water to regions that are
20 experiencing shortages.

21 AR 26364. Alternatives were required “to meet these three criteria to move forward for further
22 evaluation.” *Id.*

23 **a. Buyer Service Area Conservation Alternative**

24 Plaintiffs first take issue with the treatment of an alternative that would have required buyer
25 service area (“BSA”) conservation. *See* ECF No. 45 at 45-47. Of Plaintiffs’ several arguments on this
26 issue, the most persuasive is that the FEIS/R treats conservation in the BSA differently than
conservation in the seller service areas upstream of the delta. An alternative including BSA conservation

1 was rejected from consideration based upon the following reasoning.

2 . . . CVP contractors currently implement [agricultural water use
3 efficiency (“WUE”) best management practices (“BMPs”)], as required by
4 CVPIA Section 3405(e). Reclamation also supports WUE through the
5 WaterSMART program. This [alternative] proposes additional WUE to
6 existing and proposed plans. As part of the existing plans, CVP
7 contractors have already implemented (or are currently implementing)
8 WUE measures. Additional measures would generally require substantial
9 infrastructure and investment and would not be immediately
10 implementable. Flexibility depends on how the measures are
11 implemented; WUE could be flexible, but the flexibility decreases when
12 the measures are implemented for permanent crops.

13 The purpose and need for water transfers is to provide additional water to
14 reduce shortages. Buyers are taking actions to address shortages, such as
15 WUE measures, within the No Action/No Project, and these measures
16 would help users accommodate shortages but would not provide any
17 additional supply. Implementing agricultural WUE in the Buyer Service
18 Area would not provide water to users with existing demands affected by
19 CVP shortages.

20 AR 26379-80. Based upon this analysis, this alternative was rejected because its benefits would not be
21 immediate and would not provide substantial water. AR 26379.

22 In the very next paragraph, the FEIS/R screens an alternative that would require conservation in
23 the seller service areas upstream of the Delta:

24 This measure would be both immediate and flexible upstream from the
25 Delta for measures such as weed control. Agricultural WUE practices can
26 be implemented relatively quickly. Sellers would need to prove that water
saved is irrecoverable and reduces a beneficial use. Water could then be
sold to buyers. Buyers could call on the transfer annually as needed.
Transfer water would provide water to existing demands in the Buyer
Service Area to reduce potential shortages.

AR 26380. This alternative passed the screening process for further evaluation with a finding that the
benefits would be immediate and would create substantial water. *Id.* Plaintiffs take issue with this
apparent disparate treatment of water conservation as a source of supply. *See* ECF No. 45 at 46. Federal
Defendants argue that the EIS explained this distinction by indicating that “immediately implementable
conservation methods are already being used in the [BSA] and thus there is no room for more water
saving this way.” ECF No. 59 at 7. NEPA only requires a brief discussion of why an alternative is

1 eliminated, but even that brief discussion must be rational and supported by some information in the
2 record. *Cf. Wyoming v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 661 F.3d 1209, 1245 (10th Cir. 2011) (finding agency's
3 rejection of an alternative to be reasonable and supported by record evidence).

4 Here, the record only partially supports Federal Defendants' assertion. The FEIS/R explains that
5 Reclamation already requires CVP contractors in the BSA to "implement cost-effective [best
6 management practices] to manage water use" and explains that an alternative that would increase BSA
7 water use efficiency would need to do so by increasing efficiency "above current and proposed practices
8 identified in the water management plans." AR 26365. However, the Court cannot identify and the
9 parties have not pointed to record evidence distinguishing the efficiency/conservation status of the seller
10 agencies. In fact, some evidence suggests seller agencies may struggle to improve efficiency in a
11 meaningful way. For example, several of the seller agencies hold Sacramento River Settlement
12 Contracts. AR 25509. An environmental document prepared in connection with the renewal of those
13 Settlement Contracts indicates that "many water conservation measures that could be taken on the
14 Sacramento River have only limited economic practicality. Many [Sacramento River Settlement
15 Contractors] have indicated that they cannot implement additional conservation without substantial (or
16 perhaps total) outside funding." AR 62674. The citations provided by Federal Defendants are simply too
17 generic to establish a valid distinction in terms of water use efficiency. *See* ECF No. 59 at 7 (citing AR
18 26379 (indicating contractors in BSA "have already implemented (or are currently implementing) [water
19 use efficiency] measures," but providing no basis for comparison with upstream of delta (seller)
20 agencies/contractors); AR 26365 (same); AR 27977 (same)).

21 The decision to reject the BSA conservation alternative could, alternatively, be justified by the
22 FEIS/R's conclusion that such an alternative would not satisfy the Project's stated purposes and need
23 because it would not provide an "immediate benefit." As quoted above, the FEIS/R defines the
24 immediacy criteria as follows: "Immediate: the term proposed for this EIS/EIR is 2015 through 2024.
25 This period is relatively short, and measures need to be able to provide some measurable benefit within

1 this time period.” Plaintiffs suggest that a component would satisfy the immediacy requirement if it
2 provided some benefit by 2024, and argue that “[i]t defies common sense to claim that no conservation
3 measures could be implemented in 10 years. Without more information, [Reclamation] has utterly failed
4 to demonstrate that no additional conservation measures could be implemented in the BSA that would
5 provide “some measureable benefit by [the time period of 2015-2024].” ECF No. 45 at 46. While
6 Federal Defendants assert in reply that “because immediately implementable conservation methods are
7 already being used in the buyer service area . . . there is no room for more water saving this way.” ECF
8 No. 59 at 7. But, again, the record does not fully support this assertion. The FEIS/R indicates that BSA
9 “Districts and farmers would need to identify and invest in additional district-level or on-farm practices
10 to improve irrigation efficiencies,” AR 26365, and that “[a]dditional measures would generally require
11 substantial infrastructure and investment and would not be immediately implementable,” AR 26379, but
12 nowhere does the record provide information to support the proposition that further improvements in
13 BSA efficiency would not be possible within the timeframe of the Project. Again, the record citations do
14 not support such a conclusion, especially in light of the contrary conclusion reached regarding the
15 potential for seller efficiency gains.

16 The third screening criterion screened for measures “that have the capability of providing
17 additional water to regions that are experiencing shortages.” AR 26379. According to the screening
18 protocol, if a measure did not meet a criterion, it was screened out from further consideration. *Id.* The
19 FEIS/R independently supports its rejection of the BSA conservation alternative by concluding that such
20 an alternative would not “provide substantial water,” because it “would not provide any additional
21 supply.” AR 26380. Plaintiffs do not argue that the “provide substantial water” criterion itself or the
22 screening protocol is unlawful. Rather, they argue that “other measures that advanced to the Project
23 Alternative stage were not required to individually satisfy all CPV shortages. (AR 26382) (noting that
24 Groundwater Substitution would allow water transfers that would “reduce potential shortages.”); AR
25 26384 (discussing fact that reservoir releases “could reduce potential CVP shortages.”).” ECF No. 45 at

1 47. This is an overly cramped view of the record. The “provide substantial water” criterion explained
2 that “project participants need measures that have the capability of providing additional water to regions
3 that are experiencing shortages.” AR 26379. The other measures to which Plaintiffs refer were found to
4 satisfy this criterion (and the other two). For example, groundwater substitution would permit surface
5 water to be transferred to the BSA. AR 26382. The reservoir release alternative would do the same,
6 because it would involve release by sellers of water stored in upstream non-CVP reservoirs “for transfer
7 through the Delta to the [BSA].” AR 26384. Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate that the inclusion of
8 the “provide substantial water” criterion is improper or was improperly applied. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’
9 motion for summary judgment that an alternative requiring BSA conservation was improperly rejected is
10 DENIED; Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.

11 **b. Buyer Area Transfers Alternative**

12 Plaintiffs next challenge the FEIS/R’s treatment of an alternative that would have included
13 transfers solely within the BSA. ECF No. 45 at 47. The FEIS/R declined to consider this alternative,
14 claiming that additional transfers within the BSA would not provide substantial water because “[e]ven
15 after in-basin transfers occur, CVP contractors continue to face shortages.” AR 26384. Again, Plaintiffs
16 argue that the treatment of the BSA transfers alternative was inconsistent with the way other alternatives
17 were treated in the FEIS/R. Specifically, an alternative that would involve sellers using groundwater
18 substitution in lieu of surface water passed the screening stage because the FEIS/R found it would
19 “provide substantial amounts of water for local irrigators and allow for CVP water to be transferred to
20 the Buyer Service Area to reduce potential shortages.” AR 026382. Similarly, an alternative that would
21 have called upon seller agencies upstream of the Delta to release water from local (non-CVP) reservoirs
22 passed the screening phase because this would produce water that “would not have otherwise been
23 released downstream,” and would therefore “provide water to reduce potential CVP shortages.” AR
24 26384.

25 The Court does not find an internal inconsistency here. The FEIS/R explained that the “provision
26

1 of substantial water” criterion was designed to confirm a measure’s “capability of providing additional
2 water to regions that are experiencing shortages.” AR 26364. The record indicates that agencies in the
3 BSA experience the most severe water constraints due to shortages. AR 25427 (“Water shortages lead to
4 severe water constraints especially in the southern portion of the CVP.”); AR 25556 (“Under the No
5 Action/No Project Alternative, significant water shortages are anticipated in the [BSA].”). This fact
6 provides sufficient basis to distinguish measures that would produce water in the seller areas from those
7 that would produce water in the buyer areas. Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is DENIED on
8 this ground; Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.

9 **c. Land Retirement Alternative**

10 Plaintiffs also challenge the FEIS/R’s elimination of an alternative that included land retirement
11 in the BSA. ECF No. 45 at 47. The FEIS/R considered but eliminated such an alternative because it did
12 not comply with the project’s purpose as follows:

13 Under the San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation, Reclamation is
14 working to retire 194,000 acres of drainage impaired farmland. Irrigation
15 water for retired lands will be distributed to other lands in the San Luis
16 Unit. This [alternative] measure proposes to retire additional land above
17 the 194,000 acres. Identifying and negotiating land retirement agreements
18 with willing landowners would take several years to implement. This
19 measure is not flexible because land would go out of irrigated agricultural
20 production permanently. Further, land retirement does not provide
21 additional water to address basin-wide CVP shortages, but rather provides
22 a way for users to address shortages in the No Action/No Project
23 Alternative.

19 AR 26382; *see also* AR 27586 (land retirement alternative “not carried forward for more detailed
20 analysis because it did not meet the key elements of the purpose and need or basic project objectives as
21 it would not be immediate or flexible, and would not provide additional water”).

22 As with the BSA conservation alternative, Plaintiffs complain, among other things, that
23 Reclamation has failed to justify the FEIS/R’s finding that this alternative fails to satisfy the “provide
24 substantial water” requirement. They argue that the “position that retiring land will not provide water” is
25 “baffling,” particularly in light of the fact that the FEIS/R finds that land retirement in the seller area

1 does provide water. ECF No. 45 at 48 (citing AR 26382). Again, Plaintiffs’ real concern here is with the
2 definition of the Project itself. The Project proponents have defined the Project as one designed to bring
3 additional water from the seller service areas to the BSA. Plaintiffs have failed to identify anything
4 unlawful about this Project definition, nor with the specific criterion which embodies this purpose.
5 Absent such an argument, the Court cannot find the alternatives analysis unlawful. Plaintiffs’ motion for
6 summary judgment is DENIED on this ground; Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.
7 Because this basis, standing alone, is sufficient to support the FEIS/R’s refusal to subject this alternative
8 to further analysis, the Court declines to address Plaintiffs’ other arguments regarding this alternative.

9 **d. Alternative that Excluded Reservoir Releases**

10 As mentioned, the FEIS/R did consider an alternative that would have called upon seller
11 agencies upstream of the Delta to release water from local (non-CVP), reservoirs for transfer through the
12 Delta to the BSA. AR 26384. At least one third party commenter requested that the FEIS/R consider
13 another alternative that would have included all other water supply source concepts except reservoir
14 releases, “so reservoir release impacts from the water transfers could have been identified, characterized,
15 quantified and disclosed.” AR 27587. Plaintiffs complain that the FEIS/R failed to provide any
16 justification for its decision not to evaluate this alternative. Plaintiffs point out that Alternative 3
17 eliminated crop modification and Alternative 4 eliminated groundwater substitution, allowing for the
18 analytical isolation of the effects of these sources of water. AR 25452. However, the FEIS/R gives some
19 explanation for why it might not be necessary to create an alternative that selectively eliminated each
20 water source scheme. As the FEIS/R explains, the Alternatives “mix and match” elements so that the
21 analysis would allow decision-makers to “create an alternative that would feasibly attain most of the
22 basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental
23 effects.” AR 25452. The Court can identify nothing legally or factually inappropriate with this as a
24 general matter. More specifically, as Federal Defendants indicate, ECF No. 49-1 at 23-24, the impacts
25 from reservoir releases are evaluated in the FEIS/R in a manner that permits those impacts to be

1 distinguished from other impacts, even though they are not isolated from yet another alternative as
2 Plaintiffs request. *See* AR 25522-23, 25525 (Table 3.1-2); 25561-62; 25574. The Court further notes that
3 Plaintiffs do not address this issue in their reply brief. ECF No. 51 at 22-24. Plaintiffs' motion for
4 summary judgment is DENIED on this ground; Federal Defendants' cross-motion is GRANTED.

5 **7. Public Trust Doctrine**

6 Plaintiffs next argue that "the [F]EIS/R failed to evaluate consistency with the Public Trust
7 Doctrine." ECF No. 45 at 49-50. The origins of the public trust doctrine were explained by the
8 California Supreme Court in *National Audubon Society v. Superior Court*, 33 Cal. 3d 419 (1983):

9 "By the law of nature these things are common to mankind—the air,
10 running water, the sea and consequently the shores of the sea." (Institutes
11 of Justinian 2.1.1.) From this origin in Roman law, the English common
12 law evolved the concept of the public trust, under which the sovereign
13 owns "all of its navigable waterways and the lands lying beneath them 'as
trustee of a public trust for the benefit of the people.'" "The State of
California acquired title as trustee to such lands and waterways upon its
admission to the union; from the earliest days its judicial decisions have
recognized and enforced the trust obligation.

14 *Id.* at 433-34 (internal citations and quotations omitted); *see also San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water*
15 *Auth. v. Jewell*, 52 F. Supp. 3d 1020, 1068-69 (E.D. Cal. 2014), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part sub nom. San*
16 *Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Haugrud*, 848 F.3d 1216 (9th Cir. 2017), as corrected (Mar. 23,
17 2017). California "has an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the planning and
18 allocation of water resources, and to protect public trust uses whenever feasible." *Id.* at 446.

19 To understand Plaintiffs' argument (and what is wrong with it), one must examine the nature of
20 the public trust claim alleged in this case. While it is possible to maintain a direct cause of action against
21 an agency for violating the public trust doctrine, *see generally Baykeeper*, 242 Cal. App. 4th 202, the
22 FAC contains no direct cause of action based upon the public trust doctrine. In other words, the FAC
23 does not directly allege that any state agency actually violated the public trust doctrine. Rather, Plaintiffs
24 only allege that "[t]he EIS/EIR fails to demonstrate consistency with Public Trust Doctrine
25 requirements." FAC ¶ 139(cc).

1 Plaintiffs cite *Baykeeper*, 242 Cal. App. 4th at 242, for the proposition that state agencies have an
2 affirmative duty to perform [an analysis under the public trust doctrine], based on substantial evidence in
3 the administrative record, as a part of their CEQA review.” ECF No. 45 at 58:23-25. *Baykeeper*
4 concerned a challenge to the approval by the California State Lands Commission (“SCL”) of a sand
5 mining project and an associated EIR. 242 Cal. App. 4th at 210-11. Plaintiffs in *Baykeeper* argued that
6 the approval of the project was contrary to the public trust doctrine because the SLC failed to consider
7 whether the project constituted a permissible use of public trust property. *Id.* at 232. The court
8 concluded that sand mining is “indisputably a public trust use of sovereign land,” *id.* at 234-35, and that
9 “SLC’s authority to approve private sand mining leases of public trust property carries with it an
10 affirmative duty to take the public trust into account and to protect public trust uses whenever feasible.”
11 *Id.* at 234 (internal citations omitted). Because SLC did not make public trust findings about the project,
12 it did not satisfy its duty. *See id.* at 234-35.

13 SLC argued that it satisfied its public trust review duties by completing a CEQA review. *Id.* at
14 240. The *Baykeeper* court agreed that “[c]ompliance with other environmental statutes can serve to
15 fulfill an agency’s trust obligation.” *Id.* at 241 (emphasis added). However, CEQA review of a project
16 involving sovereign property does not necessarily satisfy the SLC’s public trust obligations. *Id.* Only
17 where the CEQA review process encompasses public trust issues does the CEQA review satisfy the
18 project proponent’s public trust obligations. *Id.* at 241-42.

19 Here, Plaintiffs assert that the Authority violated CEQA by not including a public trust
20 discussion in its CEQA document. FAC ¶ 139(cc); ECF No. 45 at 49-50. As *Baykeeper* held, an analysis
21 under the public trust doctrine is an independent duty that attaches to any agency approval of a project
22 that implicates public trust resources. 242 Cal. App. 4th at 235. That duty may be discharged through the
23 CEQA process, *see id.* at 240-43, but nothing in *Baykeeper* or any other authority suggests the duty must
24 be discharged as part of the CEQA process. *Cf.* Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21083.1 (cautioning against
25 interpreting CEQA in a manner that imposes requirements beyond those explicitly stated in the statute or

1 in the Guidelines). In other words, *Baykeeper* does not stand for the proposition that failure to include a
2 public trust analysis within a CEQA document amounts to a violation of CEQA. As this is the only
3 claim Plaintiffs allege, *Baykeeper* does not support their claim.

4 In their reply, Plaintiffs cite two additional cases to support their assertion that Defendant
5 violated CEQA by failing to include in the CEQA document a public trust doctrine analysis. ECF No. 51
6 at 19 (citing *Citizens for E. Shore Parks v. State Lands Comm'n*, 202 Cal. App. 4th 549, 570 (2011);
7 *National Audubon Society v. Superior Court*, 33 Cal. 3d 419, n.27 (1983)). In *Citizens for East Shore*
8 *Parks*, the plaintiffs alleged the SCL violated both CEQA and the public trust doctrine when it approved
9 a lease allowing a petroleum company to continue operating a marine terminal. 202 Cal. App 4th at 553.
10 Both claims were rejected. The public trust doctrine had not been violated because the SLC's decision
11 had not changed, derogated, or otherwise diminished a public trust use; rather it simply continued an
12 existing, long-standing public trust use of the navigable waters and submerged and partially submerged
13 lands in question. *Id.* at 576. The plaintiffs' independent (i.e., unrelated to the public trust) CEQA
14 violations were addressed and rejected. *Id.* at 557-568. Although the court did note that the CEQA
15 analysis addressed public trust issues, these comments were made in the context of evaluating the direct
16 public trust claim, not the CEQA claim. *Id.* at 578-79. Nowhere in *Citizens* was it suggested that CEQA
17 required an internal "public trust consistency" analysis.

18 Nor is the Court moved by Plaintiffs' citation to footnote 27 from *National Audubon*. As
19 mentioned, *National Audubon* held that the California and its agencies have "an affirmative duty to take
20 the public trust into account in the planning and allocation of water resources, and to protect public trust
21 uses whenever feasible." 33 Cal. 3d at 446. Footnote 27, appended to that holding, states in its entirety:

22 Amendments to the Water Code enacted in 1955 and subsequent years
23 codify in part the duty of the Water Board to consider public trust uses of
24 stream water. (*See [id.]* at 444.) The requirements of the California
25 Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 *et seq.*)
26 impose a similar obligation. [Citation]

These enactments do not render the judicially fashioned public trust

1 doctrine superfluous. Aside from the possibility that statutory protections
2 can be repealed, the noncodified public trust doctrine remains important
3 both to confirm the state’s sovereign supervision and to require
4 consideration of public trust uses in cases filed directly in the courts
5 without prior proceedings before the board.

6 *Id.* at 446 n.27 (parallel and certain other citations omitted). When placed in context, this footnote does
7 not suggest the existence of any obligation under CEQA to perform a public trust consistency analysis.
8 Rather, it addresses the policy underpinnings of CEQA, which require, by its own text, consideration of
9 public trust issues.

10 While there is authority to support the proposition that a CEQA consistency analysis may suffice
11 to show that an agency has considered public trust issues, *see Citizens*, 202 Cal. App. 4th at 577,
12 Plaintiffs do not cite, and the Court cannot find, any authority to support Plaintiffs’ assertion that a
13 CEQA document must contain a public trust consistency analysis, and certainly not in the absence of an
14 otherwise valid, stand-alone public trust claim.

15 Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R violated CEQA because it failed to
16 include a public trust consistency analysis is DENIED; the Authority’s cross-motion is GRANTED.

17 **B. ESA Claims**

18 **1. ESA Claims Against Reclamation**

19 Plaintiffs’ Fourth Claim for Relief asserts that Reclamation violated the ESA by failing to re-
20 initiate consultation with FWS in connection with the Project, which, according to Plaintiffs, “results in
21 additional adverse effects not contemplated in prior FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps.” FAC at ¶
22 159. In their opening brief, Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment on this claim. In opposition, Federal
23 Defendants and the Authority argue that this Court lacks jurisdiction over any ESA claim against
24 Reclamation because Plaintiffs failed to comply with the notice provisions set forth in the ESA’s citizen
25 suit provision. *See* ECF No. 48 at 26-27; ECF No. 49-1 at 24-25.

26 The Fourth Claim for Relief arises directly under the ESA’s citizen suit provision, 16 U.S.C. §
1540(g)(1)(A). *See Yurok Tribe v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation*, 231 F. Supp. 3d 450, 466 (N.D. Cal.

1 2017) (“While plaintiffs bring the same failure to reinitiate claims against both [Reclamation] and
2 NMFS, the claim against [Reclamation] may be brought under the ESA citizen suit provision, while the
3 claim against NMFS, as discussed above, may only be brought under the APA.”); *see also Forest*
4 *Guardians v. Johanns*, 450 F.3d 455, 466 (9th Cir. 2006) (granting summary judgment in favor of
5 plaintiffs on claim alleging federal agency failed to re-initiate consultation under the ESA).⁵⁰ The ESA’s
6 citizen suit provision requires notice to the alleged violator (in this claim, Reclamation), as well as to the
7 Secretary of the Interior and/or Commerce, sixty days prior to filing any suit that arises under the citizen
8 suit provision. 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(2)(A)(i). This requirement is jurisdictional. *Sw. Ctr. for Biological*
9 *Diversity v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation*, 143 F.3d 515, 520 (9th Cir. 1998). “A failure to strictly comply
10 with the notice requirement acts as an absolute bar to bringing suit under the ESA.” *Id.*

11 Plaintiffs do not even attempt to overcome this jurisprudence in their opposition/reply brief. *See*
12 ECF No. 51 at 24-30 (addressing only ESA claim(s) against FWS). Accordingly, because this Court
13 lacks jurisdiction over the Fourth Claim for Relief because Plaintiffs failed to comply with the ESA
14 citizen suit notice requirements, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment on that claim is DENIED and
15 Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.

16 **2. ESA Claim(s) Against FWS**

17 Plaintiffs’ Fifth Claim for Relief alleges that FWS violated the ESA by failing to use “best
18 available science” to determine whether the Project would jeopardize GGS. FAC at ¶¶ 163-166.

19 **a. Background Relevant to ESA Claims Against FWS**

20 “Under the ESA, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce are charged with
21 identifying threatened and endangered species and designating critical habitats for those species.” *Nat.*
22 *Res. Def. Council v. Jewell*, 749 F.3d 776, 779 (9th Cir. 2014) (“*NRDC v. Jewell*”) (citing 16 U.S.C. §

24
25 ⁵⁰ If a claim falls within the scope of the ESA’s citizen suit provision, review under the APA is unavailable and cannot be
26 used as an alternative means to obtain judicial review of a claim that fails to comply with the procedural requirements of the
citizen suit provision. *See Hawaii Cty. Green Party v. Clinton*, 124 F. Supp. 2d 1173, 1193 (D. Haw. 2000).

1 1533). FWS and NMFS administer the ESA on behalf of the Departments of the Interior and Commerce,
2 respectively.⁵¹ See 50 C.F.R. §§ 17.11, 222.101(a), 223.102, 402.01(b). Section 7 of the ESA requires
3 federal agencies to ensure that their activities do not jeopardize the continued existence of listed
4 endangered or threatened species or adversely modify those species' critical habitats. 16 U.S.C. §
5 1536(a)(2); see also *Karuk Tribe of Cal. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 681 F.3d 1006, 1020 (9th Cir. 2012).

6 Section 7's implementing regulations provide that "[e]ach Federal agency shall review its actions
7 at the earliest possible time to determine whether any action may affect listed species or critical
8 habitat[s]." 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a). "Once an agency has determined that its action 'may affect' a listed
9 species or critical habitat, the agency must consult, either formally or informally, with the appropriate
10 expert wildlife agency." *Karuk Tribe*, 681 F.3d at 1027 (internal citation omitted). An agency may avoid
11 the consultation requirement only if it determines that its action will have 'no effect' on a listed species
12 or critical habitat." *Id.* (internal citation omitted). If the wildlife agency determines during informal
13 consultation that the proposed action is "not likely to adversely affect any listed species or critical
14 habitat," formal consultation is not required and the process ends. *Id.* (citing 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(b)(1)).
15 "Thus, actions that have any chance of affecting listed species or critical habitat—even if it is later
16 determined that the actions are 'not likely' to do so—require at least some consultation under the ESA."
17 *Id.* (internal citation omitted).

18 Formal consultation results in the issuance of a "biological opinion" ("BiOp") by FWS. See 16
19 U.S.C. § 1536(b). If the BiOp concludes that the proposed action would jeopardize the species or
20 destroy or adversely modify critical habitat, see *id.* § 1536(a)(2), then the action may not go forward
21

22 ⁵¹ Generally, FWS has jurisdiction over species of fish that either (1) spend the major portion of their life in fresh water, or
23 (2) spend part of their lives in estuarine waters, if the remaining time is spent in fresh water. See *Cal. State Grange v. Nat'l*
24 *Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 620 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1120 n.1 (E.D. Cal. 2008), as corrected (Oct. 31, 2008). NMFS is granted
25 jurisdiction over fish species that (1) spend the major portion of their life in ocean water, or (2) spend part of their lives in
26 estuarine waters, if the remaining portion is spent in ocean water. *Id.* FWS exercises jurisdiction over the delta smelt; NMFS
exercises jurisdiction over the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, the latter of which are the subjects of other claims
in this case not at issue in the present motion.

1 unless FWS can suggest a “reasonable and prudent alternative[.]” (“RPA”) that avoids jeopardy,
2 destruction, or adverse modification. *Id.* § 1536(b)(3)(A). If the BiOp concludes that jeopardy is not
3 likely and that there will not be adverse modification of critical habitat, or that there is a RPA to the
4 agency action that avoids jeopardy and adverse modification, and that the incidental taking of
5 endangered or threatened species will not violate Section 7(a)(2), the consulting agency shall issue an
6 “Incidental Take Statement” (“ITS”) which, if followed, exempts the action agency from the prohibition
7 on takings found in Section 9 of the ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4); *Aluminum Co. of Am. v.*
8 *Administrator, Bonneville Power Admin.*, 175 F.3d 1156, 1159 (9th Cir. 1999).

9 In October 2014, Reclamation developed a biological assessment (“BA”) that provided the basis
10 for formal consultation on how the Project would impact various species, including the GGS, which is
11 listed under the ESA as “threatened.” AR 2625. Reclamation’s BA concluded that the Project was likely
12 to adversely affect GGS “as a result of increased mortality from reduction in available habitat for the
13 species.” AR 2666. However, certain conservation measures were identified as part of the proposed
14 action “to avoid or minimize transfers within areas likely to support GGS and to maintain migration
15 corridors (i.e., canals with water) in areas where rice fields are idled.” *Id.* In November 2014,
16 Reclamation asked FWS to prepare a BiOp, specifically seeking FWS’s concurrence with the findings of
17 the BA. *See* AR 7913. As mentioned, in formulating a BiOp, the ESA separately required FWS to
18 evaluate whether the Project would “jeopardize the continued existence” of the GGS. *See* AR 7943.⁵²

19 Based on the BA and supplemental information requested by FWS, AR 7915, FWS issued an
20 initial BiOp on April 30, 2015 (“April 2015 BiOp”). AR 7006. Shortly thereafter, Reclamation contacted
21 FWS to point out that the April 2015 BiOp relied upon conservation measures that Reclamation had not
22 included in the Project description and that were not measures Reclamation “can commit to.” AR 7267-
23 68. On June 4, 2017, FWS issued a corrected, superseding BiOp (“Final BiOp” or “BiOp”). AR 7913.

24
25 ⁵² Because critical habitat had not been formally designated for GGS, *see* AR 2632, FWS was not required to evaluate
26 separately whether the Project would adversely modify GGS critical habitat. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

1 The Final BiOp’s jeopardy analysis first evaluated the “status of the species,” which
2 acknowledged that “loss of habitat” was the “most significant effect” on the species. AR 7931. The
3 BiOp reviewed recent research on snake distribution and ecology, noting generally that GGS “have not
4 been able to disperse into all suitable habitats, and are largely restricted to areas near locations at which
5 they were likely historically abundant.” AR 7933. The BiOp also reviewed in detail documented
6 sightings of GGS. AR 7936-37.

7 Next, the BiOp evaluated factors affecting the GGS within the Project’s action area, noting “the
8 overall status of the snake has not improved since its listing.” AR 7938. Of particular relevance here, the
9 BiOp acknowledged that “rice fields and agricultural waterways can provide valuable seasonal foraging
10 and upland habitat for the snake,” but that “fluctuations in rice production and changes in water
11 management including reductions in water availability due to drought and water transfers were cited as
12 threats to the continued existence of the snake” to such an extent that FWS concluded that “these factors
13 in combination with other threats put the Butte, Colusa, and Sutter Basin populations of snakes at risk of
14 moving from the status of threatened to endangered,” with all other areas considered “to be at risk of
15 extirpation.” *Id.* Overall “by far the most serious threats to snakes continues to be loss and fragmentation
16 of habitat from urban and agricultural development and loss of habitat associated with changes in rice
17 production.” AR 7939. Of particular concern are activities that diminish “hydrologic links to suitable
18 habitat during periods of drought, flooding, or diminished habitat quality.” *Id.* The big picture for the
19 snake is complicated vis-a-vis rice field fallowing generally and fallowing due to water transfers
20 specifically:

21 Sacramento Valley populations of the snake depend on agricultural
22 croplands, leaving them vulnerable to wide-scale habitat loss in the event
23 of changes in agricultural management such as changes in crops or
24 fallowing large areas of rice fields (Paquin et al. 2006). Long-term
25 fallowing can reduce or eliminate habitat, yet short-term fallowing can
ultimately improve rice agriculture and associated habitat components and
sustain them over the long term while reducing chemical inputs and
discharges (J. Roberts in litt. 2011, referenced in Service 2012). When rice
fields are left out of production there is a substantial reduction or

1 elimination in the use of the surrounding and nearby water conveyance
2 structures by snakes where water supply is dependent upon surface or
3 ground water from non-adjacent or on-site sources (Service 2012). Radio
4 tracked snakes are known to leave previously occupied rice land sites
5 when fallowing is continued for more than one season (Wylie pers.
6 Comm. 2008, E Hansen 2008). If rice fields are planted with a rotation
7 crop, especially one that is irrigated, essential habitat components for the
8 snake may be maintained, and the long term values may be enhanced if the
9 rice crop is made more sustainable where it otherwise might be eliminated
10 (Service 2012). Fallowing fields alternately in a 'checkerboard' pattern
11 may minimize the impacts to snakes (Service in litt. 2008 referenced in
12 Service 2012).

13 Recent studies have concluded that snakes have adapted to the mosaic of
14 seasonal wetlands and upland habitats that rice cultivation mimics, and use
15 flooded rice fields for foraging, and irrigation dikes for basking sites
16 (Service 2012). Regular long-term water transfers have the potential to
17 reduce significantly the amount of rice lands and the temporary and
18 artificial wetlands they produce (Service 2012). Impacts may be especially
19 severe in those areas adjacent to State and Federal wildlife refuges which
20 may function as the core habitat to lead recovery efforts (Service 2012).

21 AR 7939.

22 The BiOp next evaluated the "effects of the action," assuming that a maximum of 60,693 acres
23 of rice land will be fallowed each year for 10 years if the full amount of permitted transfer water is
24 transferred as a result of cropland idling/crop shifting. AR 7940. This would amount to approximately
25 12.3% of the average annual rice acreage grown in the Sacramento valley from 1992 to 2012. *Id.*
26 The BiOp concluded that "[t]his reduction in habitat will likely result in increased stress on snakes that
must disperse further to find suitable habitat, a likely reduction in prey base due to less available habitat,
the potential displacement of individual snakes, increased risk of predation on snakes, and the potential
for reduced reproduction and recruitment," and that "[a]ll of these factors may result in the loss of
individual snakes through increased mortality or reduced or forgone reproduction by snakes in affected
areas." *Id.* The BiOp also repeatedly notes that "rice cultivation is important," and "fallowing of rice
fields reduces the amount and availability of habitat" and "may reduce foraging success for snakes that
have left their home range in search of shallow summer aquatic habitat," may expose snakes to other
mortality risks while they are dispersing, may reduce prey availability, and may impact reproductive

1 success and juvenile survival. *See generally* AR 7941-42.

2 Nonetheless, the BiOp concludes Reclamation’s conservation measures, discussed in greater
3 detail below, will minimize the effects of the proposed project by: (1) “ensur[ing] that most or all canals
4 and waterways, which make up a portion of snake aquatic habitat, will remain wetted during the summer
5 months, thereby providing refuge to snakes”; (2) “providing assurances that in specific high priority
6 snake habitat areas, as shown in Attachment A [to the BiOp], conservation will be implemented”; and
7 (3) “[i]n other areas where high quality snake habitat exists and snakes are known to occur, sellers will
8 be required to maintain habitat features (ditches, drains, conveyance structures, etc.) in an aquatic
9 condition that can be used by snakes, thus providing habitat across the action area.” AR 7942.

10 The BiOp concluded that these measures were “developed using the best available science on
11 snake biology, habitat use and suitability, and known occurrences,” focusing on “conservation in the
12 most important areas for snakes, considering high quality habitat and known use by snakes.” *Id.* Of
13 particular importance to the conservation measures is “maintain[ing] water in canals and ditches known
14 to be suitable for snakes,” which “represent 85% of the known snake occurrence.” *Id.*

15 In sum, the BiOp concluded that the conservation measures are “expected to reduce the severity
16 of some of the adverse effects described previously, such as loss or reduction of consistently available
17 wetted areas and isolation of snakes in islands of idled cropland with no movement corridor to enable
18 them to leave the area.” *Id.* Yet, “because there is some uncertainty that snakes will respond as
19 anticipated, that the areas identified as priority habitat are sufficiently well distributed or have the
20 capacity to maintain a large proportion of the resident snake population,” the BiOp acknowledged that
21 expected responses, “while supported by science, have not been validated by monitoring.” *Id.*
22 Accordingly, the BiOp acknowledged that an adaptive management approach proposed by Reclamation
23 would be important to address any uncertainty and allow scientists to adapt the program as new
24 information becomes available. *Id.* The adaptive management protocols include: (1) development of
25 performance measures and metrics to monitor trends in snake numbers, reproduction, and distribution;

1 (2) annual reporting by Reclamation detailing crop idling, compliance with conservation measures
2 (including maintaining water in ditches around affected fields), results of snake monitoring, snake
3 detections, known incidental snake “take,” and other pertinent information; and (3) communication
4 between Reclamation and FWS to discuss annual reports and develop additional conservation measures
5 if needed. AR 7946.

6 Finally, “[a]fter reviewing the current status of the snake, [the] environmental baseline for the
7 action area, [the] effects of the proposed project cumulative effects, and [the] proposed conservation
8 measures” the BiOp concludes that the Project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the
9 GGS.

10 The proposed project will likely result in the loss of an unknown number
11 of snakes as a result of increased mortality from temporal loss of habitat,
12 increased competition for resources, reduced reproductive rates, and
13 increased mortality from predation. We expect that crop idling and
shifting will temporarily remove suitable snake habitat and may also
reduce reproduction, recruitment, and survival of the snakes and these
effects will extend beyond the project time frame.

14 However, Reclamation is implementing a comprehensive conservation
15 strategy that is based on recent research that focuses on maintaining
suitable habitat conditions in priority areas throughout the action area.
16 Water will be maintained in areas most important to snakes and water will
not be transferred from priority conservation areas (e.g., Natomas). In
17 addition Reclamation will identify where idling has occurred, collect and
verify habitat conditions, synthesize species data and implement adaptive
18 management measures to assure effective implementation of the
conservation measures.

19 AR 7943-44.

20 **b. Mootness of Challenges to April 2015 BiOp**

21 Plaintiffs attempts to assert claims against both the April 2015 BiOp as well as the Final BiOp.
22 Claims regarding a superseded BiOp are moot. *See, e.g., American Rivers v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries*
23 *Serv.*, 126 F.3d 1118, 1124 (9th Cir. 1997); *Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game v NMFS*, 56 F.3d 1071 (9th
24 Cir. 1995); *Rio Grande Silvery Minnow v. Bureau of Reclamation*, 601 F.3d 1096, 1111-12 (10th Cir.
25 2010). Plaintiffs attempt to distinguish these cases by arguing that the April 2015 BiOp was not

1 superseded by the Final BiOp because the Final BiOp nowhere indicates that the April 2015 BiOp was
2 rescinded and because both BiOps were issued in connection with the “same project.” ECF No. 51 at 25.
3 Plaintiffs’ position on this issue is not tenable. It is clear from the record that the Final BiOp was issued
4 at least in part to correct the April 2015 BiOp’s Project description. Accordingly, the two BiOps were
5 not issued in connection with the “same project”; rather, the project addressed by the April 2015 BiOp
6 did not exist. Any direct challenges to the April 2015 BiOp are moot, and no exception to the mootness
7 doctrine applies. Nonetheless, the Court has treated any arguments raised by Plaintiffs in connection
8 with the April 2015 BiOp as though those arguments were raised against the Final BiOp, so long as
9 those arguments are relevant to the Final BiOp (e.g., if the language is substantially similar).

10 **c. Challenges to Conservation Measures**

11 **(1) “Abandonment” of Protective Measures Found in Earlier BiOps**

12 Plaintiffs argue that FWS violated the ESA because it “abandoned” protective measures required
13 in older biological opinions addressing the impact of water transfer projects on GGS, in favor of the
14 conservation measures proposed by Reclamation in connection with the Project. ECF No. 45 at 50-53. In
15 connection with certain previous water transfer projects, earlier biological opinions limited the “block
16 size” of idled parcels to 320 acres, limited the amount of rice field fallowing to 20% in each county,
17 prohibited idled parcels from being adjacent to other idled parcels, prohibited idled parcels from being
18 located on the opposite side of canals or other waterways from other idled parcels, prohibited fallowing
19 of fields for more than two consecutive irrigation seasons, and prohibited transfers from sensitive areas.
20 AR 47644; *see also* AR 22275-77, AR 22329-30.

21 It is undisputed that the “new” conservation measures adopted by the Final BiOp do abandon
22 many of these specific limitations, opting instead for an approach that claims to preclude crop
23 idling/substitution near certain priority snake habitat areas and leave water in other types of priority
24 habitat. Plaintiffs are correct that FWS cannot change its own policy or precedent without providing a
25 reasoned justification for doing so. *See SW Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation,*

1 143 F.3d 515, 53 n. 4 (9th Cir. 1998); *see also Modesto Irr. Dist v. Gutierrez*, 619 F.3d 1024, 1034 (9th
2 Cir. 2010). However, as Federal Defendants point out, the conservation measures incorporated into the
3 BiOp are not FWS policy.⁵³ Rather, they are part of the action agency’s (i.e., Reclamation’s) proposed
4 Project. Neither the ESA nor the APA prohibits changed positions under these circumstances.⁵⁴
5 Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that FWS unlawfully abandoned a prior policy is DENIED;
6 Federal Defendants’ cross-motion is GRANTED.

7 The relevant question here is whether FWS lawfully concluded that the proposed Project would
8 not jeopardize GGS.⁵⁵ *See SW Ctr.*, 143 F.3d at 523 (in evaluating FWS’s selection of one RPA over
9 another, finding that FWS “need only have adopted a final RPA which complied with the jeopardy
10 standard and which could be implemented by the agency”); *see also* 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2) (FWS
11 decision must be based on the “the best scientific and commercial data available.”).⁵⁶ That question is
12 addressed below.

14
15 ⁵³ It is of no moment that FWS has broad discretion regarding whether and how to use an agency’s BA in evaluating whether
16 a species is present in an action area or how a Project may impact a species. *See* 50 C.F.R. § 402.12(k). Nothing in the ESA
17 indicates FWS has any authority to craft, edit, or otherwise modify a proposed project.

18 ⁵⁴ Relatedly, Plaintiffs argue that FWS “arbitrarily weakened” the “April BiOp.” ECF No. 45 at 54. Specifically, Plaintiffs
19 point out that the April 2015 BiOp contained slightly more stringent conservation measures than the Final BiOp. For
20 example, the Preliminary BiOp prohibited cropland idling/shifting transfers in “priority habitats with a high likelihood of
21 snake occurrence (60 percent or greater probability).” AR 7019. This prohibition was eliminated from the Final BiOp. AR
22 7840. Plaintiffs argue that because the April 2015 BiOp indicated that this and other conservation measures that were later
23 altered in the Final BiOp were necessary to avoid jeopardy to the GGS, FWS had a duty to explain how dramatically
24 weakening those protections would still minimize adequately incidental take of GGS. ECF No. 45 at 55. Instead of providing
25 any such explanation, Plaintiffs argue that the conservation measures were modified to make them consistent with the
26 conservation measures proposed by Reclamation, AR 7450 (email from Reclamation to FWS requesting correction of April
2015 BiOp to “accurately reflect the Conservation Measures related to cropland idling transfers within the [2015 Water
Transfer BA]”) or because they simply were not acceptable to Reclamation, AR 7270 (email from Reclamation to FWS
explaining why one conservation measure included in April 2015 BiOp but excluded from Final BiOp “isn’t something that
we can commit to”). But this is exactly why FWS did not need to provide an explanation for making changes to the April
BiOp. Again, the key question is whether the Final BiOp satisfied the relevant legal standard.

⁵⁵ Contrary to Plaintiffs’ suggestion by citation to Mr. Hanson’s letter, the question is not whether the agency has identified
new science indicating the new approach does not affect GGS probability of persistence. *See* ECF No. 45 at 51 (citing AR
47644 (Mr. Hanson opining that “the agency did not identify new science indicating that limitations on the size and
distribution of fallowed parcels do not affect the snake’s probability of persistence”)).

⁵⁶ For the same reasons, the Plaintiffs’ argument that FWS “arbitrarily weakened” the April BiOp, *see* ECF No. 45 at 54, is
unpersuasive. The Final BiOp must stand or fall on its own merits. Although nothing precludes Plaintiff from citing
reasoning from the April 2015 BiOp (e.g., an explanation as to why a specific restriction is required) to argue FWS acted
unlawfully by later adopting a less restrictive measure, Plaintiffs make no such arguments here. Rather, the argument here is
simply that certain, more restrictive conservation measures found in the April 2015 BiOp were abandoned without
explanation and for the “improper” purpose of correcting the project description. *See* ECF No. 45 at 55-56.

1 of the contemporary distribution of GGS in the Sacramento Valley.” Again, this priority habitat map
 2 was validated against GGS occurrence data. *Id.* The resulting maps are found at Attachment A to the
 3 Final BiOp and depict seller water districts overlain with priority habitat data (depicted by various
 4 gradations of the color blue) and known GGS occurrence information (depicted by red dots, red outlined
 5 shapes, or red hashmarked shapes). AR 7954-67. Notably, as the 2014 Water Transfer BA explained,
 6 several seller water districts were found to contain 100% “priority habitat,” while other districts
 7 contained a “smaller percentage” of priority habitat (70.15%).

8 **Table 1: Water Districts and Area of Priority Habitat**

9 Water District	Area of Water District (Acres)	Area of Priority Habitat in Water District (Acres)	Habitat in District (Percentage)
10 GLENN-COLUSA I.D.	175,621	139,496	79.43%
CANAL FARMS	426	426	100.00%
11 CONAWAY PRESERVATION GROUP, LLC	18,965	18,965	100.00%
GOOSE CLUB FARMS & TEICHERT	5,728	5,528	96.51%
12 MAXWELL I.D.	6,803	6,803	100.00%
PELGER M.W.C.	2,969	2,969	100.00%
13 PLEASANT GROVE-VERONA M.W.C.	7,432	7,432	100.00%
PRINCETON-CORDORA-GLENN I.D.	12,162	8,872	72.95%
14 PROVIDENT I.D.	16,798	11,784	70.15%
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1004	23,235	21,766	93.68%
15 RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 108	58,820	58,820	100.00%
ROBERTS DITCH IRRIGATION COMPANY	1,785	1,785	100.00%
16 SYCAMORE FAMILY TRUST	8,431	8,431	100.00%
TE VELDE REVOCABLE FAMILY TRUST	1,282	1,282	100.00%
T&P FARMS	425	425	100.00%

17 AR 1250.

18 Plaintiffs raise several general challenges to the science underlying this approach. A 2014 BA
 19 prepared by Reclamation for a related project indicates that some of the assumptions underlying the
 20 modeling approach used to generate the maps in Attachment A have “not been tested.” ECF No. 45 at 52
 21 (citing AR 1249). But, the 2014 BA indicates the assumptions “should be reasonable” and although
 22 “much uncertainty still exists,” the assumptions rely on “the best information currently available.” AR
 23 1249. Plaintiffs do not point to any record evidence to the contrary. To the extent Plaintiffs are
 24 challenging the modeling approach selected, they have not sustained their burden. *See San Luis v.*
 25

1 *Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 593 (holding that an agency’s decision to use one modeling approach over another
2 “requires a high level of technical expertise” and courts “must be at [their] most deferential” in
3 reviewing challenges to those choices).

4 Plaintiffs also make much of the fact that the 2014 BA indicates that the model’s results give
5 only “some indication” of where GGS may occur. ECF No. 45 at 52 (citing AR 1249). While admitting
6 that such information might be helpful to supplement existing science, Plaintiffs assert the results of the
7 modeling are irrelevant to determining “how to best protect existing GGS populations and their priority
8 habitat.” *Id.* at 52 (citing AR 47644). What Plaintiffs overlook, however, is that the legal standard does
9 not require FWS to adopt conservation measures that “best protect” GGS. As discussed previously, the
10 question is whether FWS lawfully determined that the conservation measures avoid jeopardy. In sum,
11 Plaintiffs do not point to better data that could have been used to generate the maps presented in
12 Attachment A, nor do they point to a better methodology FWS should have relied upon in this effort. *See*
13 *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 602 (best available data requirement “prohibits [an agency] from
14 disregarding available scientific evidence that is in some way better than the evidence [it] relies on”).

15 Plaintiffs also raise several, more targeted challenges to FWS’s reliance on the conservation
16 measures. Generally, FWS described the new conservation measures as: “focus[ing] on cropland idling
17 restrictions in areas where snakes have a high likelihood of occurrence.” AR 7924. However, close
18 inspection of the conservation measures reveals a troubling lack of clarity in how the restrictions are
19 described (and therefore how they would be implemented). As mentioned, in finding that the Project
20 would not jeopardize GGS, FWS imposed certain terms and conditions on the Project, including that
21 Reclamation incorporate within any contract certain conservation measures.

22 “Areas with known priority snake populations,” including lands “adjacent to naturalized lands
23 and refuges and corridors between these areas,” will not be permitted to participate in cropland
24 idling/shifting transfers. AR 7926. The BiOp indicates that water sellers can request a “case-by-case
25 evaluation” of whether a specific field would be precluded from participating in long-term transfers and

1 provides the following examples of lands where cropland idling/shifting transfers will not be permitted
2 because they encompass “[a]reas with known priority snake populations”:

3 Fields abutting or immediately adjacent to Little Butte Creek between
4 Llano Seco and Upper Butte Basin Wildlife Area (WA), Butte Creek
5 between Upper Butte Basin and Gray Lodge WAs, Colusa Basin drainage
6 canal between Delevan and Colusa National Wildlife Refuges (NWR),
7 Gilsizer Slough, Colusa Drainage Canal, the land side of the Toe Drain
8 along the Sutter Bypass, Willow Slough, and Willow Slough Bypass in
9 Yolo County, Hunters and Logan Creeks between Sacramento and
10 Delevan NWRs; and Lands in the Natomas Basin.

11 AR 7926. As Plaintiffs point out, however, some of the maps in Attachment A designate known
12 observations of GGS that are inexplicably not included on this list. ECF No. 51 at 28. For example, on
13 the habitat priority map for Conway Preservation Group (“CPG”), a number of areas are identified as
14 being “specific occurrence” areas for GGS, while others are identified as “nonspecific occurrences” of
15 GGS. AR 7958. Yet, according to Plaintiffs⁵⁷ none of these areas is enumerated among the “areas with
16 known priority snake populations.”

17 This lack of specificity is problematic in light of the relevant legal requirements. The Ninth
18 Circuit has held that mitigation measures⁵⁸ may be included as part of a proposed action (and therefore
19 be relied upon when determining whether jeopardy will result) only where they involve “specific and
20 binding plans” and “a clear, definite commitment of resources for future improvements” to implement
21 those measures. *Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n v. Nat. Marine Fisheries Serv*, 524 F.3d 917, 935-36 (9th Cir.
22 2008) (finding agency’s “sincere general commitment to future improvements” inadequate to support no
23 jeopardy conclusion). One district court persuasively provided further guidance, holding that mitigation
24 measures supporting a BiOp’s no jeopardy or no adverse modification conclusion must be “reasonably
25 specific, certain to occur, and capable of implementation; they must be subject to deadlines or
26

23 ⁵⁷ Plaintiffs have asserted and Federal Defendants have not disputed that the areas within Conway Preservation Trust
24 designated as having GGS occurrences map are not among those listed. Mr. Hanson’s letter provides additional support for
25 Plaintiffs’ position. *See* AR 47645 (noting that while Conway Preservation Group is identified as potential participants in
26 the water transfer program, the area encompasses well-documented GGS populations).

⁵⁸ The Court agrees with *Oregon Nat. Desert Ass’n v. Tidwell*, 716 F. Supp. 2d 982, 1001 n.7 (D. Or. 2010), “conservation
measures,” as they are termed by Federal Defendants, are synonymous with “mitigation measures” discussed in the caselaw.

1 otherwise-enforceable obligations; and most important, they must address the threats to the species in a
2 way that satisfies the jeopardy and adverse modification standards.” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v.*
3 *Rumsfeld*, 198 F. Supp. 2d 1139, 1152 (D. Ariz. 2002) (internal citation omitted). Where one cannot
4 determine what will happen when mitigation measures are implemented, they may not be relied upon to
5 avoid jeopardy. *See Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Salazar*, 804 F. Supp. 2d 987, 1002 (D. Ariz. 2011)
6 (finding unlawful BiOp that relied on water saving mitigation projects where court had difficulty
7 ascertaining exactly what projects were planned and the estimated water savings were uncertain); *see also*
8 *Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 184 F. Supp. 3d 861, 873 (D. Or. 2016)
9 (confidence intervals used in proposed mitigation measures were so broad “that falling within them is
10 essentially meaningless”); *Nat. Res. Def. Council v. Kempthorne*, 506 F. Supp. 2d 322, 356 (E.D. Cal.
11 2007) (finding it inappropriate to adopt adaptive management process as a mitigation measure, where
12 adaptive management process has no quantified objectives and does not require that actions ever be
13 taken).

14 A court must “strike a difficult balance in reviewing the enforcement strategy outlined in the
15 administrative record. The court cannot substitute its judgment for that of the expert agency tasked with
16 adaptively managing [a natural resource], however, the court must also ensure that there are substantive
17 measures in place to deal with noncompliance.” *Oregon Nat. Desert Ass’n v. Tidwell*, 716 F. Supp. 2d
18 982, 1002 (D. Or. 2010). Here, is impossible to tell from the record whether idling transfers will be
19 permitted from areas marked on Attachment A maps as having known snake occurrences or whether
20 “case-by-case” evaluation would result in transfers being precluded from these areas. This is because the
21 BiOp does not define the term “known priority snake population,” and the exemplar locations suggest
22 that not all marked occurrences qualify for treatment as an area of known priority snake population. This
23 must be clarified on remand.

24 Relatedly, as the BiOp indicates, “by far the most serious threat to snakes continues to be loss
25 and fragmentation of habitat.” AR 7939. Plaintiffs argue that the BiOp fails to consider harm to GGS

1 from habitat fragmentation. ECF No. 45 at 53; ECF No. 51 at 29. In the effects analysis section of the
2 BiOp, the BiOp reasons that “[b]y requiring crop idling/substitution to occur away from high priority
3 habitat and areas with high likelihood of snake occurrence, and by maintaining movement corridors for
4 snakes in areas where crop idling occurs, it is expected that snakes will be able to reach suitable habitat
5 despite drying due to crop idling.” AR 7943 (emphasis added). But, at least one aspect of the above
6 sentence is inconsistent with the language of the actual conservation measures, which do not “requir[e]
7 crop idling/substitution to occur away from high priority habitat areas,” or at least do not clearly
8 delineate how such prohibitions would apply. To the contrary, the BiOp permits crop idling/substitution
9 in so-called “priority habitat” so long as “adequate water” remains available for those “priority habitat”
10 areas. AR 7925. The BiOp’s use of the term “adequate water” is confusing and requires some
11 explanation. First, the conservation measures require all water sellers will keep “adequate water” in
12 major irrigation and drainage canals. AR 7925. In connection with this requirement, the BiOp defines
13 “adequate water” as water at depths similar to years when transfers do not occur, or at least two feet
14 where information on existing water depth is limited. *Id.* Second, water sellers proposing transfers from
15 idled rice fields will ensure that “adequate water is available for priority habitat with a high likelihood of
16 giant garter snake occurrence.” *Id.* “Priority habitat” is defined as “fields abutting or immediately
17 adjacent to federal wildlife refuges” and areas indicated on the priority habitat maps discussed above. *Id.*
18 The very next paragraph explains what adequate water means in the context of “priority habitat”:

19 Maintaining water in smaller drains and conveyance infrastructure
20 supports key habitat attributes such as emergent vegetation for snake for
21 escape cover and foraging habitat. If crop idling/shifting occurs in priority
22 habitat areas, Reclamation will work with contractors to document that
23 adequate water remains in drains and canals in those priority areas.

22 AR 7925. If the BiOp intended the “high priority areas” in which it promises to not permit crop idling to
23 be something other than the “priority areas” indicated in the above-quoted conservation measures
24 section, it provides no clear explanation of that distinction. This too must be clarified on remand.

1 Plaintiffs also argue that the conservation measures were legally inadequate because (1) they
2 permitted idled parcels to be located adjacent to or across from other idled parcels; and (2) they
3 permitted idling of individual parcels on more than two consecutive years. The Final BiOp
4 acknowledges that fallowing fields in a “checkerboard pattern” may be beneficial to snakes and
5 indicated that long term fallowing can reduce or eliminate habitat. AR 7939. So far as the Court can
6 determine, the BiOp does not explain how, in light of these findings, the conservation measures avoid
7 jeopardy. A BiOp is arbitrary and capricious if it fails to “consider the relevant factors and articulate a
8 rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S.*
9 *Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 698 F.3d 1101, 1121 (9th Cir. 2012). Here, the BiOp explicitly considers the
10 issue of fallowing patterns (both spatial and temporal) and acknowledges the import of those patterns,
11 but then fails to articulate why the conservation measures avoid jeopardy, in light of the fact that the
12 measures contain no constraints on how close fallowed fields may be to one another nor any limit on the
13 number of consecutive years a field may lie fallow.

14 Relatedly, Plaintiffs argue the BiOp’s acceptance of these conservation measures as avoiding
15 jeopardy conflicts with the BiOp’s own findings that: (1) “both rice fields and canals are important
16 habitats for the snake” (AR 7932); and (2) “[d]itches, canals and other agricultural conveyances
17 typically provide limited cover” and that large predators are typically more prevalent in ditches and
18 canals (AR 7942). The BiOp appears to explain that the conservation measures’ focus on prioritizing
19 retention of water in drains and canals is sufficient because “canals and ditches known to be suitable for
20 snakes . . . represent 85% of the known snake occurrence.” *Id.* But, even assuming snakes are found
21 more frequently in canals and ditches, this does not explain why it is acceptable to focus on retention of
22 water in canals and ditches to the detriment of maintaining appropriate rice field habitat the BiOp itself
23 considers “important.” This is particularly troubling in light of the discussion above finding that the
24 conservation measure that prohibits cropland idling/shifting in “[a]reas with known priority snake
25
26

1 populations,” unlawfully imprecise.⁵⁹ As to the above described areas of concern, Plaintiffs’ motion for
2 summary judgment that the BiOp’s conservation measures are unlawful is GRANTED; Federal
3 Defendants’ and Defendant Intervenors’ cross-motions are DENIED.

4 Several other specific challenges leveled by Plaintiffs are less compelling. For example,
5 Plaintiffs suggest that adopting the conservation measures was arbitrary and capricious because they
6 contain no block size restrictions. ECF No. 45 at 53. Mr. Hanson’s letter states that the 320 acre block
7 size restriction imposed in the past was the product of “expert consensus” reflecting “special extent
8 consistent with documented giant garter snake movement patterns” based upon “extensive mark-
9 recapture and radiotelemetry data on [GGS] home range and movement” in fragmented rice landscapes
10 since the 1990s. AR 47654. But, neither Mr. Hanson nor Plaintiffs point to any study or record
11 document that suggests the 320 acre block size restriction (or, for that matter, any block size restriction
12 at all) is the ideal (let alone the only) approach to GGS conservation that would avoid jeopardy. In fact,
13 as Federal Defendants point out, in a 2010 BiOp, FWS acknowledged that it had “no data” that:

14 indicate the extent that snakes successfully relocate and assimilate into
15 adjacent or nearby habitat when rice lands are fallowed, the extent to
16 which the configuration of the landscape mosaic of rice fields and
17 fallowed rice affects the success of individuals to assimilate, the extent to
18 which snake population trends respond not only to following but to
19 subsequent increases in rice cultivation, or the degree to which fluctuation
20 in rice acreage over time mirrors variability in the snake population over
21 time.

22 AR 652. Without more, this boils down to a disagreement among experts that must be resolved in favor
23 of Federal Defendants. *San Luis v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d at 603-04 (“[W]hen specialists express conflicting
24

25 ⁵⁹ The Court is not moved by Federal Defendants’ contention that the conservation measures address uncertainties in how
26 snakes will respond to the conservation measures through adaptive management. The adaptive management in question is so
non-specific as to be essentially meaningless, save that it promises what is already required by law: reinitiation of
consultation should the project have unanticipated effects. AR 7926; *see also* 50 C.F.R. § 402.16. (requiring agency to
reinitiate consultation where two elements are present: (1) “discretionary Federal involvement or control over the action has
been retained or is authorized by law”; and (2) “new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or
critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered.”). As mentioned, to support a no jeopardy finding,
conservation measures must be “reasonably specific, certain to occur, and capable of implementation; they must be subject to
deadlines or otherwise-enforceable obligations; and most important, they must address the threats to the species in a way that
satisfies the jeopardy and adverse modification standards.” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 198 F. Supp. 2d at 1152.

1 views, an agency must have discretion to rely on the reasonable opinions of its own qualified experts
2 even if, as an original matter, a court might find contrary views more persuasive.”) (internal citation and
3 quotation omitted).

4 Plaintiffs also challenge the following additional conservation measure that requires all
5 Reclamation contracts with sellers to reflect that:

6 Sellers will continue to voluntarily perform snake best management
7 practices, including educating maintenance personnel to recognize and
8 avoid contact with snakes, cleaning only one side of a conveyance channel
9 per year, and implementing other measures to enhance habitat for snakes.

10 AR 7926. Plaintiffs argue that requiring Reclamation to include in its contracts the requirement that a
11 contractor abide by “voluntary” best management practices is meaningless, as “including a voluntary
12 term in a contract does not transform it into a mandatory term.” ECF No. 51 at 28. The Court does not
13 agree. This is imprecise drafting, at best, but the Court accepts Federal Defendants’ position that
14 Reclamation’s project description and the BiOp require implementation of the best management
15 practices. ECF No. 59 at 16-17. As to these remaining issues Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment
16 that the BiOp’s conservation measures are unlawful is DENIED; Federal Defendants’ and Defendant
17 Intervenors’ cross-motions are GRANTED.

18 **C. Remaining CEQA Challenge to Assessment of Impacts to Giant Garter Snake**

19 As explained above, Plaintiffs argue that the FEIS/R fails to satisfy CEQA’s requirements with
20 respect to analysis of the Project’s impacts on Giant Garter Snake (“GGS”). The FEIS/R concludes that
21 “[c]ropland idling/shifting actions under the Proposed Action would have a less than significant impact
22 on giant garter snakes because a relatively small proportion (no more than 10.5 percent of the rice
23 acreage) would be affected in any given year” and the “Environmental Commitments” described in the
24 Project would “avoid or reduce many of the potential impacts associated with this activity and the
25 displacement of giant garter snake that could result.” AR 26016. Plaintiffs take issue with this
26 conclusion on two central grounds. First, they argue the FEIS/R fails to explain how following 10.5

1 percent of rice acreage is less than significant in light of the fact that, according to the BiOp, “[b]y far
2 the most serious threat[] to [GGS] continues to be loss and fragmentation of habitat from urban and
3 agricultural development and loss of habitat associated with changes in rice production.” AR 7939; *see*
4 *also* ECF No. 45 at 30-31. In particular, the BiOp indicates “the quantification of habitat loss as a result
5 of the proposed action serves as a direct surrogate for the snakes that will be lost.” AR 7945. Thus,
6 Plaintiffs contend, “a loss of 10.5% of available habitat would presumably result in the same or similar
7 percentage of population loss.” ECF No. 45 at 31. Plaintiffs point out that the FEIS/R does not explain
8 how such a loss would not constitute a “substantial adverse effect” on the GGS population. *Id.*

9 The Authority responds by pointing out, correctly, that Plaintiffs’ description of the factual
10 picture is overly simplistic, in part because, “idling would be focused in areas where [GGS] occurrence
11 probability is low.” AR 27449. But, as discussed above, the Environmental Commitments designed to
12 ensure that idling would be focused in areas where GGS occurrence probability is low are fatally
13 unclear. As a result, the Court finds that the FEIS/R cannot lawfully rely on the Environmental
14 Commitments to avoid evaluating what may otherwise be a substantial adverse effect. As to Plaintiffs’
15 motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R’s reliance on Environmental Commitments in relation to
16 its analysis of impacts to GGS violates CEQA, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is GRANTED;
17 the Authority’s cross-motion is DENIED.

18 Plaintiffs raise a separate challenge to the FIES/R’s CEQA analysis under *Lotus*, 223 Cal. App.
19 4th at 655-56, a case discussed at length above. As mentioned, *Lotus* concerned an EIR for a highway
20 construction project through an old growth redwood forest that would have required construction
21 activity in and around numerous protected trees.. *Id.* at 649. Certain “avoidance minimization and/or
22 mitigation measures” were incorporated into the project to “avoid and minimize impacts as well as to
23 mitigate expected impacts,” including numerous procedures designed solely to avoid impact to the trees.
24 *Id.* at 650-51. In part because of these mitigation measures, the EIR concluded there would be no
25 significant environmental effects caused by the project. *Id.* at 651. The California Court of Appeal found

1 the EIR unlawful, in part because it incorporated the proposed mitigation measures into its description of
2 the project before concluding that any potential impacts from the project were less than significant. *Id.* at
3 655-56. The “avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures,” as they were characterized in the
4 *Lotus* EIR, were not “part of the project,” but, rather, were “mitigation measures designed to reduce or
5 eliminate the damage to the redwoods anticipated from disturbing the structural root zone of the trees by
6 excavation and placement of impermeable materials over the root zone.” *Id.* at 656. In this way, the EIR
7 improperly “compress[ed] the analysis of impacts and mitigation measures into a single issue,” thereby
8 “disregard[ing] the requirements of CEQA.” *Id.* This type of failure was deemed dangerous because the
9 lack of analysis and findings about the extent of impacts makes it impossible to determine if the
10 mitigation measures are sufficient. *Id.*

11 Unlike the concept of carriage water, which, as the Court found above, serves both project and
12 mitigation purposes, *see supra* Part IV.A.2.b, there can be no such finding in connection with the
13 Environmental Commitments related to controlling where idling may or may not occur. No Defendant
14 argues and the Court can find no evidence to support a finding that those Environmental Commitments
15 serve any independent project purpose. Therefore, incorporating these Commitments into the project
16 description runs afoul CEQA according to *Lotus*. No party argues that *Lotus* was wrongly decided.
17 Accordingly, the FEIS/R’s analysis of GGS does not comport with CEQA for this additional reason. As
18 to Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment that the FEIS/R’s analysis of impacts to GGS violates *Lotus*,
19 Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is GRANTED; the Authority’s cross-motion is DENIED.

20 **V. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

21 For the reasons set forth above:

22 (1) Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN
23 PART;

24 (2) Federal Defendants’ motion for summary judgment is GRANTED IN PART AND
25 DENIED IN PART; and

1 (3) The Authority's motion for summary judgment is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED
2 IN PART.

3 As the Court has concluded that both challenged documents (the FEIS/R and the BiOp) are at
4 least in some part unlawful, the parties are directed to meet and confer before submitting a joint
5 proposed form of judgment that identifies a schedule for remand and/or a joint proposed schedule for
6 any anticipated further proceedings in this case. Any such documents(s) shall be filed on or before
7 March 16, 2018.

8 The Court has provided ample and specific direction to give the parties and counsel what they
9 need to make this happen without further involvement by this Court. The only matter beyond the control
10 of the Court is a desire by both sides to accomplish this directive. The Court relies on the duty,
11 competence, and professionalism of those involved to accomplish the mission.

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: February 15, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE